

Structure and Symmetry in Terence's *Adelphoe*

MARK L. DAMEN

With all that has been said, it seems impossible to say something new about the last act of Terence's *Adelphoe*.¹ Incredible as it sounds, however, there is a perspective which has not been taken and sheds light on the controversial ending of the play. Past arguments have dealt, for the most part, with the specific nature of Terence's adaptation and whether or not the

¹ The bibliography on this problem is extensive. H. Marti, "Terenz 1909–1959," *Lustrum* 8 (1963) 72–79, reviews scholarship on *Adelphoe* prior to 1960. The bibliography provided by F. H. Sandbach, "Donatus' Use of the Name Terentius and the End of Terence's *Adelphoe*," *BICS* 25 (1978) 123–45, catalogs work up to 1976. S. M. Goldberg, "Scholarship on Terence and the Fragments of Roman Comedy: 1959–1980," *CW* 75 (1981) 96–100, discusses more recent contributions. The work on *Adelphoe* with direct bearing on this study is:

- W. G. Amott, "The End of Terence's *Adelphoe*: A Postscript," *G&R* 10 (1963) 140–44
 W. G. Amott, *Menander, Plautus, Terence* (Oxford 1975) 54–55
 K. Büchner, *Terenz: Adelphen*, in *Studien zur römischen Literatur* 8 (Wiesbaden 1970), esp. 1–20
 M. Damen, "Reconstructing the Beginning of Menander's *Adelphoi* (B)," *ICS* 12 (1987) 67–84
 G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952)
 E. Fantham, "Hautontimorumenos and *Adelphoe*: A Study of Fatherhood in Terence and Menander," *Latomus* 30 (1971) 983–96
 W. E. Forehand, "Syrus' Role in Terence's *Adelphoe*," *CJ* 69 (1973) 52–56
 W. E. Forehand, *Terence* (Boston 1985) 104–19
 S. M. Goldberg, *Understanding Terence* (Princeton 1986), esp. 23–28
 J. N. Grant, "The Ending of Terence's *Adelphoe* and the Menandrian Original," *AJP* 96 (1975) 42–60
 N. A. Greenberg, "Success and Failure in the *Adelphoe*," *CW* 73 (1979–80) 221–36
 W. R. Johnson, "Micio and the Perils of Perfection," *CSCA* 1 (1968) 171–86
 E. Lefèvre, "La structure des *Adelphes* de Térrence comme critère d'analyse," in *Théâtre et Spectacles dans l'Antiquité* (Leiden 1983) 169–79
 C. Lord, "Aristotle, Menander and the *Adelphoe* of Terence," *TAPA* 107 (1977) 183–202
 R. H. Martin, *Terence: Adelphoe* (Cambridge 1976)
 V. Pöschl, "Das Problem der Adelphen des Terenz," *S.B.* (Heidelberg 1975) 4. 5–24
 O. Reith, *Die Kunst Menanders in den 'Adelphen' des Terenz*, with appendix by K. Gaiser (Hildesheim 1964), esp. 101–20
 F. H. Sandbach, "Donatus' Use of the Name Terentius and the End of Terence's *Adelphoe*," *BICS* 25 (1978) 123–45
 H. Tränkle, "Micio und Demea in den terenzischen Adelphen," *Mus. Helv.* 29 (1972) 241–55 (Henceforth, all of the above will be cited by last name only.)

Latin text might resemble the Greek original in detail.² Because, however, the question is largely one of whether Terence has added scenes, not merely words, to Menander's drama, it seems advisable to back up and view the play as a whole, that is, to analyze the scenic structure of *Adelphoe* and evaluate its ending in light of the general arrangement of events in the drama.³ Such analysis, we will see, supports the conclusion that in the finale Terence has followed Menander's general design of scenes, if not also his words.

Let us begin by breaking the entire play into the general sequences of action that carry the plot forward:⁴

1. *Micio and Demea* (26–154). The older brothers explain and demonstrate the basic situation: Demea has given his older son Aeschinus to his brother Micio for adoption but has kept and raised his younger son Ctesipho. Micio and Demea are very different fathers. Micio is generous and indulgent, Demea strict and gruff. Although the sons are now adults, the fathers still argue over whose method of child-rearing is better and analyze both sons' behavior for evidence of their own success and the other's failure.

2. *Ctesipho* (155–287). Ctesipho is united with his girlfriend Bacchis, a flute-player, through the efforts of his brother Aeschinus and Micio's slave Syrus and in spite of her owner, the pimp Sannio.

3. *Sostrata and Geta* (288–354). Micio's neighbor Sostrata has a daughter Pamphila who unbeknownst to Micio is pregnant with Aeschinus' child. Sostrata's servant Geta brings her news of Aeschinus' abduction of a flute-girl. Assuming Aeschinus is being unfaithful to her daughter, she

² Although both sides have made excellent points, the balance has tipped in favor of those who view the ending of the Roman comedy as a reflection, at least in its lineaments, of the Greek original; see Lord 194. The finales of Menander's recently recovered *Samia* and *Dyskolos* contain surprising turns in the plot, not unlike that in *Adelphoe*, though neither quite matches its unexpectedness; see A. Thierfelder, "Knemon, Demea, Micio," in *Menandrea, Miscellanea Philologica* (Genoa 1960) 107–12; Amott (1963) 142 ff., and (1975) 54: "The general ragging of Micio . . . is as Menandrian as anything in Terence." Those relatively few who believe Terence made substantial changes in the finale of Menander's play are cited and briefly summarized by Grant 43 n. 2; see below, note 25.

³ By "structure" I refer strictly to the larger framework of the play's action, as opposed to the wider application of the term commonly used to mean the arrangement of dramatic elements at any level; cf. Lefèvre 169–79; see also Büchner 17.

⁴ I employ the following terms, loosely borrowed from cinema, to designate the components of the plot (in descending order of length): *section*, one of two divisions of a double plot, comprising about half the story; *sequence*, a continuous block of action representing a major development in the drama, usually but not always spread over a series of scenes; *scene*, a subsection of a sequence, often consisting of a confrontation between two characters (e. g. Syrus and Sannio, Demea and Micio) which marks one step toward the resolution of the sequence. It should be noted that these divisions are based not on the movements of characters on and off stage but on developments in the plot; therefore, a scene may entail numerous exits and entrances, or a sequence very few. Also, *interstice* (see below, pp. 104–06), for lack of a perfect word, denotes a bridging sequence or series of sequences which links the two sections of a double plot.

sends Geta to inform Hegio, a friend of her late husband and a protector of the family.

4. *Demea and Syrus* (355–437). Demea returns to Micio's house where he encounters Syrus. To remove him from the vicinity, the slave tells him that Ctesipho, who is actually inside, is at their home in the country. Before departing, Demea pontificates on the benefits of strictness in educating children, after which Syrus mocks him by extrapolating his principles to the running of a kitchen.

5. *Hegio and Demea* (438–516). Geta brings Hegio to Sostrata's house. From them Demea learns that Aeschinus will soon become a father by the ravished Pamphila. Demea and later Hegio go in search of Micio.

6. *Aeschinus* (517–712). Aeschinus' love affair is brought to light. After Syrus once again sends Demea away, this time on a wild-goose chase, Micio gives Aeschinus permission to marry Pamphila.

7. *Demea and Micio* (713–62). Back from his fool's errand, Demea finally meets up with Micio. Still thinking Aeschinus has abducted Bacchis for himself, he strongly objects to Micio's proposed cohabitation of flute-girl and mother. Micio leaves his brother in the dark about Ctesipho's involvement with Bacchis and urges him to let the matter rest and join the festivities.

At this point the sequence leading to the problematical ending begins. Demea discovers by accident that Ctesipho is inside Micio's house. When he enters, he sees his son with a flute-girl. The ending itself then commences with his third encounter with Micio. From here the dramatic action accelerates considerably. Events come in rapid succession, climaxing in Micio's sudden wedding and the precipitous liberation of Syrus.

8. *Micio and Demea* (787–881). Demea confronts Micio with his breach of their non-intervention pact. Obviously in the wrong, Micio counters with a sophistical argument of little substance but enough smoke to confound his already shaken adversary. He encourages his brother to erase his bad mood and join in the wedding party. In the most surprising turn of events in the play, Demea agrees, going so far as to adopt Micio's generous, affable persona.

9. *Syrus* (882–88). Syrus is the first to encounter this "new" Demea who greets his former foe with kind words. Syrus retreats, uncustomarily speechless.

10. *Geta* (889–98). Geta also receives kind words and praise from Demea, a man who hardly knows him and cannot even remember his name.

11. *Aeschinus* (899–923). When Aeschinus appears impatient at the wedding preparations, Demea puts the theory of indulgence into action and bids him dismiss formalities and break the wall down between Micio's and Sostrata's houses.

12. *Sostrata and Hegio* (923–58). Hearing about Demea's proposed demolition, Micio confronts his brother, who not only reconciles him to a

broken wall but also convinces him to marry Sostrata and bestow on Hegio a sizeable tract of land.

13. *Syrus* (958–83). Syrus reappears and at Demea's behest again Micio gives him his freedom, as well as his wife's freedom and a loan of money.

14. *Demea and Micio* (984–97). Finally, Micio demands Demea account for his uncharacteristic generosity. Demea explains that he wanted to demonstrate that Micio's way of life was "not sincere or essentially right and good, but derived from complacency, indulgence and free-spending" (986–87).

The play divides into two, clearly separate sections: a first and longer section (sequences 1–7, above) in which Micio with charm and smooth sophistication triumphs over Demea, and a second (8–14) in which Demea defeats Micio at his own game. These two sections are separated by an interstice in which Demea learns that Micio has broken his pledge not to interfere in the upbringing of Demea's son. Each section opens and closes with an argument between Micio and Demea (1/7, 8/14). These four confrontations clearly serve as the boundary markers of the sections and fall into symmetrical pairs. The outer pair (1 and 14) shows Micio the weaker of the two older brothers: in 1, Demea informs him of Aeschinus' abduction of a flute-girl and he must on the spot rationalize his son's behavior to his righteously indignant brother; and in 14, Micio accepts the loss of his bachelorhood, his slave Syrus, land, money and, most important, his favored status in Aeschinus' and Ctesipho's eyes.⁵ In the inner pair (7 and 8) Micio prevails over his brother.⁶ Twice he forces Demea to allow him to dictate the proper treatment of both sons, once by deceiving

⁵ It could be added that sequences 1 and 14 are linked by *aequum et bonum*, a phrase both Micio and Demea use in criticizing each other's educational methods (*nimum ipsest durus praeter aequomque et bonum*, 64; *id non fieri ex vera vita neque adeo ex aequo et bono*, 987); see Johnson 185 n. 21, Martin 28–29, 239. Whether Terence is imitating a similar verbal echo in Menander is, of course, impossible to determine, but Demea's mimicry of Micio's words follows well from the general structure of the play which is, I believe, attributable to Menander; see below, p. 100. It should be noted, however, that parallel phrases do not, for the most part, fit neatly into parallel sequences, e. g. 833–34 = 953–54. Nor should we expect them to. The structure of balanced sequences is a comprehensive map the details of which do not have to correspond in the same way as the general structure and, in fact, would look over-calculated and unnatural if they did. By making cross-references between sequences which are not parallel, the playwright gives the play a more natural, less contrived texture. After all, a play is not a mathematical equation and must seem simultaneously spontaneous and carefully orchestrated. Conceived first, the general structure gives the play coherence and conveys to the audience a feeling of unity, that they are watching a single event despite its many pieces. On the other hand, the words, which represent a different part of the creative process, are added later, naturally with resonances throughout the play, not solely in accordance with the general structure of which they are not a part, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 347E–F. The carefully balanced sequencing is the guiding principle of the play, while verbal echoes bind its fabric and keep it from falling into rigid, self-contained segments.

⁶ See Johnson 180: "The brothers' third confrontation (787–854) ends with the triumph of Micio, . . ."

Demea—or rather not enlightening him about Ctesipho's situation—and once by convincing a startled Demea to become more easygoing. Both sequences end with Micio inducing his angry brother to join in the festivities. The outer pair of Micio–Demea confrontations holds the play together, while the inner demarcates the most important transition in the plot, Demea's change of heart.

Within the first section (sequences 1–7) there is a carefully balanced arrangement of action:

1. Micio and Demea: Micio's Indulgence (26–154)
2. Ctesipho's Affair (155–287)
 3. The Neighbors: Sostrata and Geta (288–354)
 4. Demea and Syrus: The Benefits of Strictness (355–437)
 5. The Neighbors: Hegio and Geta (438–516)
6. Aeschinus' Affair (517–712)
7. Demea and Micio: The (Temporary) Victory of Indulgence (713–62)

Micio and Demea confront each other at the beginning and end of the section. As we move in toward the center, the next sequences (2 and 6) highlight the troubled love affairs of the younger brothers, first Ctesipho and later Aeschinus. Inside these, sequences 3 and 5 involve the neighbors whose daughter has been impregnated by Aeschinus. The news of the abduction reaches Sostrata in the first sequence and Hegio in the second; both misread the situation the same way. At the center of this section Demea confronts Syrus, who cleverly insults him and keeps him at bay by misinforming him of Ctesipho's whereabouts.

A close comparison of the parallel sequences confirms the correctness of this division of the action. Sequences 1 and 7 are similar in that both entail confrontations between Micio and Demea. Sequences 3 and 5 also bear a remarkable resemblance in basic design:

3. The Neighbors: Sostrata and Geta
 1. Sostrata's Worries: Pamphila's pregnancy (288–98)
 2. Geta's Bad News: Bacchis' Abduction (299–350)
 3. Geta leaves to appeal for help from Hegio (350–54)
5. The Neighbors: Hegio and Geta
 1. Hegio's Worries: Aeschinus' Dishonor (438–59)
 2. Hegio's Bad News: Pamphila's pregnancy (460–510)
 3. Hegio leaves to appeal for justice from Micio (511–16)

Sostrata's worries about Pamphila's situation in scene 3. 1 parallel Hegio's similar worries in 5. 1. Naturally, however, the mother dwells on her daughter's pain and anguish, while the surrogate father focuses on the young man who dishonored her. In 3. 2 and 5. 2, bad news about the future couple is delivered to their unsuspecting parents: Sostrata learns from Geta of Aeschinus' abduction of a flute-girl, and Demea learns from Hegio of Aeschinus' impending fatherhood. In 3. 3 and 5. 3, a protector of Pamphila

(Geta/Hegio) leaves to petition a higher authority (Hegio/Micio). In both scenes the "buck is passed" up the social ladder from slave to free man and from poor to rich man. Sequences 3 and 5 clearly comprise a contrasting pair as the neighbors, first the slaves and women and then the men, are drawn into Aeschinus' tangled web.

The same sort of affinity does not, however, exist between the other parallel sequences (2 and 6). This derives, no doubt, from Terence's insertion of a scene from Diphilos into sequence 2.⁷ His reworking has disrupted the original arrangement of scenes and the careful balancing of sequences. Even so, sequences 2 and 6 are not without similarities and their differences suggest the general nature of Terence's revision.⁸ Both have four scenes, but only four of those eight scenes (asterisked) are parallel to each other.

2. Ctesipho's Affair

1. Aeschinus/Sannio: The Payment of the Pimp (155-208)
- *2. Syrus/Sannio: Syrus fends Sannio from the door (209-53)
3. Syrus/Ctesipho: The Nervous Son (254-64)
- *4. Aeschinus/Ctesipho: Aeschinus scolds Ctesipho (265-87)

6. Aeschinus' Affair

1. Syrus/Ctesipho: The Nervous Son, Again (517-37)
- *2. Syrus/Demea: Syrus fends Demea from the door (537-91)
3. Micio/Hegio: The Permission for Aeschinus' Marriage (592-609)
- *4. Micio/Aeschinus: Micio chastises Aeschinus (610-712)

In scenes 2. 2 and 6. 2 Syrus fends a hostile intruder (Sannio/Demea) from the door.⁹ In 2. 4 and 6. 4 a young man whose love affair has been rescued

⁷ Ad. 6-11.

⁸ See Damen 67-84, esp. bibliography in note 1.

⁹ Lefèvre, 171-76, argues unconvincingly that Terence has added scenes 1-2 of sequence 6 (traditionally act 4, scenes 1-2). Although he is correct that these scenes do not in strict terms advance the plot, he fails to see their importance in the overall action. Syrus' second dismissal of Demea, the wild-goose chase, keeps Demea away from Micio's house during a critical juncture in the plot. With Demea gone, Ctesipho's love affair will not be disclosed and Micio and Aeschinus can resolve their business unmolested (see below, pp. 97-98). The duplication of plot elements is so common in Menander that the recapitulation of the Syrus-Demea confrontation comprises a stronger argument for than against Menandrian origin; cf. the double deception in *Dis Exapaton*, the double eviction of Chrysis in *Samia*, Euelio's beating of Congrio and later the Servus Lyconidis in *Aulularia*, Knemon's successive rejection of Getas and Sikon in *Dyskolos*. Lefèvre's suggestion (176-78) that 763-86, the turning point between the sections, was also added to Menander's play by Terence is unfounded. There is no evidence, and it is indeed highly implausible, that the crucial revelation of Ctesipho's affair and Micio's perfidious involvement come from Micio himself (Lefèvre 178).

The seemingly unmotivated entrance of Ctesipho and Syrus (517) also does not constitute an argument for Terentian reworking. More than once Menander brings conversations "that would more realistically be ended indoors" out onto the stage for the audience's benefit; cf. *Perik.* 708, *Ad.* 288; see Martin 150, with reference to Gomme-Sandbach 514. It should be noted that for whatever purpose Terence has left unstated the obvious reason for Ctesipho's and Syrus' conversation to take place outside: Ctesipho is urging Syrus to stand guard at the doors and

from the brink of disaster (Ctesipho/Aeschinus) is chastised by an older relative (Aeschinus/Micio) for failure to seek help sooner (272/691). Unlike these, 2. 1 and 2. 3 have little in common with their counterparts 6. 1 and 6. 3. Rather, the converse seems truer. 2. 3 and 6. 1 bear a close resemblance in that they feature the same characters, Ctesipho and Syrus. In both scenes Ctesipho displays his inability to handle his own business. 2. 1 and 6. 3 are also similar in their purpose, if not their characters, insofar as in both reparation for a wrong (abduction/rape) is promised to an injured party (Sannio/Hegio) by an older relative (Aeschinus/Micio) of the person responsible for the injury (Ctesipho/Aeschinus). To gauge by the "uncontaminated" sequence (6), we can see that Terence's adaptation of sequence 2 probably consisted largely of inverting scenes 2. 1 and 2. 3. If we reverse these scenes and bring Ctesipho on in 2. 1 and Aeschinus in 2. 3, the same sort of balance that is found in sequences 3 and 5 is restored to 2 and 6.¹⁰ The diagram below illustrates a possible reconstruction of the original disposition of scenes in sequence 2 (reconstructed scenes in italics):

2. Ctesipho's Affair (155–287)

1. *Syrus/Ctesipho: The Nervous Son*
2. Syrus/Sannio: Syrus fends Sannio from the door
3. *Aeschinus/Sannio: The Payment of the Pimp*
4. Aeschinus/Ctesipho: Aeschinus scolds Ctesipho

6. Aeschinus' Affair

1. Syrus/Ctesipho: The Nervous Son, Again (517–37)
2. Syrus/Demea: Syrus fends Demea from the door (537–91)
3. Micio/Hegio: The Permission for Aeschinus' Marriage (592–609)
4. Micio/Aeschinus: Micio chastises Aeschinus (610–712)

From this it is clear that the sequences of the first section are arranged in parallel around the central confrontation of Syrus and Demea.

keep Demea away, just as he kept Sannio away before. Nor does Syrus' later entrance (763) lack motivation: *sed postquam intus sum omnium rerum satur, / prodeambulare huc lubitum est* (765–66). He is tipsy (591) and wants to escape the bedlam of wedding preparations inside Micio's house. It is not an incontestable motivation to enter but it is perfectly adequate in a comedy. Lefèvre may be correct that Terence has played up the classic comic confrontation of slave and irascible old man, but I see no compelling evidence that Menander's play excluded these scenes altogether. Sandbach, 129–30, sees in Donatus the possibility of an implied comparison between Terence's and Menander's version of 539 (in 4. 1); cf. also his comments on Donatus at 541, 560 and 578 (pp. 133–34).

¹⁰ This reconstruction presupposes that Syrus has smuggled Aeschinus and Bacchis into the house under Micio's nose and they are already waiting inside Micio's house at the beginning of the play; see Damen 75 f. Such surreptitious activity on the part of slaves in New Comedy is not unparalleled. The unnamed Servus Lyconidis of *Aulularia* returns to Megadorus' house and hides the stolen gold without anyone noting his presence (701–12). Overall, it is fair to say that some slaves in New Comedy are sneaky and at times evade those whom we might expect to notice them.

Remarkably, the same sort of design exists for the controversial ending:

8. Micio and Demea: The Benefits of Indulgence (787–881)
9. Demea and Syrus: Kind Words for an Old Enemy (882–88)
10. Demea and Geta: Kind Words for a Stranger (889–98)
11. Demea and Aeschinus: Indulgence in Action (899–923)
12. Demea provides for the neighbors at Micio's expense (923–58)
13. Demea obtains freedom and money for Syrus (958–83)
14. Demea and Micio: The Evils of Indulgence (984–97)

As in the first section, Micio and Demea open and close the second section (sequences 8 and 14). In sequences 9 and 13 Demea rewards the cunning Syrus, first with kind words and later with freedom and money. In sequences 10 and 12 Micio's poor neighbors reap the benefits of Demea's "new" demeanor. In the central sequence (11), Demea pampers Aeschinus, impatient with the wedding preparations, and suggests he destroy Micio's wall.

The central sequence marks a fundamental change in Demea's methods. Up to this point, he has indulged himself only in Micio's affable rhetoric, but from 11 on he puts his new language into effect. The sequence itself demonstrates this transition from word to action.¹¹ Demea first receives the impatient Aeschinus with caring words (899–904) and then suggests, later orders, that the garden wall be torn down (905–16). The other sequences are aligned around this transition. In 9 Demea promises to do Syrus a favor and in 13 he delivers on his promise by securing Syrus' and his wife's freedom, as well as a loan from Micio. In 10 Demea expresses his good will toward Geta as a loyal representative of his family's interests and in 12 puts those words into action by securing Micio's marriage to Sostrata, Geta's mistress.

The two major sections of action, the body of the play (sequences 1–7) and the ending (sequences 8–14), are designed on the same type of pattern, in spite of the fact that the first is considerably longer than the second. Both sections have seven sequences which are arranged in parallel groups enclosing a central sequence but their congruity runs deeper than that. Not only are they similar in structure but the sequences are also parallel in content. Both sections begin and end with dialogues between Micio and Demea (sequences 1/7 and 8/14). Demea dominates the central sequences (4 and 11) of both sections. The neighbors' travails and triumphs occupy the

¹¹ Demea's words at 877–78 forecast this intention to imitate first Micio's words and then his actions: *age, age, nunciam experiamur contra ecquid ego possiem / blande dicere aut benigne facere, . . .* He expresses his intention first "to speak sweetly" and then "to act kindly." Martin, 228–29, sees a transition in sequence 11, but of a different sort. In his view, Demea's intentions modulate from an earnest attempt to adopt his brother's *mores* to a realization that he can have it both ways by billing Micio for his own acts of generosity. The best that can be said for this is that the transition at 911–15, if it exists, is well disguised; see below, note 25.

sequences (3/5 and 10/12) on either side of the central ones, and enveloping those are ones (2/6 and 9/13) in which Syrus dominates the action.¹²

A closer examination of both sections, sequence by sequence, will clarify their affinities. Of course, no sequences in drama are identical or even perfectly parallel and these present no exceptions. The differences that the parallel sequences exhibit are as interesting as their similarities and link them equally well through inversion or contrasted imitation of the action in the parallel sequence. Furthermore, because the second section is clearly designed to invert the first (i. e. Demea point by point steals victory away from Micio), we will find as much contrast as congruity and many ironies, especially where Demea is involved.¹³

¹² There is also an interesting and instructive contrast between the two sections. Whereas Micio dominates the first section and exerts his will mostly from offstage, Demea controls the action of the second section from the stage itself. Micio is on stage for fewer than three of seven sequences in the first section; Demea, however, never leaves the stage in the second. In fact, he is on stage overall almost twice as much as Micio (in 12 versus 7 sequences). Paradoxically, this arrangement works in Micio's behalf. While we are directly confronted with Demea's excessive generosity and malevolent kindnesses, Micio's extravagances we see mainly through others' eyes. For instance, it is left to us to imagine such unpleasant moments as Micio's shock at the revelation of Aeschinus' impending fatherhood, his decision to break his agreement with his brother and buy Bacchis for Ctesipho, his misplaced praise of Syrus for managing the abduction and his rationalization of Aeschinus' behavior to Sostrata's family. On the other hand, we see all of Demea's prejudices in action. His character leaves nothing to the imagination, except perhaps his mysterious conversion. It helps to understand the uneven presentation of the older brothers if we realize that the stage action is designed so as to make Micio seem more appealing by sequestering many of his more difficult moments offstage. Our imaginations naturally fill these voids with pleasant scenes as an extension of his pleasant disposition elsewhere. With Demea we are never given that opportunity. Micio would, perhaps, not appear so attractive if the action of the play took place in the market and we were exposed to his misjudgments as often as his brother's.

¹³ Many of Demea's retributions are prefigured in the earlier section of the play in things he hears or sees; cf. Forehand (1985) 119: "(the finale) is not so unexpected as it might appear at first glance." (That we should not expect the following echoes and parallels to occur in corresponding sequences, see above, note 5.) 1. Demea's seemingly sudden shift to excessive generosity is, in fact, clearly presignified by his general perception throughout the play that Micio's behavior is extravagant. 2. His involvement in Aeschinus' life is suggested by Micio's intrusion in Ctesipho's. 3. His conception of the form his revenge should take may be traced to Micio's insistence that he relax and join the day's festivities (754-56, 838-39, 842, 854); see Grant 58. 4. The idea of falsifying a change of heart (985-88) may be seen to stem from Micio's earlier lies about their sons' situations (745-54). 5. His request that, if Micio does not feel genuine shame at Aeschinus' behavior, he can at least pretend to be upset (733-34), also foreshadows the deceptive nature of Demea's conversion. 6. Micio's celebrated bachelorhood (43-44, 811-12) provokes Demea's famous match-making (928-46). 7. Micio's claim early in the play that, although Demea is Aeschinus' natural father, he himself is his "admonitory" (*consiliis*) father (126) evidently remained with Demea, because near the end of the comedy he affirms to Aeschinus that he is his father "in both spirit and nature" (902). 8. The proposed breach of the garden wall (908) recalls the luxurious outdoor furniture which is mentioned at the culmination of Demea's and Syrus' second confrontation, the wild-goose chase (585-86). 9. Demea's adulation of Syrus and Aeschinus in the later section of the play (903, 964-68) reflects his brother's praise of Syrus' and Aeschinus' part in abducting Bacchis (367-68). 10. Conversely, his attempt to flatter Geta is nearly undermined by his inability to

1/8. *Micio and Demea* (26–154, 787–881). These sequences open the major sections of the action. In both Micio, who is on stage first, lectures his brother on the proper education and evaluation of young men. Each time Micio must defend himself: In sequence 1, Demea brings news that Micio's indulgent son has beaten up an innocent man and abducted a prostitute, apparently for his own enjoyment; and in 8, Demea confronts him with a clear breach of his promise not to interfere in Ctesipho's life. Both times Micio covers up the inadequate performance of his doctrines with glib language and both times in spite of having right on his side Demea walks away without making his mark.¹⁴

The differences in these sequences highlight their similarities, and together they make it clear that the second is a new beginning, a parallel inversion of the first.¹⁵ Whereas Micio begins sequence 1 with a long soliloquy (26–77) outlining the history of his conflict with his brother and painting himself as a kind, caring father, Demea closes sequence 8 with a soliloquy (855–81) reviewing their conflict from his perspective and refurbishing himself with the same airs of an indulgent, loving father which Micio had given himself earlier.¹⁶ In the first, Micio all but loses the

remember Geta's name (891). Although in their earlier meeting Hegio mentioned it three times in his presence (447, 479, 506), the old, irascible Demea paid hardly any attention to the slave. Now the new Demea makes a poor attempt to compensate for his previous oversight with over-generous praise. 11. Finally, in answer to Micio's assertion that the bride will be accepted without a dowry and both she and Aeschinus' (supposed) mistress will live under his roof (728–29, 745–54), Demea suggests to Aeschinus that he should take his bride without the formalities of a wedding (905–10). Behind this preposterous suggestion lurks the shame and horror that Demea first registered when he learned of Aeschinus' irregular conduct in procreating his child (467–86, 721–34). Everything else has been done without regard for tradition, thinks Demea, why not the wedding, too?

I could also point to specific expressions used by Demea in the second section which echo earlier statements, mostly ones by Micio: e. g. 80–81 = 883, Duckworth 118 note 40; 746–48 = 909–10/925–27, 733–36 = 934, 72–73 = 967–68, Johnson 182 ff.; 934 = 107, Arnott (1975) 55; 42–43 = 863–64, Goldberg 101–02. Even though both occur in the same section, Sandbach (140–41, 145 n. 57) notes that Demea's later generosity at Micio's expense is foreshadowed by his earlier acceptance of the flute-girl with no mention of recompense to Micio who has paid for her (842–50). I include these specific ironies and echoes because they resemble the parallels and contrasts which we will find on the wider level of general plot construction when we compare the first and second sections. Clearly on all levels it is the playwright's intention to echo and invert the first section in the second.

¹⁴ Johnson's assessment of Demea is incisive, 177: "It is true that Demea lectures Micio on every possible occasion, that his lectures are funny and irritating (funny because irritating) even as his rage and self-pity are funny and irritating. But the wounds he gives are clean, and for all his energy and bluster he is not merely narrow-minded and tough but rather desperate and rather lonely as well."

¹⁵ P. W. Harsh, *A Handbook of Classical Drama* (Stanford 1944) 398: "This [soliloquy, 855–81] of Demea corresponds with that of Micio at the opening of the play." See below, note 40.

¹⁶ Fantham (977) compares 40–46 and 862–68; Johnson (181 f.) compares 39 and 865; Grant (49) compares 131–32 and 829–31, and also (p. 58) 50–51 and 879–80.

quarrel. The abduction casts his pedagogical methods in a very bad light. He must resort ultimately to a plea of *nolo contendere* by insisting Demea mind his own business and abide by the very agreement Micio himself will later break, the infringement of which will trigger the second section.¹⁷ In the aftermath of this first confrontation Micio all but admits defeat: *nec nil nec omnia haec sunt quae dicit* (141), "What he said is not completely wrong, or right." In the second section, Demea with much the same reluctance concedes defeat to Micio who through indulgence has won the love and admiration of his sons while he himself is feared and shunned: *miseriam omnem ego capio, hic potitur gaudia* (876), "Grief is my part, joy is his." Thus, these opening sequences of the two major sections are closely linked by a contrast in victor, just as we will see the final sequences (7/14) are also.¹⁸

2/9. *Syrus* (155–287, 882–88). The second sequences of the major sections feature Micio's crafty slave *Syrus*.¹⁹ Forehand rightly points out this character's importance in the drama.²⁰ *Syrus*' contribution to the successful outcome of the younger brothers' love affairs cannot be understated. Although Terence has obscured what was probably more explicit in Menander, the slave somehow played a crucial role in the abduction,²¹ then by a clever trick reconciled the pimp to the loss of the girl, helped convince Micio to pay for her and later fended Demea from Micio's house and kept him out of the way of the happy resolution of the love affairs. If such efforts can be construed as meritorious, *Syrus*' rewards in the later half of the play are well-earned and clearly anticipated in his activities in the first section.

In the comic climax of sequence 2, *Syrus* wins over the pimp, for the most part, with smooth words alone and accomplishes permanently what Aeschinus' violence could do only temporarily. It is fitting, then, that his rewards in the parallel sequence (9) come first in the form of kind words from his old rival. Suddenly sweet-natured and affable, Demea arouses *Syrus*' suspicions. Hence, the slave is uncharacteristically curt in his

¹⁷ Sandbach (139 f.) unsuccessfully defends Micio's infringement of his agreement with Demea, although he makes several important points.

¹⁸ See below, pp. 98–99; cf. Johnson (180–82) who gives a sensitive, dramatic reading of Demea's transitional soliloquy.

¹⁹ Aeschinus' role in the abduction (sequence 2) is not small but was to a large extent secluded offstage in Menander's play such that his audience was not really confronted with the young man's considerable involvement in the resolution of his brother's problems. Terence has changed that by adding the scene from Diphilos' *Synapothnescontes* which focuses attention on Aeschinus and the abduction rather than *Syrus* and its aftermath. Even so, the Roman drama deals less with Aeschinus than *Syrus*, who paves the way for the purchase of the flute-girl from the pimp and leaves only the final details to be settled by his young master.

²⁰ See Forehand (1973) 52–56; also (1985) 116: "(*Syrus*) is instrumental in helping the young men with their difficulties." The slave appears in as many scenes as Micio and has more lines than any character except the older brothers.

²¹ *Ad.* 315, 368, 560, 568, 967–68.

responses to Demea's compliments, does not pursue the old man's expressions of good will and at the first opportunity withdraws from conversation. Whereas in sequence 2 he brings down a battery of words and wisdom on Sannio, in 9 he has hardly ten words to say to Demea before he retreats from the scene. The contrasting length of the sequences is ironical and humorous, and the different pictures of Syrus, manipulating Sannio and being manipulated by Demea, fuse the sequences with the same sort of contrast by which the Micio-Demea sequences were linked above.

3/10. *The Neighbors: Sostrata and Geta* (288-354, 889-98). Sequence 3 demonstrates the neighbors' outraged reaction at Aeschinus' abduction of a flute-girl. Geta speaks in especially harsh tones of the whole family's misconduct. This sequence ends with Sostrata sending Geta off to bring back Hegio, her late husband's friend and their only protector. In sequence 10, Geta enters speaking back inside the house to Sostrata. He announces that he will see whether Aeschinus' family is ready to receive the bride. When Demea meets him, he praises Geta for having upheld the honor of the family for whom he works. Both sequences focus on the neighbors' problems entailing the same concern, Aeschinus' delay in claiming his bride (333-34, 889-90). Besides the obvious connection that Geta and Sostrata figure large in both sequences, Geta's harsh judgment of Demea's family and Demea's kind words for Geta link the sequences by contrast.

4/11. *Demea* (355-437, 899-923). These are the central sequences, the points around which the structure and themes of the play pivot. Both feature Demea, first the martinet who exercises stern control over Ctesipho and later the "new" Demea who practices leniency on Aeschinus. The extremes of his behavior create a contrast that binds these sequences together. In the earlier one he expounds his theory of child-rearing full of strong exhortations, "Do this!" and "Don't do that!" (417), with Syrus as a comic foil applying Demea's home wisdom to home economics. In the later sequence the seemingly reformed Demea puts into practice his newly adopted program of indulgence. In place of fierce admonitions and finger-wagging we find bland phrases like "What's wrong, Aeschinus?" (901) and, about his new-found indulgence, "That's the way I am" (923). The comparison of these sequences provides a glimpse of Ctesipho's life and its small but tragic ironies. In 4 Demea makes it clear that his son at home receives only discipline and disapproval from his father, but in the parallel sequence, when Demea has supposedly reformed, it is not Ctesipho but Aeschinus, his ever-fortunate brother, who reaps the rewards of their father's new-found leniency. These diametrically opposed views represent the essence of the change in Demea's character and duly occupy the focal points of the two major sections.

5/12. *The Neighbors: Hegio* (438-516, 923-58). Sequences 5 and 12, like 3 and 10, involve Micio's neighbors. These sequences are linked most closely through Hegio, who first appears in 5 as Sostrata's protector and later through Demea's efforts is rewarded in 12 with a gift of land. Thanks

again to Demea, Sostrata also is rewarded in the later sequence with marriage to Micio. Demea also links these sequences. In 5 he learns, much to his horror, of Aeschinus' impending fatherhood. His shock there makes an effective contrast to his later glee in 12 at Micio's sudden marriage. Parenthood and marriage, Demea and the virtuous but poor neighbors whose patience and good character earn them justified, if over-generous rewards, bridge and bind these sequences.²²

6/13. *Syrus and Micio* (517–712, 958–83). Just as in sequences 2 and 9, Syrus is again a dominant figure in 6 and 13. Micio, who also appears in both, connects these sequences as well. On the surface Syrus' role in 6 may seem purely comical, but under close inspection it becomes clear that he plays a crucial part in its successful outcome. His purposeful misdirection of Demea through the city, "the culmination of the Syrus role"²³ and arguably his finest hour, not only delivers laughter but also removes Demea from the scene and allows Micio and Aeschinus to resolve their business uninterrupted. Ironically, although Syrus deceives Demea in 6, in the parallel sequence 13 Demea rewards Syrus by persuading Micio to free him. It is a fitting vengeance on both Micio and Syrus that Demea removes his most formidable adversary from Micio's house, not through honest rage but treacherous generosity.

Also, in both sequences it is at Aeschinus' behest that Micio agrees against his personal interests to lend support to a weaker party, in 6 the undowered Pamphila and in 13 the slave Syrus.²⁴ In both cases his

²² Another link between sequences 5 and 12 may be found in the contrast between Pamphila's fertility (486–87) and her mother Sostrata's sterility (931).

²³ Forehand (1973) 56.

²⁴ The three-actor rule prohibits a speaking actor from playing Aeschinus after 916; see Sandbach 138. One actor plays Aeschinus and Syrus; see Damen 80–81:

Lines	Actor 1	Actor 2	Actor 3	Mute Actor	Terence's Additions
855–81		Demea			
882–88		Demea	Syrus		
889–98	Geta	Demea			Syrus
899–916	Geta	Demea	Aeschinus		Syrus
917–19	Geta	Demea			Aeschinus
920–23		Demea			Aeschinus
923–58	Micio	Demea		Aeschinus	
958–97	Micio	Demea	Syrus	Aeschinus	

In the Greek original Aeschinus, not Syrus, must have gone inside to inform Micio of Demea's suggestion to destroy the garden wall (916). Menander's Syrus cannot have done it because he had already left the stage at 888 in order for the actor playing him to reappear as Aeschinus momentarily (899). That there is no speaking actor free to portray him after 916 does not, however, preclude Aeschinus' presence on stage. While the Aeschinus actor changes mask and costume offstage (917–58), a mute actor may accompany Micio on stage at 923 and play Aeschinus, whose relative silence from 916 to the end of Terence's play suggests just such a design in Menander. Aeschinus' few words after 916, mostly insipid pleading and cries of joy, could easily have been conveyed by the non-verbal reactions of a mute actor. Therefore, whether

indulgence of his son leads him to the loss of a considerable sum of money, but the shape his charitable contributions take makes an interesting contrast. He forfeits money once by allowing Pamphila into his family without a dowry and twice again by letting Syrus leave his house without paying for his freedom and instead giving him a loan. Ironically, he loses each time but in opposite ways, first by letting someone into his *familia* and later by letting someone out of it. These sequences are similar in that both involve Syrus and the misfortunes of Micio, which are in both cases brought about largely through his indulgence of Aeschinus, and are contrasted by Demea's frustration in the former and glee in the latter.

7/14. *Demea and Micio* (713–62, 984–97). Coming full circle, the play focuses again on the older brothers. As sequences 1 and 8 began the two major sections of the play, sequences 7 and 14 provide the resolutions of the sections. Neither resolution is entirely satisfactory. In the former Micio leaves Demea with the (mistaken) impression that Aeschinus will both marry Pamphila and keep the prostitute Bacchis at home, and in the latter Demea grudgingly accepts Ctesipho's girlfriend into his house but leaves an undeserving Micio saddled with an old wife and her poor family. The sequences share other similarities. Whereas in the earlier parallel sequences 1 and 8 Micio precedes Demea on stage, in 7 and 14 Demea precedes Micio. In each of the sequences one of the fathers allows the flute-girl to live with him. Demea's lecture on the dishonesty of Micio's indulgent ways (985–88) serves as a strong rejoinder to Micio's earlier lies (745–53) and discourse on complaisance (737–41).²⁵ The fathers criticize each other's outward demeanor: in 7 Micio urges Demea to look happy for

or not Aeschinus was portrayed by a speaking actor does not matter to his role in his adopted father's demise or to the congruity of sequences 6 and 13.

²⁵ The discrepancy between Demea's monologue (855–81) and his final speech (985–95) has evoked much discussion and seems on the surface to indicate that Terence has deviated from his model in the latter, possibly also in much of the second section; see Büchner and Lefèvre (above, note 2). It is far simpler, however, to suppose that Terence has made changes in not the later speech (see Reith 101–20) but the earlier one (see Grant 53–58). I suggest that, by dispensing at that point with Menander's clear admonition to the audience that Demea's change of heart is not genuine, Terence has created greater uncertainty as to the nature and outcome of the experiment. This would accord with other changes made by Terence that serve to generate dramatic suspense, e. g. *HT* 178 ff. and 572 ff., and the general omission of expository prologues; see Amott (1975) 53: "By limiting the audience's knowledge to that available to his stage characters at the time, he may have deliberately intended his audience to share his characters' ignorances and worries," and Goldberg (28) in reference to *Ad.* 855–81: "Terence has created ambiguity where Menander so often created clarity." The function of Demea's monologue (855 ff.) as a "second prologue" and the frequency of suppressed information at the beginning of Terence's plays make this suggestion all the more likely. Demea's repeated asides (884–85, 896–97, 898, 911–15, 946, 958) provide a commentary on his scepticism and belie his true conversion; see Fantham 988 f., Grant 54, Forehand (1985) 111. For our purposes here, it is safe to conclude that Menander's play ended with a fourth and final Micio–Demea confrontation in some form or other.

Aeschinus' wedding (754–56), and in 14 Demea asserts that what his sons thought was a cheerful, easy-going nature was only a facade, not *ex vera vita* (986–88).

The differences in the sequences shed an interesting side light on the brothers' characters and the vicissitudes of their struggle. Demea plays the interrogator in the first sequence, demanding to know how Micio will accommodate both wife and girlfriend under one roof. In the second sequence Micio is the questioner, demanding to be told the reason for Demea's sudden change of character. As in the opening sequences (1 and 8), in each of the closing sequences a different brother emerges victorious. In 7 Micio's ebullient spirit and mischievous prevarications leave Demea dumbfounded, while in 14 Demea's scathing analysis of lenient parenting leaves Micio uncharacteristically laconic. Finally, although a different brother ultimately prevails in each sequence, the outcome of the sequences is much the same. In the final words of 7 Demea gives up in exasperation (761–62): *ipsa si cupiat Salus, / servare prorsus non potest hanc familiam*, "if Salvation herself wanted to, there is no way she could save this family." At the close of 14 Micio gives his brother a brief, doubtlessly double-edged "Bravo!" (997) and brings the play to an abrupt end.²⁶

With this overview we can see that the ending is clearly modelled on the body of the play. It is a recapitulation that echoes the main play sequence by sequence but focuses on the vices instead of the virtues of indulgence. The most important characters of the first section reappear in the same order in the second: Micio and Demea, Syrus, the neighbors, Demea, the neighbors again, Syrus again, Demea and Micio. One after another, sequences in the later section recall those in the earlier one and encourage the audience to reconsider the preceding action. Point by point the playwright purposefully erases the sympathetic picture he has painted of the indulgent parent. That is surely an essential element in the play's clear but unstated message: moderation is the key to the successful education of youth.²⁷ By destroying the contrast between himself and Micio, Demea

²⁶ Martin 241; Pöschl 18 ff.; Greenberg 221 (n. 3).

²⁷ See Forehand (1985) 111; Lord 193; Forehand (1973) 52 n. 4; Johnson 186; O. L. Wilner, "The Role of Demea in the *Adelphoe*," in Studies in honor of Ullman, *The Classical Bulletin* (St. Louis 1960) 55–57; Duckworth 287; P. J. Enk, "Terence as an Adapter of Greek Comedies," *Mnemosyne* 13 (1947) 87, 91. Tränkle, nn. 4 and 5, assembles the arguments on this issue. Sandbach, 138–40, makes a strong but ultimately unconvincing case for the essential integrity of Micio's *paideia* and its product: "... it turns out that Aeschinus has not told (Micio) that he has got Pamphila with child. This does not show that there was anything wrong with the educational methods, certainly not that they ought to have been stricter (138)." Granted, but Aeschinus' secrecy does point to Micio's misconception that indulgence leads to trust; cf. 52–54. To this extent Micio is seriously misguided: even if he knows he will not be punished, a young person is still disinclined to confess a wrong he has committed because with or without the censure of his elders it is an acknowledgement of failure. Micio does the right thing—he is lenient and understanding with his son—but for the wrong reason, to win his trust. He shows that he knows but does not understand Peripatetic principles.

forces his brother to play the strict parent or lose his easy life. When Micio refuses to exchange roles with Demea, he is trumped, thereby acknowledging that he could not be the easygoing Micio if there were no gruff Demea to play against and that there is not room in any world for more than one of his kind.

Who is responsible for the replication of the first section in the second? Considering Terence's revision of sequence 2 and his obvious disinterest in the balanced arrangement of scenes there, I think he makes an unlikely candidate. Not the architect of this or any plot, he generally focuses less on structural integrity and more on consistent comic quality. This is not to deprecate his talent. If we had the original to compare to his adaptation, we would probably find that, while Menander's may be a better play, Terence's is a better comedy. The ending, a brilliant imitation and inversion of the first section, shows, without doubt, the signs of a master-craftsman of dramatic action. Menander, who constructed over a hundred comic plots, is very likely that man. It would, however, be helpful in confirming this point of view if there were some corroborating evidence from Greek drama to support a Hellenic origin for this sort of dramatic structure, some earlier Greek drama with two discrete sections, separated by an interstice, of which the second echoes the first.

There is, and from the likeliest source. Since antiquity the connection between Menander and Euripides has been well-recognized.²⁸ For plays like *Ion* that include elements common in later comedy (rapes, abandoned babies, recognitions, deceptions and happy endings), Euripides was rightfully heralded the forefather of New Comedy.²⁹ Menander himself was well aware of his debt to Euripides. More than once he alluded to his tragic forebear and even imitated him directly.³⁰ Euripides is the first place to look for a play that is similar in structure to *Adelphoe* and may have inspired Menander.

From there one does not have to search far. In the Euripidean corpus there is an obvious candidate, *Heracles*, a play whose structure has generated criticism not unlike that of *Adelphoe*.³¹ The hero's sudden outbreak of madness separates the play into discrete sections: the rescue of Megara and the children, Heracles' madness and deliverance by Theseus. This constitutes a striking effect and "extremely good theatre," no doubt, intended

²⁸ See T. B. L. Webster, *Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974) 56 ff.; W. G. Arnott, "Menander qui vitae ostendit vitam . . .," *G&R* 15 (1968) 9 ff.

²⁹ Satyrus, *Vita Euripidis*, col. 7.

³⁰ *Epit.* 1125, *Asp.* 427, *Sik.* 176 ff.; see Arnott (above, note 28) 9-11, and Goldberg 204-05.

³¹ Still, the best analysis is D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto 1967) 17-18, 78-90. Of more recent contributions, see J. Gregory, "Euripides' *Heracles*," *YCS* 25 (1977) 259-75; J. Shelton, "Structural Unity and Euripides' *Herakles*," *Eranos* 77 (1979) 101-10; G. Bond, *Euripides: Heracles* (Oxford 1981).

to shock the audience.³² Such sharply divided dramatic action has inspired critics to question Euripides' rationale in devising so disjointed (or seemingly so) a plot.³³ It is not, however, our purpose here to criticize Euripides or Menander for their unintegrated plots but to show how the latter has borrowed and adapted his predecessor's concept of a symmetrical double plot structure.³⁴ While it is possible that it is Terence, not Menander, who has imitated Euripides in the ending of *Adelphoe*, I will proceed on the assumption that it is much more probable that the Greek playwright is borrowing from his Greek forebear.

Like most tragedies of the classical period, *Heracles* involves fewer convolutions of plot and moves at a less frenetic pace than later comedy in general does. Therefore, its structure is simpler insofar as it has not as many elements (i. e. sequences, scenes, characters, entrances and exits, etc.) as *Adelphoe* has. Still, even on this simpler level it is clear from broad analysis of the dramatic action that Euripides' tragedy has the same sort of double plot structure as Menander's comedy:

SECTION 1

1. Amphitryon/Megara: Amphitryon prays that Heracles will return to save himself and Heracles' children and wife Megara, all of whom are suppliants at Zeus' altar (1-106)

CHORUS: The Weakness of Old Age (107-37)

2. Lycus/Amphitryon/Megara: The suppliants accept that death is inevitable (138-347)

CHORUS: The Labors of Heracles (348-441)

3. RESCUE: Heracles saves the suppliants (442-636)

CHORUS: Prayer for Blessings (637-700)

³² K. Hartigan, "Euripidean Madness: Herakles and Orestes," *G&R* 34 (1987) 127. W. G. Amott, "Red Herrings and Other Baits: A Study in Euripidean Techniques," *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 3 (1978) 6-14, suggests that the "unimaginative and second-rate" beginning of the play is designed to give the complaisant audience a communal "thrill of horror," when Lyssa makes her sudden entrance "like the fortissimo G in the sixteenth bar of the second movement of Haydn's Surprise Symphony." With such theatrical effects the play was popular in the post-classical period; see T. B. L. Webster, *Greek Tragedy, G&R New Surveys in the Classics* 5 (Oxford 1971) 36; *Greek Theatre Production* (London 1956) 137. There can be little doubt Menander knew the play.

³³ While many debate the reason and intended effect of such a discontinuous plot, no one to my knowledge questions that Euripides is responsible for the multipartite structure. Therefore, it is not strictly necessary to review the explanations proposed for Euripides' peculiar plot structure, but a glance at recent contributions (see above, note 31; especially the introduction to Bond's commentary) will certainly complement the following discussion.

³⁴ By "double" I do not mean, in the traditional sense, having two sets of parallel characters, such as lovers. With this term I allude to the fact that in these dramas one section of the plot is independent of but parallel to the other.

INTERSTICE

4. Amphitryon/Lycus: Preparation for Lycus' Death (701–33)
 5. Lycus (offstage) and CHORUS of Joy: Lycus' Death (734–814)
 6. Iris/Lyssa: The Coming of Madness (815–74)
 7. Amphitryon (offstage) and CHORUS of Horror: The Children's Deaths (875–909)
 8. Messenger: The Deaths of the Children and Megara (910–1015)
- CHORUS: Ode of Grief (1016–27)

SECTION 2

9. Amphitryon/Heracles: Amphitryon begs the chorus to be quiet so as not to wake the sleeping madman Heracles surrounded by his dead wife and children (1028–88)
 10. Amphitryon/Heracles: Heracles wakes and, seeing what he had done, wishes for death (1089–1152)
11. RESCUE: Theseus saves Heracles and Amphitryon (1153–1428)

Heracles' unexpected bout of homicidal madness divides the play in half and creates the tripartite structure: Section 1 (sequences 1–3), Heracles' rescue of his wife Megara and their children; Interstice (sequences 4–8), the murders of Lycus but also of the children and Megara;³⁵ Section 3 (sequences 9–11), Theseus' rescue of Heracles. The sequences in each section are carefully balanced. In the first section, sequence 1 establishes, in Burnett's words, the "suppliant drama" which its parallel sequence (3) resolves with the unexpected intervention of Heracles.³⁶ The central sequence of the first section (sequence 2) features Lycus, the brutal usurper and would-be murderer of innocents. In the second section, sequence 9 introduces the broken hero, asleep and unaware of his terrible deeds. The parallel sequence 11 contains the resolution of this problem, Theseus' unforeseen rescue of the great hero. The central sequence of the second section (sequence 10) features the awakened Heracles, once the savage murderer of his own family but now a broken, suicidal man.

³⁵ Although the audience can hardly have suspected they were moving into a new section of the plot at 701, especially one so different from the preceding action, the interstice of *Heracles* opens not with Lyssa's arrival (815) but the preparations for Heracles' murder of Lycus (701); see Amott (above, note 32) 11, who recognizes correctly that 701 marks the real shift in focus. That is surely an intentional effect, to envelop the audience in what seems to be predictable plot development before unexpectedly casting them into *terra incognita*.

³⁶ A. P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971) 158 ff.

As in *Adelphoe*, the two major sections are parallel in content as well as structure. Sequences 1 and 9, which open the sections, both display spectacular tableaux: first, the suppliants kneeling at the altar of Zeus, and later the same characters lying dead around the bound and sleeping Heracles. In both sequences Amphitryon speaks for victims of unjust cruelty, Heracles' family (1) and the hero himself (9). These sequences are contrasted insofar as the source of the unjust cruelty in 1 is human (Lycus) and in 9 is divine (Hera). Sequences 2 and 10, the central scenes, are connected through the victims' common decision to face death. First, Megara resolves not to fear death if it is inevitable, and later grief for his wife and children drives Heracles to the brink of suicide. The central sequences both feature assassins, the would-be murderer Lycus and the actual murderer Heracles, an unlikely pair grafted together by the former's intention and the latter's achievement of the children's murders.³⁷ The strong contrast between the guilty Lycus and the innocent Heracles underscores the injustice, or at least the indeterminable justice, of the gods, a theme running throughout the play.

In the closing sequences (3 and 11), an innocent victim is delivered from death by an unforeseen rescuer. In 3 Heracles unexpectedly arrives from Hades and saves Megara and the children from Lycus, and in 11 Theseus arrives from Athens (and Hades, too!) and rescues Heracles from death at his own hand. Neither arrival is completely unanticipated. In sequence 1, it is made clear that Heracles' whereabouts are uncertain. He may or may not return to save his family (25, 97). In sequence 3 Heracles mentions that he rescued Theseus trapped in the Underworld (619) and thus prefigures his own rescue in the parallel sequence later (11). Again, a contrast between the sequences underscores an important theme in the play. Having successfully wrestled death, Heracles is a superhuman figure who uses his extraordinary strength to destroy a man, whereas Theseus, also a hero but less invincible than Heracles, uses persuasion and friendship to win the fallen hero back to life. Human virtues embodied by Theseus prove as great as, if not greater than, Heracles' divine powers.

It should be apparent from this brief analysis of *Heracles* that Euripides' play exhibits a plot design very similar to that of *Adelphoe*. In both dramas the sequences of the two major sections are arranged symmetrically around a central sequence. The first section of both plays is considerably longer than the second. In Menander's play the second section takes place for the most part after the last choral interlude; in Euripides' it falls entirely after the final ode.³⁸ The first section of each highlights a strong antagonist, the

³⁷ The connection between Heracles and Lycus was, no doubt, enhanced on the Greek stage by one actor's portrayal of both characters; see A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*², ed. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford 1968) 146.

³⁸ The final act-break of Menander's original fell probably at what corresponds to 854/855 in Terence; see Damen 71-73.

bloodthirsty Lycus and the Demea who practices uncompromising strictness. The second section highlights a reformed one, the new, more lenient Demea and Heracles the guilt-stricken murderer and humanized demigod. The second section of both plays features a startling and unexpected change of character: Demea plays the kind, indulgent father, and Heracles shows himself the murderer rather than the protector of his family. The central sequences of the earlier sections spotlight unsympathetic characters, the old Demea and Lycus, while those of the later section dwell on more sympathetic characters, the new Demea and the suffering Heracles. The dissimilarities between Euripides' and Menander's plot designs stem largely from their differing levels of complexity. The tragedy does not have the numerous sequences of the comedy, or the balanced arrangement of scenes within parallel sequences. Yet the basic design of section-interstice-section remains unchanged.

One part of the tragedy is, however, more complex than its analogue in the comedy: the interstice. Whereas Demea learns the truth about Ctesipho in fewer than twenty-five lines, the murders of Lycus, Megara and the children take over three hundred lines. As short as it is, the interstice of *Adelphoe* can be divided into three brief scenes:

1. Syrus and Demea (763-75): Syrus' Joy
2. Dromo (776): "Hey, Syrus, Ctesipho wants you to come back!"
3. Demea and Syrus (777-86): Demea's Anger

First, the drunk Syrus encounters Demea, who rails at him helplessly (763-75). Second, Dromo appears for only one line (776) but long enough to upend the whole play by informing Demea of Ctesipho's true whereabouts.³⁹ Third, Syrus attempts to cover up the truth but Demea for the first time in the play enters Micio's house and sees the real situation for himself (777-86). As in the major sections enveloping it, the central scene of the interstice, Dromo's brief but crucial appearance, is sandwiched between parallel scenes, Demea's confrontations with Syrus, which are contrasted by Syrus' domination in the first half (1) and Demea's in the second (3).

The interstice of *Heracles* is more complicated. Lycus goes inside to meet his death (sequence 4). His death-cries rise above the chorus' song of joy (5). Iris escorts Lyssa to the palace to drive Heracles mad (6). Amphitryon's cries of horror at the slaughter of the children inside the palace mingle with a song of terror (7). Finally, a messenger describes Heracles' murder of his own family (8). Like the major sections, the sequences of the interstice are arranged in parallel groups around a central,

³⁹ The remark by O. Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (Berkeley 1978) 95, in reference to Phaedra's *deltos*, with which she informs Theseus of her supposed rape by Hippolytus, is pertinent here: "... so small and impersonal a messenger sets in motion large and tragic consequences." With about as many words to say, Dromo is the *deltos* of *Adelphoe*.

pivotal sequence, the arrival of Madness (6). Here 4 is linked with 8 and 5 with 7 through a series of ironic contrasts. From 4 and 5 we are led to expect a report of Lycus' demise, but instead in 7 and 8 we learn of the death of the children and Megara. Through Heracles' earlier arrival (3) the audience anticipates the fate of his victim Lycus in 4, although Lycus does not foresee his death and walks inside unaware of what awaits him in the palace. Conversely, the death of Heracles' family in 8 takes the audience by surprise but not, ironically, the victims Megara and the children who have prepared for death earlier in the play (2). In other words, in the earlier sequences (4 and 5), the audience is prepared for the murder (Lycus') while the victim is not, and in the parallel sections (7 and 8) the victims (Megara and the children) are prepared for their deaths while the audience is not. The offstage voices in 5 and 7, announcing respectively the good news of Lycus' murder and the bad news of the children's slaughter, also bind these parallel sequences by their similarity and contrast.

Euripides' interstice is quite complex but, like Menander's, not longer than the main sections themselves. The sequences, though numerous, are relatively brief and the action moves quickly and inexorably toward and away from its terrible climax. Yet, the interstice is not short. Unlike Menander's of merely twenty-five lines, Euripides' is drawn out to well over three hundred. This comes as no surprise if, as seems likely, this sort of dramatic construct is a novelty on the stage in its day. The intrusion of the gods in the middle of the play, a daring stroke to be found in no Greek tragedy prior to this, would boldly announce to the Greek audience, accustomed to seeing gods at the beginning or end of a drama, the end of one play and the beginning of another.⁴⁰ It is not unnatural, then, that Euripides calls attention to his venturesome innovation by drawing out and elaborating that section of the drama. Nor is it unnatural for Menander *not* to dwell on the interstice which is not his invention. To judge by a lesser Greek drama of the fourth century, *Rhesus*, that imposes the gods and sudden plot reversals on the center of the play, Euripides' experiment did not pass unnoticed or unimitated but was infrequently met with the inventive genius witnessed in *Adelphoe*.⁴¹ Menander wisely brushes past the interstice, does not invite

⁴⁰ Similarly, Menander uses a prologue-like soliloquy (855–81) to announce the beginning of the second section of his comedy; see above, note 25. To usher in the new play, each author simulates a type of opening scene which was conventional in his day. In this vein Forehand (1985) 108, calls the end of *Adelphoe* "a sort of *deus ex machina*."

⁴¹ *Rhesus* seems hardly worthy of Euripides, *pace* W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the 'Rhesus' of Euripides* (Cambridge 1964). Imitations of Euripides' double plot continue into our own age; see D. H. Porter, "MacLeish's *Herakles* and Wilder's *Alcesteiad*," *CJ* 80 (1984–85) 147: ". . . the bipartite structure of MacLeish's *Herakles*, in which Acts 1 and 2 are related to each other as contrasting panels, Act 1 poisoning the hero at the peak of his career, Act 2 plunging him into the depths, owes much to the structure of Euripides' play."

comparison to Euripides and moves on to the second section where he has built a more complex and innovative structure than his predecessor's.⁴²

In conclusion, the structure of sequences and scenes in *Adelphoe* argues for an ending derived from Menander. The intricately balanced system of parallel sequences within and between sections of the plot betrays a highly evolved sense of dramatic construction indicative of a master playwright, recalling Menander more than Terence. Comparison of the plot of Euripides' *Heracles* with that of *Adelphoe* shows the Greek ancestry of this particular dramatic structure and supports a Hellenic origin for the symmetrical double plot. The limitations of this approach are self-evident. At the great remove required in the analysis of whole plays, it is almost impossible to discern details which Terence may or may not have taken from the original. Nor is it advisable with this approach to evaluate Menander's reasons for using such a structure, or his success.⁴³ Final opinions on such a difficult problem as Demea's sudden volte-face cannot be reached by judging only one aspect of a play such as the general structure. The conclusions reached here should be added in with those reached by other methods of analysis and together they should lead us to a final judgment. As far as this study goes, however, it is fair to say that the ending of *Adelphoe* probably derives from Menander.

Utah State University

⁴² Menander diminishes not only the scope of the interstice but also the grandeur of the intruding characters. Euripides uses the gods Iris and Lyssa to redirect the action, whereas Menander uses only one otherwise unimportant slave Dromo. The difference in the status of these characters represents Menander's attempt to invert, while still imitating, Euripides' plot structure. It should be noted that Menander also inverts the general design of *Heracles* by applying the simple ABA design of Euripides' main sections to his own interstice and the more complex structure found in Euripides' interstice to the main sections of the comedy. If nothing else, it is an ingenious means by which to make a simpler plot more complex without completely reworking its basic design or merely adding more scenes or sequences.

⁴³ Amott (1963) 144, suggests that Menander's reasons for using this particular structure were to "surprise an unsuspecting audience with a final ironic twist" and that "the traditional *komos* finale of old Attic comedy may still have retained some influence after the death of Aristophanes."