

Therefore, the following conclusions can be reached: (1) Dual priesthoods, before the augurate of C. Julius Caesar, were allotted to a number of individuals during the Hannibalic War, with the possible exception of C. Marcius Rutilus (Censorinus), in accordance with the prorogation and iteration of magistracies; (2) but with the end of the third century, such a cumulation of priesthoods was avoided, though not specifically forbidden, through the nomination and cooptation procedures.

Loyola University
of Chicago

G. J. Szemler

PLAUTUS, *RUDENS*, ACT 3 SCENE 5
(780–838)¹

- 780 DA. Vtrum tu, leno, cum malo lubentius
quiescis an sic sine malo, si copias?
LA. ego quae tu loquere flocci non facio, senex.
meas quidem te invito et Venere et summo Iove
de ara capillo iam deripiam. DA. tangedum.
- 785 LA. tangam hercle uero. DA. agedum ergo, accede huc
modo.
LA. iubedum recedere istos ambo illuc modo.

century membership of two Aemilii, M. Aemilius Scaurus, praet. 56, and M. Aemilius Lepidus, IIIvir r.p.c., (to the praet. 56, v. Rohden, RE, 1 (141), pp. 588, 23 ff.; MRR, 2, p. 206; to the IIIvir, v. Rohden, RE, 1 (73), pp. 556, 9 ff.; Hoffman Lewis, op. cit., pont. no. 1). Difficulties are caused by the appearance of two Claudii, of whom Ap. Claudius Pulcher, cos. 54, was a patrician and C. Claudius Marcellus, praet. 80, who was a plebeian, (MRR, 2, pp. 171 and 255); as well as by the somewhat earlier appearance of two Sempronii, Ti. Sempronius Longus, cos. 194, and (Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, or) Ti. Sempronius P.f. Ti. n. Gracchus, cos. 177, 163, in the augural college, (MRR, 1, pp. 283, 309, 405, 406, n. 4, and 407, n. 5). Explanation was offered by Bardt, who assumed that gentilician limits were applied only in the case of patrician families; (his argument was derived from Livy, 10. 8, 9). Bardt's assumption seems to be feasible; nevertheless, he does not explain why such a system "had to be maintained" only in the augural college.

1) I have benefited greatly from the scepticism of Professor H.D. Jocelyn. Professor F.R.D. Goodyear and my pupil, Mr. P.G. Hooker, have also saved me from error.

- DA. immo ad te accedent. LA. non hercle equidem cen-
seo.
- DA. quid ages si accedent propius? LA. ego recessero.
uerum, senex, si te umquam in urbe offendero,
790 numquam hercle quisquam me lenonem dixerit
si te non ludos pessumos dimissero.
- DA. facito istuc quod minitare; sed nunc interim,
si illas attigeris, dabitur tibi magnum malum.
- LA. quam magnum uero? DA. quantum lenoni sat est.
795 LA. minacias ego flocci non faciam tuas,
equidem has te inuito iam ambas rapiam. DA. tangedum.
LA. tangam hercle uero. DA. tanges, at scin quo modo?
i dum, Turbalio, curriculo, adfert(o domo)
duas clauas. LA. clauas? DA. sed probas. propera cito.
- 800 ego te hodie faxo recte acceptum ut dignus es.
LA. cheu! scelestus galeam in naui perdididi;
nunc mi opportuna hic esset, salua si foret.
licet saltem istas mi appellare? DA. non licet.
- 804-5 ehem! optume edepol ecum clauator aduenit.
LA. illud quidem edepol tinnimentum est auribus.
DA. age accipe illinc alteram clauam, Sparax.
age, alter istinc, alter hinc adsistite.

The pimp Labrax has threatened to abduct the girls Palae-
stra and Ampelisca from the altar on which they have sought
refuge. Daemones has summoned his two *lorarii*, Turbalio and
Sparax, who are to keep guard over Labrax and ensure that he
neither approaches the girls nor makes his escape. The slave
Trachalio has departed to fetch his master Plesidippus. Between
the departure of Trachalio and his return with Plesidippus oc-
curs the fifth scene of the third act, a part of which I have quot-
ed above. I shall argue that a section of this scene is a Plautine
invention.

Lines 780-91 are straightforward. Daemones threatens
Labrax that if he offers any resistance he will get a thrashing
(780-1). Labrax scorns his threats (782) and reiterates his inten-
tion to abduct the girls (783-4). Daemones tempts him to try
(784-5). Labrax is quickly overawed by the prospect of a thrash-
ing from the *lorarii*, who are close at hand (786-8), and the only
gesture of defiance of which he is now capable is a threat to be
revenged on Daemones if ever he should encounter him on his
home ground, in Cyrene (789-91). This dialogue is complete in

itself, and Labrax's final threat to be revenged on Daemones when next they meet provides an excellent cue for Daemones' exit²).

But Daemones does not leave the stage. Instead the scene begins again. Labrax once more expresses his scorn for Daemones' threats (795 *minacias ego flocci non faciam tuas* ~ 782 *ego quae tu loquere flocci non facio, senex*). He declares again his intention to abduct the girls (796 *equidem has te inuito iam ambas rapiam* ~ 783-4 *meas quidem te inuito et Venere et summo Iove | de ara capillo iam deripiam*). Daemones again tempts him to try (796-7 DA. *tangedum.* | LA. *tangam hercle uero* ~ 784-5 DA. *tangedum.* | LA. *tangam hercle uero*). Consider now 792-4, which usher in this recapitulation. To Labrax's threat of vengeance in Cyrene Daemones delivers the unimaginative and repetitive retort *facito istuc quod minitare; sed nunc interim, | si illas attigeris, dabitur tibi magnum malum*. Whereupon Labrax inquires, with needless punctiliousness, *quam magnum uero?* And this elicits another unimaginative response from Daemones: *quantum lenoni sat est*. Lines 792-4 are, I suggest, a bridge passage, a rather clumsy attempt to provide Labrax with an excuse for repeating the remark which he made at line 782 – for before Labrax may repeat his repudiation of Daemones' threats (at 795), Daemones must be made to threaten Labrax afresh. Both the language of Daemones in 793 (*dabitur tibi magnum malum*) and the inconsequence of the question and answer in 794 suggest the handiwork of Plautus. A similar technique may be seen at lines 103-10 of this play. Here Fraenkel (*Plautinisches im Plautus* [Berlin 1922], 123-5 = *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* [Florence 1960], 117-9) has shown that the exchange of courtesies in 103 (PL. *pater salueto, amboque adeo*. DA. *saluos sis*) must in the Diphilean original have been followed by the inquiry of Plesidippus at 110 (*isticin uos habitatis?*), and that Plautus has interrupted the natural progression of the dialogue by allowing the slave Sceparnio to engage in two pieces of inept and impertinent word-play, of which the second uses the same minatory formula which Daemones uses at 793 (*dabitur tibi magnum malum* ~ 107-8 DA. *uirile sexus numquam*

2) Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*² (Berlin 1912), 160, points to certain similarities between Act 3 of the *Rudens* and Soph. *O.C.* 720-1043, the scene in which Creon attempts to abduct Antigone. He compares in particular these last words of Labrax (789-91) with 1036-7 *οὐδὲν σὺ μεμπτόν ἐνθάδ' ὄν ἐρείς ἐμοί, | οἴκοι δὲ χήμεις εἰσόμεσθ' ἂ χροὴ ποιεῖν*. These are Creon's final words before he leaves the stage.

habui. PL. at di dabunt. | SC. tibi quidem hercle, quisquis es, magnum malum). The excuse for Sceparnio's second impertinence is provided by the ascription to Daemones of a gratuitous and unwanted observation (106–7) and by the ascription to Plesidippus of a remark both unexpected and out of character – much in the way that the gratuitous and inconsequential exchanges in lines 792–4 provide the excuse for the recapitulation of Labrax's repudiation of Daemones' threats in 795.

That lines 795–7 duplicate lines 782–5 has often been recognised, but no satisfactory explanation for the duplication has yet been given. P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (Berlin 1886), 73–4, argued that the ineffective repetition of Labrax's threats effectively indicates that the *leno* is more a man of bluster than a man of action. Similarly A. Garzya, *Note al Rudens di Plauto* (Naples 1967), 45, believes that the 'vana schermaglia' of lines 785–96 and the duplication of ideas in 782–5 and 795–7 contribute to the 'finalità tecnica' of this Act, whose purpose is to retard the action long enough for Trachalio to find Plesidippus³). Leo, in his edition of 1896, suggested that lines 795–7 were composed by a later hand to serve as a briefer substitute for lines 782–94. A. Thierfelder, *De rationibus interpolationum Plautinarum* (Leipzig 1929), 108 n. 1, declares himself satisfied that both passages owe their origin to Diphilus. Marx, in his edition of the *Rudens* in 1928, p. 162, approached the question after the manner of Leo and argued that lines 780–1 and 795 ff. represent Plautus' translation of the Diphilean original, and that lines 782–94 are an adaptor's later abridgement of that translation, intended by their author to be performed in place of, not in addition to, the longer and genuine section which follows. This judgement is endorsed by A. Klotz, *Rb. M.* xcv (1952), 292 n. 1. By contrast, G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches* (Berlin 1931), 94, declares lines 785–96 to be an addition by Plautus ('eine Einfügung von mittlerer Länge ... und mittelmäßiger Güte'⁴).

³) T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1953), 167, also writes that 'Trachalio's errand should be covered by an act end; instead Diphilos introduced the club tableau (III, 5) to mask the lapse of time'.

⁴) I shall not discuss the view of H. Drexler, *Philologus*, Supplbd 26 (1934), 58–60, that Plautus invented the whole of Act 3 Scene 5. Drexler believes that Plautus has radically rewritten Diphilus' play. This extreme position is countered by W. H. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilos* (Munich 1953), 171–232.

Objections can be raised to all of these theories. Against Langen, Thierfelder and Garzya it is to be emphasised that the repetition is too blatant and ineffective to serve any subtle dramatic end. That there is an unfortunate element of duplication here must be acknowledged. But Jachmann does not explain why Plautus should have wished to insert so uninspired and pointless a piece of repetition as lines 785–96. And, against Marx's theory, I cannot envisage the motive which might prompt a later adaptor to dispense with the excellent knock-about scene with the club-bearers. The least objectionable theory is that of Leo. But against this I should adduce the two observations which I have already made: that 791 reads remarkably like a cue for *Daemones'* exit, and that 792–4 read like a passage deliberately contrived to provide a link between the two parts of the scene. It remains to observe that the technique of recapitulation is Plautine too. When Plautus adds a passage of his own devising, often his return to his original model is marked by an echo or repetition of the words or idea with which he abandoned his model. Fraenkel has given abundant demonstration of this Plautine technique. I cite two examples detected by him in the *Rudens*: (i) lines 502–3 are echoed by lines 538 and 540, and the intervening passage expands what in Diphilus was probably a brief passage of repartee into a protracted verbal skirmish reminiscent of the *uelitationes* of the professional Italian buffoons (*Pl. im Pl.* 112–13 = *Elementi* 106–7)⁵); (ii) the question at line 627 *quid istuc est negoti?* is repeated at 641 *quid negotist?*, while the intervening lines contain an exchange of scurrilous banter ruinous both to the pace and to the tone of the scene (*Pl. im Pl.* 119–23 = *Elementi* 113–7). In these two passages the recapitulation rounds off the Plautine addition and ushers in the Greek original; I suggest that in the present passage the recapitulation rounds off the Greek original and ushers in the Plautine addition.

I suggest that Plautus decided to expand Diphilus' brief scene (780–91), that he designed lines 792–7 to bring the action back to the point at which the scene began, and that from line 798 onwards he offers his own variation on the Diphilean theme. But what was Plautus' purpose? Nothing more, I suspect, than to introduce a bit of horseplay. He has at hand a pair of thugs who have been set to guard the pimp. They are competent to perform this guard duty without the aid of weapons. Weapon-

5) See also W. Beare, *C. R.* xliv (1930), 165–8.

less they advanced a step towards Labrax and his bluster was silenced. But give them a pair of punitive implements to brandish and not only is the decorative and minatory effect of the thugs increased but there is also scope for a few lines more of clowning. What armament, then, is Plautus to give them? We expect a *lorarius* to wield a whip. But, if whips are what the audience expects, then let Fasolt and Fafner wield clubs. Now, it is true that the term *lorarius* appears not in any comic text but only in the scene-epigraphs (for references see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, s.u.). But the appositeness to Plautus' servile thugs of this name is vouchsafed both by Gellius, 10. 3. 19 (*hi ... tamquam in scaenicis fabulis qui dicebantur 'lorarii' ... quos erant iussi uinciebant aut uerberabant*) and by the fact that *lora* are what these thugs do generally wield. At *Capt.* 657-8, for example, orders to bring forth *lora* are given to a trio of slaves who are shown by their names to be of the same pedigree as Turbalio and Sparax (*Colapbe, Cordalio, Corax,| ite istinc, ecferte lora*). And at *Adelphi* 182 another pimp is threatened with a beating by wielders of *lora*: this is the scene which Terence claimed to have translated *uerbum de uerbo* (11) from Diphilus. In Greek comedy we find the whip cracked by the master: Men. *Dysk.* 502 τὸν ἰμάντα δός, γοαῦ, *Samia* 106-7 Koerte (321-2 Austin)⁶ ἰμάντα παιδῶν τις δότω|ἐπὶ τουτονί μοι τὸν ἀσεβῆ, *ibid.* 317-18 Koerte (662-3 Austin), Antiphanes fr. 74. 7-8 Koch ἔξω τις δότω|ἰμάντα. This is not to say that the comedians did not allow slaves and their masters to use sticks: Ar. *Pax* 1121 παῖ' αὐτὸν ἐπέχων τῷ ξύλῳ τὸν ἀλαζόνα, *Vesp.* 458 παῖε τῷ ξύλῳ, Men. *Samia* 440 Austin ἀν λάβω ξύλον, Pl. *Poen.* 1319-20 *ite istinc, serui, foras,| ecferte fustis* (and so many a Plautine master). But grant that there would be no oddity in a *lorarius* wielding a stick, a *fustis*. What of a *claua*? The *clauae*, though they are indeed described as *fustes* at 816, are more than mere sticks. The mention of the name *claua* evinces a gasp of horror from Labrax (799), and the spectacle of the two *clauatores* conjures up in his mind an image of club-bearing Hercules (821-3). These implements, introduced with such pomp and wielded with such ceremony, are no ordinary ξύλα or *fustes*. They are awesome Herculean clubs. Nowhere else in Plautus or Terence is the word *claua* used of a punitive implement; but it is encouraging to know that the word was so used

6) C. Austin, *Menandri Aspis et Samia* (Berlin 1969).

in native Roman comedy, in the *fabulae togatae* and the Atellan farces (Titinius 43 Ribbeck³, Novius 79 R³).

While the former part of the scene (780–91) is straightforward in thought and colourless in diction, the scene with the club-bearers displays several marks of Plautine inventiveness and elaboration – a play on words at 811 (*inuitas ... inuitassitis*: cf. *Trin.* 27), a joke *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* at 816 (*amplectitote crura fustibus*: Marx compares *Capt.* 651–2 *quid cessatis, compedes,| cur-rere ad me meaque amplecti crura?*), and a ‘transformation’ joke (821–3 *heu hercle! ne istic fana mutantur cito:| iam hoc Herculei est?*), *Veneris fanum quod fuit,| ita duo destituit signa hic cum clavis senex*: see Fraenkel, *Pl. im Pl.* 23–38 = *Elementi* 21–35⁸). Where the Plautine addition ends is disputable. The altercation between Labrax and the *lorarii-clauatores* at 826–38 may well be Diphilean (there is no mention here of clubs)⁹, and this passage may have provided Plautus with the model for lines 810–20, where Daemones gives the instructions which are carried out in 826–38 – these instructions are in part a duplicate of those already given by Trachalio before his departure (775–7). Compare 803 *licet saltem istas mi appellare?* with 826 *Palaestra!*, 813–4 *si appellabit quempiam,| uos respondetote istinc istarum uicem* with 827 *haec quidem Palaestra quae respondit non mea est*, 815 *sin ipse abitere hinc uolet* and 817 *etiam me abire hinc non sinent?* with 834 *quaeso hercle abire ut liceat*. The Plautine addition will therefore begin at the point where Daemones ought (on my earlier contention) to have left the stage (after 791) and will end at about the point where he

7) *Herculei* Lindsay: *Herculi* codd. Lindsay’s is the likeliest solution to this crux (for the form see *Cas.* 398, *Persa* 2); *hoc Herculist iam* edd. uett., *iam hoc H. fit* Palmer, <modo> post *est* Acidalius (and so Marx and most modern editors).

8) Marx, who is hostile to all attempts to find Plautine originality in the play, supports his contention that lines 821–3 owe their origin to Diphilus by comparing a similar ‘transformation’ at 86: *non uentus fuit, uerum Alcumena Euripidi*. But this is almost certainly Plautine too: see Fraenkel, *Pl. im Pl.* 68–9 = *Elementi* 64–5, H.D. Jocelyn, *C. R.* lxxx (1966), 148. The name of Hercules is conjured with again at 766–7, a passage which commentators misunderstand because they have not read Housman, *C. R.* xxxii (1918), 162–3. To Housman’s illustrations may be added J.G. Frazer, *Apollodorus* (Loeb 1921), ii, Appendix 1, and commentary on *Ov. Fasti* 4.553.

9) This may answer the objections of any who may feel, with Webster and Garzya, that Diphilus would have allowed a fair length of time to elapse before bringing Trachalio back onto the stage. But, for all we know, Diphilus may have placed a choral interlude after this scene.

does leave the stage (he leaves after 820: nothing after lines 821–3 need be Plautine invention).

Finally, to the play on words which has already been noticed in this scene I propose to add a further example which has gone unnoticed by the commentators. At line 803 Labrax asks Daemones for permission to address the girls. Daemones refuses permission and signals the return of his *lorarius* with the clubs: *ebem: optume edepol eccum clauator aduenit*¹⁰. ‘That’, replies Labrax, ‘means a ringing in the ears’: *illud quidem edepol tinnimentum est auribus*. In 805 *clauator* is scanned as a disyllable, with synizesis after the suppression of the intervocalic *u*. Examples of this phenomenon are given by both Sonnenschein (*Rudens*, ed. maior 1891, ed. minor 1901) and Marx¹¹), but many have been reluctant to acknowledge its appearance here. C.F.W. Müller, *Plautinische Prosodie* (Berlin 1869), 472, declared it to be ‘ganz ungläublich’ that Plautus should have written *clauator aduenit* when he could have written *clauator uenit* (as Bentley conjectured); but he would prefer Plautus to have written *ebem optume edepol clauator eccum aduenit*. Lindsay, in his text of 1905, records Bentley’s conjecture with favour in the *apparatus criticus*. And in his

10) According to Marx the first hand of D wrote *clauatorē*, and I. Amatucci (Corpus Paravianum, 1949) records that T also presents the accusative. Marx alone among editors prints *clauatorem*. The uses of *eccum* and its cognates are complex: see Sonnenschein, *Excursus* to his 1891 edition, p. 188, Lindsay on *Capt.* 169. Lindsay observes that ‘the subject of the sentence is usually attracted into the Acc. by *eccum*, &c., e.g. *Amph.* 1005 *sed eccum Amphitruonem aduenit*, except where the verb precedes, e.g. *Pseud.* 693 *uenit eccum Calidorus*’ (‘and’, it might be added, ‘where the subject precedes’, as at *Rud.* 844 *Plesidippus eccum adest*). It is possible to go a little further than this. The instances in which the subject is found attracted into the accusative all display one trait of similarity which has not been remarked upon. Marx cites *Amph.* 1005 *sed eccum Amphitruonem aduenit*, *Curc.* 676 *sed eccum lenonem incedit*, *Miles* 1290 *sed eccum Palaestronem stat cum milite*, *Stich.* 527 *sed eccum fratrem Pamphilippum incedit*; to these add *Miles* 1215 *sed eccam ipsam egreditur foras*. In all these instances the accusative immediately follows the combination *sed eccum* (*eccam*). The accusative appears not to be used in any other circumstances – where, by the application of Lindsay’s formula, it might have been expected (e.g. *As.* 151 *atque eccam inlecebra exit tandem*, *Persa* 543 *sed optume eccum ipse aduenit*, *Most.* 363 *eccum Tranio a portu redit*, 686–7 *enga! optume eccum aedium dominus foras | Simo progreditur ipsus*). The accusative may be correct at *Rud.* 805, but it is not, as Marx supposes, inevitable.

11) For further discussion of the linguistic phenomenon see Lindsay, *Captivi*, p. 22, Leumann-Hofmann, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich 1928), 106 § 95 and 112 § 99 (g).

Early Latin Verse (Oxford 1922), 142, he continues to complain that “clator” for *clauator* seems somehow unattractive’. I believe that there was deliberate purpose in Plautus’ introduction at this moment of the pronunciation *clauator*. What is the point of Labrax’s comment in 806 – ‘that means a ringing in the ears’? ‘Quum caput claua tunditur, aures tinnitum audiunt’, says Turnebus; and so say the commentators. But while a blow on the head may indeed cause the ears to ring, a ringing in the ears is not the first or the most obvious discomfort which a person who suffers such a blow is likely to record. I suggest that *clator* (*clauator*) was meant to call to mind the word *clator** (from the verb *calare*), a word which appears in Plautus in the form *calator*, “crier”, a slave in attendance whose business it was to remind his master of the names of persons in the streets (= *nomenclator*; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.6.50) (Sonnenschein on 335)¹². The word *clauator* appears here only (the word found in later verse is *clauiger*) and was probably coined for the sake of the pun. The idea of introducing such word-play was possibly suggested to Plautus by Labrax’s initial question in 803 – ‘May I call them?’ Dæmones replies ‘No. Ah, here comes the club-bearer/caller’. ‘That’, comments Labrax, ‘means a ringing in the ears’¹³.

Queens’ College, Cambridge

James Diggle

12) Cf. Festus p. 38. 12 Mueller (p. 34. 14 Lindsay) *calatores dicebantur serui ἀπὸ τοῦ καλεῖν, quod est uocare*. The form *clator*, which is not attested, is equivalent to the Greek κλήτωρ: Corp. gloss. Lat. ii. 96.1 gives ‘Calator κλήτωρ’. The noun *tinnimentum* appears here only. Plautus uses the verb *tinnire* five times – four times of an unpleasantly loud human voice (*As.* 448, *Cas.* 250, *Poen.* 33, *Pseud.* 889). In the fifth passage the subject is *tintinnabulum* (*Trin.* 1004).

13) A more obvious play on words is achieved through the exploitation of a similar linguistic phenomenon at *Truc.* 682–6: TR. *iam postquam in urbem crebro comneo, | dicax sum factus: iam sum caullator* (Weise: *cauillator* codd.) *probus*. AST. *quid id est, amabo? mitte* (Spengel: *istaec* codd.) *ridicularia; | cauillationes uis, opinor, dicere*. TR. † *ita ut (ita at Bothe, istud Leo) pauxillum differt a cauilibus*. *Truculentus*’ rustic pronunciation yields *caullator* (suggesting *caulis*) in place of *cauillator* (*cauillator*); and when taxed by *Astaphium* for this rusticity he (apparently) retorts by pronouncing *cauilibus* as *cauilibus*, which he feigns to believe accords with *Astaphium*’s principles of urban elocution.