

verschmilzt so sehr mit seinem Objekt, daß er sich am Himmel selbst wiederfindet³²).

Münster

Wolfgang Hübner

οὐκέτ' ἐπιψαύω γαίης ποσίν, ἀλλὰ παρ' αὐτῶ
Ζανί θεοτρειφέος πίμπλαμαι ἀμβροσίης.

Vgl. hierzu die Interpretation von F. Boll, Das Epigramm des Claudius Ptolemäus, Sokrates 9 (1921) 2–12, abgedr. in: Kleine Schriften zur Sternkunde des Altertums, hrsg. V. Stegemann (und E. Boer), Leipzig 1950, 143–155.

32) Der Vorgang wiederholt sich in säkularisierter, ‚versachlichter‘ Form in der Neuzeit: Mit seiner Vorliebe für Sach-Sternbilder erfand N. L. de Lacaille in seinem „Coelum australe stelliferum“ (Paris 1763) am Südhimmel die sich ergänzenden Sternbilder *Telescopium* und *Microscopium*, nachdem J. Hevelius 1690 in Äquaturnähe einen *Sextans* angenommen hatte, vgl. H. Werner – F. Schmeidler, Synopsis der Nomenklatur der Fixsterne, Stuttgart 1986. Er fand auch ein Sternbild *Caelum*, das jedoch nicht ‚Himmel‘, sondern ‚Grabstichel‘ bedeutet.

PLAUTUS' CHORUSES

One of the results of the new Menander discoveries of the last thirty years has been to confirm beyond doubt that there was a Greek convention, regularly followed by Menander, so far as we can see, and probably by New Comedy in general¹), of dividing a play into five acts by means of four extradramatic choral interludes, during which the stage was empty of actors. It is obvious that Plautus and Terence abandoned this convention. There is no trace in the Latin manuscripts of anything corresponding to the ΧΟΡΟΥ notes of the Greek papyri, and in some of the Latin plays, including Terence's *Andria*, based on a Menandrian original, the stage is empty fewer than four times. The attempts of ancient scholars to impose act divisions on Terence can be seen as prompted by the Greek convention but doomed to failure; hence the confused statements which we find in the commentary of Donatus²). It is clear that the Latin adapters sometimes bridged a

1) Cf. Euanthius, de fab. III. 1, Donatus ad Ad. praef. I. 4, Hermes 111 (1983) 442.

2) Cf. A. Blanchard, Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre (Paris 1983) 184–9.

Greek act division and eliminated the associated empty stage, so that a significant lapse of dramatic time, such as Menander would have covered by a choral interlude between acts, has to be supposed within a few lines of text and without an empty stage³). Whether there were regular pauses of any kind during the performance of the Latin plays is still in dispute⁴), but it is generally agreed that such pauses are likely to have been filled with music by the *tibicen* rather than with a choral performance⁵).

The *advocati* of Plautus Poen. 504 ff. and the fishermen of Rud. 290 ff. are often called choruses⁶). There is some justification for this but they differ from Menander's choruses in almost every respect⁷). They take part in the action of the play and their words are recorded in the text; neither is true of Menander's choruses. The *advocati* do not enter on to an empty stage but following Agorastocles; their opening speech is in trochaic *septenarii* and therefore probably accompanied by the *tibicen*⁸), but it is a reply to Agorastocles' entrance speech, in the same metre, and in no sense an interlude. They are alone on stage only during their exit

3) E.g. Plaut. Cist. 773 (G. Burckhardt, Die Akteinteilung in der neuen griechischen und in der römischen Komödie [Diss. Basel 1927] 17 f.), Most. 531 (Phoenix 39 [1985] 6–9), Ter. And. 235 (C.Q. 33 [1983] 430).

4) The arguments of C. Questa, Entr. Hardt 16 (1970) 210–15, 220, that there were no regular pauses, seem to me much stronger than the counterarguments of A. Primmer, Handlungsgliederung in Nea und Palliata (ÖSB Wien 441, Vienna 1984) 16–20, 53–65 (cf. C.R. 35 [1985] 397). The fact that a lapse of dramatic time coincides with an empty stage is an argument for supposing an act division in the Greek original but not for supposing an interlude in the Latin play, since in the latter a lapse of time can occur without an empty stage. The strongest candidates for a brief interlude by the *tibicen* seem to be the few places where an exit is immediately followed by the re-entry of the same character (Plaut. Asin. 809, Cist. 630, Tri. 601, Ter. H.T. 873). If an interlude by the *tibicen* was normal in such cases, Pseud. 573a, where uniquely the text refers to such an interlude, would be playing with the convention (cf. R. L. Hunter, The New Comedy of Greece and Rome [Cambridge 1985] 38 f.).

5) Later Roman theatres had no space for a dancing chorus; it is likely that this difference from Greek theatres derives from earlier Roman practice (H. D. Jocelyn, The tragedies of Ennius [Cambridge 1967] 18). Choral interludes were formerly supposed at Plaut. Bacch. 108 by F. Leo, Hermes 46 (1911) 292–5, at Ter. H.T. 170, 409 by R. T. Flickinger, C.Ph. 7 (1912) 26–8, and more generally by R. T. Weissinger, A study of act divisions in classical drama [Diss. Univ. Iowa 1940] 82; this theory was fostered by the mistaken belief that the chorus was addressed by Habrotonon at Men. Epir. 430 Sandbach and took part in the action of the play (cf. K. J. Maidment, C.Q. 29 [1935] 20 f.).

6) Gloss. Lat. I. 128 CO 353 (= Kaibel, C.G.F. 72) *apud Romanos quoque Plautus comoediae choros exemplo Graecorum inseruit* may refer to them.

7) Questa, Entr. Hardt 16 (1970) 211.

8) W. Beare, The Roman stage (London ³1964) 222 f.

speech, 809–16, in which they announce their intention of going home; this is in spoken *senarii*, the metre of the whole deception scene from 615, it was presumably uttered by a single spokesman and can no more be called an interlude than a monologue spoken by any character alone on stage. The fishermen do enter on to an empty stage, and their entrance lines, as well as their following dialogue with Trachalio, are in iambic *septenarii*, probably accompanied by the *tibicen*; but there is no justification for regarding their entrance lines as an interlude or even necessarily as a song. In fact it is only by virtue of their numbers that the *advocati* and the fishermen merit the title ‘chorus’. They are always addressed and referred to in the plural and their utterances regularly use the first person plural, although it seems probable that no more than one of them spoke⁹). Poen. 619 *tantum hominum* seems to imply a group of at least 5–6 *advocati*. There is no necessity for more than 2–3 fishermen, but the analogy of the *advocati* encourages one to think of rather more.

We must not, of course, assume that all dramatists of the New Comedy conformed exactly to Menander’s practice in their use of choruses. Aristophanes’ last two plays (Eccles. 392 B.C., Plut. 388 B.C.) seem to represent a transitional stage in the development of the fifth-century chorus to the extradramatic chorus of New Comedy, but we do not know when or how completely the five-act system became established¹⁰). Some have supposed that Plautus in the main took over the *advocati* and fishermen from the Greek originals of the *Poenulus* and *Rudens*, noting similarities to fifth-century Greek comic choruses¹¹). These similarities, however, can be explained in several different ways and provide only very weak support for the hypothesis that the *advocati* and fishermen originate in choruses of Plautus’ Greek models. On the other hand the differences from Menander’s choruses which I have stressed, if not conclusive, count against the hypothesis. Such evidence as we possess indicates that the five-act

9) It is doubtful whether any conclusions can be drawn from the use of the singular in Poen. 524 *duco*, 728 *censeo*. Greek choruses frequently use the first person singular; cf. M. Kaimio, *The chorus of Greek drama within the light of the person and number used* (Soc. Scient. Fenn. Comm. Hum. Litt. 46, Helsinki 1970).

10) Cf. Hunter, *Z.P.E.* 36 (1979) 23–38, with references to earlier discussions. Hunter is rightly much more cautious than earlier writers in inferring choruses from fragmentary texts; in fact he is unable to adduce any certain instance of a post-Aristophanic chorus which takes part in the action of the play.

11) Maidment (n.5) 23, Beare, *Rom. Stage*³ 209, G. Maurach, *Plauti Poenulus* (Heidelberg 1975) 241, 254 f., Hunter (n.10) 37 f.

system and extradramatic choral interlude were the norm for New Comedy, and it seems probable that the practice of Diphilus at least, the author of the original of the *Rudens* (32), would not have differed very greatly from that of Menander with regard to such a basic dramatic convention. The possibility that the Greek originals of the *Poenulus* and *Rudens* were exceptions to the norm cannot be ruled out, but it is not a particularly attractive hypothesis in default of strong arguments in its favour. I wish to argue that an alternative hypothesis is much more probable, namely that both *advocati* and fishermen are very largely the creation of Plautus, that the *advocati* have no direct connection with Greek choruses and the fishermen a minimal one, and that the differences between them and Menander's choruses are to be accounted for by their Roman origin. This hypothesis can be supported by a considerable number of positive arguments based on the text of Plautus. It will be shown that the rôles of both the *advocati* and the fishermen display many features that are uncharacteristic of Greek New Comedy, so far as we know it, but very characteristic of Plautus. A hypothesis which economically accounts for these features as well as the differences between Plautus' choruses and Menander's is not to be dismissed lightly. It will be shown moreover that the Plautine changes postulated are of a kind that Plautus probably made elsewhere; this further adds to the probability of the hypothesis.

Amongst other arguments I shall use breaches of realism and consistency as signs of Plautine modifications. This method has been much criticized but is justifiable. It is not invalidated by the fact that it has often been abused. We must indeed never forget that our knowledge of Greek New Comedy is based very largely on a few plays of one dramatist, Menander. In what survives of his work Menander shows himself a careful craftsman, but other dramatists may well have been less careful. Nor are total realism and complete consistency to be credited even to Menander. A play is not to be equated with real life, and the realism for which Menander was famed in antiquity seems a very limited one from a modern standpoint. The fact remains that in his flagrant disregard for realism and consistency Plautus differs hugely from Menander. Since we know very little about dramatists of the New Comedy other than Menander, in the case of Plautine plays not known to be based on a Menandrian original, the way is always open to attribute its un-Menandrian features to some other named or unnamed Greek dramatist. A hypothesis however which attributes

to Plautus features which are known to be characteristic of him has an advantage over one which attributes them to a Greek dramatist whose characteristics are largely a matter for speculation. We know from the fragments of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* that some inconsistencies in Plautus result from modifications to his Greek model, and it is highly probable that others do. Furthermore, since a tendency towards greater realism clearly marks the development from Old to New Comedy, it is likely that other New Comedy dramatists were much closer to Menander than to Plautus in this respect. Instances of lack of realism or consistency in Plautus may legitimately be used as at least possible indications of modifications to the Greek original. Individually trivial details may be significant in combination. Each case has to be treated on its merits. It is my contention that sufficient demonstrably Plautine features are associated with the *advocati* and fishermen to establish a fairly strong probability that they are largely the creation of the Latin dramatist.

I

We may begin with the *advocati*, considering first their rôle in the plot. Agorastocles is in love with Adelphasium, who is in the possession of a *leno*, Lycus. In the face of Lycus' refusal to allow Agorastocles access to Adelphasium (98–101, 156–8) Milphio devises a scheme (165 ff.). Agorastocles' bailiff Collybiscus is to be provided with 300 *philippi* by his master, to call on Lycus, pretending to be a stranger, and to express a wish to spend the money enjoying himself in the secrecy of Lycus' establishment. When Collybiscus is in Lycus' house, Agorastocles is to approach Lycus and accuse him of harbouring his slave and money; Lycus will deny it, not knowing Collybiscus and thinking Milphio is meant, and will thus lay himself open to a charge of theft. In order that this scheme may be put into effect, Collybiscus is given 300 *philippi* (415 f.) and disguised (425 f., 577), and Agorastocles goes into town to fetch *testes* (424, 447). Agorastocles duly returns at 504 with a group of men variously described as *testes* (531, 565, 582, 711, 765), *amici* (512, 573; cf. 504, 508) and *advocati* (506, 526, 531, 546, 568, 767, 806). It is clear that the crucial function of these men in Milphio's scheme is to act as witnesses in support of the action for theft with which Lycus will be threatened; that function is accurately described by the word *testes* used of them when they are first mentioned and sometimes later. Of what were

they to bear witness? Milphio's scheme clearly envisaged Collybiscus as being discovered in Lycus' house after Lycus had denied it (180–3); the denial would be important to the case against Lycus. When the *advocati* rehearse the scheme in 557–65, they repeat that Agorastocles is to come in search of his slave and money and that Lycus will deny having them, adding that they are to be witnesses *ad eam rem*. As thus foreshadowed, so in the event, after Collybiscus has entered Lycus' house (720), Agorastocles accuses Lycus of having his slave and money in his house, Lycus denies it, commenting on the fact that Agorastocles has come with witnesses, and Agorastocles then fetches Collybiscus from Lycus' house (761 ff.); Agorastocles specially draws the attention of the *advocati* to the fact that they have heard Lycus' denial (767) and seen Collybiscus come out of Lycus' house (785 f., 796). Milphio's scheme required the *advocati* for this, but not for more than this.

There is no reason to doubt that Milphio's scheme derives from Plautus' model, the *Karchedonios* (53). The once current theory that it was 'contaminated' from a second Greek play was rightly rejected by E. Fraenkel¹²). The theory of B. Krysinieł that it was invented by Plautus is quite implausible¹³). Since the *advocati* have an essential rôle in Milphio's scheme, if the scheme derives from the *Karchedonios* they must also, but not necessarily their entire rôle. In any case there is no need to suppose that in the Greek play Agorastocles' witnesses were in any sense a chorus. It seems very unlikely that a group of men who are fetched by Agorastocles to perform a specific task, and who go home after they have performed it, would have been used to provide choral interludes elsewhere in the play¹⁴). Nor did their essential rôle in the plot make it at all natural that they should sing or dance. There seems no reason why they should not have been simply minor characters of the play, such as Sostratos' mother, daughter and slaves in *Men. Dysk.* 427 ff. (the first a speaking character, the rest mute). In fact however there are grounds for supposing that Plautus substantially expanded their rôle. We shall see that they

12) *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Philol. Untersuchungen 28, Berlin 1922) 262–70 = *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960) 253–60.

13) *Eos* 34 (1932–3) 1–69. She made a number of good observations, however, on the way the scheme is executed in Plautus' play.

14) *Questa* (n. 7) loc. cit. H.-J. Mette, *Lustrum* 10 (1965) 96, supposes that the interludes in the *Karchedonios* were provided by a chorus of normal Menandrian type. Hunter (n. 10) 37 f. envisages a secondary chorus, but that is speculation; the supposed parallel in *P. Berol.* 11771 (C.G.F.P.R. 239) is very doubtful.

play a considerably larger rôle in the execution of the scheme than was foreshadowed in Milphio's plan and that there are a number of incongruities associated with the execution of the scheme. The hypothesis which best explains all the facts is that in the *Karchedonios* the *advocati* performed only the minimum rôle required by Milphio's scheme and were mute extras¹⁵), and that Plautus gave them a more active part and substantial speaking rôle. This hypothesis must now be tested against Plautus' text.

In the deception of Lycus in III 3 the *advocati* take an active part. They approach Lycus first (621 ff.), tell Collybiscus' story for him and introduce him to Lycus (644–77). Thus they play a supporting rôle to Collybiscus, which is described in two metaphors from hunting; 648 *canes compellunt in plagas lepide lupum*, 676 *nos tibi palumbem ad aream usque adduximus*¹⁶). In 621–77 Collybiscus is reduced to the rôle of a spectator in the background, making admiring comments on the cleverness of the *advocati* (647 f., 653 f., 666). In fact the *advocati* take over a large part of Collybiscus' rôle in the deception of Lycus¹⁷). This was not foreshadowed by Milphio's plan, which assigned to Collybiscus the task *ut . . . dicat . . . se peregrinum esse . . .* (174 f.), nor by what was said at Collybiscus' first appearance, when his *callere* was emphasized (578–81). Moreover there is a certain lack of realism about the part played by the *advocati* in the deception of Lycus. Their dialogue with Lycus begins with a prolonged exchange of abuse (621–43) before they get down to business, not calculated, one might think, to win Lycus' confidence. On the other hand their participation in the deception of Lycus would lessen their value later as witnesses¹⁸). On seeing them with Agorastocles, Lycus could not forget that they had introduced Collybiscus to him and might well suspect that he was being tricked, as they virtually admit in 743–5, when they suggest taking precautions to prevent Lycus recognizing them (an idea which is then dropped)¹⁹). Lycus does in fact recognize them and does suspect a plot but misconceives its nature (768–76). It is amusing that he jumps to the wrong conclusion but

15) Cf. the friends of Plesidippus in Rud. 89 ff.

16) Cf. G. Petrone, *Teatro antico e inganno: finzioni plautine* (Palermo 1983) 196–8.

17) Krysiniel (n. 13) 43.

18) Cf. P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (Berliner Studien 5, Berlin 1886) 191.

19) Cf. Krysiniel (n. 13) 44.

hardly realistic²⁰). These incongruities agree very well with the hypothesis that the active participation of the *advocati* in the deception of Lycus does not derive from the *Karchedonios* but is a Plautine addition.

Further support for the hypothesis comes from a consideration of the status and character of the *advocati*; there are contradictions here which suggest Plautine alteration. As already noted, they are sometimes described as *amici*; but other aspects of their characterization do not match this description. Since Agorastocles is wealthy, it would be natural for him to have friends of similar social status; and respectable members of the upper class would be best suited for the essential rôle which the *advocati* had to perform in Milphio's scheme, to act as witnesses in a case against Lycus²¹). The *advocati* however are not of the same social status as Agorastocles, but poor (515 *plebeii et pauperes*, 536) and freedmen (519). Moreover Agorastocles does not treat them with the respect due to friends, even of lower status; he contemptuously abuses them and reminds them of their servile origin (514)²²). They react by complaining of their treatment by the rich and asserting their independence (515–28, 536–40, 811–13); but it is with slaves that they contrast themselves, with all the dignity of those who stand one rung above the bottom of the social ladder. They assert their independence indeed with such vehemence as to make it slightly surprising that they have agreed to help Agorastocles at all. Their motive was evidently not good will towards him, but what it was is left unclear. It has been suggested that they may be Agorastocles' own freedmen and therefore under the obligations owed by *clientes* to their *patronus*²³). This would agree well with their attitude of grudging compliance, less so with their stronger expressions of independence such as 520 *nos te nihili pendimus*. It is not necessary however to see a *clients-patronus* relationship here, and without a clear indication of it in the text we are hardly justified in assuming one; Plautus may not have wished to define the status of the *advocati* very precisely. They could have been motivated by the hope of free meals (529–35, 810) or just dislike of *lenones* (622, 815 f.). Besides their poverty, there is more than a hint that they

20) Cf. Krysiniel (n. 13) 45.

21) Cf. Bacch. 261 f. *antiquom hospitem . . . advocavit* and other cases cited by V. J. Rosivach, *Maia* 35 (1983) 83–5.

22) Petrone (n. 16) 20–2 observes that 510 *loripedes* and 513 *cribro pollinario* also suggest the world of the slave.

23) Rosivach (n. 21) 86 f.

are of somewhat disreputable character: an addiction to litigation is imputed to them (586 f.) and their skill in deception is particularly emphasized (653–4 *mortalis malos! ut ingrediuntur docte in sycophantiam*; cf. 574, 603, 648, 666). The most likely explanation of the inconsistent characterization of the *advocati* is that in the *Karchedonios* Agorastocles' intended witnesses were indeed the upper-class friends that we should expect (the word *amici* being a survival of their original status), and that Plautus downgraded them to vulgar freedmen²⁴). That they were freedmen in the *Karchedonios* is very unlikely, since in the Greek world freed slaves did not acquire citizenship and, even if eligible, would be undesirable as witnesses²⁵). That their characterization in the Latin play is largely due to Plautus is supported by its distinctly Roman colouring; this appears already in their designation as *advocati*²⁶) and even more when Milphio recognizes in them professional litigants who spend more time in the *comitium* than does the praetor (583–5)²⁷). The character-transformation would fit their new rôle as active participants in the intrigue, and this was probably its primary, if not its only purpose. The fact that the *advocati* have something in common with the *edax parasitus* and *sycophanta impudens*, two (overlapping) stock types of New Comedy²⁸), is not inconsistent with this. When Plautus invents he can both draw on Roman life and use conventional motifs of New Comedy, as I have shown elsewhere in connection with his cooks²⁹). The *advocati* too are a literary creation and will reflect contemporary Roman life only to a certain degree.

Much of the characterization of the *advocati* is found in their entrance scene (III 1). That scene contains other signs of Plautus' hand. The greater part of it consists of two sections, 504–46 and 567–73, in which Agorastocles complains of the slowness of the *advocati* and they justify it; at the end of each section Agorastocles

24) Rosivach (n. 21) 83–90 saw this, but his analysis did not go far enough.

25) E. Rawson, *Freedmen in the early second century B.C.: The evidence of comedy* (forthcoming). In 621 Plautus applies Roman law to make them *Aetoli cives* (cf. A. S. Gratwick in *Cambridge history of classical literature*, ed. P. E. Easterling and E. J. Kenney, II [Cambridge 1982] 113).

26) Cf. Kubitschek, RE 1 (1893) 436–8 s.v. *Advocatus*.

27) Cf. O. Fredershausen, *De iure Plautino et Terentiano* (Diss. Göttingen 1906) 48.

28) Ter. H.T. 38; cf. J. O. Lofberg, C.Ph. 15 (1920) 61–72. The parasite must however have been a reality of Roman life in Plautus' time; cf. Cato, Agr. 5, 4, Enn. Sat. 14–19.

29) Cl. Ant. 4 (1985) 72–102.

says he was only joking (541, 572). This theme is not entirely irrelevant to the plot but is elaborated at disproportionate length, even if some of the repetitions are excluded as post-Plautine³⁰). The extended development of the idea and 574 *mittite istaec* signalling the end of a digression are characteristic of Plautus³¹). Plautus' starting point could have been a brief exhortation to hurry addressed by the impatient Agorastocles to his friends in the *Karchedonios*³²). I cannot accept the argument of W. G. Arnott³³) that 522 f. *liberos homines per urbem modico magis par est gradu ire, servoli esse duco festinantem currere* bears a resemblance to Alexis fr. 263 K. ἐν γὰρ νομίζω τοῦτο τῶν ἀνελευθέρων εἶναι, τὸ βαδίσειν ἄρρηθμως ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς too close to be ascribed to chance. The resemblance is not that great. Alexis' speaker expresses a Greek commonplace (Arnott cites parallels), his serious moralizing tone is quite different from that of Plautus' defensive freedmen, he refers to ἀρρηθμία, which does not necessarily imply speed, and in using the word ἀνελεύθερος he is unlikely to have actual slaves in mind. The Alexis passage could have served as the starting point for Plautine elaboration, but there is no need to suppose that it did. Rather 523 suggests that the slowness which so conspicuously characterizes the entry of the freedmen *advocati* is a deliberate reversal of the conventional comic motif of the *servus currens*³⁴). The following sentence, 524 f. *praesertim in re populi placida atque interfectis hostibus non decet tumultuari*, is probably Plautine invention³⁵).

Between the two sections of III 1 devoted to the snail-like pace of the *advocati* is sandwiched one in which they are tested on their knowledge of the scheme in which they are to participate (547–66). This prepares for III 3 and largely repeats the scheme as originally outlined by Milphio³⁶); characteristic of Plautus are the

30) Cf. Maurach (n. 11) on 543–6, 567–75; but I am not convinced that Plautus himself is not to blame.

31) Cf. Fraenkel, P. im P. 143 = El. Pl. 136.

32) Cf. Merc. 671, Pseud. 920, Men. Dysk. 430, Ter. Eun. 912 f.

33) Rh. Mus. 102 (1959) 260.

34) Krysiniei (n. 13) 37, Petrone (n. 16) 18 f. 508 f. express the *topos* that the old are slow (Maurach [n. 11] 241); but the *advocati* are not old and there is no reason to regard the whole passage as a variant on the *topos*.

35) Cf. Truc. 75 (not considered by Arnott), K. H. E. Schutter, *Quibus annis comediae Plautinae primum actae sint quaeritur* (Groningen 1952) 125, Maurach (n. 11) 42 f., Petrone (n. 16) 19.

36) Cf. Krysiniei (n. 13) 37 f.

breach of the dramatic illusion in 550–4³⁷) and the little joke in 566. Finally in 574 f. Agorastocles once again reassures himself that the *advocati* are fully prepared.

Moving on to III 2, with the entry of Milphio we have a scene involving four speaking characters. Increasingly the evidence indicates that this was at least not normal in Greek New Comedy and that many, if not all, four-speaker scenes in Plautus and Terence result from changes by the Latin adapter³⁸). It is true that the spokesman of the *advocati* is somewhat different from a normal character, but the fact remains that there is no known parallel for such a scene in Greek New Comedy. The hypothesis that in the *Karchedonios* the *advocati* were mute extras gives a normal three-speaker scene; and there is no difficulty in ascribing their whole speaking rôle in this scene to Plautus. As already noted, Milphio at once recognizes them (it is not clear how) as professional litigants; his taunt prompts a curse from them (588). 591–4 and 600–3 prepare for the deception of Lycus in III 3; the *advocati* are instructed to point out Lycus to Collybiscus, since Collybiscus does not know him. If the active rôle of the *advocati* in the deception is a Plautine addition, these lines must be also; Collybiscus could have identified Lycus in some other way in the *Karchedonios*. In 595–9 the *advocati* demand to inspect the money carried by Collybiscus on the implausible pretext *ut sciamus quid dicamus mox pro testimonio*; the real reason for the inspection is to allow them to comment on the stage money, lupins such as 'barbarians' use to fatten oxen. The breach of the dramatic illusion and the allusion to the Roman world as *barbaria* are both characteristic of Plautus³⁹). In 604b–8 Agorastocles and Milphio are sent indoors by Collybiscus; the *advocati* engage in a few brief exchanges with Agorastocles to overcome an unaccountable reluctance on his part to go in. Finally in 609–14 the sound of Lycus' door opening is heard, which prompts an indecent pun⁴⁰), the *advocati* station themselves in front of Collybiscus, which prepares for the next scene and prompts a joking comparison with homosexual *scurrae*⁴¹), and the

37) Petrone (n. 16) 25–9 brings out well the metatheatrical character of this passage in which the *advocati* rehearse their part in the play within a play; cf. F. Muecke, *Cl.Ant.* 5 (1986) 225.

38) K. Gaiser, *A.N.R.W.* I. 2 (1972) 1037 f., 1073–9, F. H. Sandbach in *Le monde grec – Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels 1975) 197–204.

39) Maurach (n. 11) ad loc., Petrone (n. 16) 31–7, Muecke (n. 37) 220.

40) Cf. Fraenkel, *P.* im *P.* 397 = *El. Pl.* 376.

41) P. B. Corbett, *Eranos* 66 (1968) 121 and Maurach (n. 11) ad loc. are wrong to reject Ussing's interpretation of 612, which alone gives *pone* real point.

advocati identify Lycus, as prepared by 591–4. For the *Karchedonios* it is easy to imagine a dialogue between Agorastocles, Milphio (to whom Plautus here gives only a small rôle) and Collybiscus, with Agorastocles' friends as silent bystanders; the friends would naturally make their exit together with Agorastocles (608).

The active rôle of the *advocati* in the deception of Lycus finishes at 677; having explained how he can profit from Collybiscus, they leave Lycus to deal directly with Collybiscus in 683 ff., firmly refusing to be further involved (674–7, 679 f.). They do not however go away, as one might have expected, because Collybiscus says he wishes them to see him hand Lycus the money (681); they agree to watch from a distance (682 *procul*) and must be supposed to stay in the background for the rest of the scene⁴². Now, as we have seen, Milphio's scheme did not require anyone to witness the money being given to Lycus. Why did the dramatist here keep the *advocati* on stage? The reason soon becomes clear. Before Lycus takes Collybiscus into his house at 720, he demands immediate payment of the money (704 f.). A surprising development then follows; the *advocati* suddenly summon Agorastocles from his house to witness the hand-over. On our hypothesis this development cannot have taken place in the *Karchedonios*; and in fact G. Jachmann observed that there are a number of reasons for attributing it to Plautus⁴³. As a piece of stage action it is artificial and highly unrealistic that, when Collybiscus is on the point of handing over the money and eager to do so (706), the actual hand-over should be delayed for six lines while the *advocati* call Agorastocles out to watch, unobserved by Lycus. Milphio's plan did not prepare for this and it is inconsistent with the very reasonable concern expressed by Collybiscus in 604–6 that Agorastocles should be kept out of sight of Lycus *ne fallaciae praepedimentum obiciatur*. It is also inconsistent with Agorastocles' subsequent behaviour; in his dialogue with Lycus in III 5 he conspicuously fails to refer to the fact that he has himself seen Collybiscus give Lycus the money. Krysinieł (n. 13) 42 f. further noted that the

That the word *scurra* could have a homosexual connotation is shown by Most. 15 *urbanus scurra . . . deliciae populi*. There is also play with the sexual sense of *consuetudo* (O.L.D. s.v. 3b); cf. *Asin.* 703 *ut consuetus es puer olim*, *Aul.* 637, *Capt.* 867, *Rud.* 1074. Plautus likes to joke about homosexuality; cf. D. Hughes, *Rh.Mus.* 127 (1984) 51 n. 8, S. Lilja, *Arctos* 16 (1982) 57–64. I do not know on what Petrone (n. 16) 17 bases her belief that *scurrae* is equivalent to 'actors'.

42) Cf. Krysinieł (n. 13) 44.

43) *Plautinisches und Attisches* (Problemata 3, Berlin 1931) 205 f.

sudden calling out of Agorastocles here suspiciously resembles 205–9, where Milphio suddenly calls out Agorastocles to observe Adelphasium⁴⁴). We can add that 711–20 again involve four speaking characters.

The possibility must be considered that the handover of the money on stage is also a Plautine invention. It is suggestive, but not conclusive, that Lycus makes his demand in the form of a Plautine riddle (704 f.) and that the prospect of the hand-over serves to motivate the continued presence of the *advocati* on stage (681). As we shall see, there is no reason to doubt that in the *Karchedonios* Collybiscus gave Lycus the money, but this could have happened behind the scene. If the hand-over was not witnessed, it made no difference to the subsequent action whether it took place behind the scene or on stage. It seems more likely however that in the *Karchedonios* too Collybiscus gave Lycus the money before they went indoors (713–15); it would be in the interest of the deception that Lycus should at least be shown the bait.

If neither the *advocati* nor Agorastocles were present in the *Karchedonios* during the deception scene, with the exit of Lycus and Collybiscus at 720 the stage would have been empty. This is a likely place for a choral interlude, marking a lapse of some time⁴⁵), after which Lycus will have come out of his house again to meet Agorastocles and his friends coming out of Agorastocles' house. One effect then of Plautus' introduction of Agorastocles at 711 will have been to bridge the Greek act division. Who entered first at the beginning of the new act we cannot be sure, but the dialogue between Agorastocles and the *advocati* in 721–45 could well have replaced an original entrance monologue of Agorastocles. That this dialogue is the work of Plautus can hardly be doubted. Jachmann demonstrated how characteristically Plautine it is, in the string of impertinently laconic retorts by the *advocati*, in the play with repeated *quippini*, in the pun of 729, in the unnecessary repetition of Milphio's scheme and in the unexpected variation on that scheme in 732–4⁴⁶). The debate on what to do next is absurdly unrealistic; on seeing Collybiscus give Lycus the money, his master might have been expected in real life to intervene immediately

44) I have argued in B.I.C.S. 35 (1988) 101–110 that 205–9 are in all probability also Plautine invention.

45) 759 perhaps preserves an indication in the Greek that stage-time has moved on since the preceding act, in which Lycus was making preparations for his lunch (469, 615 f.; cf. 529, 1282).

46) Plaut. und Att. 203 f.

rather than allow him to enter Lycus' house. For Plautus however this dialogue, apart from its comic effect, was required by his premature introduction of Agorastocles and served to provide an interval between the exit and re-entry of Lycus⁴⁷). In its presumed context in the *Karchedonios* the relatively polite exchange of greetings between Agorastocles and Lycus in 751 ff., before Agorastocles makes his accusation, would be quite natural; in its Plautine context, after Agorastocles has witnessed Collybiscus hand over the money and enter Lycus' house, it is somewhat surprising.

The *advocati* speak three times in III 5. In 767 their *meminimus* in reply to Agorastocles' *mementote* is dispensable; a nod of agreement would have sufficed. Their other two utterances are in 779–85a, a passage which there are other reasons for attributing to Plautus. Here, after admitting that they have helped to deceive Lycus, the *advocati* belatedly make use of their knowledge that Collybiscus has just given Lycus the 300 *philippi* and point out that the wallet containing the gold is on Lycus' person; and this leads to Agorastocles forcing Lycus to hand it back (784 f. *age omitte actutum, furcifer, marsuppium: manifeste fur es*). It was recognized by Leo that this is inconsistent with several passages at the end of the play which state or imply that the 300 *philippi* are still in the possession of Lycus (1351, 1360–3, 1384, 1393 f., 1408)⁴⁸). Now there are great difficulties in the way of reconstructing, even in outline, the end of the *Karchedonios*. In the first place it is uncertain how Plautus intended his play to end. The manuscript tradition has preserved variant endings; 1372–1422 seem to be an alternative to 1315–71, although failing to provide a satisfactory entry for Lycus⁴⁹). Moreover it is clear that neither version can be at all close to the Greek. Both involve six speaking characters; in both the mere fact that the girls have been discovered to be the freeborn daughters of the Carthaginian Hanno is assumed to render the Calydonian Lycus actionable, as if all were Romans, in a *liberalis causa*, against which Lycus can offer no defence (1344–9, 1387–93). Plautus must have drastically transformed the end of the *Karchedonios*. It seems probable that he cut short the original conclusion of Milphio's scheme, in which it served, according to plan, to force Lycus' capitulation, and substi-

47) Cf. Krysiniel (n. 13) 44.

48) Plauti comoediae II (Berlin 1896) on 1363; cf. Jachmann, *Χάριτες*, Festschrift F. Leo (Berlin 1911) 270.

49) Cf. Maurach (n. 11) 394–8, with references to earlier discussions of this intractable problem.

tuted a more farcical finale, based on the *liberalis causa* motif, which he also incorporated in a second trick (1086–1110)⁵⁰). It is probable then that in the ending of the *Karchedonios* Milphio's scheme played an important rôle, and likely that the references at the end of Plautus' play to the money belonging to Agorastocles in Lycus' possession, Agorastocles' threats to take Lycus to court on a charge of theft and demands for repayment of twice the sum and perhaps Lycus' offer to make simple restitution (1362 *simplum solvere*) are relics of the situation in the Greek play. The premature repayment in 784 can be seen as an addition by Plautus designed in some degree to replace what he omitted at the end of the play. It was connected with his earlier addition; for Agorastocles could not at this point have demanded the money back if he had not seen it given to Lycus (hence *manifesto fur es*)⁵¹).

In III 6 the *advocati* speak two short sentences in 798–800, prompted by the flight of Lycus, and an exit monologue in 808b–16. Again there are grounds for attributing these to Plautus. To begin with the exit monologue, this largely consists of complaints about the treatment of the poor by the rich, a theme which we have already seen reason to attribute to Plautus. Moreover Jachmann found other grounds for attributing these lines to Plautus and for believing that Plautus drastically transformed III 6⁵²). He acutely observed that the immediate cause of the grumbings of the *advocati* is Agorastocles' dismissal of them with instructions to meet him *cras . . . in comitio*, and that the way in which Agorastocles shelves any further action against Lycus until 'tomorrow' (cf. 800) is inconsistent with the end of the play (1342 *eamus in ius*), dramatically inappropriate given the crucial importance of such action as an integral part of Milphio's scheme to free Adelphasium, and paralleled by other places where Plautus has probably cut short a strand of action in his Greek model, especially Pseud. 1231 *cras agam cum civibus*⁵³). Now it has been justly

50) Gratwick, C.H.C.L. II 98–101, 113.

51) According to A. Watson, Roman private law around 200 B.C. (Edinburgh 1971) 148 f., the mere fact that Lycus is caught with the supposedly stolen property in his hands would under Roman law justify the graver charge of *manifestum furtum*; but Agorastocles would hardly have recognized the *marsupium* at once if he had not himself just seen Collybiscus give it to Lycus. In the *Karchedonios* the charge would presumably have been one of receiving stolen property; cf. D. Cohen, Theft in Athenian law (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Rechtsgeschichte 74, Munich 1983) 84–6.

52) Xáουτες 272.

53) Cf. E. Lefèvre, *Hermes* 105 (1977) 449.

observed that, since the action of the play is set on the festival of the Aphrodisia, no case could actually be taken to court until the following day⁵⁴). That does not however invalidate Jachmann's objection to the way in which the *cras* motif is used in III 6 to give the impression that Milphio's scheme will have no developments within the play, at most it suggests that there may have been a reference to 'tomorrow' at the *end* of the *Karchedonios*. Whereas Jachmann believed that Plautus' changes here resulted from his insertion of Milphio's scheme into the plot of the *Karchedonios* from another Greek play, it is better to see them as resulting from his transformation of the end of the *Karchedonios* in such a way that Milphio's scheme was no longer needed to achieve its ultimate object, the freeing of Adelphasium; the *cras* motif in III 6 can be interpreted as signalling Plautus' intention to drop the original ending of Milphio's scheme, although he inconsistently preserved some relics of that ending in his own finale.

A different line of inquiry can perhaps reveal a little more about Plautus' changes in III 6. Let us consider the movements of the characters at the end of this and the preceding scene. These show certain inconsistencies which suggest Plautine tampering. Having dismissed the *advocati*, Agorastocles goes back into his house (808); the *advocati* set off for home (814) and can be assumed to leave in the direction of the *forum*. We have seen reason to believe Agorastocles' dismissal of the *advocati* a Plautine addition, and there are other grounds for believing that Plautus may at the same time have altered Agorastocles' movements. It has long been considered one of the most serious incongruities in the *Poenulus* that Milphio comes out of the house of his master Agorastocles at 817 anxious to find out how his scheme is progressing (*expecto quo pacto meae techinae processuræ sient*); it appears that he must somehow have failed to meet Agorastocles when he entered his house at 808, after the successful completion of the first part of the scheme⁵⁵). The explanation of this incongruity could be that in the *Karchedonios* Agorastocles did not then enter his house. If he did not, he can only have gone towards the market-place, presumably accompanied by his friends and with the intention of

54) Gratwick, *Hermes* 99 (1971) 29, Maurach (n. 11) on 800. The action of a play could extend over two days (A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A commentary* [Oxford 1973] 325 f.), but this is very unlikely to have been the case with the *Karchedonios* (cf. 1133 *Aphrodisia bodie*, 1180 *festu' dies*, etc.).

55) Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* (Berlin ²1912) 172 f., Jachmann, *Plaut. und Att.* 196 f., Fraenkel, *P.* im P. 269 f. = *El. Pl.* 259 f.

taking some further immediate action against Lycus. Thus Plautus' change of Agorastocles' movements would go together with his use of the *cras* motif to curtail one strand of the plot of the *Karchedonios*. The hypothesis that in the *Karchedonios* Agorastocles made his exit towards the market-place, not into his house, at the end of this scene can be supported by another piece of evidence. At 929 Milphio, after his encounter with Syncerastus, returns home with the words *nunc intro ibo: dum erus adveniat a foro, opperiar domi*; this too, as has long been observed, is inconsistent with Agorastocles' having entered his house at 808⁵⁶). 923–9 are generally regarded as a doublet of 917–22 and post-Plautine; and it cannot be denied that the content of both passages is substantially the same and that there are verbal repetitions (917 ~ 923 *di immortales*, 920 *ibo intro* ~ 929 *intro ibo*). It is by no means obvious however which passage, if either, is the post-Plautine interpolation; there are no compelling linguistic objections to either passage and Plautus is notoriously prone both to repetition and to inconsistency. In any case, whoever wrote 929, we are entitled to ask why he introduced such an obvious inconsistency. It seems not unlikely that 929 preserves a relic of Agorastocles' movements in the *Karchedonios*. One would then have to suppose that Plautus cut a scene depicting Agorastocles' return before he comes out of his house again at 961; the most likely place for such a scene would be at the beginning of the new act which probably began after 929, before the entrance of Hanno⁵⁷). That Plautus was capable of making such changes is proved by his treatment of the movements of Nicobulus in the *Bacchides*⁵⁸). To make sense of Milphio's entrance lines in 817 ff. we must also suppose that in the *Karchedonios* Collybiscus did not make his exit into Agorastocles' house at 805, but that is not unlikely. There are other grounds for attributing Collybiscus' exit lines, 802–5a, to Plautus: he claims to have stuffed himself with *exta*, although they have not yet been brought from the temple (491, 617, 847, 863), and this motif duplicates what the soldier says in 1285. In the *Karchedonios* Collybiscus

56) J. L. Ussing, T. Macci Plauti comoediae (Copenhagen 1875–92) on 928.

57) Mette (n. 14) 56. If Plautus found such a scene in the *Karchedonios*, he could have kept Milphio on stage to meet Agorastocles, but he might well prefer the effect of having Hanno on stage to overhear Agorastocles' entrance lines in 961 ff., which probably derives from the *Karchedonios* (cf. Gratwick [n. 54] 29).

58) At 348 he leaves for the *forum*, but at 525 he is assumed to be at home, because Plautus omitted a scene of the *Dis Exapaton*; cf. E. W. Handley, Menander and Plautus (London 1968) 14 with n. 11.

could have accompanied Agorastocles to the market-place or been sent back to the country, from where he originally came (170).

Finally, it seems likely that Plautus has altered the manner of Lycus' exit at the end of III 5. Plautus makes him flee towards the *forum* (cf. 1338 ff.) as soon as Agorastocles goes into his house and before he brings Collybiscus out. That is intelligible in its Plautine context; Lycus has just been informed by the *advocati* that he has been duped (779–82) and in typically Plautine comic style declares that he has no option but to go and hang himself (787–95). In the presumed situation of the *Karchedonios*, however, it would be premature at this point for Lycus to give in so easily on the strength of the unsupported accusation of Agorastocles. This suggests that in the *Karchedonios* he remained on stage until after Agorastocles brought Collybiscus from his house, argued with Agorastocles and accompanied him towards the market-place. Lycus' premature flight will then have been another of the changes in this section of the play associated with Plautus' curtailment of the original conclusion of Milphio's intrigue⁵⁹). In 798a *quid nunc, scelestē leno?* Agorastocles, coming out of Lycus' house, gives expression to his expectation of finding Lycus waiting for him; we may suppose that in the *Karchedonios* this expectation was not disappointed. In Plautus however the *advocati* inform Agorastocles of Lycus' flight and this prompts Agorastocles' declaration *cras suscribam homini dicam* (800). Thus the last little bit of the speaking rôle of the *advocati* can be fitted into the interlocking network of Plautine changes.

Some of the details of this interpretation may be thought too speculative, but our main hypothesis, that the whole speaking rôle of the *advocati* was created by Plautus and that their counterparts in the *Karchedonios* were κωφὰ πρόσωπα, fits such a range of phenomena in the text that it must be accorded a high degree of probability. It provides an economical explanation of a considerable number of features of this section of Plautus' play which do not look like the work of a dramatist of the Greek New Comedy creating a play from scratch, notably the exaggerated emphasis on the slow entry of the *advocati*, their characterization as vulgar freedmen, the incongruities caused by their active participation in the deception of Lycus and their calling Agorastocles out to witness the money being handed over, and the divergence from the apparent Greek convention that a *quarta persona* should not

59) Cf. Krysiniel (n. 13) 46 f.

speak; and it agrees well with a considerable number of positive indications of Plautine authorship.

The hypothesis receives further confirmation from the increasing weight of evidence that both Plautus and Terence regularly made similar changes. The evidence is clearer for Terence, because we are helped by statements of Terence himself and of Donatus and can compare his four Menandrian plays with the rediscovered texts of Menander. We can now see that his introduction of extra characters from other Greek plays, a procedure which his ancient critics, for their own reasons, denigrated as *contaminare fabulas*, was only a special case of a more general practice; without altering the main framework of the Greek plot he was following, he not infrequently changed characters' movements, especially to bridge act divisions, and created new dialogues by introducing characters into extra scenes and by creating new speaking characters, whether based on mute extras of his Greek models or invented⁶⁰). For Plautus we have to rely on analysis of the plays, but this has yielded a number of probable examples of similar changes, changes which go beyond the mere expansion of a monologue or dialogue of his model but for which no additional Greek model need be postulated. These include the alteration of characters' movements and their involvement in new pieces of stage action, their introduction into extra scenes and participation in newly created dialogues⁶¹), and finally the invention of new speaking characters⁶²). Of particular relevance to the *advocati* is

60) C.Q. 33 (1983) 428–31 with references.

61) E.g. Bacch. 572–86 Pistoclus' brief and unnecessary trip into Bacchis' house, making possible the Parasite's door-knocking comedy (Primmer [n. 4] 55 f.; cf. C.R. 35 [1985] 396 f.), 920b–1045 Nicobulus kept on stage and Chrysalus reintroduced for a second letter-deception (Primmer [n. 4] 49–52, 65–70), Cas. 353–421 Cleustrata added to the lot-drawing scene (Lefèvre, Hermes 107 [1979] 327 f.), Most. 308–98 offstage symposium transferred on stage, bridging act division (Gaiser [n. 38] 1074 f.), Poen. 198–409 Agorastocles and Milphio added to a scene depicting Adelphasium and Anterastilis on their way to the temple (B.I.C.S. 35 [1988] 101–110), Pseud. 573^a Pseudolus' brief trip into his house preparing for his triumphant entrance monody (Jachmann, Philologus 88 [1933] 454–6), Rud. 663–882, 1045–1128 Palaestra and Ampelisca introduced into extra scenes to be shown taking refuge at the altar on stage (Gaiser [n. 38] 1075 f.), Stich. 154 Crocotium's movements altered to bridge act division (Fraenkel, P. im P. 287 = El. Pl. 276, Burckhardt [n. 3] 19).

62) E.g. Curc. 251–370 the cook, a doublet of Palinurus (Cl. Ant. 4 [1985] 95–9), Mil. 813–69 Lurcio, a doublet of Sceledrus (H.-W. Nörenberg, Rh. Mus. 118 [1975] 285–310), 1394–1427 Cario, a doublet of a *lorarius*, who is also given a few words to speak (B.I.C.S. 32 [1985] 83 f., Cl. Ant. 4 [1985] 94 f.), Most. 858–903 Pinacium, a doublet of Phanicus, introduced early as a substitute for the Greek

the case of Saturio's daughter, disguised as an Arabian, in Pers. 543 ff., another four-speaker scene. I shall argue elsewhere that she was mute in the corresponding scene of the Greek play but given a speaking rôle by Plautus in order to take an active part in the deception of Dordalus⁶³). Her skilful performance in this rôle prompts admiring aside comments from Toxilus very similar to Collybiscus' comments on the *advocati*: 622 *ita catast et callida*, 635 *lepide lusit*, 639 *sapienter*.

II

The case of the fishermen of the *Rudens* is less complicated and can be dealt with much more briefly. They take part in the action of the play but only in one scene, in a brief dialogue with Trachalio, 310–24. Trachalio asks them whether they have seen either Plesidippus and his friends or Labrax and Charmides, and to both questions they give a negative answer. The development of the plot would therefore not be affected if this dialogue never took place. Moreover it contains certain inconsistencies. First, since the fishermen are only passing the temple of Venus on their way from the town to the seashore (295), they are not in a position to state confidently (316, 323) that no one answering the description of Plesidippus or Labrax, with their respective parties, has come there. In contrast, when Plesidippus earlier inquired of Daemones if he had seen Labrax (124–30), Daemones carefully explained why he was the ideal person to ask (131–7). Trachalio's inquiries can be seen as a doublet of Plesidippus', used less appropriately. Secondly, in this scene Trachalio is informed by the fishermen that neither Plesidippus nor Labrax has come to the temple, and in 324–6 he infers (correctly) that Labrax has cheated Plesidippus and absconded with the girls by ship, stating that he had expected this; in the following scene however, when he meets Ampelisca coming from the temple, he expects Plesidippus to be inside and is surprised when told that he is not (340 f.), he expects a *prandium* to be

entr'acte (I. Weide, *Hermes* 89 [1961] 198–203, Gaiser [n.38] 1040 f.), Pers. 183–250, 271b–300a Paegnium with his letter from Toxilus, a doublet of Sophoclidisca with her letter from Lemniselenis (Hughes [n.41] 46–57; cf. Lilja [n.41] 62).

63) I agree with G. Chiarini, *La recita. Plauto, la farsa, la festa* (Bologna 1979) 164 f., that the interrogation of the girl in 591–661 is a Plautine addition, but would also attribute to Plautus her speaking rôle in the rest of this scene and the following scenes. Cf. C.Q. 39 (1989) 392–396.

in preparation in accordance with Labrax's invitation and is surprised to hear that it is not (342–7) and that Labrax abducted the girls by ship (335–7). The dialogue between the fishermen and Trachalio is therefore not only dispensable but inconsistent with the following scene in giving Trachalio information which he should not have until he learns it from Ampelisca. Trachalio's 'I expected this' in 324–6 is a doublet of 376 f., introduced prematurely. It seems unlikely that such inconsistencies are to be attributed to Diphilus. Jachmann observed the second inconsistency and tried to explain it by supposing that 324–8 and 337b–48a are Plautine insertions⁶⁴), but there is no good reason for denying the substance of 337b–48a to Diphilus. It is more likely that Plautus inserted Trachalio's meeting with the fishermen and reflections on it in 309–30. We can suppose that in the Greek play an entrance monologue by Trachalio (306–8) led directly into the following Trachalio-Ampelisca scene⁶⁵).

What then of the fishermen's entrance lines, the theme of which is their poverty and hard way of life? Wilamowitz suggested that they are based on a song of Diphilus' chorus⁶⁶). Now it is indeed probable that Diphilus' first act ended at 289, the first point at which the action allows a break⁶⁷). It is therefore probable that there was a choral interlude at this point of the Greek play, and, in view of the unusual setting of the play, fishermen would be the obvious choice for its chorus. Wilamowitz's theory presupposes that the words of this choral song were, exceptionally, written out in the text of Diphilus which Plautus used. This cannot be disproved, but, unless there are other grounds for attributing the fishermen's words to Diphilus, it is easier to attribute them to Plautus. Commentators have been unduly influenced by Greek parallels for the association of poverty with fishermen and by the Greek words of 296 f. and 310⁶⁸). Although most of the substance of the passage could derive from Diphilus, equally it contains nothing which could not have been written by Plautus. Plautus must have been perfectly familiar with fishermen, especially

64) Plaut. und Att. 88 f.

65) The arguments of Lefèvre, *Diphilos und Plautus* (Abh. Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwiss. Kl. [10] 1984, Stuttgart 1984) 7–10, that Ampelisca is a Plautine invention are unconvincing.

66) Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin 1925) 120.

67) P. E. Legrand, *Daos* (Paris 1910) 483, A. Freté, *R.E.L.* 8 (1930) 69 f., Jachmann, *Plaut. und Att.* 98 n. 3.

68) F. Marx, *Plautus Rudens* (Abh. Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl. 37/1, Leipzig 1928) on 290 ff., 297, 310, Rosivach (n. 21) 92 f.

perhaps those who, unlike Gripus (910), did not use boats but merely gathered shellfish and fished with rods from the shore⁶⁹). The fact that Plautus was in all probability responsible for the grumbings of the poor *advocati* strengthens the case for also attributing to him the complaints of the fishermen about their poverty. In style the passage is very Plautine, with its frequent alliteration and assonance. Wilamowitz asserted, 'erfunden kann er diesen auch bei ihm singulären Chor nicht haben'; that underestimates Plautus. It is likely enough that Plautus' starting point was a reference at the end of Diphilus' first act to the approach of a band of fishermen who would constitute the chorus; but there is no reason to suppose that Plautus derived from Diphilus more than the idea of a chorus of fishermen.

III

We can guess at some of the motives which may have led Plautus to create his choruses of *advocati* and fishermen. First, their potential for visual effects must have counted for something, although we cannot know just how this potential was exploited on the Roman stage. The slow gait of the *advocati*, so often referred to in the text, must have been emphasized, perhaps with comic exaggeration, as we may guess that the haste of the *servus currens* was comically exaggerated. That the fishermen were provided with the *ornatus*⁷⁰) of their trade and carried rods and lines is proved by a reference in the text (293 f.); they would thus add colour to the play's setting. The lively iambic *septenarii* would be well adapted to some sort of dancing entry⁷¹), but the fact that the same metre is used in the following dialogue discourages speculation along these lines. Secondly, both choruses provide a mouthpiece for some mild social comment of little or no relevance to the main action of the play, expressing the grumbles of the poor; these must have struck a chord with many of the audience. It may be right to recognize something of the spirit of Naevius in this and to regard Poen. 537 *ne nos tam contemptim conteras* as a significant echo of Naev. Bell. Poen. 39 Warrington *superbiter contemptim conterit*

69) Cf. Curc. 474 *forum piscarium*, in a certainly Plautine passage. Greek loan-words for shellfish, as for so many other things, were embedded in the language (L. R. Palmer, *The Latin language* [London 1954] 81).

70) The fact that the fishermen directly address the audience gives *ornatus* theatrical overtones; cf. Muecke (n. 37) 219 n. 14.

71) Cf. W. M. Lindsay, *Early Latin verse* (Oxford 1922) 274-6.

*legiones*⁷²), even if Petrone (n. 16) 22–4 goes too far in claiming to decode the ‘troupe’ of *advocati* as ‘l’incarnazione scenica del vecchio teatro di Nevio’⁷³). After all the poor are always with us. Thirdly, the *advocati* added a new dimension to the deception of Lycus, emphasizing one of Plautus’ favourite themes. Their active participation in the deception temporarily turns Collybiscus into an audience of one, who comments on their performance; here and in the expanded scenes of preparation the idea of the deception as a play within a play is emphasized. The *Persa* provides a good parallel for the metatheatrical treatment of the deception as a ‘performance’ and for its expansion by Plautus⁷⁴). Fourthly, in the *Rudens* the appearance of the fishermen served, in place of the choral interlude which probably occurred at this point of Diphilus’ play, to provide an interval between the exit of Palaestra and Ampelisca at 289 and Ampelisca’s re-entry at 331⁷⁵),

Finally we may consider possible formal models for Plautus’ choruses. We have seen that New Comedy is unlikely to have provided them. It is not very likely that Plautus was directly influenced by Old Comedy; the resemblances between Plautus and Aristophanes are in general better attributed to native Italian traditions of popular comedy, themselves no doubt influenced by the types of comic drama which developed in Magna Graecia⁷⁶). For Plautus’ choruses the most likely model is perhaps to be found in the choruses of contemporary Roman tragedy. That Roman republican tragedies did have choruses is certain, although we know very little about them⁷⁷). Since they were regularly based on fifth-century Attic tragedies in which the chorus took an active part, it would often have been difficult to dispense with the chorus. In at least one case Ennius probably introduced a chorus which was not in his Greek model. A chorus of soldiers is attested for his *Iphigenia* (Gell. 19, 10, 12), but there is no such chorus in his probable model, Euripides’ *I.A.*, which has a chorus of women of Chalcis⁷⁸). What part this chorus of soldiers played in the action of Ennius’ *Iphigenia* we cannot say, but on the assumption that

72) Fraenkel, RE Suppl. 6 (1935) 638.

73) Her suggestion that 514 alludes to the imprisonment of Naevius is unconvincing, given the frequency with which Plautus refers to the shackles of slaves.

74) Cf. Chiarini (n. 63) 126–78, Petrone (n. 16) 37–9.

75) Marx (n. 68) on 290 ff.

76) Fraenkel, P. im P. 398 f. = El. Pl. 377.

77) Jocelyn, Trag. of Enn. 19 f.

78) Cf. Jocelyn, Trag. of Enn. 318 f., 334–7.

Ennius followed the main lines of the Greek play it cannot have been a significant one; in this they resemble Plautus' *advocati* and fishermen. Moreover the well known lines uttered by Ennius' soldiers (195–202 Jocelyn) show a certain resemblance in subject-matter and style to the utterances of the *advocati* and fishermen. They express the moralizing reflections of persons of low social status, although, it is true, their complaints of enforced idleness are more relevant to the plot than the complaints of Plautus' choruses. They use trochaic metre, possibly though not certainly *septenarii*, and the same stylistic devices of repetition and assonance, taken to even greater extremes, that especially characterize Plautus' fishermen: *otio qui nescit uti plus negoti habet quam cum est negotium in negotio*. These resemblances lend some plausibility to the theory that Plautus borrowed from contemporary tragedy the idea of occasionally using similar choruses for his own purposes; it does not seem that parody is involved. In any case Ennius' soldiers provide an example of a Roman dramatic chorus which justifies describing Plautus' *advocati* and fishermen as choruses. Plautus may indeed cast a little light into the obscurity which surrounds the chorus of Roman tragedy. If the *advocati* and fishermen are modelled on Roman tragedy rather than New Comedy, this lends some support to Leo's theory that there was no choral song on the Roman stage but that the utterances of the chorus were always delivered by its leader⁷⁹). As Jocelyn has observed, there was probably never space in a Roman theatre for the elaborate dancing of fifth-century Attic choruses and 'without this the songs of the Attic poets would have had little theatrical value'⁸⁰). It is therefore not unlikely that, even when a Roman tragedian retained the chorus of his Greek model, he drastically curtailed its songs. It is possible that in form Plautus' choruses do not differ greatly from those of contemporary Roman tragedy in general.

London

J. C. B. Lowe

79) Pl. Forsch.² 96.

80) Trag. of Enn. 31.