

11a–b–c must surely distract from Aeschines' point in utilizing the theme in the first place¹⁷).

St. Johns, Newfoundland

Mark A. Joyal

17) Both Plato and Xenophon also explore the use of this theme. Socrates in Plat. Ap. 24d3 ff. ironically presents the paradox that while all Athenians improve the young men of the city, he alone corrupts them. $\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ = 'to improve' figures prominently in Xen. Mem., especially books III and IV, where early references to Socrates' $\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha$ (cf. III 1, IV 1) serve a programmatic function (see also O. Gigon, Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien [Basel 1953] 94 f.). Moreover, Xenophon's defence of Socrates against the official charge of corrupting the young is contained in Mem. I 2.1–8 and shows why the theme of 'improvement' is a cornerstone around which he constructs his work: rather than corrupt, Socrates turned young men toward virtue and 'care of the soul'. I submit that Aeschines' use of this theme basically serves the same apologetic function that is so evident in Plato and Xenophon. For other apologetic devices in the *Alcibiades*, cf. my remarks in the preceding paragraph, with n. 12; and for further points of contact between the *Alcibiades* and the Platonic *Apology*, see Döring, op.cit. (n. 1) 27–9.

For support of my research I wish to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

THE *CORNICULA* ASCRIBED TO PLAUTUS

The now fragmentary comedy *Cornicula* was attributed to Plautus by the two late grammarians Nonius and Diomedes; Varro knew the play and although he quoted from it twice he did not name the author. It is the purpose of this paper to investigate what can be learned about this lost comedy by comparing its seven brief but informative fragments with similar elements in surviving plays¹).

1) The utility of this method has been demonstrated by J. Wright, *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata* (Rome 1974); however, Wright did not include in this essential work a study of the "lost" comedies of Plautus. Works on individual fragmentary plays attributed to Plautus include F. Winter, *Plauti Fabularum Deperditarum Fragmenta* (Bonn 1885); H. T. Rowell, *Accius and the Faeneratrix of Plautus*, *AJP* 73 (1952) 268–280; H. Lucas, *Zum Fretum des Plautus*, *RhM* 87 (1938) 188–190; A. S. Gratwick, *Sundials, Parasites, and Girls from Boeotia*, *CQ* 29 (1979) 308–323; K. Déry, *Vidularia: Outlines of a*

First, is the *Cornicula* correctly assigned to Plautus? Neither Accius nor Gellius mention it and Varro's silence on its author has led to speculation that the *Cornicula* is not a Plautine comedy²). Indeed, E. H. Clift preferred to regard it rather as the work of Naevius on the grounds that "Varro quotes fragment I in connection with his account of how the circus got its name (L. L., V, 153). Naevius' is the only name mentioned in this account, and it immediately follows the fragment of the *Cornicula*, to which no name is attached. A line or so later Naevius is again referred to simply as *poeta*. It seems as if the whole account may have been drawn from Naevian usage and Naevian plays. Supporting this view is the fact that fragment II, though quoted at the beginning of a long Plautine list, is sandwiched between passages beginning 'Naevius ...' and 'apud Naevium ...' (L. L., VII, 52)"³).

Although this argument points out some real problems with the identification of the author as Plautus, all the same it is necessarily made *ex silentio* for on the other hand Varro also attributes the *Astraba* directly to Plautus at 6.73 but at 7.66 he quotes from it without naming him⁴). The other two sources for the fragments of the *Cornicula* have credited the comedy to Plautus six times⁵). The sheer number of ascriptions does not of course prove the validity of the attribution but it does offer corroborative testimony in the face of a lack of solid evidence against Plautine authorship. It may be just as well then to conclude merely that the *Cornicula* belongs to the *comœdia palliata* and at all events bears a healthy resemblance to Plautine style⁶), and that it may have been written by one

Reconstruction, CQ 37 (1987) 432–443; R. K. Ehrman, Polybadiscus and the *Astraba* of Plautus: New Observations on a Plautine Fragment, ICS 12 (1987) 85–91. See also S. M. Goldberg, Terence and the Fragments of Roman Comedy, CW 75 (1981) 104 ff.

2) Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 5.153; 7.52.

3) E. H. Clift, *Latin Pseudepigrapha: A Study in Literary Attributions* (Baltimore 1945), 61. Concerning the testimony of Nonius and Diomedes Clift remarks, "What value these later citations should have in supporting the Plautine rather than Naevian authorship of the play it is impossible to judge, but it seems most reasonable that our verdict be confined to listing the *Cornicula* among the doubtful plays, or among the spurious, since the earliest testimony, that of Varro is decidedly weak."

4) Ehrman 86. It must be remembered also that *De Lingua Latina* has not survived complete. See Clift 62.

5) Nonius 63.11, 134.26, 134.31, 147.27, 220.13; Diomedes 383.15. See Clift 61 ff.

6) It has long been observed that the fragments of Naevius' comedies parallel elements in Plautus'; see Wright 34 ff.; E. Fraenkel, *Naevius*, RE suppl. Bd. 6, 628 ff. See note 33 below.

of those imitators of Plautus who contributed to the 130 comedies Gellius says were imputed to him in antiquity⁷).

Most editors have followed Ritschl in accepting the title as *Cornicula*, “The Little Crow”, a reading based on Varro, L. L. 5.153 and 7.52⁸). However, although Nonius too calls it *Cornicula* at 63.11, at 134.26 and 31 he has also transmitted the title as *Cornicularia*, which would mean either “The Tale of the Little Crow” or “The Tale of the Horn-Emblem”, the latter derived from *corniculum*, a Roman award given for bravery⁹). For Ritschl and subsequent editors the crucial point for deciding between the two alternatives was that Varro himself had called the title by the female *Cornicula*, a reading which eliminates the possibility of a neuter plural “The Horn-Emblems”¹⁰). The alternate *Cornicularia* presents other problems as well. First, if accepted it presents a strictly Roman allusion as the title of a *palliata*¹¹), while the soldier who appears in fragments 1 and 2 was a mercenary of Demetrius rex, a Greek king whose name may well have been taken from the original. While insertions of Roman references into a Greek setting do occur, and Plautus in particular was fond of the device, there is little to recommend the reading *Cornicularia* on the basis of our current evidence; the presence of a Greek soldier indeed argues against the reading.

What can be said about the significance of ‘*Cornicula*’? In the Plautine corpus, beyond the fact that titles were sometimes changed after the poet’s death, the transmitted name of a comedy does not always have a great deal to do with the nature of the play itself. For example, while ‘*Captivi*’ is a title that reflects the theme of the comedy, ‘*Rudens*’ is taken from one scene and hardly reveals the plot; similarly ‘*Truculentus*’ alone might lead to the expecta-

7) Gellius 3.3.1 ff.

8) F. Ritschl, *Parergon Plautinorum Terentianorumque* (Berlin 1845; repr. Amsterdam 1965), 155.

9) Our knowledge of the *corniculum* and its significance is rather hazy. See V. A. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army* (London 1981), 97–99. On the problems of equating a title from *corniculum* with the *Pterygion* of Philemon see T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1970), 127,7 and 215,3.

10) In both passages Varro uses the phrase *in Cornicula*.

11) Cf. the *Triumphus* of Caecilius Statius and the discussion of Latin titles for *palliatae* in Wright, 90 ff. R. G. Kent accepts *Cornicularia* in his Loeb edition of Varro because of the presence of the soldier. However, see Ritschl, *op. cit.* on the manuscripts of Varro. In the text of the play a Roman metaphor does occur in connection with a soldier; see J. A. Hanson, *The Glorious Military*, in: *Roman Drama*, ed. T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley (New York 1965), 53.

tion of something along the lines of Menander's *Dyscolus*¹²). But even if we do not know the precise relevance of '*Cornicula*' at least the range of its possibilities is narrowed down since the title suggests that we are dealing with a crow rather than a military award. A crow does in fact appear figuratively in a scene of deception at *Most.* 832 ff. as the slave *Tranio* outwits two stupid *senes*¹³), and it is certainly conceivable that our play took its name from a scene that somehow involved or suggested a crow¹⁴). Webster for instance inferred from the title that "the soldier may have been pecked by others", by which he seems to mean that the soldier is manhandled by the comedy's intriguers, just as *Pyrgopolynices* is at *Mil.* 1388 ff.¹⁵). While this could be true it is difficult to derive this interpretation out of the title alone since "crow" is not a term in Latin that of itself suggests physical abuse. It may simply be the obvious, that somehow a crow literally figured in the comedy, whether on stage or not¹⁶).

*

Three characters have been preserved in the fragments of the *Cornicula*: the soldier, whose name has been lost, a maid, apparently beautiful, whose name is unique in comedy, and a slave with a stock name whose assistance is entreated in the most vigorous terms. It is to these that we now turn.

In the first fragment an unidentified character exclaims, *quid cessamus ludos facere? circus noster ecce adest!* Fortunately *Varro* has provided not only the background of the passage but he has also revealed the involvement of the soldier, for in discussing the word *armilustrium* he remarks (5.153):

12) See T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester 1960), 109 f.; Webster (see note 9) 68, 154.

13) *Nam inter voltorios duos / cornix astat, ea voltorios duo vicissim vellicat.* The word *cornix* is used no less than 5 times in 6 lines. Cf. *Cicero*, *Mur.* 25, *inventus est scriba quidam, Cn. Flavius, qui cornicum oculos confixerit.* A similar proverb is found at *Flacc.* 46. For names of birds as derogatory terms, see S. Lilja, *Terms of Abuse in Roman Comedy* (Helsinki 1965), 34 f.

14) At *Mil.* 1044 *Palaestrio* remarks of *Pyrgopolynices*, *nam volturio plus humani credo est.*

15) Webster (see note 9) 128, 7. Such manhandling also occurs elsewhere, for example *Pers.* 793 ff.

16) Cf. the donkeys in the *Asinaria* and the *Astraba*; on the latter see *Probus* 2.23 Keil.

locus idem circus maximus dictus, quod circum spectaculis aedificatus, ibi ludi fiunt, et quod ibi circum metas fertur pompa et equi currunt. itaque dictum in Cornicula militis adventu quem circumeunt ludentes.

Varro here provides evidence that the metaphor of the circus is applied in this comedy because other characters form a circle around the soldier as they play their games around him, that is as they mock him (*ludentes*). More than 100 years ago Lorenz noted in his commentary on the *Miles Gloriosus* the similarity between this fragment and Mil. 991 where the maid Milphidippa comments in an aside on the presence of Pyrgopolynices whom she and the other conspirators are plotting to deceive: *iam est ante aedis circus ubi sunt ludi faciendi mihi*¹⁷). The phrase *ludos facere* and the compound *ludificari* are of course found frequently in Plautus but *circus* as a figure for the person who will provide the scene and occasion for the *ludi*, that is as the source of sports, games and holidays, occurs only in the *Cornicula* and the *Miles Gloriosus*¹⁸). The resemblance of phrase and metaphor suggests in turn that there is some similarity between our nameless soldier and Pyrgopolynices. Soldiers are not always the primary victims of intrigue in Plautine comedy, although they may be deceived secondarily¹⁹), and so the specific reference to *circus* in connection with *ludos facere* indicates a comedy in which the soldier rather than a pimp or an old man is the main victim. The locution also indicates that as in Plautine comedy normal relationships are turned upside down and that the ambusher is the ambushed, the victimizer becomes the victimized.

Another line suggesting an intrigue is fragment 3 (Nonius 63. 11): *pulchrum et luculentum hoc nobis hodie evenit proelium*. This line was probably not spoken by the soldier himself since in comedy a soldier's accounts of *proelia* usually are tales of battles that took place in the past, whereas this fragment speaks of a battle occurring *hodie*, that is, presently on stage²⁰). It is more likely

17) A. Lorenz, *Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus III: Miles Gloriosus* (Berlin 1886; repr. Zürich 1981), 178.

18) The word does occur twice in the phrase *per circum* at Pers. 199 and Poen. 1291, neither time in the sense noted by Varro.

19) As in *Bacchides*, *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Truculentus*; the real soldier (see note 24, below) in the *Poenulus* is left high and dry by the pimp Lycus but is not a victim as such. See Hanson, 61 ff.; E. W. Leach, *The Soldier and Society: Plautus' Miles Gloriosus as Popular Drama*, RSC 27 (1979) 192.

20) Leo, *Plauti Comoedia II* (Berlin 1896), 532 does assign this line to the

therefore that *proelium* is used to refer to the deception played upon the soldier. This is further supported by the use of *nobis*, since intrigue in comedy involves more than one person, for example a tricky slave and his accomplices, and as is frequently observed, military language does belong to the clever slave²¹). Finally, *evenit* implies process which in turn suggests a stratagem and its unfolding, as for example at Pseud. 574, *pro Iuppiter, ut mihi quidquid ago lepide omnia prospereque eveniunt*. That the *proelium* turns out *luculentum* is further evidence for success in the deception. If this is correct this is also additional support for the idea of the inversion between the soldier, the one who normally wages *proelia*, and other characters in the *Cornicula*.

Again, we must be careful to keep in mind that for the comic soldier military matters lie for the most part in the past and that while they are on the stage they are usually more interested in Venus than in Mars. The very presence of the soldier as a deceived character thus indicates a sexual situation around which the deception is worked. In addition, fragment 7, *face olant aedes arabice*, also signifies some sort of erotic context, for scent is frequently associated in comedy with love-making²²).

Since our soldier is designated by Varro as the focal point of intrigue it is a logical assumption that he must also be the "blocking" or "obstructing" character of the piece, the "agelast"²³). Pyrgopolynices of course is the obstacle to the true love of Philocomasium and Pleusicles and as such he is removed through the ingenuity of Palaestrio with the aid of Acroteleutium and her attractive maid Milphidippa among others. As we will see there is evidence of both the beautiful maid and the clever slave in the *Cornicula* and so again we have grounds for concluding that this comedy followed a path like that of the *Miles Gloriosus* in some respects.

There is yet another parallel between our soldier and Pyrgopolynices. At Mil. 75 ff. Pyrgopolynices states that he functions for a particular Hellenistic king:

soldier. At Asin. 912 the parasite comments thus on Artemona's attack on De-maenetus, *tempus est subducere hinc me, pulchre hoc gliscit proelium*.

21) See G. Williams, Evidence for Plautus' Workmanship in the *Miles Gloriosus*, *Hermes* 86 (1958) 84 and 97; E. Fantham, Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery (Toronto 1972), 73 and 107 ff.

22) Cf. Cas. 225 ff., Men. 353, Mil. 924; cf. 1254 ff. See Webster (see note 9) 32, on Eubulus *Stephanopolides* 100 K; see J. I. Miller, The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire (Oxford 1969), 9; 101 ff.

23) See Northrop Frye, *The Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton 1957), 163; E. Segal, *Roman Laughter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968), 70 ff.

*nam rex Seleucus me opere oravit maxumo
ut sibi latrones cogere et conscriberem.
regi hunc diem mihi operam decretumst dare.*

The soldier in the *Cornicula* served as a mercenary (*latro*) for king Demetrius for ten years (Varro 7.52): *qui regi latrocinatu's annos decem Demetrio*. No other soldiers in Roman comedy identify the monarch they serve²⁴). The use of *latro* here in connection with a specific Hellenistic king suggests that the character addressed here is the same as the soldier in the first fragment.

From the brief information contained in this fragment the most likely candidate for the king named here is Demetrius Poliorketes who was granted the title *basileus* by the Athenians (reflected here by *rex*) and who was in power for more than the ten years specified²⁵); Poliorketes' long career as a military leader further enhances this identification. There are also precedents for reference to Poliorketes in comedy; for instance, Plutarch, *Demetr.* 12 and 26 relates that the comic poet Philippides made Demetrius the target of his wit and Diphilus' *Hairesiteiches* is taken by Webster as "an obvious parody of Demetrius' title Poliorketes"²⁶). In addition, on the basis of Demetrius' weakness for women among other factors²⁷), Grimal has made a case that the character of the lustful Pyrgopolynices, though he worked as a *latro* for Seleucus, was in fact modeled on Poliorketes²⁸). This Demetrius then is ideally suited to be the figure named in the fragment.

*

24) Cf. Webster (see note 9) 39. At *Poen.* 663 ff. the *advocati* lie to Lycus the pimp that Collybadiscus was a *latro* of king Attalus; however, Collybadiscus is only disguised as a soldier as part of the intrigue. Since Varro has identified our character as a *miles* it is not likely that he too is a slave in disguise. On *latro* in Plautus see P. Grimal, *Le Miles Gloriosus et la vieillesse de Philemon*, REL 46 (1968) 134 f.

25) Plutarch, *Demetr.* 18. See W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911), 107 ff.

26) Webster (see note 9) 183.

27) Plutarch, *Demetr.* 14.

28) Grimal 129-144; Webster (see note 9) 220. Cf. Mil. 499 f., *an quia latrocinamini, arbitramini / quidvis licere facere vobis, verbero?* In his article *Woman Hates Soldier: A Structural Approach*, GRBS 14 (1973) 289-90 and 293, Webster argued that Thrasonides of Menander's *Misoumenos* also was a mercenary of Demetrius Poliorketes, but at *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (see note 9) 217 ff. he disagreed with G. W. Elderkin, *The Curculio of Plautus*, AJA 38 (1934) that the original of the *Curculio* was written by Philippides as a satire against Poliorketes. That Poliorketes is the Demetrius meant at Bacch. 901 see J. Barsby, *Plautus: Bacchides* (Oak Park, Ill. 1986), 167. At *Phaedrus* 5.1 it is certain that the poet has

The *Cornicula* also contains two characters whose names have survived. The first is the maid Phidullium in fragment 5, preserved by Nonius 147.27: *oculitus ut animitus, medullitus*. *Plautus Corni* (sic): *qui amant ancillam meam Phidullium oculitus*²⁹). The termination in *-ium* is much more common for the names of *meretrices*, but there are other instances of this name type for maids, such as Crocotium and Stephanium in the *Stichus* and Astaphium and Pithecius in the *Truculentus*. The name in this fragment is derived from φείδομαι, “sparing”, and although other names from the root φείδ- do occur this is the only example of this particular appellation in comedy³⁰). Indeed, the surviving texts of New and Roman comedy provide very few names of maids at all and only “Doris” is used more than once as a name associated with the role³¹). Even Terence has no consistent appellations for his *ancillae*, although he does prefer to give them ethnic names such as Mysis (*Andria*) and Phrygia (*Heauton Timoroumenos*)³²). All the same, if the *Cornicula* is a Plautine comedy, or even an imitation, it must be remembered that although Plautus did occasionally use stock names, he delighted in ‘speaking names’ for his characters³³). “*Phidullium*” as a unique name therefore may have been meant to convey some aspect of the character’s personality or function in the piece, just as the maid Stephanium’s name (“Garland”) is appropriate to the carousal at the end of the *Stichus*.

Equally important is the use of the adverb *oculitus*, for this also is the only instance of the word in Latin literature. Nonius equated it with *animitus* and *medullitus* by which we are no doubt supposed to understand two things. First, the adverbial suffix *-itus*

confused Demetrius of Phaleron with Poliorketes in connection with Menander; see J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy III* (Leiden 1961), 536 f. and B. E. Perry, *Babrius and Phaedrus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1984), 351 ff.

29) The reading of the maid’s name was established by Quicherat from the *fedulium* of the manuscripts and his reading has generally been followed by Plautus’ editors, although Leo 533 preferred the spelling *Phedulium* and assigned the line to a *leno*. Ritschl, *Quaestiones onomatologicae comicae*, *Opuscula Philologica III* (Stuttgart 1877; repr. Hildesheim 1978), 312 and 335, read *Hedylium*, the name of a *meretrix* at Pseud. 188. Cf. A. Traina, *Comoedia: Antologia della Palliata* (Padova 1969), 90.

30) E. g. Pheidias in Menander’s *Heros*, *Kolax*, and *Phasma*; Pheidylos in Philippides’ *Ananeousa*; Phidippus in Terence’s *Hecyra*.

31) “Doris” occurs in Menander’s *Kolax* and *Perikeiromene*; “Dorias” is an *ancilla* in Terence’s *Eunuchus*.

32) See note 38 below.

33) The evidence for Naevius’ use of names is far less clear and so the name preserved here gives no evidence for Naevian authorship.

frequently designates origin, as in *divinitus*, “from heaven, from the gods”, and *funditus*, “from the bottom, from the foundation”; second, adverbs such as *medullitus* and *animitus* also have in common an indication of depth of feeling, “from the soul”, “from the marrow” and so “profoundly, deeply”. This latter connotation is apparently taken also by Paulus-Festus 179, *oculitus quoque dicitur ut funditus, penitus, quo significatur tam carum esse quam oculum*. It is true that in Roman comedy as in other poetic genres the eye is used as a metaphor for endearment³⁴), but if the definition in Paulus-Festus is correct, then *oculitus* is exceptional in yet another way, for only here is the adverbial *-itus* suggested to mean “as much as”; for instance, *animitus* does not precisely mean “as much as the soul” nor does the comic formation *pugnitus* at Caecilius Staius *Fallacia* 48 mean “as much as my fists” but rather “with my fists”³⁵). The grammarians’ point seems to be that the singular *oculitus* is a specific formation, and as such was perhaps coined to take off on adverbs such as those they have listed as similar. The line therefore should be taken to mean something like “those who love my maid Phidullium eyefully”, or to give it its comic punch, “those who love my maid Phidullium from the bottom of their eyes”.

What then can we deduce about Phidullium herself, this *ancilla* who is not only the bearer of a distinctive name but also is associated with an unusual adverb? It is logical to conclude from the connection of “eye” in *oculitus* and men’s falling in love with her that she is one of several maids in New and Roman comedy whose beauty, a function of sight after all, inspires admiration and, if she is typical of this particular type, lust as well. The best known example of the character of course is Casina whose physical charms drive the senex of the play to make a fool of himself. Elsewhere among the ravishing and lust-inspiring maids of comedy are Ampelisca of the *Rudens*, Astaphium of the *Truculentus* and Pasicompsa who is passed off as a maid in the *Mercator*³⁶). It is significant also that the *ancilla* Milphidippa whom we met earlier

34) E. g. Cist. 53, Curc. 203, Mil. 1330, Most. 311, Pers. 765, Poen. 366, 385, 394, Pseud. 179, Stich. 764.

35) Nonius 514.7: *pugnitus pro pugnis: nisi quidem qui sese malit pugnitus pessum dari*.

36) Cf. Philemon 115 K.-A. and the remarks of Clement Alexandrinus, Paedag. 3.11. 73, the source of the quotation; Titinius, *Psaltria* 5 Ribbeck; Menander’s *Plokion* (also translated by Caecilius Staius) contained a beautiful maid. At Men. 541 ff. Erotium’s unnamed *ancilla* attempts to inspire Menaechmus’ erotic appetite, but she does not succeed.

with the *circus* and the deception of Pyrgopolynices is also beautiful and arouses the soldier's lechery at first sight³⁷).

*

The other character whose name has been preserved is Lydus, found in fragment 6:

*em te opsecro,
Lyde, pilleum meum, mi sodalis, mea Salubritas.*

Even though Lydus is addressed here as *sodalis* he is clearly a slave for he bears an ethnic name and as Donatus remarks on Terence, *Andr.* I 3. 21, such names are one of the marks of the role; moreover Cicero, *Flacc.* 65 observes that *Lydus* was a prominent stock name for principal slaves in Greek comedy³⁸). The name is of course familiar as that of the officious slave-pedagogue of the *Bacchides* and its original, Menander's *Dis Exapaton*; it is found again as the title of a Middle Comedy of Antiphanes and in a fragment of an unnamed comedy of Atilius³⁹). Here the slave is addressed as "my cap, my buddy, my healthfulness", each of which terms is peculiar in its own right. The last vocative, *mea Salubritas*, coupled with *te opsecro*, is reminiscent of the speech at *Poen.* 417 ff. where the young lover Agorastocles solicits the aid of his slave Milphio:

*AG. nunc opsecro te, Milphio, hanc per dexteram
perque hanc sororem laevam perque oculos tuos
perqu' meos amores perque Adelphasium meam
perque tuam leibertatem – MI. em nunc nihil opsecras.
AG. mi Milphidisce, mea commoditas, mea salus,
fac quod facturum te promisisti mihi,
ut ego hunc lenonem perdam.*

37) Of her Pyrgopolynices says at *Mil.* 988–9, *edepol haec quidem bellulast*; cf. his remark at 1006: *tum haec celocla autem illa apsenite subigit me ut amem.*

38) Donatus: *semper . . . nomina comitorum servorum aut a nationibus sunt indita ut Mysis Syrus . . .* Cicero: *nam quid ego dicam de Lydia? quis umquam Graecus comoediam scripsit in qua servus primarum partium non Lydus esset?* Cf. *Strabo* 7. 304.

39) Quoted by Varro, *L. L.* 7,90: *cape, caede, Lyde, come, conde*; interestingly the imperatives here are appropriate to a cunning slave of comedy: see Ehrman, *The Double Significance of Two Plautine Names*, *AJP* 105 (1984) 332; B. Brotherton, *The Vocabulary of Intrigue in Roman Comedy* (Menasha, Wisconsin 1926), 47, 55, 60 ff., 64, 65; and Fantham 44. Kent read *condi* as the final imperative and regarded this Lydus as a cook, but as Brotherton, 47, has observed, *condire* is also found as a word of intrigue.

Salubritas is found only here in comedy although it is used in other genres; however, the base of the word, *salus*, is employed several times by Plautus in reference to slaves and parasites, as in the passage above⁴⁰). Now, although *te opsecro* need be nothing more in comedy than a mild expletive, often of exasperation, the address “my healthfulness” makes it clear that the speaker of the *Cornicula* fragment truly requests Lydus’ assistance just as Agorastocles had solicited Milphio by joining *te opsecro* with the abstract vocatives *mea commoditas* and *mea salus*. Indeed, addresses that are abstracts denoting health or safety are conferred upon a slave elsewhere when the young master depends on him to help him out of a sticky situation and so the address here may well have been intended to achieve a similar result⁴¹).

Another parallel to the address in fragment 6 is also instructive, for similar language is found at Cas. 733 ff. Here the conversation is between the lecherous senex Lysidamus and his slave Olympio. Lysidamus has fallen in love with the beautiful maid Casina and longs for Olympio to win her in marriage so that he can enjoy first night privileges with her. But the road to gratification is paved with humiliation and Lysidamus finds himself more than once in one of the most extreme reversals in comedy:

LY. mane. OL. quid est? quis hic est homo?
 LY. eru’ sum. OL. quis erus? LY. quouis tu servo’s. OL.
 servos ego? LY. ac meu’. OL. non sum ego liber?
 memento, memento. LY. mane atque asta. OL. omitte.
 LY. servos sum tuos. OL. optumest. LY. opsecro te,
 Olympisce mi, mi pater, mi patrone. OL. em,
 sapis sane.
 LY. tuo’ sum equidem.
 OL. quid mi opust servo tam nequam?
 LY. quid nunc? quam mox recreas me?

In the *Casina* the *senex* not only admits that he is the slave’s slave, a common enough thought of lovers in comedy, but also declares Olympio “my father, my patron”⁴²). *Patronus* of course is associ-

40) Asin. 717f., Bacch. 879, Capt. 864, Cas. 801, Pseud. 709. Of course other abstracts such as the *commoditas* here are also found.

41) For instance Asin. 713 ff.; Cas. 801; Curc. 305 f.; Epid. 614; Men. 137; Pseud. 709. Cf. Bacch. 879 f.; Capt. 864. At Merc. 867 Eutyclus, the *sodalis* of Charinus refers to himself as *Spes, Salus, Victoria*.

42) See especially Asin. 652 and 689 f.; Poen. 447 f.; Rud. 1266 and 1280.

ated with *libertus* and suggests a person who can free the enslaved, and in comedy the one enslaved by love or lust. In the *Cornicula* the speaker takes a similar line for he addresses Lydus as *meum pilleum*, “my cap”. There is most likely a variation of the *patronus* idea in *pilleum* as “my cap of freedom”⁴³), that is as an allusion to the manumission of a slave and the cap that was the token of his liberation, which is in fact the significance of the word in its only other appearance in comedy, Amph. 462⁴⁴). It is likely then that we have in *meum pilleum* another instance of the inversion of normal relationships between master and slave for the most credible interpretation here is that as with *salubritas* the speaker looks to the slave to free him from a difficult situation.

Of the two vocatives considered so far the first and third are figures for an ideal state of being, health and freedom. Their appeal is intensified by their bracketing position around the most unusual address of all for a slave, *mi sodalis*, “my pal.” In extant comedy *sodalis* is reserved for free social equals such as Pistoclerus and Mnesilochus of the *Bacchides*, the comedy where the term is found the most often⁴⁵). Its presence here demonstrates the desperation of the speaker who is willing to appeal to Lydus not only with the formulae of comic reversal, but also to label him his peer, at least for the present contingency. It is unlikely therefore that the speaker is a fellow slave of Lydus for two reasons. First of all, in no instance in extant comedy does one slave call another *sodalis*. Secondly by comic convention the use of *meum pilleum* should be addressed to a slave by a free man since, in addition to the reasons given above, one slave could hardly look to another for manumission⁴⁶); rather slaves tend to abuse slaves with quips relating to

43) The phenomenon is well documented for Plautus’ era and earlier: Livy 24.32.9, 30.45.5, 45.44.18 ff.; Polybius 30.18.3; Dion. Hal. 4.24.6; Martial 11.6.4. See F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius III* (Oxford 1979), 441 and N. M. McKay, *Martial Book XI: A Commentary* (Oxford 1985), 73.

44) *ibo ad portum atque haec uti sunt facta ero dicam meo; / nisi etiam is quoque ignorabit; quod ille faxit Iuppiter / ut bodie raso capite calvos capiam pilleum*. Sosia’s reference to his shaved head makes it certain that *pilleum* is his cap of freedom. See Livy 34.52.12 and 45.44.19 noted above.

45) At Bacch. 645 ff. the slave Chrysalus says that he goes carousing with his master, but this claim is not verified by Mnesilochus. A similar claim is made by Tranio at Most. 19 ff. and supported by the remarks of his fellow slave Grumio; cf. Pseud. 1268. However, in none of these instances is a slave termed *sodalis*.

46) The only example in extant comedy of one slave deliberately freeing another is Toxilus’ liberation of his lover Lemniselenis from the pimp Dordalus in the *Persa*. Even this case does not represent a true parallel to our fragment since *sodalis* is used by men in reference to other men.

punishment and confinement. On the other hand we have observed that it is common in comedy for a free man to look to a slave to help him out of a desperate predicament. Consequently, even though the locution is unusual, it seems best to assign the line to a free man addressing a clever slave.

Regrettably we do not know more about this Lydus, whether his name was a pun on *ludus* and if so whether he was responsible for the *ludos facere* against the soldier, just as Palaestrio was the "architect" of deceit in the *Miles Gloriosus*⁴⁷). Nor can we be certain who actually addresses Lydus, whether a lover in need of the slave's assistance, perhaps even the soldier himself, but again it is plausible that a love affair of some sort was involved in the *Cornicula*, for the reasons noted earlier.

Finally, an expression of comic sneakery is found in fragment 4, *mibi Laverna in furtis celebrassit manus*, where the speaker names an Italian goddess of rogues and thieves⁴⁸); her only other appearances in comedy are in fragment 3 of the *Frivolaria* attributed to Plautus and *Aulularia* 445⁴⁹). In the latter she is invoked by Congrio, a cook, a type noted regularly in comedy for sticky fingers⁵⁰). Here the linking of *furtis* with the goddess' name, along with the only certain parallel in the *Aulularia* suggests that the speaker here is a cook also, although a clever slave, perhaps Lydus himself, can by no means be ruled out.

*

Examination of the remains of the *Cornicula* and their correspondence to the surviving Latin comedies demonstrates that the ascription of the play to Plautus by Nonius and Diomedes, if not explicitly by Varro, is well founded. The fragments reveal a comic

47) Mil. 901 f. Cf. Bacch. 129, *non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo convenit*, where *ludus* is used in its sense of "school": Barsby, 107 and C. J. Mendelsohn, *Studies in the Word-Play in Plautus* (Philadelphia 1907), 10 and 41.

48) See K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich 1967), 139 and G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich 1912, repr. 1971), 236.

49) *Frivol.* . . . *sequimini me hac sultis legiones omnes Lavernae*. Aul. 445, spoken by Congrio cocus: *ita me bene amet Laverna, te iam nisi reddi / mihi vasa iubes, pipulo te hic differam ante aedis*.

50) See G. E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952), 262 and J. C. B. Lowe, *Cooks in Plautus*, CA 4 (1985) 75, 88, 90. Although the context of the *Frivolaria* is less clear, there is no reason why it should not be spoken by a cook to his assistants.

world of the kind Plautus enjoyed bringing on stage. If it is not his work it could certainly have been a skilfully excuted imitation, sufficiently similar to Plautine style to cause it to be assigned to him by later grammarians.

Kent (Ohio)

Radd K. Ehrman

CENSORINUS, SULLA, AND MARIUS

Upon his return from his promagistracy in Asia Minor in late 95 or early 94 BC, Sulla was prosecuted for extortion by a certain Censorinus, but his accuser failed to appear for the trial. Censorinus is identified as C. Marcius Censorinus, later a purported Marian partisan, and scholars have naturally seen the hand of Marius behind this abortive prosecution, which they have linked with the spate of political trials in 95. This episode is even alleged to have delayed Sulla's pursuit of the consulship for several years¹). Unfortunately, the importance of the Censorinus episode has been vastly overblown and the alleged role of Marius in it is highly questionable.

Let us begin by examining how this incident came to be regarded as historically significant. In 1959 E. Badian drastically – and almost certainly correctly – altered the chronology of Sulla's career in the 90s by placing his urban praetorship in 97 and his promagistracy in Asia Minor in 96. One consequence of this revision was to place Sulla's return from Asia Minor and the Censorinus episode in late 95 – the year of the bitter court battles between the friends and enemies of Marius. Identifying Censorinus as “the later Marian adherent”, Badian logically saw his

1) Plut. Sulla 5.12. Identity: F. Münzer, RE s. v. Marcius, no. 43, 1550. On the date, see n.2 below. Delayed Sulla's career: see n.25 below. There is some doubt regarding the specific charge: Plutarch has Censorinus alleging that Sulla extorted money from an allied kingdom; Firm. Mat. Math. 1.7.28 gives the charge as *spoliatae provinciae crimen*; cf. Erich S. Gruen, Political Persecutions in the 90s B.C., *Historia* 15 (1966) 51 n.116; Arthur Keaveney, Sulla: The Last Republican (London 1982) 45 and 54 n.33.