

THE FINALE OF PLAUTUS' *CURCULIO*

In the final scene of Plautus' *Curculio*, 679 ff., the distribution of the dialogue between speakers has been much disputed. In particular editors have disagreed on whether the eponymous hero of the play, the parasite Curculio, is present, and, if so, whether he has a speaking part; the editors who do give him a speaking part have generally confined it to two utterances in 712–14, where they have some support from the MSS.¹ Recently, however, S. Lanciotti, in his edition of the play² and in a paper preparing for that edition,³ has broken new ground by giving Curculio a major speaking rôle in the scene. I believe that Lanciotti is right but does not go quite far enough. I shall also argue that the scene is in all probability entirely Plautine invention, replacing the original ending of his Greek model.

Underlying the disagreements of editors are the divergent and incomplete attributions of the MSS. Neither the *notae personarum* nor the scene-headings of the MSS, however, have any authority. It is virtually certain that they do not represent an authentic tradition

1) So A. Ernout, *Plaute III* (Paris 1935), J. Collart, *T. Maccius Plautus, Curculio* (Paris 1962); cf. O. Ribbeck, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Plautinischen Curculio*, Ber. über d. Verh. d. Kön. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-Hist. Kl. (1879) 98 f., J. Wright, *Plautus: Curculio* (Ann Arbor 1981) ad loc., E. Lefèvre, *Curculio oder Der Triumph der Edazität*, in: E. Lefèvre / E. Stärk / G. Vogt-Spira (edd.), *Plautus barbarus* (Tübingen 1991) 80 n. 50, C. W. Marshall, *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy* (Cambridge 2006) 109 n. 81. Curculio is given no speaking part in the scene by J. L. Ussing, *T. Maccii Plauti comoediae II* (Copenhagen 1878), F. Leo, *Plauti comoediae I* (Berlin 1895), G. Goetz / F. Schoell, *T. Macci Plauti comoediae III* (Leipzig 1901), H. Bosscher, *De Plauti Curculione disputatio* (Diss. Leiden 1903) 160–3, W. M. Lindsay, *T. Macci Plauti comoediae I* (Oxford 1904), E. Paratore, *Plauto Curculio* (Florence 1958) 21 f. = *Anatomie plautine* (Urbino 2003) 99–101; that he is not present is argued explicitly by E. Fantham, *The Curculio of Plautus: an Illustration of Plautine Methods in Adaptation*, CQ 15 (1965) 97 f., G. Monaco, *Plauto Curculio* (Palermo 1969) 216 f.

2) S. Lanciotti, *Titus Maccius Plautus Curculio, Editio plautina sarsinatis VIII* (Urbino 2008).

3) S. Lanciotti, *In margine ad una prossima edizione del Curculio*, in: R. Raffaelli / A. Tontini (edd.), *Lecturae plautinae sarsinates VIII, Curculio* (Urbino 2005) 56–67.

going back to the time of Plautus; probably all have been added by readers at one time or another to an original bare text.⁴ Even the indication by the MSS of a change of speaker is worth little. Ancient dramatic texts did mark changes of speaker, but in ways that were very vulnerable to mistakes in copying.⁵ The only safe guide is the text. In the scene in question a pattern of dialogue can be discerned that allows us at least partly to reconstruct the distribution of speakers with confidence, although on certain lines doubt will always remain as to the speaker intended by the dramatist.

The theme of the scene is the final defeat of the pimp Cappadox, the villain of the piece. Having been tricked into releasing his slave Planesium to Curculio posing as the representative of the soldier Therapontigonus, he has received from Therapontigonus' banker Lyco the agreed price of the girl (685). He has promised, however, to return the money if the girl is discovered to be free-born (490–4, 667–9). The final scene depicts his reluctant fulfilment of this promise under prolonged verbal and physical bullying. The net result is that Cappadox has lost his property, whereas Phaedromus has won without cost his beloved Planesium, who has moreover been discovered to be Therapontigonus' sister and therefore eligible for a legitimate marriage.

The previous scene, which brought about the recognition of Planesium, ended with Phaedromus, Therapontigonus, Planesium and Curculio on stage, and without any indication in the text of the exit of any of them. Lanciotti⁶ rightly argues that the absence of any indication of the exit of Curculio is at least *prima facie* evidence that he remains on stage during the following scene; it is not conclusive, however, since an unmarked exit cannot be ruled out.⁷ The announcement by Therapontigonus,⁸ of the approach of Cappadox, 676–8 *sed eccum lenonem, incedit, thesaurum meum*, links the two scenes. In his entrance-lines 679–86a Cappadox, who must be sup-

4) J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique* (Paris 1954) 209–29, B. Bader, *Szenentitel und Szeneneinteilung bei Plautus* (Diss. Tübingen 1970) 144, C. Questa, *Sulla divisione in scene del teatro plautino*, *Maia* 26 (1974) 301–19, Lanciotti (as n. 3) 58, 60.

5) J. C. B. Lowe, *The Manuscript Evidence for Changes of Speaker in Aristophanes*, *BICS* 9 (1962) esp. 38 f.

6) Lanciotti (as n. 2) 57, 65.

7) It is assumed by Fantham (as n. 1) 98.

8) So editors rightly with most MSS; Phaedromus B³. *Thesaurum meum* implies Therapontigonus' expectation of the return of his money by Cappadox.

posed at his last exit to have gone in search of Lyco (cf. 559), reveals that he is on his way home from the market-place, having been paid by the banker.⁹ He is at once accosted and subjected to a verbal assault; and it is clear that in 686b–92 this assault is carried out by a pair of other characters. Twice Cappadox addresses his opponents as *vos ambo* (687, 692), there is an obvious parallelism in 686b–687a *heus tu, leno, te volo :: et ego te volo?*, and in view of Cappadox's reply in 688b–9a *quid mecum est tibi? | aut tibi?* it is probable that 687c–8a *sta sis ilico :: atque argentum propere propera vomere* should be divided between two speakers, although the MSS do not mark a change of speaker before 688. Again there are balancing threats in 689b–92a *quia ego ex te hodie faciam pilum catapultarium | atque ita te nervo torquebo, itidem ut catapultae solent :: delicatum te hodie faciam, cum catello ut accubes, | ferreo ego dico*. That one of Cappadox's assailants is Therapontigonus is indicated by the military language of 689 f., whether or not M. Fontaine¹⁰ is right to see a sexual double entendre in *nervo*, and is confirmed when in 697 Planesium asks her brother to spare Cappadox on the grounds that he has kept her *bene et pudice*. The intervention by Planesium is prompted by Cappadox's appeal for help in 696 to *Planesium, et te, Phaedrome*, which also prompts Phaedromus to offer his services as arbitrator, 701 *animum advortite (hoc), si possum hoc inter vos componere*, 702–3a *dicam meam sententiam, | siquidem vultis quod decrero facere*. Lanciotti¹¹ has recognized that Phaedromus' offer to arbitrate is inconsistent with his having taken part in the verbal assault on the pimp and shown that Cappadox's second assailant can therefore only have been Curculio; and this is Lanciotti's conclusive argument for Curculio's presence in the scene. Moreover there is another reason for believing that Phaedromus has not been involved in the attack on Cappadox: 702b *accede huc, leno* provides a clue to the grouping of characters on stage, suggesting that Phaedromus has up to now been standing with Planesium somewhat apart from the

9) It is not necessary here to discuss the lack of clarity, attributable to Plautine *neglegentia*, over the sums involved; cf. P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (Berlin 1886) 134–6, Lefèvre (as n. 1) 86–8.

10) M. Fontaine, *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy* (New York 2010) 118. Despite his eventual status as brother of Planesium and brother-in-law of Phaedromus, Therapontigonus is to some extent characterized as a *miles gloriosus*; cf. Lefèvre (as n. 1) 95 f.

11) Lanciotti (as n. 3) 65.

others. Lanciotti¹² is surely right, then, to assign to Curculio 687a, 688a, 691–2a, 694a; in each case the parasite echoes the threats of Therapontigonus,¹³ and the play on the double meaning of *catello* in 691–2a fits his rôle as the funny man of the play.¹⁴ In his earlier discussion Lanciotti¹⁵ assigned 693b to Curculio, 694a to Therapontigonus, but the violence of the threat favours the attribution to the soldier of 693b *collum opstringe, abduce istum in malam crucem* (equivalent to an *in ius vocatio*),¹⁶ and 694a *quidquid est, ipse ibit potius*, playing on the literal meaning of *in malam crucem* and its common use as a mere imprecation,¹⁷ is more appropriate to the parasite. It is not clear why Leo and Lindsay,¹⁸ rejecting the MSS' attribution to Therapontigonus, assigned 693b to Phaedromus, but it is hardly appropriate to the would-be arbitrator.

Phaedromus' offer to arbitrate is accepted by Therapontigonus, 703b *tibi permittimus*, and with a qualification by Cappadox, 704 *dum quidem hercle ita iudices, ne quisquam a me argentum auferat*. It is unrealistic, but dramatically effective, that the pimp does not yet know why money has been demanded of him, what the arbitration is to decide, or that Planesium has been recognized as Therapontigonus' sister, and does not receive this information until 716f.¹⁹ Cappadox's unwillingness to accept a decision which would involve him in loss of money is in character, and it prompts a reminder that he has promised to repay the price of his slave if she should turn out to be freeborn, 705 *quodne promisti?* Who raises the subject of Cappadox's promise and who conducts the interrogation of the pimp which leads up to Phaedromus' adjudication in 714b–17 is not immediately obvious, but Cappadox's rôle is clear enough. He at first pretends ignorance of any promise, 705b *qui promisi?* The reply 705c *lingua* prompts the shameless retort

12) Lanciotti (as n. 2).

13) Bosscher (as n. 1) 159f. noted the parallelism of the passage; cf. B. Wallochny, *Streitszenen in der griechischen und römischen Komödie* (Tübingen 1992) 166 n. 111, *par pari respondere*.

14) Cf. 600–7, 659–64.

15) Lanciotti (as n. 3) 67.

16) Cf. 695 *intestatum*, A. C. Scafuro, *The Forensic Stage* (Cambridge 1997) 178f., comparing Rud. 859f. It is uncertain whether *opstringe* is addressed to an attendant or to Curculio (Collart [as n. 1] ad loc.).

17) Wright (as n. 1) ad loc.

18) (as n. 1).

19) Scafuro (as n. 16) 179, Wallochny (as n. 13) 147.

705d–6 *eadem nunc nego. | dicendi, non rem perdendi gratia haec nata est mihi*, which characterizes him as the familiar type of the *peiiurus leno*.²⁰ A renewed threat of physical force, 707a *nihil agit, collum opstringe homini*, persuades him to co-operate, 707b *iam iam faciam ut iusseris*, 708b *roga quod lubet*. Faced with the specific question 709–10a *promistin, si liberali quisquam hanc adsereret manu, | te omne argentum redditurum?* the pimp at first equivocates, 710b *non commemini dicere*, then flatly denies any promise and demands to be told where and in whose presence he is alleged to have made one, 711b *nego hercle vero: quo praesente? quo in loco?* This prompts an answer that satisfies Phaedromus, 714b *satis credo tibi*, and is the basis for his adjudication in 715–17. Who speaks in 712–14 has been much disputed but can now perhaps be finally settled, before we consider who takes part in the interrogation of Cappadox in 705–11.

712a *me ipso praesente et Lycone tarpezita* provides the crucial evidence against the pimp. The obvious reference of the statement is to 490–4 where Cappadox in the presence of Curculio and Lyco several times confirms his promise to return Therapontigonus' money if Planesium is found to be freeborn (492 *meminero*, 493 *et nunc idem dico*, 494 *memini*). The inference that 712a is spoken by Curculio, the indisputable witness of Cappadox's statements in 490–4, was no doubt drawn by the corrector of B and the attribution has been accepted by Ribbeck and others.²¹ It is true that 490–4 imply an earlier promise, presumably made by Cappadox to Therapontigonus before the action of the play begins, and it appears from 434 that the banker was present when Therapontigonus made his original bargain with Cappadox; but to interpret 712 as referring to an hypothetical off-stage incident rather than an earlier scene witnessed by the audience is a dubious expedient,²² and the mention of Lyco has no point except as a reference to the earlier scene. That many scholars have rejected the obvious interpretation of 712a

20) Cf. 495 f., Pers. 428, Rud. 558, 1355.

21) (as n. 1). O. Zwierlein, *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus I* (Stuttgart 1990) 268, takes 712a to refer to 490–4 but deletes the line as a post-Plautine interpolation (see below n. 25).

22) Cf. Collart (as n. 1) 124, Lanciotti (as n. 3) 61 n. 53. Of less weight is the argument of Ribbeck (as n. 1) 98 and Collart (*ibid.*) that Therapontigonus should not act as witness in the quasi-judicial situation in which he is the plaintiff and an interested party.

is due to their assumption that Curculio does not speak elsewhere in the scene. Since Lanciotti has demonstrated that this assumption is false, the attribution to Curculio can be accepted with confidence.

Cappadox is no longer able to deny his promise and can only attempt to silence Curculio, 712b *non taces?*, probably accompanied by a threatening gesture. It must be Curculio who then defiantly replies 713a *non taceo*. The best MSS mark no change of speaker after this or at the beginning of 714 and the whole of 713b–14a makes excellent sense in the mouth of Curculio, *non ego te flocci facio: ne me territes. | me ipso praesente et Lycone factum*; Curculio refuses to be cowed by the threat implied in Cappadox's *non taces?* and defiantly repeats his statement.²³ Most editors, including Lanciotti, assign *non ego te flocci facio: ne me territes* to Cappadox but without cogent reason. The argument of Paratore²⁴ that *ne me territes* in 713 must be spoken by Cappadox because he used the same phrase in the same metrical position in 568 has no merit. In 568 the phrase is appropriately used in response to an immediately preceding threat; but here Cappadox has not just been threatened by Curculio, whereas a threat is implicit in Cappadox's *non taces?*²⁵ Lanciotti follows the majority of editors in assigning 714a to Therapontigonus, although the best MSS mark no change of speaker before the line. He thus supposes 712a, spoken by Curculio, to refer to 490–4 but the almost identical 714a, spoken by Therapontigonus, to refer to an earlier incident; but the objections to attributing 712a to Therapontigonus apply equally to 714a, despite Lanciotti's rather forced attempt at an explanation.²⁶

Although Lanciotti assigns 712a and 713a to Curculio, in the rest of 705–14 he follows the *communis opinio* in giving the main

23) So Ernout, Collart, Wright (as n. 1). On this interpretation the repetition in 714 is perfectly intelligible (cf. Langen [as n. 9] 37).

24) Paratore (as n. 1) 101, followed by Fontaine (as n. 10) 68. I am not persuaded by Fontaine's argument that the parasite's name should be spelt Gorgylio and that 713 alludes to the γοργόλιξ element in its etymology; 'Weevil' is much more appropriate to a parasite than 'Fast-and-Furious Man'.

25) Bosscher (as n. 1) 162 saw that *ne me territes* is the response to the implicit threat in *non taces?* ("illud *non taces?* acerbe iubentis est") and that the whole of 713 coheres, but, following Ussing (as n. 1), mistakenly attributed *non taces?* to Therapontigonus. Ribbeck (as n. 1) 98 f. and Zwierlein (as n. 21) 268 object to *ne me territes* because they fail to recognize the threat implicit in *non taces?* There are no good grounds for deleting 713b–14a with Ribbeck or 712 f. with Zwierlein.

26) Lanciotti (as n. 3) 66 n. 59.

rôle in the interrogation of Cappadox to Therapontigonus. According to this scenario, in favour of which one can argue that the soldier took the lead in the attack on Cappadox in 686–94, *Curculio* does not speak again until 712a, when he breaks in with the crucial statement that he had heard Cappadox's promise with his own ears (*me ipso praesente*). There is a difficulty, however. 707a *nil agit, collum opstringe homini* stands out from the rest of this passage as an angry comment, in the third person, on Cappadox's shameless denial in 705d–6, followed by a threat to use physical force, and looks like an intervention by a different character from the one who addresses Cappadox directly in 705 and the following lines. Leo and Lindsay attributed 707a to Phaedromus and this attribution is accepted by Lanciotti; but it does not fit Phaedromus' rôle as arbitrator and the outburst is more appropriate in the mouth of the soldier, like the very similar 693 (also attributed to Phaedromus by Leo and Lindsay). If on the other hand we take as starting point that 707a ought to be spoken by Therapontigonus, an alternative and in my view preferable scenario presents itself: it is *Curculio* who raises the subject of Cappadox's promise in 705a (as he had raised the subject of repayment in 688a *argentum ... vomere*) and assumes the principal rôle in 705–14 as prosecutor in the quasi-judicial interrogation of the pimp, while Therapontigonus, the plaintiff, and Phaedromus, the arbitrator, stand aside. On this interpretation the character who in this scene consistently taxes Cappadox with his promise is *Curculio*, the character who had witnessed it earlier in the play. The flippant 705c *lingua*, which Lanciotti, following B and the *communis opinio*, attributes to Phaedromus, rather suits the parasite, as does the milder tone of 708a *quando vir bonus es, responde quod rogo* in contrast to the soldier's angry intervention in 707a. I would therefore attribute to *Curculio* 705a.c, 708a, 709–10a, 711a, 712a and 713–14a.

In 714b *satis credo tibi* Phaedromus expresses himself persuaded by the evidence presented to him and in 715–17 proceeds to deliver his verdict (715 *meam sententiam*, 717 *hoc iudicium meum est*), of which the immediately relevant part is that Cappadox must return the money. In 719–27 Cappadox complains of an unjust verdict, curses both Therapontigonus and Phaedromus, and tries to put off immediate payment, but Therapontigonus' threat to use his fists persuades him to hand over the money in his possession (727b *age ergo, recipe*).

Two final lines bring the play to a close on a festive note. In 728 it is clearly Phaedromus who invites the soldier to a feast and forecasts his own imminent wedding. The final line begins with a conventional prayer *quae res bene vortat mi et vobis* and ends with the usual appeal to the audience *spectatores, plaudite*. The prayer could well be spoken by either Phaedromus or Therapontigonus; since the MSS mark a change of speaker before 729, most editors opt for the latter. Lanciotti,²⁷ however, has made the attractive suggestion that the last line is spoken by Curculio; it certainly has more point in the mouth of the ever-hungry parasite (cf. 660–4).²⁸ *Vobis* probably refers to the audience.²⁹

In short, the parasite Curculio takes a significant part in the final scene of the play named after him, as befits one of Plautus' favourite characters.³⁰ He actively assists Phaedromus and Therapontigonus in forcing the villain of the piece, the pimp Cappadox, to disgorge his ill-gotten gains. Lanciotti deserves the credit for recognizing this. I have tried to show, however, that a close reading of the text suggests an even larger rôle for the parasite than Lanciotti allows, particularly in the interrogation of the pimp that occupies the latter part of the scene.

There are cogent grounds for believing that the scene is entirely Plautine invention. It goes without saying that Plautine rewriting, at least, is to be found in details, notably the use of technical Roman legal terminology (695 *intestatum*, 709f. *si liberali quisquam hanc adsereret manu*, 684, 722 *ad praetorem*). That does not, however, exclude the possibility that a nucleus of the scene is derived from a Greek model. Nor does the generally farcical nature of the scene. Scafuro,³¹ seeing "hallmarks of Athenian procedure . . . in the Roman scene", believes that the arbitration was probably in Plautus' Greek model. She also notes, however, that the arbitration

27) Lanciotti (as n. 2) app. crit.

28) Cf. J. C. B. Lowe, *Plautus' Parasites and the Atellana*, in: G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom* (Tübingen 1989) 161–9 for the Plautine emphasis on the gluttony of parasites.

29) Cf. *Asin. 2 quae quidem mihi atque vobis res vortat bene*. The audience is regularly addressed in an extradramatic coda, e.g. *Bacch. 1211 spectatores, vos valere volumus*; Marshall (as n. 1) 196f. speculates on how this may have been staged. There is not always a clear break between what an actor says in character and address to the audience (M. G. 1436f., *Pseud. 1332–5*, *Rud. 1418–23*).

30) Cf. E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin 1922) 245–50.

31) Scafuro (as n. 16) 177–80, 191.

is subverted because Cappadox at first refuses to accept the verdict, threatens himself to take Therapontigonus before the praetor, and is only persuaded by means of physical intimidation; this she would attribute to Plautine expansion. That Plautus' contribution to the scene was more extensive than the modification of verbal details is indicated by the fact that five speaking characters take part in the scene, whereas there is good evidence that normally, at least, Greek New Comedy did not use more than three.³² The part of Planesium could be dispensed with fairly easily, but the basic structure of the dialogue, in which two characters attack their victim and another acts as arbitrator, necessarily requires four speaking actors. It is clear that Plautus liked to end a play with an ensemble scene involving four or five speaking characters, and to achieve this has probably often altered his Greek models more or less drastically.³³

That Plautus has in this play made substantial changes to his presumed Greek model is likely on general grounds. In a brief but seminal note Fraenkel³⁴ convincingly argued that obvious Plautine additions to his Greek model are likely to have been balanced by corresponding omissions and that these probably account for various loose ends which had previously been attributed to post-Plautine *retractatio*. Fantham³⁵ too has argued for substantial Plautine compression of the plot of his model, resulting in his shortest play. In particular it seems probable that a Greek dramatist would not have treated the *anagnorisis* with such extreme brevity.³⁶ It is clear from Plautus' own statements that in the *Casina* he curtailed the *anagnorisis* to make room for more comic scenes (Cas. 64–6, 1012–14), and probable that in other plays too he curtailed a feature of his Greek models that did not much interest him in favour of more comic scenes.³⁷ That he should have replaced the original ending of his Greek model with a comic finale depicting the humiliation of

32) K. Gaiser, Zur Eigenart der römischen Komödie, ANRW 1972, 1037 f., 1073–9; K. B. Frost, Exits and Entrances in Menander (Oxford 1988) 2 f.; G. F. Franko, Ensemble Scenes in Plautus, AJPh 125 (2004) 27 n. 2.

33) Franko (as n. 32) 33, Marshall (as n. 1) 113.

34) Fraenkel (as n. 30) 153 n. 1; cf. Lefèvre (as n. 1) 97–9.

35) Fantham (as n. 1) 84–100.

36) T. B. L. Webster, Studies in Later Greek Comedy (Manchester 1953) 202: “it seems unlikely that the whole double recognition was crammed into a single scene.”

37) Cf. Gaiser (as n. 32) 1067 f.

the pimp is a priori likely. Supporting this is the fact that the finale of the *Curculio* is entirely based on the idea that Cappadox has promised to repay the money he has received if Planesium is found to be freeborn, and that the sole dramatic function of this promise is to prepare for the finale. The dramatist who conceived the finale depicting the humiliation of the pimp in all probability also caused him to make the promise that prepares for it. Was this dramatist Plautus or the author of his presumed Greek model? In view of the nature of the finale Plautus is more likely. There is thus a strong case for the conclusion of Lefèvre³⁸ that both the promise and the whole final scene are to be attributed to Plautus, whatever other innovations he made in the rest of the play.

Confirmation is provided by the similar final scenes of two other Plautine plays.³⁹ The finale of the *Poenulus* has come down to us in two alternative versions, and it is uncertain which, if either, is authentically Plautine, wholly or in part.⁴⁰ For the present argument it is sufficient to note that both are in all probability of largely Roman origin, even if no doubt containing some elements derived from the *Karchedonios*.⁴¹ In one version four speaking characters are involved, in the other six. Both versions resemble the finale of the *Curculio* in depicting a confrontation between the pimp Lycus and three opponents, Agorastocles, Hanno and Antamoenides, with two girls, Adelphasium and Anterastilis, also present, silent in the background in the first version, speaking briefly in the second. Agorastocles and Antamoenides demand sums of money from the pimp, Agorastocles the 300 *philippi* in Lycus' pos-

38) Lefèvre (as n. 1) 89: "die beiden Passagen 490–492 und 667–669 ... sollen Cappadox' spätere finanzielle Niederlage vorbereiten." Lefèvre's arguments for free composition by Plautus in other parts of the play are less convincing; cf. Scafuro (as n. 16) 170 n. 36.

39) Fantham (as n. 1) 98 noted the similarity but did not elaborate.

40) Zwierlein (as n. 21) 66–87 argues for 1372 ff., Lefèvre, Plautus' *Poenulus* zwischen *Néα* und Stegreifspiel, in: T. Baier (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus' Poenulus* (Tübingen 2004) 52 f. for 1338–71. Both may be performance variations contemporary with Plautus; cf. Marshall (as n. 1) 273.

41) The view of Lefèvre (as n. 40) 14–18, that Milphio's original scheme is pure Plautine invention is implausible, although Plautus has certainly added Roman touches such as references to *addictio* (cf. Scafuro [as n. 16] 459). References in the final scene to that scheme and to Antamoenides' dealings with the pimp probably in some sense derive from the *Karchedonios* but not in their present form. The reluctance to take legal action in a foreign city that Hanno expresses in 1402–4 is hardly consistent with the rest of the scene and may well derive from the Greek play.

session as a result of Milphio's Collybiscus-scheme (1351 *duplum pro furto mi opus est*, 1362–63 *simplum solvere, trecentos philippos*, 1384 *mi auri fur est*, 1401 *aurum*), Antamoenides the *mina* he had paid to Lycus for Anterastilis (1353, 1359, 1399, 1414, 1401 *argentum*). In both versions the pimp is reduced to abject capitulation by threats of being taken to court; in 1342–55 he agrees to meet all his opponents' demands with thrice repeated *sume hinc quid lubet* (1351–3), in 1387–97 he is a grovelling suppliant for mercy. Moreover underlying both versions is the idea, central to the whole second half of the *Poenulus*, that the recognition of Adelphasium and Anterastilis as freeborn will ipso facto allow their freedom to be asserted in a liberalis causa. Gratwick⁴² has shown, however, that this idea is based on Roman law, is incompatible with Greek law, must be a Plautine innovation, and implies drastic Plautine rewriting of the end of the play. In both versions of the finale Lycus admits that he always knew the girls to be freeborn and expected someone to claim their freedom (1347 f. *miratus fui | neminem venire qui istas adsereret manu*, 1391 f. *iam pridem equidem istas esse scivi liberas | et expectabam si qui eas adsereret manu*); this is inconsistent with the early part of the play,⁴³ but serves the immediate dramatic purpose of putting Lycus in the wrong and rendering him liable to punishment. By admitting that he had known of the girls' free birth Lycus deprives himself of the defence that he had bought the girls as slaves in good faith and of any right to compensation; hence in 1377–81, as soon as he learns that Hanno has discovered the girls to be his daughters, Lycus at once assumes he has no hope of recovering what he had paid for them, *periere, opinor, duodeviginti minae, | qui hasce emi*. Thus in both versions it is made clear that Lycus must not only repay money to Agorastocles and Antamoenides but must also lose what he had paid for the girls. He is a loser all round. It is probable that the pimp of the *Karchedonios* did not know that the girls were free-born; he would then have no reason to fear being forced to give them their freedom without receiving any compensation.

Finally, another finale depicting the punishment of a pimp is that of the *Persa*. At Pers. 777 Dordalus enters to find Toxilus,

42) A. S. Gratwick, Plautus, in: E. J. Kenney / W. V. Clausen (edd.), Cambridge History of Classical Literature II (Cambridge 1982) 98–103.

43) Cf. Lefèvre (as n. 40) 19f.

Sagaristio, Lemniselenis and Paegnium engaged in a drinking party to celebrate their successful deception of the pimp. In his entrance-monologue he laments having fallen for Toxilus' trickery and having thereby thrown away a cart-load of money (782 *vehiculum argenti miser eieci*); he threatens vengeance (786). The financial loss of which he complains and about which he is later taunted (852 *sescenti nummi quid agunt, quas turbas danunt?*, cf. 743 *minas sexaginta*)⁴⁴ refers to the money he has handed over as a result of Toxilus' trick; that he was paid the same sum by Sagaristio for the freedom of Lemniselenis (437–9) is ignored.⁴⁵ He is invited to join the party with ironical courtesy (790–2), and then subjected to prolonged mockery (803 *ludos*, 805 *elude*, 807 *inridere*, 811 *delude*, 833 *ludificemus*, 843 *ludificari*, 850 *inrides*), and physical (809 f., 846 f.) and verbal abuse (815, 819 f., 855 f.), until he finally capitulates (855 *manus do vobis*). Toxilus, Sagaristio, Lemniselenis and Paegnium all at one time or another take an active part, although the distribution of speakers is sometimes uncertain. The whole scene is in a variety of metres and there must have been an elaborate musical accompaniment to all the dialogue, and to drinking (821 f.) and lascivious Ionian dances performed by Paegnium (804–8), Sagaristio (824 f.) and Toxilus (825 f.). There are several reasons for supposing that not only the form of this scene, an elaborate polymetric *canticum*, but most, at least, of its content, is Plautine invention. The principal reasons are as follows.⁴⁶ First, five speaking characters are involved; the concerted attack of four against one resembles but goes even beyond the final scenes of the *Curculio* and *Poenulus*.⁴⁷ Secondly, as

44) On the problematic relationship of *sescenti nummi* to *sexaginta minae* (665, 683, 743) cf. W. Hofmann, *Plautinisches in Plautus' Persa*, *Klio* 71 (1989) 401–3.

45) Cf. Stärk, *Persa oder Ex oriente fraus*, in: Lefèvre / Stärk / Vogt-Spira (as n. 1) 154–8, for the probably Plautine origin of Sagaristio's fraud, which duplicates Toxilus' scheme. I am not persuaded by Lefèvre, *Plautus' Persa zwischen Néa und Stegreifspiel*, in: S. Faller (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus' Persa* (Tübingen 2001) 27–31, that the Toxilus-intrigue is also pure Plautine invention rather than modified by Plautine omissions and additions (cf. J. C. B. Lowe, *The virgo callida* of Plautus, *Persa*, *CQ* 39 [1989] 392–9, Scafuro [as n. 16] 419–22).

46) A probably Plautine detail is the twin-motif in 830 f.; cf. E. Woytek, *T. Maccius Plautus, Persa*, *Öst. Ak. der Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl. SB* 385 (Vienna 1982) 391, Lefèvre (as n. 45) 61 f.

47) Lemniselenis is more conciliatory, like Planesium in the finale of the *Curculio*. Woytek (as n. 46) 431, would attribute “de[n] damenhafte[n] Takt der Frau” to a Greek dramatist rather than to Plautus, but it contributes to the dynamic of the Latin scenes; cf. also Anterastilis in *Poen*. 1406 *abi, diiunge inimicitias cum improbo*.

has been shown by D. Hughes,⁴⁸ Paegnium is probably entirely a Plautine creation, a doublet of Sophoclidisca. Thirdly, the unrealistic drinking-party on stage has no real parallel in Greek New Comedy and is probably to be attributed to Plautus, with several similar scenes.⁴⁹ Fourthly, Dordalus has not in fact done anything to deserve such treatment;⁵⁰ this points to his final humiliation being entirely a Plautine innovation.

In all three plays the pimp is threatened with being taken to court, although mere threats are sufficient to force him to capitulate first.⁵¹ What would be the charges is left vague;⁵² this is comedy, not a court of law. Plautus gives the impression, however, that in each case the pimp is guilty of trafficking in free citizens,⁵³ although the charge could not be supported by the facts.⁵⁴ The use of Roman legal terminology would suggest to an unreflecting Roman audience that Roman citizens and Roman law were involved, despite the dramatic fiction that the setting is Greek.⁵⁵ In *Pers.* 749 *qui hic commercaris civis homines liberos*, 845 *leno qui hic liberas virgines mercatur* it is clearly implied that the pimp has been buying and selling free citizens, an heinous crime in Roman eyes; and the same must be the justification of Hanno's *in ius te voco* addressed to Lycus at *Poen.* 1343. In the *Curculio*, apart from his promise, Cappadox is probably in any case regarded as guilty of

48) D. Hughes, The Character of Paegnium in Plautus's *Persa*, *RhM* 127 (1984) 46–57.

49) J. C. B. Lowe, Plautus' 'Indoor Scenes' and Improvised Drama, in: L. Benz / E. Stärk / G. Vogt-Spira (edd.), *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels* (Tübingen 1995) 27 f. with n. 15. Cf. Lefèvre (as n. 45) 23 on the Saturnalian character of the parody of a symposium.

50) T. Ladewig, *Plautinische Studien*, *Philologus* 17 (1861) 474–6 = *Schriften zum römischen Drama republikanischer Zeit*, edd. U. Gärtner / E. Stärk (Leipzig 2001) 180 f., Woytek (as n. 46) 58, Stärk (as n. 45) 158 f., R. Hartkamp, *Leno periit* – Die Rolle des Kupplers Dordalus, in: Faller (as n. 45) 135–7. Contrast Knemon in Menander's *Dyscolus*.

51) M. P. Schmude, *Reden – Sachstreit – Zänkereien* (Stuttgart 1988) 75 with n. 60.

52) *Scafuro* (as n. 16) 178, 421 f., 430.

53) *Gratwick* (as n. 42) 108, 113.

54) On the unrealistic nature of the charge in the *Persa* cf. Woytek (as n. 46) 37 with n. 170, Lefèvre (as n. 45) 29 f.

55) A. S. Gratwick, Hanno's Punic Speech in the *Poenulus* of Plautus, *Hermes* 99 (1971) 30 n. 1: "Plautus is treating the situation as if the people involved were Romans in Rome."

trafficking in free girls, the charge levelled by Phaedromus against Therapontigonus in 620 *mercari furtivas atque ingenuas virgines*, although the facts of the case could not make such a charge stick. A Roman audience would not be concerned about legal niceties.⁵⁶ In each case Plautus takes care to put the pimp in the wrong; in the *Curculio* Cappadox has explicitly promised to repay the money if the girl is found to be freeborn, in the *Poenulus* Lycus admits he always knew that his girls were freeborn, in the *Persa* Dordalus agrees to buy *furtivam meo periculo* (715; cf. 524 f., 589).

The similarity of these three final scenes increases the probability that in all three Plautus has by various means replaced the original ending of his Greek model with a farcical finale depicting the defeat and humiliation of a pimp by the more sympathetic characters.⁵⁷ Given the nature of New Comedy plots the pimp must often have been a blocking character, an obstacle to the hopes of young lovers. Plautus, however, delights to exaggerate the villainy of his pimps, depicting them as by definition *lutum*, ‘filth’

56) The *Rudens* presents similar confusion. Labrax is hauled off *in ius* (859 f.) on the ostensible charge that having accepted *arrabo* from Plesidippus he then absconded with Palaestra (861 f.; cf. 46), and is subsequently condemned by *recuperatores* to have his slave sequestered (1282 f.), although neither Greek nor Roman law would justify this penalty. Elsewhere, however, it is suggested that Labrax’s crime is stealing freeborn girls from their parents and forcing them into prostitution (748 f.); although the pimp would in reality have a ready defence against the charge, it serves to magnify his guilt in the eyes of a Roman audience. Cf. T. E. Kinsey, Notes on the ‘*Rudens*’ of Plautus, *Latomus* 25 (1966) 276 f., Scafuro (as n. 16) 418, Lefèvre, *Plautus’ Rudens* (Tübingen 2006) 33–6.

57) Comparable also is the finale of the *Pseudolus*, in all probability largely attributable to Plautus, in which the *senex* Simo is humiliated and forced to hand over money to Pseudolus. The similarities between the three plays here discussed lend support to the view that it was Plautus who introduced Ballio’s promise in 1070–8, in the form of a Roman *sponsio*, to pay Simo 20 *minae* and let Phoenicium go for nothing if Pseudolus should succeed in his scheme against Ballio (G. Jachmann, *Zum Pseudolus* des Plautus, *Philologus* 88 [1933] 444–6, W. Görler, *Plautinisches im Pseudolus*, *Würz. Jahrb.* 9 [1983] 98–104 f., M. M. Willcock, *Plautus: Pseudolus* [Bristol 1987] 16 f., 131, Lefèvre, *Plautus’ Pseudolus* [Tübingen 1997] 26 f., 81 f.). Plautus leaves it unclear how the various debts were finally settled. Ballio’s promise is not mentioned in the finale, nor is it explained how Pseudolus can have known about it, but it can be regarded as implied by Pseudolus’ agreement to repay half of the 20 *minae* gained from Simo, since otherwise he would be left owing money to Ballio and Calidorus. It thus contributes to the humiliation of Simo as well as increasing Ballio’s loss. In the Saturnalian world of Plautus it is pimps and old men who are losers, not slaves.

(Pers. 406).⁵⁸ This tendency is obvious in many verbal details. It can also be seen in the farcical scenes depicting the humiliation of a pimp which end these three plays. Another Plautine pimp spoke for the Roman audience: *omnes mortales, si quid est mali lenoni, gaudent* (Rud. 1285).⁵⁹

Oxford

J. C. B. Lowe

58) Cf. E. Segal, *Roman Laughter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968) 79–90, Lefèvre (as n. 45) 84–7, id. (as n. 40) 41 f., Marshall (as n. 1) 140–4.

59) Different factors must be invoked to explain the inclusion of Labrax in an invitation to dinner in Rud. 1423. In the very last line of the play, after Daemones has jokingly issued a non-invitation to the audience, the invitation to Labrax and Gripus can be regarded as metatheatrically directed at fellow actors rather than dramatic characters; cf. Lefèvre (as n. 56) 108.