eine eigene Untersuchung: der Kleider- und Rollentausch von Herr und Diener und unter Freunden, ein Motiv, das seine Wurzel in der *Ilias* hat und das sich über Mozarts Opern *Hochzeit des Figaro* und *Don Giovanni* bis in die neueste Zeit verfolgen läßt; reizvoll wäre es auch, das Verhältnis von Verkleidungsintrigen zu Doppelgängerstücken zu untersuchen: diese enthalten oft unbewußte, unabsichtliche 'Verkleidungen' und lassen sich damit auch als 'Intrigen wider Willen' verstehen. Für die systematisch-strukturelle Erforschung solcher Motive bleibt noch viel zu tun.

DOMINA-tricks, or How To Construct a Good Whore from a Bad One.

Elaine Fantham, Princeton

Since the nineteenth century the public has become so familiar with the golden hearted prostitute as a type of opera, operetta and indeed ancient comedy, that we may forget that this generous lady owes her effectiveness on stage to the pre-existence of her opposite, the thoroughly greedy gold digger. Gold digger and golden heart alike may tell us something about men's values — strictly on the gold standard — but I will keep feminist rhetoric out of this exercise in comic analysis. I would like to honor Eckard Lefèvre and his long record of stimulating work on both Plautus and Terence by returning to a favourite theme. I hope to show how the tricks of the greedy courtesan displayed in Plautine adaptation were reused to create the intrigue based on misrepresentation of the golden hearted courtesan as we know it best from Terence.

We owe to Eckard Lefèvre an insightful essay on the Plautine comedy which carries the art of the *meretrix* to its greatest height of effrontery, the *Truculentus*.[1] There the ruthless controlling intellect is Phronesium, "Practical wisdom" or "clever lass", with her equally heartless sidekick Astaphium. As in *Trinummus* Plautus has named his version after an incidental character, featured in only one or two scenes. There is no clue to the author or title of Plautus' Greek model. It recalls the young wastrels of Philemon or Diphilus, but Menander was certainly not too refined to stage such a villainous heroine. The prologue of his lost *Thais* invokes the muses to tell of a woman young, beautiful, proud, greedy, skilled at demanding money and excluding lovers.[2] Menander's *Thais*

[1] E. Lefèvre, „Truculentus oder Der Triumph der Weisheit", in: E. Lefèvre, E. Stärk, G. Vogt-Spira, Plautus barbarus. Sechs Kapitel zur Originalität des Plautus (ScriptOralia 25), Tübingen 1991, pp. 175-200.

[2] Men. fr. 185 K.-Th. with its context from Plutarch: καθάπερ ὁ Μένανδρος ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ τῆς Θαΐδος πεποίηκεν· 'ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἄειδε τοιαύτην, θεά, / θρασεῖαν, ὡραίαν δὲ καὶ πιθανὴν ἅμα, / ἀδικοῦσαν, ἀποκλείουσαν, αἰτοῦσαν πυκνά, /μηθενὸς ἐρῶσαν, προσποιουμένην δ' ἀεί.' The grand epic formula suggests that the

cannot be dated and may not have been produced before his *Andria* or *Heautontimoroumenos* or the famous *Eunouchos*, but the archetypal gold-digger had to preexist in art, as well as in life, to explain the assumptions and suspicions of the citizen males and the powerful paradoxes of the honest girls and generous women of Menander's courtesan plays.

Jim Tatum called *Truculentus* "the most sardonic of Plautus' comedies," I suppose because it is a comedy of vice triumphant.[3] Certainly *Truculentus* has often been condemned in moral terms as thoroughly unedifying, and in dramaturgical terms as lacking a proper intrigue. Yet the play's sexual morality is surely no worse than that of *Bacchides*, *Menaechmi*, or *Miles Gloriosus*, and its trickery no more outrageous. What then is its offence? Is it that the woman wins, and wins, not so much through clever deceptions as through an outright assertion of her sexual powers? Like a female Pseudolus Phronesium glories in her power to cheat and shares with the audience and her cronies her confidence in stripping her lovers of their assets.

Let's start by reviewing the play's Dramatis Personae, its setting and its mechanisms. To help readers follow the intricacies of the plot and show its affinities of cast and structure with Terence's *Eunuchus*, I have combined in one diagram stage-plan and named character types of both plays, indicating some of the correlations between them and noting the order of their appearance on stage.

playwright is claiming to present a sort of female Odysseus, reaching a new level of *poneria*. In another fragment (186) a victimized lover voices his self-reproach in the same style as Diniarchus.

[3] Plautus: the Darker Comedies, (Bacchides, Casina and Truculentus), translated with introduction and notes by J. Tatum, Baltimore 1983, p. 147. The comedy has also been helpfully discussed under the rubric "satiric comedy" by D. Konstan, Roman Comedy, Ithaca 1983.

1) TRUCULENTUS.

	House 1	**House 2**
	lover (act 3)	Domina
	STRABAX	**PHRONESIUM**
	Gatekeeper	Gatekeeper
	Truculentus	**Astaphium**
from city	**Diniarchus** lover (act 1)	**Stratophanes** from harbour soldier lover (act 2) (**Cyamus**)
	Father-in-law (act 4) (maid, laundress etc)	
	AUDIENCE	

Notes: both Phronesium and her newest lover Strabax have gatekeepers.
Diniarchus, like his prospective father in law, lives offstage.
Each act brings a new lover on stage.
Cyamus is Diniarchus' boastful representative in act 2, parallel to function of Gnatho in **Eunuchus**

2) EUNUCHUS.

	House 1	**House 2**
	lover (act 1)	Domina
	PHAEDRIA	**THAIS**
	slave	maid
	Parmeno	**Pythias**
	Chaerea	**Sister**
from country	Phaedria (Act 4)	from harbour **Thraso** soldier lover (act 3) **Gnatho** Parasite Chremes (brother: act 3)
	Father (act 5)	
	AUDIENCE	

Notes: Phaedria opens play like Diniarchus: Thais appears early in dialogue with him. Pythias is her chief maid, but more a positive go-between than negative gatekeeper. Second plot has Phaedria's young brother Chaerea rape Thais' 'sister'. As Father-in-law appears in *Truculentus* to settle Diniarchus so Father (and Chremes, the 'sister's' brother) settle Chaerea's case through marriage. Some minor characters such as the eunuch Dorus, the lesser maids of Thais and the kitchen staff of Thraso, have been omitted.

The Prologus of *Truculentus* opens by identifying the house of Phronesium, a woman of modern morals (*huius saecli mores*) who never demands from her lover — what he has already given — but makes sure he has nothing left to give. We will learn that at least one other character, the rich country boy Strabax, has a house on stage, but the playwright does not want to weaken his focus by mentioning him too soon. Instead this outer, impersonal, prologue gives as sole starting point of the action that Phronesium is pretending to have had a child by a soldier lover in order to get his money. This is supplemented by the inner prologue of young Diniarchus, who serves to voice the playwright's take on the crazy behavior of lovers in general, before he gets round to confessing his own record. He is the *intimus*, the old trusted lover of this powerful courtesan; but now she has found a richer lover in the Babylonian soldier who is expected today, and she is claiming to have born his child, so she will need to shut out Diniarchus. Unlike the external prologue he is not certain that her claim is fraudulent, because of his absence on a mission to Lemnos, but he suspects she has borrowed a baby for the purpose: he would have known if she were pregnant.

Thus Phronesium has already had two lovers, the young townsman and the foreign soldier: before the first act is over we learn that she has just acquired a third admirer, the country boy, and is using her maid Astaphium as a go-between. In fact Astaphium is the mistress of ceremonies, the doorkeeper who controls the comings and goings of the play. Like those odd little weather houses, Phronesium's house is one into which one figure is expelled as another is admitted: the stage street is more of an antechamber for her clients than a public thoroughfare, and virtually everyone who comes on stage is hoping to enter her house or reluctantly leaving. The actors and the action rotate through her revolving door, with a miniature procession of lovers admitted so long as they are future givers, and expelled once they have given. As each man is drained she moves on to the next, and the plot will give each man his turn of hoping for satisfaction, moving his predecessor outwards and away. In this truly Brechtian world it is the duty of both victim and predator to keep the money passing from innocent to professional.

A brief outline of the action will display its cyclic form and its lack of anything like a *peripeteia*.

ACT I, introduced by Diniarchus's prologue, shows him sparring with Astaphium. Diniarchus overhears her undertake to fetch a male (*eumpse* 114) from his home to Phronesium, and disputes her claim that she is going to get the midwife; isn't this a new lover? They fence verbally until he mentions a new source of money (174) and she changes to inviting him in: challenged about the new baby she maintains the fiction and confirms that the soldier is expected to arrive any minute, but still urges him into the house (209). Astaphium sings a song of triumph that she has got him out of the way and can go to fix the rendezvous with the young country lad in the house next door. But that door is opened by the hostile Truculentus; after an exchange of insults he goes back in, leaving Astaphium to boast of her plans to tame him.

Now (322) Diniarchus returns to the stage from Phronesium's house, tired of waiting for her. After a few minutes of his complaint she follows to invite him back and tell him the truth about her feigned pregnancy and her maid's quest to borrow a baby.

At this stage Plautus' audience has no reason to suspect that Diniarchus is this baby's father, but the Greek audience may well have been alerted in the prologue. Phronesium promises to let Diniarchus return as soon as she has extorted money from the soldier (420) but makes this promise the cue to demand a new present. Diniarchus is taken in and leaves, telling the world his faith in her affection for him. This 'first act' is almost half the play.

ACT II, focussed on the soldier Stratophanes, opens with a flamboyant childbirth scene, as Phronesium parades her delicate condition for his benefit. The soldier enters confidently but is quickly reduced to misery as Astaphium plays up Phronesium's sufferings and the child's talents, and Phronesium disdains his costly gifts — which she nonetheless takes in. The action is turned round when Diniarchus' cook Cyamus appears bringing mules loaded with gifts. Exaggerating her thanks to the absent Diniarchus Phronesium humiliates Stratophanes further and soldier and cook face off, his sword against the other's cleaver. When Cyamus beats a retreat, Phronesium shuts her door in the soldier's face, and he leaves in despair for the forum at 644.

ACT III. Two short scenes show Astaphium welcoming in the country boy Strabax, who has taken 20 minae due to his father; returning to the door she finds Truculentus himself, now converted to charming ways, and asks him in on her own account.

ACT IV. Without a significant pause, Diniarchus appears, encouraged by Cyamus' report, and meets Astaphium, still mounting guard at the door. If she has got rid of Truculentus it is not explained; certainly the country boy Strabax is still inside with Phronesium and Diniarchus is sent away with the message that he has been outbid.

Here opens the only phase in the action that is not controlled by Phronesium and her maid. As Diniarchus stands outside threatening to sue them, he sees his for-

mer father-in-law Callicles with his maid and Phronesium's hairdresser, and laments that his sins have caught up with him. In the only real reversal of the play Callicles discovers from the maids that Phronesium has his daughter's baby and Diniarchus is the father. Diniarchus escapes trouble by asking to marry her (841) and promising to retrieve the baby. But in the next scene he succumbs to Phronesium's counter-claim and leaves the play with the baby still in her possession.

ACT V. Plautus still has to resolve the rival claims of Strabax and Stratophanes. The soldier returns with a mina of gold, to be treated with renewed complaints and contempt. When Strabax comes out from the bedroom after 'his girl,' Phronesium again insults the soldier and wheedles Strabax; Stratophanes challenges him in a full scale reprise of the vicarious confrontation with Diniarchus, but Strabax flashes his ready money and Phronesium arbitrates accordingly. She will sleep first with Strabax, giving priority to the one who still has money to offer, then with the soldier. They are in no position to object and she closes the action congratulating herself on her business sense and thanking Venus who has controlled the drama.

In the end, then, it is only Strabax — the newest lover — who scores; while Diniarchus is kept on the hook until his own change of status removes him in act IV and Stratophanes is kept dangling from his first arrival in act II to a moment after the play which may never actually happen. Those two, after all, have had their time with Phronesium, so that there is a certain poetic justice, which Astaphium clearly affirms in 733-5:

> *plus enim es intromissus quom dabas;*
> *sine vicissim qui dant* [*operam*] *ob illud quod dant operis utier.*
> *litteras didicisti: quando scis, sine alios discere.*

This is really a play not of one but two skilled courtesan protagonists: a mistress who screens herself through her maid, and a maid who both protects her mistress and does her own business on the side. Astaphium once did business with Diniarchus, and clearly expects to entertain Truculentus. Her double function makes her if anything even more powerful than Phronesium: while the audience sees or is told about Phronesium's exploitation of her lovers, it is Astaphium who provides the running commentary: Like Mercury in *Amphitruo* she mediates the action for the audience, and it is not surprising that she actually has the longest role and most songs.

Through Astaphium *Truculentus* voices an explicit code, using the language of analogy to instruct the audience in the rules of the courtesan's game. This women's code is actually preceded and complemented

by Diniarchus' account in the prologue of what the lover gains and loses from mercenary love. No lover, he declares, could ever learn all the ways of ruining himself; with wheedling and scolding (28) the woman can sting him for a year's support — then give him a mere three nights, collecting oil and grain and wine on the side. The lover is like a fish; she dangles her line until he bites the bait: after meeting her demands he gets extra nights until he is truly hooked; then when she quarrels with him, he loses his cash and his heart, or if he gets the occasional night, his heart is happy but his cash is gone. Her household constantly generates new demands — replacements for lost money, for clothes, maids, silver plate, furniture. All this we will see in the play.

But the next embarrassment of the lover which Diniarchus describes — his need to conceal losses from parents — plays no role in *Truculentus* as adapted. His loss of all his money to the courtesan was almost certainly the cause of the broken engagement implied in Act 4.[4] This aspect of the action must have been prominent in the original Greek comedy. But this extravagance also reflects a changing social pattern in the world of Plautus' audience. It is in their world that Diniarchus imagines pimps and courtesans swarming around the banker's tables to add new payments to their accounts. It is in their world that victory (over Macedonia and Syria?) has brought peace and prosperity, so that men with money have an obligation to spend it on love; *amare oportet omnes qui quod dent habent* (76).

A different version of lover-mistress relations offered in Astaphium's first song is also left unsubstantiated in this play — the invasion of the courtesan's establishment by gangs of young bloods who descend on them and strip the place of food and drink, thinking it fair fighting to plunder those who plunder them. In this play no lovers invade the courtesan's house by force, or have to conceal the loss of money from their parents. Only the theme of wasting their goods has come to stay; in a series of financial metaphors Diniarchus admits having squandered his liquid assets on Phronesium's household, which has put him out of business and

[4] Cf. *Truc.* 770 *Calliclem video senem / meus qui adfinis fuit* and 848-9 *iam illi remittam nuntium adfini meo, / dicam ut aliam condicionem filio inveniat suo*, which show that Callicles' daughter was first engaged to Diniarchus but her father had cancelled the engagement (as in *Andria*) and found another young man to be her future husband. See now the discussion of A.C. Scafuro, The Forensic Stage, Cambridge 1997, pp. 258-9.

taxed his capital away. But he can still realize on his house and smallholding.[5] This is the information that turns Astaphium's indifference to a warm welcome, and restores the discarded lover to being *noster*, "one of us".

In her second solo song the image of hook and line gives way to more likenesses for the courtesan's talents; she must have fine teeth and a skilled tongue to smile and speak nicely despite her wicked intentions; she must be like a bramble catching at and stripping the passing male, but if he stops giving, she should discharge him as a deserter from military service. Let him love while he has cash, and find a new profession when he runs out of funds, or make way for those who still can give; the real lover forgets that he has already given and cheerfully ruins his fortune. For the courtesan there is no such thing as enough.

Phronesium and Astaphium have only one enduring principle: to take without giving; the lover-customer who has still something to give is welcome, while he who has given his all is discarded as dead and empty of promise. But if their art of taking without fulfilling their side of the bargain is simply a repetitive cycle from one act to the next, there is more potential comedy in their juggling of the comings and goings of each of the three customers to ensure an endless postponement of satisfaction. If Phronesium comes closest to honesty with her old lover Diniarchus, the fact remains that he too gives without being gratified; persuaded to stay away while Phronesium cajoles the soldier, he follows up his lavish gifts to find another man in occupation, and is overtaken by the obligation to marry before he can claim his turn.

It is this dark satiric world of greed and folly which haunts the fears of the elderly Fathers who populate Terence's Menandrian comedies. Yet Terence's plots do not revolve around money like the plays of Plautus, nor do his slaves and courtesans gloat over getting it. Deception is too obvious a dramatic engine: instead self-deception is exploited for its own comic value. Instead of the less respectable characters misbehaving, the respectable elders assume their misbehavior and confuse the circumstances. Phronesium fakes having given birth, so when the innocent Andrian girl of Terence's first adapted play goes into labour, the suspicious

[5] Diniarchus must either be fatherless, or like Lesbonicus in *Trinummus* and Philolaches in *Mostellaria*, taking advantage of his father's absence on business.

elderly father Simo tells his son's intriguing slave that he is not deceive first they have sent for the midwife and now they are simulating tl sounds of childbirth (470-76): soon a woman will arrive with a baby co cealed in her baggage so that they can blackmail his son into this marria with a pauper of no family (490-94). And when the slave takes the bal and sets it on the path of the prospective wealthy father-in-law Chreme he stages a quarrel for the old man to hear, in which the same accusatic of borrowing the baby to pretend motherhood provokes the Andrian girl maid into confirming that the baby is the Andrian girl's child by you Pamphilus. Although *Truculentus* is the only surviving play to involve supposititious baby, the fact that *Andria* makes open sport of the tri proves this was an established variant in traditional courtesan comed But there is no courtesan in *Andria*: old father Simo's mistake is to a sume that an unprotected girl who has lived in the house of a courtesan - the dead Chrysis — must have learned such tricks from her environment.

The best demonstration of this half submerged tradition is rath *Eunuchus*, both in its construction of Thais' behavior and in the misrepr sentations to which it is subjected, not only by suspicious slaves a fathers, but even by the leading lover of the play. You will remember th *Eunuchus* combines two plots, both centred on the house of the courtes Thais. Thais has taken in and brought up respectably the orphaned citiz girl she calls her sister. Thais and the sister are loved, with very differe modes of loving, by the two sons of a respectable neighbour. While t older boy, Phaedria, just through his ephebic training, loves and has fr quented Thais, the young lad Chaerea has only just discovered wome and is smitten with passion for the young girl he has seen escorted in t street.

In the absence of a narrative prologue the audience has to be i troduced slowly to the honourable reality of Thais' motives through h words and deeds, but is given the standard negative reading of Thais' b havior early on by the slave Parmeno. Keeping *Truculentus* in mind, v realize that Terence's audience may have heard with complete disbeli Thais' explanations to Phaedria of why she is denying him sexual acce Phaedria is angry that he is both summoned and dismissed — *non eam nunc quidem / quom accersor ultro? an potius ita me comparem / n perpeti meretricum contumelias?* (46-48). Like Diniarchus he realises is too deeply in love to resist, and assumes that once she sees he is in h

ower she will cheat and deceive him (54-55). Even Parmeno, his slave, in only advise him to ransom his heart as cheaply as possible — that is pay out as little as he can (74-76) and try not to kick against the pricks. haedria must have squandered quite a sum, since Parmeno hails Thais as *ostri fundi calamitas* (79).

Like Astaphium or Phronesium, Thais begins by asking Phaedria hy he has not come in to her, then provides the prehistory of this comdy as she explains to Phaedria why he has recently been shut out of her ouse. Parmeno, the cynical witness to this dialogue, undertakes to interpt as soon as he thinks she is lying. Thais' explanation is that her mother as given a young girl of citizen birth, and when Thais moved to Athens ith her protector, she brought the girl with her. She claims that she inerited all she has from this protector: but by Thais' own admission she as received many gifts from Phaedria. Before him there was a soldier ver, who went to campaign in Caria; it is only since he left that Phaedria as been her trusted lover, her *intumus* (the same word used for iniarchus). When Thais' miserly uncle sold the young girl as a slave, her oldier lover bought her as a present for Thais, but now that he has found ut that Thais is having an affair with Phaedria he is making excuses not give her the girl and may even have taken a fancy to her. This is the eason she wants Phaedria to stay clear until she can get the girl away om the soldier and restore her to her citizen family.

At this point it is not Parmeno the slave but Phaedria himself who ejects her story: the whole sad tale of the girl means only one thing; haedria is to be shut out and the soldier welcomed in! (158). The real xplanation is that she prefers the soldier and is afraid the girl will steal im from her. Angrily he begins to reproach her with the gifts he has obained for her — the Ethiopian maid and Eunuch she asked for. Thais offers to abandon her plan rather than offend him, then returns to her request; just two days! Phaedria does not believe her: do the audience? Not, think, until she gives the proof of her sincerity when she is left on stage.

> *me miseram! forsan hic mihi parvam habeat fidem*
> *atque ex aliarum ingeniis nunc me iudicet.*
> *ego pol, quae mihi sum conscia, hoc certo scio*
> *neque me finxisse falsi quicquam neque meo*
> *cordi esse quemquam cariorem hoc Phaedria.* (197-201)

This day will be decisive because — this she has not told Phaedria — she is expecting the arrival of the young girl's citizen brother: the implication is that once identified the girl will be safe in the control of her family.

As in the *Truculentus*, *Eunuchus* moves to a competition between rival lovers; in *Truculentus* the soldier brought exotic slave girls, while the townsman Diniarchus sent his slave Cyamus to deliver food supplies, in *Eunuchus* it is Parmeno who parades across the stage with the eunuch and Ethiopian just as the soldier's parasite Thraso enters to make Thais a present of the young girl; thus neither rival is involved in the exchange of insults, only their deputies, each of whom is reluctant to leave Thais' doorway open to the other. There is no scene with Thais herself, who thus escapes the contamination of being seen to take gifts from both rivals at once. Instead the plot takes an entirely new twist when the lustful young Chaerea acts on a casual jest of Parmeno and demands to be substituted for the Eunuch so that he can 'get' the girl. There can be no doubt of his intentions, since Parmeno reacts by protesting that this is a crime (*flagitium facimus*). But Chaerea draws on the stereotype to justify his plot (382-5).

> *an id flagitiumst, si in domum meretriciam*
> *deducar et illis crucibus, quae nos nostramque adulescentiam*
> *habent despicatam et quae nos semper omnibus cruciant modis,*
> *nunc referam gratiam atque eas itidem fallam ut ab illis fallimur?*

Passing over the complications introduced by Chaerea's impersonation and rape, we might note that the famous scene where the soldier lover leads his kitchen troops to besiege the courtesan's house is motivated by another false suspicion of a standard courtesan trick; the soldier thinks she has been thrusting a rival under his nose (794-5). In fact the man he has seen with Thais is not his actual rival Phaedria, who has been sent to the country, but the young girl's brother, who has come to identify her. Once Thais is confident of the girl's free status she does not bother to disabuse the soldier, but leaves the brother to declare the girl's free birth and drive the soldier from the field. When the rape is discovered and Chaerea identified as the rapist, Terence again uses the expectations of both his respectable characters and his audience to highlight the paradoxical virtue of his heroine Thais. Parmeno returns pleased with himself that he has obtained a particularly difficult and expensive love object for Chaerea from a money-grubbing courtesan, at no cost or trouble. In more general terms he

congratulates himself on educating Chaerea in their nature and habits.[6] Thus even slaves voice the usual bourgeois prejudices.

But the audience has already seen Thais treat the wretched Chaerea with the utmost generosity, acknowledging her own status as perhaps worthy of *contumelia*, but distinguishing the higher standards he should have maintained (865-6). We began the play with Phaedria indignant at the *contumelia* of courtesans.[7] At its climax Chaerea is shamelessly optimistic that his rape will turn out well: instead of apologizing for his treatment of Thais he simply claims he took Pamphila not from *contumelia* but from love (877), and asks Thais' help in persuading his father to permit his marriage (885-8).

There is one more reversal that is not usually seen as a link between these two plays: Phronesium triumphs at the end of *Truculentus*, graciously declaring that she will share her favours between Strabax and the soldier. Modern readers have often jibbed at the corresponding outcome of *Eunuchus*. When the father of Phaedria and Chaerea gives his protection to Thais in return for her forgiveness of young Chaerea's rape, Chaerea and Parmeno concludes that Phaedria will now monopolize Thais; *fratris igitur Thais totast* (1040). Instead the last fifty lines see Gnatho urge the brothers to share Thais with Thraso in order to help finance her needs: (1075-8, 1080)

> *quod des paulum est, et necessest multum accipere Thaidem.*
> *ut tuo amori suppeditare possint sine sumptu tuo*
> *omnia haec, magis opportunus nec magis ex usu tuo*
> *nemost. principio et habet quod det et dat nemo largius...*
> *neque istum metuas ne amet mulier: facile pellas ubi velis.*

First Chaerea, then her lover Phaedria, accept this bargain, and Thraso is told his social graces have won him acceptance. The whole sequence is very Plautine, and would have fitted the *Truculentus* perfectly. It probably did fit the ending of the Menandrian *Kolax* that the soldier should pay to share in the courtesan's favours — and get very little in return.[8] But if it offends that the anti-typical Thais of Terence's play, who has had to pardon so much, should be shared out behind her back, we might counter with three arguments. 1) Thais has already freely associated with the soldier: 2) it would be far more offensive if this generous woman were herself to propose the time-sharing arrangement to the infatuated Phaedria, and 3) not only *Truculentus*, but the proposed outcome of the Plautine *Asinaria* shows that such shared services were a normal arrangement.[9] Indeed the contract previously drawn up by the rival lover in *Asinaria* 751-809 suggests that in comedy such exclusive long-term contracts could seem presumptious.

If the bad courtesan keeps multiple lovers dangling in order to extract money from each in turn, if she uses their jealousy and competitiveness to raise their contributions, while temporizing to keep their eagerness more intense, the good courtesan will either give herself to one lover, or if she takes on more than one, will act for some altruistic purpose. That purpose is all the more poignant if it is to save a younger woman from being forced to live as a courtesan in her turn. Terence's Thais (Menander's Chrysis) has always been admired, but she becomes even more remarkable when she is seen in the shadow of Phronesium or Menander's eponymous Thais. Did Menander perhaps create them both?

[6] Cf. 927 *meretrice avara*, 932 *meretricum ingenia et mores*.

[7] *Eun.* 48 above *meretricum contumeliae*: Thais' gentle protest provokes Chaerea's denial *non me contumeliae / fecisse causa, sed amoris* in 877.

[8] On the 'problem' of the ending of *Eunuchus* see most recently P.G. McC. Brown in E. Handley and A. Hurst (eds.), Relire Ménandre, Geneva 1990, pp. 49-61.

[9] At *Asin.* 917-8 the parasite of the defeated rival plans to persuade Argyrippus (who has paid 20 minae for a year's sole enjoyment of his girl) to share her services, in view of the cost of her maintenance. We might also compare [Demosth.] 59, 29 where Timanoridas and Eucrates club together to buy Neaera outright for 30 minae.

SPUDASMATA

Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten
Begründet von Hildebrecht Hommel und Ernst Zinn
Herausgegeben von Gottfried Kiefner und Ulrich Köpf

Band 80

DRAMATISCHE WÄLDCHEN

2000

GEORG OLMS VERLAG HILDESHEIM · ZÜRICH · NEW YORK

DRAMATISCHE WÄLDCHEN

Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von
Ekkehard Stärk und Gregor Vogt-Spira

2000

GEORG OLMS VERLAG HILDESHEIM · ZÜRICH · NEW YORK