dererseits beschaffen ist. *Grammatici certant, et adhuc sub iudice lis est.*

Ferner ist es leider keine Lösung, zu postulieren, daß alles, was einem an dem überlieferten Material nicht zusagt, dem Eingriff eines Interpolators zuzuschreiben ist, dessen einziges Talent darin besteht, daß er sich ständig durch seine eigene schreiende Inkompetenz verrät. Es ist ein methodisch grundsätzlich verfehlter Ansatz, einen Interpolator als textkritischen Sündenbock einzuführen. Natürlich ist vieles in dem uns überlieferten Text vorhanden, was wir nicht als den 'reinen' Plautus betrachten können, aber nichtsdestotrotz ist es Teil der Überlieferung. Es kommt auch durchaus vor, daß die Gründe, die für die Annahme einer Interpolation vorgetragen werden, unbefriedigend sind.[27]

Schließlich ist es schwierig, ein objektives Kriterium zu finden, welches uns eine sichere Grenzziehung zwischen Material, das wir für definitiv 'Plautinisches im Plautus' erklären, und solchem Material, das wir als nachplautinische Interpolation bestimmen, erlaubt.

Abschließend möchte ich meiner Hoffnung Ausdruck verleihen, daß es *cuiuis fortiori* gelingen möge, einen neuen wissenschaftlichen Text von Plautus zu erstellen, der seinen Vorgängern vielleicht sogar überlegen ist und der hoffentlich nicht durch die Annahme zu vieler Interpolationen ausgedünnt sein wird! Das ist eine Herausforderung für dieses neue Millennium. *Ecquis poscet prandio?*

[27] Vgl. "The Schizophrenic Lover and the Logic of Farce", in: L. Benz u.a. (Hgg.), Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels (ScriptOralia 75), Tübingen 1995, S. 97-106.

The Market in Sooth: Supernatural Discourse in Plautus[1]

Niall W. Slater, Atlanta

The work of Eckard Lefèvre and his students at Freiburg has enormously enriched our understanding of the complexity of cultural cross-fertilization in the earliest days of Latin literature. This work has not only given fresh and compelling answers to long-standing questions about translation and adaptation at Rome but has also increasingly revealed the sophistication of elite support for such literary endeavors. The fiction of Plautus's plays is that they are all set in a Greek-speaking, not a Roman world, yet like Shakespeare's Italianate plays,[2] this world of elsewhere is by no means free from contemporary social and ideological struggles. The language of the plays bears the marks of pressure and distortion, of negotiation and re-evaluation, which the audience heard in the language of the Senate, the law courts, and other contemporary public venues. Recent scholarship has rightly emphasized the Saturnalian inversions of Roman comedy;[3] such inversions, however, do not abolish, but only suspend, the usual workings of power. Indeed, some struggles continue unabated.

I propose to examine briefly one such contemporary Roman struggle, the struggle for control of access to the divine, through the figure of the *hariolus* or soothsayer in Plautus. The *hariolus* was a marginal figure outside the framework of state religion who, along with his close kin, the astrologer, was often in later periods of tension expelled from Rome. A brief examination of the *haruspex*, who was part

[1] An early version of this article was presented at "Ancient Comedy: Continuity and Change," at the University of Queensland, organized by J. Whitehorne, and subsequent versions at Colgate University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
[2] S. Greenblatt, Shakespearean Negotiations, Berkeley 1988 is an excellent example of, and introduction to, new historicist readings of such 'escapist' settings.
[3] E.g., E. Segal, Roman Laughter, Harvard [1]1968 (Oxford [2]1988), drawing on C.L. Barber's work on Shakespeare. On Roman comedy and the Saturnalia, see also E. Lefèvre, „Palliata und Saturnalien", Poetica 20 (1988), pp. 32-46.

of the state religion, offers a useful contrast. Having assessed the general picture of the *hariolus* in Roman comedy, we will then be able to examine in detail how his art is introduced only to be marginalized and then suppressed at the end of Plautus' most interesting study of divine justice, the *Rudens*.

Under the verb *hariolari* in the "Lexicon Plautinum" one finds remains of a lively struggle over its definition. It means either "to prophesy the truth" or "to talk nonsense," and the positivist philologists of a century ago, for whom a word had to have a unified, stable meaning, battled mightily over which definition covered all the uses.[4] A quick review of examples shows that, while the verb most often acknowledges that another has spoken the truth, its meaning in context is in fact "any fool can see that."

Two passages in Plautus suffice to make the point. In the *Mostellaria* the banker Misargyrides arrives, demanding his money from Tranio:

> MIS. *salve et tu. quid de argentost?* TR. *abi sis, belua.*
> *continuo adveniens pilum injecisti mihi.*
> MIS. *hic homo inanis est.* TR. *hic homo est certe hariolus.*
> (569-571)

No soothsayer is required to determine from Tranio's answer that he has no money to pay the banker. The tone of *hariolus* is more sarcastic than ironic: "ah, he's had a divine revelation on the subject." So too Lysidamus in the *Casina*: Cleostrata asks what her husband Lysidamus wants, and the slave Chalinus jokes, "to see you dead and burning on your pyre." Lysidamus's aside confirms this (referring to Chalinus): *hariolum hunc habeo domi* (356). Again, the joke lies in its obviousness.

The *hariolus* can be more than a joke, but generally he remains a figure of fun. At the end of the *Menaechmi* prologue, the speaker is listing the various stock characters who in different plays inhabit the stage:

[4] G. Lodge, Lexicon Plautinum s.v. (with refs.); cf. C. Knapp, "Notes on Terence," CR 21 (1907), pp. 46-47, a rather too compressed discussion of *hariolari* in Terence.

> *sicut familiae quoque solent mutarier:*
> *modo hic habitat leno, modo adulescens, modo senex,*
> *pauper, mendicus, rex, parasitus, hariolus ...*
> (74-76)

The *hariolus* then is already a stage 'type,' familiar to the audience; indeed Naevius wrote a comedy entitled *Hariolus*.[5] His name makes plain that he is a Roman figure.[6] It is far from clear that he would have even had a Greek counterpart at this period.[7] The "oracle-seller" of Old Comedy had long since disappeared from the stage. From the company he keeps here he seems a character more to be scoffed at than to be sympathized with.[8]

[5] Transmitted as *Ariolus* in Gell. 3, 3, 15 and Macr. 3, 18, 6, as *Hariolus* in Fest. p. 202, 23. Gellius says Naevius wrote the play while in prison for insulting the Metelli and, more importantly, in part to apologize: he was freed (loc. cit.) *cum in his quas supra dixi fabulis* [sc. *Ariolum et Leontem*] *delicta sua et petulantias dictorum, quibus multos ante laeserat, diluisset.* We may doubt this account of Naevius's prison sentence (cf. H.B. Mattingly, "Naevius and the Metelli," Historia 9 [1960], pp. 414-439 and H.D. Jocelyn, "The Poet Cn. Naevius, P. Cornelius Scipio and Q. Caecilius Metellus," Antichthon 3 [1969], pp. 32-47), but the notion that the *Hariolus* formed part of Naevius's apology is most intriguing. It is virtually unimaginable that Naevius appeared in either play *in propria persona* to offer an apology. Far more likely is that the plays were seen as socially useful or supportive of state policy, and one should consider this possibility, even if the account of Naevius's imprisonment is rejected. The *Hariolus* might have attacked a group seen as socially dangerous, along the lines suggested below.

[6] The etymology of *hariolus* is uncertain, but the stem *har-* [possibly *har(u)-* < **gher* intestine] is the same as that in *haruspex*. See s.v. "Harioli" and "Haruspices" in: Der Kleine Pauly, and more fully s.v. "Haruspices," RE VII, 2 (1912), coll. 2431-2432; s.v. "Harioli," RE Suppl. III (1918), col. 886.

[7] Though see below on the *Poenulus* (449ff.). C.B. Gulick, "Omens and Augury in Plautus," HSPh 7 (1896), pp. 235-247 argues that the *Poenulus* scene comes from the Greek original (p. 237), but the situation seems more complicated. The *haruspex* served no particular deity, unlike Greek cult practice. If this speech was in the original, Plautus has replaced the priest of Venus with the *haruspex* — perhaps implying more significant alterations of the original plot than we might otherwise assume. See below.

[8] The "king" seems odd here: none appears in the surviving *palliata*. Perhaps the prologue includes in his purview the tragic stage (where the *hariolus* was not necessarily a figure of fun). E. Stärk, Die *Menaechmi* des Plautus und kein griechisches Original, Tübingen 1989, argues that *Menaechmi* is a free composition by Plautus. If

What distinguishes a *hariolus* in performance? Cyamus's description of Stratophanes in the *Truculentus* paints the stage picture:

> CYA. *me intuetur gemens;*
> *traxit ex intumo ventre suspiritum.*
> *hoc vide! dentibus frendit, icit femur;*
> *num opsecro nam hariolu'st qui ipsus se verberat?*
> (599-602)

The *hariolus* thus knows how to put on a good show for his customers.[9] The irony in the *Truculentus* passage is that the soldier Stratophanes' genuine emotion can be theatricalized and therefore trivialized by comparison with the suspect, possibly fraudulent performance of the *hariolus*.

The *hariolus* is also disparaged as someone only women believe in. The old bachelor Periphanes in the *Miles* feels himself fortunate in not having a wife: a wife would waste his money on all sorts of extravagances, chief among them consulting fortune-tellers. She would say to her husband:

> *... da quod dem quinquatribus*
> *praecantrici, conjectrici, hariolae atque haruspicae;*
> *flagitiumst, si nil mittetur quae supercilio spicit ...*
> (692-694)

The list climaxes in the woman who tells fortunes by examining eyebrows, but it is clear that the *hariola* and all her ilk are frivolous indulgences.

This last passage links the *hariolus* and the *haruspex*, and we must now compare the two figures. Whereas references to *harioli* are scattered through eight plays, references to the *haruspex* cluster in one play, the *Poenulus* — unsurprisingly, given his pivotal role in this comedy. Two other passages beyond *Miles* pair the *hariolus* and the *haruspex*,[10] a pairing which owes as much to Plautus's delight in the

so, the list of stock characters here should be fundamentally Roman and moreover grounded in performance.

[9] Might this allude to a previous performance, perhaps of the title character in Naevius's play (for which see above, n. 5)?

[10] *Amph.* 1132 and *Poen.* 791. Apart from these, the *haruspex* occurs outside the *Poenulus* only in the *choregus's* speech at *Curc.* 483, describing where one finds various types in Rome: *in Velabro vel pistorem vel lanium vel haruspicem* ... Cf. T.J. Moore, "*Palliata togata*: Plautus, *Curculio* 462-486," AJPh 112 (1991), pp. 343-362.

sound of the two words together as anything else.[11] We should not therefore simply equate the two kinds of soothsayers. To begin to understand the differences, let us look at the *haruspex* in the *Poenulus*.

Hanno, the little Carthaginian of the title, is searching for his long-lost daughters, who have fallen into the clutches of the villainous pimp Lycus. The *haruspex* is first mentioned when Lycus returns in a foul humor from sacrificing to Venus, for the *haruspex* has offered only discouragement:

> *condigne haruspex, non homo trioboli,*
> *omnibus in extis aibat protendi mihi*
> *malum damnumque et deos esse iratos mihi.*
> (463-465)

Having failed to buy Venus's favor, Lycus storms off without letting the *haruspex* take the meat that he was normally entitled to (455-457). Even if one were to accept the notion of a purely 'contractual' relationship between man and the gods (and J.A. Hanson has suggested to the contrary that moral desert plays a significant role in human/divine relations in Plautus[12]), the *leno* here has clearly not kept his part of the bargain. This scene prepares for the sharp reversal Lycus later suffers when deceived by the clever slave. He re-appears at line 746, congratulating himself on the money that he has just received from Collybiscus, not yet knowing that he has been deluded by another well-trained Plautine performer.

> *suspendant omnes nunciam se haruspices,*
> *quam ego illis posthac quod loquantur creduam,*
> *qui in re divina dudum dicebant mihi*
> *malum damnumque maximum portendier:*
> *is explicavi meam rem postilla lucro.*
> (746-750)

But retribution waits: Lycus soon learns of his deception. His not entirely logical reaction is to complain about the soothsayer he consulted:

[11] Cf. G. Maurach, Der Poenulus des Plautus, Heidelberg ²1988, ad 791: „die Zusammenstellung [von *hariolus*] mit *haruspex* ist wegen des Gleichanfangs häufig gewesen, *TLL* 6, 3; 2534, 53ff."

[12] J.A. Hanson, "Plautus as a Sourcebook for Roman Religion," TAPhA 90 (1959), pp. 48-101; on the *do ut des* formulation, 86-87. Hanson also suggests an intended contrast between the pimp's failure and the favor immediately won by the two daughters when they sacrifice to Venus (849-850).

eheu! quom ego habui hariolos haruspices;
qui si quid bene promittunt, perspisso evenit,
id quod mali promittunt, praesentariist.
(791-793)

The *haruspex* whom he denounced as not worth three obols turns out to have known whereof he spoke after all.[13]

The *haruspex* makes one final but essential contribution to the play. When Lycus's slave Syncerastus returns from the shrine of Venus, he notes again that Lycus could not propitiate Venus, while our two heroines, Hanno's daughters, won her favor immediately with their sacrifice (847-850). The girls tell us more, when they appear: the *haruspex* has prophesied their freedom.

ANTE. *nimiae voluptatist quod in extis nostris portentumst, soror,*
quodque haruspex de ambabus dixit …
nos fore invito domino nostro diebus paucis liberas.
(1205-1207)

This prophecy comes true in short order, as Hanno reveals himself as their father. The *haruspex* and his art are thereby vindicated.

We now turn to the theme of the *hariolus* and his function in the *Rudens*. Here Plautus chooses to differentiate between the *haruspex* and the *hariolus*, and an examination of this play suggests some interesting reasons why.

The *Rudens* has always been a favorite in the Plautine repertoire, for a number of reasons. Its sea-shore setting is a welcome escape from the claustrophobic city settings of most New Comedy. Character and action are unusual and lively. Above all, it is a particularly satisfying comedy of divine justice, in which the heroines are rescued both from storm and slavery, the pimp punished, and, as David Konstan has demonstrated,[14] the values of the city-state and the guarantees of property and individual human rights are asserted even in the untamed realm of nature away from the city. It is to this scheme of justice, and to its Romanization, that we first must turn.

[13] Maurach (above, n. 11) ad 791 takes *hariolus* as a predicate modifying *haruspex* and translates: „Ach, (wie schlimm), daß ich (wirklich) hellseherische Wahrsager hatte." The plural seems poetic.
[14] D. Konstan, Roman Comedy, Ithaca 1983, pp. 73-95.

Arcturus as prologue opens the play. He speaks as a representative of Jupiter — indeed, as a citizen of the divine city-state ruled by Jupiter:

ARC. *qui gentis omnis mariaque et terras movet,*
eiius sum civis civitate caelitum …
(1-2)

Jupiter is an *imperator* for both gods and men,[15] and his first concern, it seems, is with justice in the courts (13-20). Arcturus specifically rejects the *do ut des* formulation in Roman religion: Jupiter knows who the *boni* and the *scelesti* are, and the latter's attempts to buy him off with gifts and sacrifices (23) are doomed to failure. Only after Arcturus has urged his audience to pursue the Roman virtues of *pietas* and *fides* (29) does he narrate the play's background.

To summarize: a young Athenian named Plesidippus, living at Cyrene, sees and falls in love with Palaestra, possessed by the pimp Labrax. He pays for an option on the girl, but Labrax decides to skip town with both money and girl. A storm (arranged by Arcturus) wrecks his ship and scatters Labrax, Palaestra, another slave girl named Ampelisca, and a certain very valuable trunk along the shore. The trunk contains the recognition tokens, which will prove that Palaestra is the daughter of Daemones, an old Athenian living in self-imposed exile on this shore. The denouement will of course be the standard New Comedy recognition. Daemones finds his long-lost daughter and marries her off to Plesidippus. The priestess of Venus, whose shrine marks this deserted shore, plays a significant role in this recognition.

The play proper begins after the storm. Old Daemones and his slave first see Labrax and his companion swimming for their lives, then Palaestra and Ampelisca, escaping the wreck in a small boat. The women reach the shore safely, though separately, find each other, and finally make their way to the Venus's and the protection of her priestess.

After these romantic adventures, the play returns to the more familiar world of comedy. Plesidippus's slave Trachalio arrives, looking for his master; Plesidippus and Labrax had arranged to meet at the

[15] Line 9, a military metaphor in these republican days; cf. Konstan (above, n. 14), pp. 86-87.

shrine of Venus to offer a sacrifice and transact their business, but Trachalio is unsurprised to find that Labrax is not there. He suspected treachery all along:

> *credidi: factum est quod suspicabar,*
> *data verba ero sunt, leno abit scelestus exsulatum,*
> *in navem ascendit, mulieres avexit: hariolus sum.*
> (324-326)

The *hariolus* appears here in his ironic function: anyone who knows Labrax knows that he is treacherous. Trachalio then encounters Ampelisca coming from the shrine of Venus; she has already been put to work fetching water for the priestess. When Trachalio, changing his opinion, assumes that Labrax and his master Plesidippus are both within the shrine, preparing to sacrifice to Venus as planned, it is Ampelisca's turn to be ironic:

> TR. *certe huc Labrax ad prandium vocavit Plesidippum*
> *erum meum eru' voster.* AM. *pol hau miranda facta dicis:*
> *si deos decepit et homines, lenonum more fecit.*
> TR. *non rem divinam facitis hic vos neque erus?* AM. *hariolare.*
> (344-347)

Trachalio was indeed a *hariolus* with his first conclusion, though unknowingly. Ampelisca then narrates the story of the shipwreck — a story with possibly disturbing implications about divine justice.

The figure of Neptune appears three times in this narrative. While we might normally take the god simply as a metaphor for the sea, a closer examination suggests an interesting development. Trachalio, when he learns that the shipwreck foiled Labrax's plan to flee to Sicily, praises Neptune as an *aleator* (359) for his role in the storm. This is, to say the least, a striking metaphor. Should it bother us if Neptune plays dice with the universe? Trachalio's comparison may simply illustrate his own character, for a slave would be well-acquainted with dicing, but it also suggests a chance and arbitrariness about Palaestra's rescue that comports ill with the well-ordered moral universe Arcturus told us about at the beginning of this play. Then Ampelisca depicts Neptune as a too-generous host who has done his guest in with too much drink: *Neptunus magnis poculis hac nocte eum*

invitavit (362).[16] Plautus does not choose to leave us with the image of a drinking and dicing Neptune, however: a little later, as Ampelisca continues the tale of their escape from the shipwreck, Trachalio makes a joke of her misfortunes by calling Neptune a finicky aedile (*fastidiosus / aedilis*, 371-372), who tosses inferior goods (meaning the girls themselves) overboard. In isolation we could simply categorize this joke as a typical Plautine insult between slaves. Coming after the previous two instances, it has the effect of a climax. Neptune is transformed from a rake into a conscientious and hard-working official of the divine *civitas* ruled over by Jupiter, which Arcturus told us about at the beginning.

Trachalio again proclaims that he knew all along that the *leno* would attempt something like this and says that he ought to set up business as a *hariolus* (*occipiamque hariolari*, 377). He thus returns to the point he was making before Ampelisca's arrival and closes off a sequence of typically Plautine banter.[17] The discussion then turns to Palaestra and the loss of those items of hers in the pimp's trunk which are essential to her hope of rediscovering her family.

The arrival of the wet and miserable Labrax, accompanied by Charmides, frightens Ampelisca back into the shrine of Venus. After considerable fun at the expense of their physical sufferings, both also enter the shrine to seek help.[18] This precipitates the crisis, for Labrax, once he sees the girls, tries to reclaim them as his property. Trachalio rushes back on, appealing to Daemones for aid, and the issue is joined.

As David Konstan has shown, the central question is whether the justice of the city, which guarantees rights of citizenship and property, extends out into the realm of nature, i.e., to this deserted shore. This very important insight ties together both the fate of the two women and

[16] Compare Sosia and Mercury in *Amphitruo*. Sosia suggests the night is prolonged because the Sun is sleeping off a hangover, but Mercury objects to this anthropomorphism (*deos esse tui similis putas?* 284).

[17] E. Lefèvre, Diphilus und Plautus: Der Rudens und sein Original, Mainz 1984, pp. 7-10 shows Ampelisca to be wholly a Plautine invention, Trachalio substantially so also (pp. 15-16). Therefore this scene (particularly the two slaves' mutual insults) is Plautine invention as well.

[18] Though not before Charmides makes one more allusion to Neptune, now as a winemaker, and specifically of Greek wines (*vinis Graecis*, 588). The joke is surely Plautine and another indication that all the allusions to Neptune are ascribable to his account.

the coming dispute over possession of Labrax's trunk — that trunk even now floating ashore somewhere down the coast, containing Palaestra's proofs of Athenian citizenship. But does more than one city mean more than one kind of justice? Labrax takes whichever view suits his interests at the moment. His assault on the priestess when she tried to protect the girls at Venus' altar (671-673) shows what he is capable of, and he seems more than ready to try violence again on anyone weaker than himself. His view is that the girls are his property, and nothing can alter that. When Daemones tries to quote the law, he resists:

> DAE. *non licet: ita est lex apud nos* — LAB. *mihi cum vostris legibus*
> *nihil est commerci. equidem istas iam ambas educam foras.*
> *tu, senex, si istas amas, huc arido argento'st opus;*
> *si autem Veneri complacuerunt, habeat, si argentum dabit.*[19]
> (724-727)

The language here is distinctly Roman: Labrax denies any *commercium* with the society Daemones represents. Moreover, what law does Daemones represent? He himself is not a Cyrenian but an Athenian (741), and his sympathy is the more engaged when he learns that Palaestra was born in Athens. Labrax, however, makes his own threats, among them this one to Daemones:

> *verum, senex, si te umquam in urbe offendero,*
> *numquam hercle quisquam me lenonem dixerit*
> *si te non ludos pessumos dimissero.*
> (789-791)

Labrax regards the city as his native element, where he can behave as he wishes. There he could pay back this troublesome old man as he deserves. Out in nature, beyond the bounds of the city, he feels unprotected and can be cowed by the threats of violence from Daemones' overseers guarding him. The question posed is not just whether the law of the man-made city or the realm of nature rules here, but what sort of city the play envisions as well, Labrax's violent city or the Athens of Daemones. In fact Labrax is only restrained by the overseers until Plesidippus arrives and hauls the pimp off to court. This stops his attempt to carry the girls off, but the action remains poised here on the edge,

[19] A telling perversion of *do ut des*: Labrax is perfectly willing to deal with Venus — for cash.

between the world of the city and the world of nature, waiting for a new impulse.

That impulse arrives in the form of Daemones' slave Gripus, who has fished Labrax's trunk out of the surf. Naturally he dreams of finding gold inside the trunk to buy his freedom, but his dreams are even more ambitious than that. He wants land, a house, and then his own slaves. He dreams of becoming a king among kings (*apud reges rex*, 931: by no means an innocent ambition in a Roman context) and finally of building a city of and unto himself, for he will give it his own name (*ei ego urbi Gripo indam nomen*, 934a). Though less obviously anti-social than Labrax's rejection of the laws of the city, Gripus's ambition of becoming his own, self-sufficient city implies a similar rejection of social bonds.[20] He trusts no one, except his master (with whom he does not initially plan to share any treasure).

Gripus encounters Trachalio, who recognizes the trunk as belonging to Labrax, and a dispute over its possession begins. Gripus's position is that the property once lost in the sea loses its status as private possession and then belongs to whoever fishes it out. Trachalio maintains that it still belongs to the original owner and tries to trick Gripus into an admission that this is so. Gripus's response is significant:

> GRI. *nescio neque ego istas vostras leges urbanas scio,*
> *nisi quia hunc meum esse dico.* TR. *et ego item esse aio meum.*
> (1024-1025)

Gripus rejects "city laws" and adheres to what we would now call John Locke's view of property: what one reclaims from the state of nature becomes one's own property. Gripus and Trachalio both accuse each other of being thieves, but neither this nor the slapstick tug-of-war over possession of the trunk resolves the issue. Trachalio's first attempt to suggest an arbitrator gets him nowhere, but after both have exhausted themselves in the struggle, Gripus eventually proves more amenable, especially as Trachalio now proposes Daemones, Gripus's own master, as the arbitrator. Gripus is of course delighted, since he has every reason to believe that his master will judge in his favor and agrees.

[20] Cf. Konstan (above, n. 14), p. 75.

Events turn out a bit differently. Trachalio speaks first. Instead of claiming half the chest for himself, as he threatened to Gripus, he asks only for the small casket containing Palaestra's belongings. Gripus, despite his ever-increasing protests, is not allowed to present his case at all.[21] Daemones agrees that Palaestra be allowed to see and identify the trunk, despite Gripus's protest that she will of course claim to recognize the trunk whether it contains her property or not (1096-1098).

Gripus's worries should be obviated by Palaestra's offer to describe the contents of the rush casket before she has seen them. This will be an indisputable proof of ownership — except for one possibility:

> GRI. ... *quid si ista aut superstitiosa aut hariola'st atque omnia*
> *quidquid insit vera dicet? idne habebit hariola?*
> DAE. *non feret nisi vera dicet: nequiquam hariolabitur.*
> *solve vidulum ergo, ut quid sit verum quam primum sciam.*
> (1139-1142)

Suddenly the figure of the *hariolus*, heretofore a buffoonish figure of fun in the play, emerges as a real danger to the settled order of things. What if the *hariolus*, though clairvoyance, could identify the contents of a trunk without seeing them, and therefore claim another's property? What will happen to the laws of either property or citizenship, if someone with supernatural access to knowledge can use that knowledge to his or her own personal benefit?

The danger is more apparent than real, of course: we know that both casket and tokens belong to Palaestra. Palaestra not only identifies them but proves herself to be Daemones' long-lost daughter in the process. He joyfully welcomes her and determines to marry her off to

[21] On the unfairness here, see Lefèvre (above, n. 17), pp. 18-19 and 21-23, who takes this for a sign that Plautus is responsible for the whole notion of an arbitration scene over possession of the trunk. If so, then Plautus is also largely responsible for the central philosophical issue of the play as Konstan (above, n. 14) has outlined it, for an explicit dispute over whether the laws of the polis apply to property found in the sea is fundamental. Consequently the opening of the prologue, with its conception of the divine world as a city ruled by Jupiter as *imperator* will also have been a Plautine invention in support of this theme.

Plesidippus, a fellow Athenian and (what else) a friend's son and even a distant relative (1198; 1214).[22]

The happy ending is thus already secured, but Plautus is not content until he has played a comic variation on the recognition scene. Labrax returns to claim Ampelisca, who is still indisputably his property.[23] He discovers Gripus talking to himself about his loss of the chest, and his hopes revive. Gripus agrees to help Labrax recover the trunk — for a talent. Labrax gladly swears to pay while planning to cheat Gripus, but Daemones, who has possession of the trunk, forces Labrax to free Ampelisca first, then grants Gripus his freedom as well. Amidst this rash of freedoms granted (Trachalio is promised his, too), even Labrax, having fulfilled his oath and regained the rest of his property, can be invited to the concluding celebration. Divine justice has restored everyone and everything to its proper state.

And yet at least the shadow of another order of things still lingers even in its suppression by this happy ending. In Gripus's fear that Palaestra might be a *hariola*, we see for a moment the threat of human clairvoyance or supernatural knowledge that might operate outside the scheme of divine justice. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and nowhere more so for the Romans than in the realm of the divine. The Roman view of the gods differed from many modern notions of the divine. In his fundamental study of religion in Plautus, J.A. Hanson pointed out that "the stock epithets of the gods [in Plautus] postulate their immortality and power, but seldom their justice and never their omniscience."[24] He identifies only four passages in which the concept of the gods' omniscience is even alluded to and suggests that it was "a comprehensible idea, available for speculation," but not part of the Romans' usual picture of the divine.[25] Roman religion did not possess oracular shrines of the gods as Greek religion did. The gods were

[22] Cf. Lefèvre (above, n. 17), p. 29.

[23] In the absence of direct proof otherwise. As Lefèvre shows (above, n. 17), pp. 23; 34, Plautus has wholly invented Ampelisca and therefore both this scene of dispute over her freedom as well as the reconciliation with Labrax.

[24] Hanson (above, n. 12), p. 100.

[25] Hanson (above, n. 12), pp. 59-60. The four passages are *Merc.* 626 (*di sciunt*), *Capt.* 313 (*deus ... auditque et videt*), *Amph.* 57 (*quasi nesciam*, Mercury speaking), and *Amph.* 1133 (*quae futura et quae facta eloquar*, Jupiter speaking).

powerful, and one hoped that they acted in the interests of justice, but one did not consult them about the future.

On the other hand, knowledge of the future means power, and if the Roman gods were not interested in, or capable of, offering this knowledge, competitors were very likely to come into the market. The history of soothsayers, fortune-tellers, and astrologers at Rome suggests that this is precisely what happened. Roman religion was primarily concerned with the relationship of the whole state to the divine and largely a monopoly of the Roman ruling class. Like any other monopoly enterprise, this class resisted competition. The notion of 'free enterprise' in divine knowledge was just as distasteful and dangerous to this group as any other form would have been.

The suppression of Bacchic worship in 186 B.C. shows how the Roman Senate dealt with competitors to the state religion.[26] Heads of households were instructed to deal with family members who had joined this disreputable cult, and Livy records that hundreds, perhaps even thousands were executed.

At the time of this suppression, however, the *haruspices* had firmly established themselves, if not precisely within, then in close alliance with, the state religion. Livy's superb re-creation of the consul Postumius's speech to the people just as the violent suppression of Bacchic worship is about to begin is a masterpiece of xenophobic rabble-rousing, directed against foreign religious influences. Yet Rome has a defense:

> *Hac vos religione innumerabilia decreta pontificum, senatus consulta, haruspicum denique responsa liberant.*
> (Liv. 39, 16, 7)

Thus haruspicy, although it too like the Bacchanalia had come from Etruria, works together with the *pontifices* and the Senate to defend Roman religion against foreign corruption. While this re-created speech might be dismissed as Augustan anachronism, Livy elsewhere records numerous Senate consultations of the *haruspices* in the second

[26] An event reflected (and refracted) in Plautus's *Casina*: J. Cody, "The *senex amator* in Plautus' *Casina*," Hermes 104 (1976), pp. 453-476; W.T. MacCary, "The Bacchae in Plautus' *Casina*," Hermes 103 (1975), pp. 459-463; Plautus, Casina. Ed. by W.T. MacCary and M.M. Willcock, Cambridge 1976; cf. N.W. Slater, Plautus in Performance, Princeton 1985, pp. 91-93 (= Amsterdam ^{2}2000, pp. 74-76).

century BC, suggesting that they were trusted allies.[27] Though *haruspices* were not priests, they worked in close co-operation with the latter, and with the Senate. This, I suggest, explains why Plautus could substitute a *haruspex* for a character who was almost certainly a priest of Venus in the Greek original of the *Poenulus*, and why the action so explicitly vindicates that figure and his prophecies. Lycus twice explicitly sneers at the *haruspex* and his prophecies of disaster for the pimp. In his first speech, when he returns in a rage from consulting the *haruspex*, he has already convinced himself that the *haruspex* was wrong by a simple demonstration:

> *quid ei divini aut humani aequomst credere?*
> *mina mihi argenti dono postilla datast.*
> (466-467)

Somewhat later in the play, having made even more money, Lycus proclaims his defiance again (746-750, quoted above). The key of course is *postilla*: the prophesied results arrive, just a little later. Venus and the *haruspex* in this play represent a unified system of divine justice.

Not so the *hariolus*. As we have seen, the *hariolus* is mostly a figure of fun, a joke to be used and immediately dismissed. Only rarely outside the *Rudens* is the *hariolus* more than this. One example does suggest more irony than usual. In the *Miles* the slave Palaestrio has enlisted the aid of Acroteleutium to play the part of a woman madly in love with the title character, Pyrgopolyneices. She plays — or overplays — the part with great glee. At Pyrgopolyneices' door, however, she stops and does not knock. When her servant asks why, she replies:

> ACR. *quia non est intus quem ego volo.* MILPH. *qui scis?*
> ACR. *scio pol ego, olfacio;*
> *nam odore nasum sentiat, si intus sit.* PAL. *hariolatur.*
> PYRG. *quia me amat, propterea Venus fecit eam ut divinaret.*
> (1255-1257)

[27] See below. The persecution of 'foreign influences' could easily have involved the *haruspices* in 186, but had it done so, we would surely hear of it. Only in imperial times does consulting a *haruspex* become politically dangerous. Augustus forbids consulting them about anyone's death (Cass. Dio 56, 25); Tiberius forbids consultations without witnesses (Suet. *Tib.* 63).

The question is, to whom is Palaestrio's line directed: Pyrgopolyneices (already on stage) or the audience? Many assume the former, but given the usual contemptuous tone of *hariolari*, this seems unlikely: Palaestrio has no interest in doing anything to disturb Pyrgopolyneices' belief in her sincerity. I take it rather that his aside is directed to the audience, who know perfectly well what Acroteleutium is doing. She knows that Pyrgopolyneices is there and observing her (see 1218). As sometimes happens with asides, Pyrgopolyneices overhears, but he interprets it literally, not ironically. The comparison is clear: what Palaestrio can see through and dismiss as *hariolatur,* the unfortunate Pyrgopolyneices takes seriously as divination.

The *hariolus* emerges, if very subtly, as a real problem only in the *Rudens*, threatening justice, both human and divine. The human realm reflects the divine polis, ruled by Jupiter the *imperator*. Apparent injustices can, however, emerge on the human level. On entering, bedraggled and despairing, Palaestra complains of the gods' injustice in shipwrecking her and wonders why they disregard her outstanding *pietas* and other good deeds (190-195). The reward for her *pietas* arrives at the end of the play, when she is restored to her parents: the shipwreck is only an instrument to that end.

Jupiter the *imperator* is assisted by other officials, wittingly or not, such as Neptune the aedile and Arcturus the court reporter. Even the self-interested Gripus serves justice in the end. Labrax tries to cheat Gripus of the promised talent, cheerfully admitting his perjury thus: *tun meo pontifex peiiurio es*? (1377), "are you the *pontifex* in charge of my perjury?" The answer is, yes, and Gripus and Daemones enforce the oath after all. The divine city proves to be made in a human image then: its institutions are those of the Roman republic, in which Senate and religious authority work together and indeed overlap.

There is room in this system then for the *haruspex* but not the *hariolus*, for the former could be and was successfully co-opted into the existing system. The evidence from Livy bears this out. As Thulin notes,

> Auf dem sakralen Gebiet überlieferten die Sibyllinischen Bücher zuerst unmittelbar die griechische Lehre, und in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Republik wurden sie öfter als die H[aruspices] offiziell zu Rat gezogen. Aber vom zweiten Punischen Krieg an, der Zeit der größten nationalen Erregung, war das Ansehen der H[aruspices] in Rom in stetem Steigen, so daß sie schon im 2. Jhdt. v. Chr. fast ebenso häufig wie die Sibyllinischen Bücher (16:22), im ersten fast ausschließlich (12:5) über die Staatsprodigien befragt wurden [...].[28]

I do not suggest that Plautus wrote his plays for the purpose of furthering the religious policy of the senatorial class — but neither was he interested in opposing that policy. Plautus does more than record the rise and fall of the fortunes of the *haruspex* and the *hariolus* in the market for sooth-saying. His text adopts and adapts to his dramatic purposes the growing, and apparently senatorially fostered, distinction between the *haruspex* and the *hariolus*. Where he needs a figure with genuine insight into the future in the *Poenulus*, he employs the former. Where he wishes to make a joke of the possibility, he uses the latter. It would be too much to attempt to date the *Rudens* on the basis of the more threatening picture of the *hariolus* which appears at the end, but one may at least speculate that the image of the *hariolus* prophesying vainly in opposition to the divine plan of recognition and rescue was not unwelcome and might even call for a crowd reaction.[29]

Outside the theatre, *harioli* and *haruspices* continued to practice their arts, but the reactions of the Roman audience to their oral performances had already been subtly shaped by their viewing of *Poenulus* and *Rudens*. They returned from holiday to everyday with a strengthened sense of family and social order — and a greater appreciation for the insights of the *haruspex*.

---

[28] RE VII, 2 (1912), col. 2433 s.v. "Haruspices."

[29] Nor should we overemphasize the serious: compare Gripus's metatheatrical mockery of Daemones' moralizing at 1235-1253, well analyzed by T.J. Moore, The Theatre of Plautus, Austin, Texas 1998, pp. 77-80. Even at his most romantically serious, Plautus never lets us completely forget that his fictions are fictions, their happy endings imaginative constructs, their guarantees of justice and order narratological and not necessarily actual.

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