

Copyright

by

Daphne Francois

2011

The Report committee for Daphne Francois

Certifies that this is the approved version of the following Report:

Amicitia in the Plays of Terence

Approved by

Supervising Committee:

Supervisor:

Timothy J. Moore

L. M. White

Amicitia in the Plays of Terence

by

Daphne Francois, B.A.; B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2011

***Amicitia* in the Plays of Terence**

by

Daphne Francois, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

SUPERVISOR: Timothy J. Moore

Amicitia – Roman friendship – is delineated as an ideal reciprocal relationship between elite Roman males of fairly equal social standing. When individuals of unequal rank share this ideal reciprocal relationship, *amicitia* is labeled as “patronage” or “clientship”. This report seeks to test these ideals by examining the language of *amicitia* between individuals of equal and unequal rank in the plays of Terence. The results of this study show that Terence’s plays broaden the definition of *amicitia* to encompass a wide range of various friendships, including clientships. The language of *amicitia* supports the evidence available from late Republican and Imperial Rome that the measurement of reciprocity is indeterminate, *amicitia* and clientship share the same terminology of friendship, and that it can illuminate character development throughout the plays of Terence.

Table Of Contents

Introduction.....	1
<i>Amicitia</i> in Rome.....	3
Why Terence?.....	10
Chapter 1: Friendship between Equals.....	15
Fathers/ <i>Senes</i>	15
Sons/ <i>Adulescentes</i>	46
Chapter 2: Friendship and Clientship.....	64
Conclusion.....	87

INTRODUCTION

In his opening monologue of the *Adelphoe*, the *senex* Micio, offers his opinion on different philosophies of parenting styles. Micio prefers to be a lenient parent—a parent who is a friend to his child—rather than a strict and overbearing father, who rules with an iron fist (*imperium*):

Et errat longe mea equidem sententia, qui imperium credit gravius esse aut stabilius vi quod fit quam illud quod amicitia adiungitur. mea sic est ratio et sic animum induco meum: malo coactus qui suom officium facit, dum id rescitum iri credit, tantisper pavet; si sperat fore clam, rursum ad ingenium redit. ille quem beneficio adiungas ex animo facit, studet par referre, praesens absensque idem erit. hoc patruius, potius consuefacere filium sua sponte recte facere quam alieno metu: hoc pater ac dominus interest. hoc qui nequit, fateatur nescire impereare liberis.

“In my opinion, he is completely wrong in thinking that paternal authority based on force will carry more weight than authority that grows out of love. Here’s what I think and I am convinced I am right: the man who behaves well because he is afraid of being punished does so only as long as he thinks he may be caught. If he thinks he can go undiscovered, he reverts to his natural tendencies. The man whose devotion you’ve won by kindness acts out of conviction. He’s anxious to give as much as he’s received, and he’s always the same whether or not you’re there. A father’s job is to train his son to do the right things as a matter of course rather than through fear—in fact that’s the difference between a father and a master. A man who cannot do this had better admit that he doesn’t know how to handle children.”¹

Adelphoe 65-77

According to Goldberg, the *amicitia* that Micio endorses “depends on shared values and opinions”; conflict in these very opinions and values form the crux of Terence’s plots.² In

¹ The translations in this thesis are from Copley (1967) with specific modifications by me where I think the text needs to be explicitly and literally rendered.

² Goldberg (1986) 103.

addition to the different kinds of *amicitia* that exist in Terence's plays, the competing notions of this reciprocal relationship create the necessary problems and dilemmas for his stories. The exaggerated plots and attitudes expressed within Terence's plays rely on the audience's recognition of the etiquette and conduct of *amicitia* because real problems and concerns of Roman social practices reside in them.³ As Goldberg says, "Beneath their [Micio and Demea] comic attitudes and comic problems are real attitudes and real problems of social behavior and obligation."⁴ Even a modern audience can empathize with Micio and Demea's competing styles of parenthood. Micio raises the difficult question of whether a parent should act as an authoritative figure or as a friend in his child's life. Thus it is essential to study the conditions and terms of *amicitia* in Terence's works to reveal the problems inherent in Roman social practices of *amicitia* ca. mid-2nd century BCE. The aim of this study is to pinpoint how various friendships and networks function in Terence's plays, which will supply fruitful questions surrounding Roman friendship. What are the difficulties in establishing and maintaining such a complex relationship? Can we concretely identify the benefactions exchanged? How do the parties involved react when the friendship is threatened? What are the duties of a friend when etiquette is breached? What are the conditions surrounding a friendship where there is substantial inequality in wealth and status?

³ Goldberg (1986) 75.

⁴ ibid. 75.

***Amicitia* in Rome**

Amicitia—Roman friendship—in its most basic sense is an idealized relationship between elite Roman males of fairly equal social standing. It depends on the reciprocal exchange of services, affections, cares and favors with the expectation of gratitude returned for the services provided and help extended when needed; this bond is assumed to derive from natural affinity and feelings, seeing that *amicitia* is a cognate of the Latin word meaning “love” or “affection”—*amor*.⁵ When Roman citizens or groups of unequal socio-economic background share this reciprocal relationship, the label of “patronage” or “clientship” is more appropriate.⁶ Other than inequality in status and wealth, Roman friendship and patronage actually share many characteristics, the most important being the language employed in the exchange of concrete goods and services: (1) *amicus/amici* (“friend/friends”); (2) *officia* (“services”); (3) *beneficia* (“favors”); (4) *merita* (“benefits”); (5) *gratia* (“goodwill”).⁷ A fundamental and obligatory service exchanged between friends was the *officium*. Not only could *officium* be defined as a concrete

⁵ Hellegouarc'h (1963) 63. Hellegouarc'h provides an even more general definition of *amicitia*: *amicitia* is a certain favorable rapport established between two men or two political groups. Subsequent associative terms and sub-categorizations are then listed exhaustively. For purposes of this thesis, Hellegouarc'h's overview of *amicitia* based on quasi-kinship will be the main concern for Terence's six extant plays since the plots are grounded in securing marriage between respectable Greek citizen households.

⁶ Hellegouarc'h (1963) 41. Badian (1958) 143-4; 158. In Badian's section of Rome's incorporation of western allies from 218-133 BCE, the dependant or “free” allied states would regard themselves as clients in relation to Rome, which was their patron. In return for *beneficia* received, these independent states would owe *officia* to the Roman people. The *beneficia* would entail military protection from Rome or even Roman citizenship in exchange for emergency military aid from the allies such as when Rome called on the Italian Confederacy during the Hannibalic War. By the late Republic, *patronus-cliens* relations were formed between the rich and powerful Roman citizens and cities abroad. This type of patronage then became hereditary, fomenting competition at Rome amongst elite families.

⁷ Hellegouarc'h (1963) 152-70. Hellegouarc'h defines and examines the terms *officium*, *beneficium* and *meritum* respectively.

expression of *fides* (“trust”) implicit in the relationship but was also interchangeable with its synonymous terms, *beneficium* and *meritum*.⁸ *Gratia* slightly differs from *officium*, *beneficium* and *meritum* because the term represents more of an attitude rather than a concrete service; *gratia* is the sense of expectation of return initiated once a service has been offered. *Gratia* is usually associated with terminology analogous to creditors and debtors.⁹ The fact that Cicero, Seneca and Pliny did not differentiate these terms demonstrates that a Roman had no need to categorize the exchange of services.

Not only were these terms of exchange interchangeable, but a Roman also found it difficult to determine the precise measurement of the benefaction between friends. After an *amicus* bestows an initial favor upon the recipient, the value of the repayment remains obscure to both parties. In a prime example put forth by Saller from Cicero’s *Ad Familiares* 2.6.1-2, Cicero requests a favor from Curio. In this request, Cicero purposefully feigns naiveté with regards to the value of the favors exchanged between him and Curio. In fact, by establishing ambiguity in the balance of favors, this leaves the door open for both men to obligate themselves further in a continuous exchange.¹⁰ In addition to the imprecise appraisal of reciprocal services in Roman friendship, scholars are uncertain whether affection (*amor/caritas*) was a necessary component. Brunt argues for the existence of the genuine amicable feelings between upper class Roman male friends even if the relationship seems to be purely of a political nature.¹¹ Brunt, however,

⁸ Saller (1982) 15-21. Saller acknowledges the interchangeability of these terms throughout the ancient sources.

⁹ Saller (1982) 21.

¹⁰ Saller (1989) 17.

¹¹ Brunt (1965) 4. Brunt provides the correspondence between Cicero and Appius Claudius as an example of a political connection based on natural affection.

does not take into account the agenda of Cicero's treatise on friendship (*De Amicitia*) as an exhortation to champion the ideals of virtue versus a calculating political pragmatism of *amicitia* in the Roman experience. Although affection may have been the foundation for certain *amicitiae*, *caritas* is not a necessary component for a healthy friendship. In short, scholars agree that reciprocal exchange, however its values might be weighted, is necessary for Roman friendship whereas affection could be a factor.

Once having recognized that the term “friends” (*amici*) can be applied where exchange of services but little to no intimacy exists, Brunt rightfully proposes that “*amicitia* had imperceptible gradations in quality and degree”.¹² Brunt observes that friendship does not simply stem from a more natural affection versus the more sterile patron-client relations. Rather he observes that the practice of patron-client exchange becomes subsumed into *amicitia*, seeing that clientship automatically borrowed the euphemistic language of friendship.

The custom of the *salutatio*—the formal greeting begun early in the morning at the patron’s home between a patron and his clients—paraded a patron’s *amici* whose statuses range from those who are closer in social standing to the patron (*amici superiores*) to “friends” who were clearly from the lower class (*amici inferiores*).¹³ A good example comes from Vitruvius, in which he describes how a patron would receive clients in the atrium—an extension of the sphere of the *paterfamilias* at the *salutatio*.¹⁴ These *amici inferiores* were presumably *clientes* but were addressed as friends to assuage

¹² Brunt (1965) 7.

¹³ Hellegouarch (1963) 54. Saller (1989) 57.

¹⁴ Wallace-Hadrill (1997) 238.

the asymmetrical reality of the relationship.¹⁵ An entourage of both dependants and benefactors by the late Republic became a sign of political power and prestige; all were called “friends”.¹⁶ *Amici* could be friends of intellectual accord, political advancement or business affairs and did not necessarily have to be from similar socio-economic backgrounds.

Amicitiae, however, encompassed various forms of relationships including those of a more political and business nature. According to Hellegouarc'h and Brunt, friendships were precarious in nature, especially political friendships because *amici* are sought for the political whims of the moment.¹⁷ The same can be said for the nature of the patron-client relationship.¹⁸ Political friendships in the late Republic for the most part rested on the family structure. Maintaining these bonds within certain elite circles could easily prove advantageous and disastrous. In 88 BCE, Quintus Pompeius Rufus married his fourth wife, Caecilia Metella to appease aristocrats, but her death provoked the slackening of the bond and immediate rejection by the same elite circle.¹⁹ Friendships and patron-client relationships obligated an *amicus* to give good advice, lend money when necessary and perform all manner of services; both relationships rest on the bonds of mutual self-interest. Clientship, however, was more susceptible to threats of exploitation especially in terms of financial assistance. Clients of lower social background were

¹⁵ Cloud (1989) 206. Hellegouarc'h (1963) 54.

¹⁶ Gelzer (1969) 80.

¹⁷ Hellegouarc'h (1963) 12; Brunt (1956) 6; Drummond (1989) 92-3. “A relationship formed one day could crumble the next without any concern for another person.”

¹⁸ Drummond (1989) 101. Drummond’s conclusions are drawn from the historical narratives of Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Drummond observes that their accounts of past events are colored by the historians’ observations of contemporary Roman customs.

¹⁹ Hellegouarc'h (1963) 12.

characterized as “pawns for political support, canvassing, intimidation and violence” while operating on an ideal plane.²⁰ In summation, Roman friendships could be characterized as a political vehicle in which both parties are obligated to perform mutual services. Familial ties are most likely the basis for Roman elite friendships but did not guarantee that these bonds would last. The characteristics and mutual services of Roman clientship overlap with Roman friendship and can sometimes be indistinguishable. Inequality between the parties must be disparate enough in order to differentiate between Roman friendship and clientship because Roman friendships could have formed between parties of not exactly equal socio-economic backgrounds.

In the 1997 volume titled *Greco-Roman perspectives on Friendship* edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Fiore summarizes Cicero’s idealistic definition of Roman friendship by comparing the orator’s views from his famous treaty *Laelius: De Amicitia* and the *Commentariolum Petitionis*, which may have been written by his brother, Quintus, in the following statement:

In both the client-patron and friend-friend relationships in Roman society, a chain of obligations was established between the benefactor and beneficiary. The obligation to render appropriate honor and gratitude to one’s benefactor was an essential factor in political and personal conduct. The reciprocal character of the obligation made the relationships dynamic and afforded them great social impact. Each benefaction led to the obligation of reciprocity in the beneficiary. The latter’s return, be it in gratitude, expressions of honor or another benefaction, led to an obligation in the initial beneficiary, which obligated him to an even greater benefaction.²¹

²⁰ Drummond (1989) 92-3.

²¹ Fiore, Benjamin, S.J. (1997) 66. Fiore points out that the *Commentariolum Petitionis* relegates even sincere *amicitia* to a more pragmatic and compromising relationship for the sake of political ambition. This political bent, however, did not preclude these more “proper” *amicitiae* from developing or maintaining genuine affection.

Inherent in this Ciceronian definition summarized by Fiore is the automatic pairing of clientship/patronage—a reciprocal relationship between unequals—with that of *amicitia*—“friendship” i.e. a reciprocal relationship between social equals. Cicero defines *amicitia* as a reciprocal relationship based on mutual good will (*benevolentia*) and affection (*caritas*), maintained by moral excellence (*virtus*). It is necessary to note that the views reflected in Cicero’s treatise represent how Roman elite circles conduct their friendship. Cicero championed his philosophy of *amicitia* during a tumultuous period when Julius Caesar was assassinated (44/3 BCE) and civil unrest ensued. Therefore Cicero’s comments are conditioned by the period when he especially relied on his political alliances.²² Besides the strong sense of reciprocity necessary for both kinds of bonds, patronage and friendship also share similar terminology.²³

According to Saller, by the early Imperial period, one cannot clearly distinguish between patronage and friendship because: (a) the parties in both relationships used the same terminology for naming each other and the goods and/or acts exchanged, and (b) the Romans did not consciously or objectively set out to distinguish these two kinds of relationships.²⁴ Wallace-Hadrill, on the other hand, agrees with Saller’s conclusions that the Romans used the language reserved for expressing obligation, friendship and trust

²² Konstan (1997) 124; 130-1. Burton (2004) 214.

²³ Saller (1989) 56-7. “Though willing to extend the courtesy label of *amicus* to some of their inferiors, the status conscious Romans did not allow the courtesy to obscure the relative social standings of the two parties.” Based on the high Imperial Roman sources of Pliny and Seneca, Saller lists the different subcategories of *amici*: (1) *superiores* (2) *pares* (3) *inferiores* (4) *clientes*. In addition, a third century marble inscription from Gallia Lugdunensis honoring a T. Sennius Sollemnis shows Sollemnis describing himself as both *amicus* and *cliens* of his patron Paulinus. Saller does not indicate whether the inscription is from BCE or CE which again poses problems for this case-study.

²⁴ Hellegouarc’h (1963) 54. After Hellegouarc’h attempts to distinguish the two relationships, even he observes that it is difficult to evaluate the precise criteria that could draw a hard line between friendship and patronage. This could be due to the idea that the Romans chose to blur the lines between patronage and friendship because their respective terms began to overlap with one another.

indifferently for both *amici* and *clientes*, but believes there is a clear and decided distinction, at least in a Roman's consciousness, between friendship and clientship.²⁵ According to Konstan, however, a relationship between friends and the reciprocity of benefits are distinct in principle but not necessarily mutually exclusive; the mechanics of friendship do not require the parties involved to tally and pay back every single act of kindness or favor (*beneficium* or *gratia*) in kind, whereas the social dynamic with regards to reciprocity of benefits permits less leniency in the business of exchange and clientship.

Although evidence for early Republican Roman marriage relations is scarce, comic writers of the third and second centuries provide a tentative picture of this constantly evolving institution.²⁶ In her discussion of the formulation of marriage alliances from the negotiation to engagement stage—at least for late Republican Rome—Treggiari puts forth Cicero's betrothal of his daughter, Tullia, as a paradigmatic model. Treggiari demonstrates from her Ciceronian example that the welfare and happiness of one's child—in his case, his daughter—factored into the matchmaking process. Although augmentation of familial prestige was important, advancement of the family's *dignitas* was not necessarily the only motivation.²⁷ Regardless of this particular example, *amicitia*, a quid-pro-quo relationship, is at the heart of the transaction between the guardians, who

²⁵ Wallace-Hadrill (1989) 77.

²⁶ Treggiari (1991) 35-6. Marriage laws, especially those concerning the increasing protective rights of the *materfamilias*, had to react to the gradual inclusion of neighboring Italian tribes and the Greeks from southern Italy and Sicily.

²⁷ Cicero had an unusually extreme admiration for his daughter's [Tullia's] opinion not only in matters of her own marriages but even in Cicero's political decisions. See Treggiari (2002) 49-71. Treggiari offers a thorough case study on the re-construction of Tullia's character based mostly on the evidence from Cicero's letters. It is worthy to mention that this could be Cicero's rhetoric to exaggerate his daughter's personal qualities.

possess the *patria potestas* over the young adult male and female in question.²⁸ For example in Terence's *Hecyra*, when the marriage union between Pamphilus and Philumena is threatened by Philumena's inexplicable unwillingness to remain in her husband's household, both Laches and Phidippus are most concerned above anything else about the potential breakdown of their carefully crafted *amicitia*.²⁹ This example will be discussed more in depth in a later chapter.

However, one must be aware that the evidence available for Roman friendship is grossly skewed towards the tumultuous period of the late Republic and conditioned mostly by the views of Caesar, Cicero, Octavian and others.³⁰ In addition to the fact that the social practices of friendship and patronage eventually blend and overlap by the late Republic going into the Imperial period, the fundamental practices of reciprocal exchange remain fairly the same across these two periods. Roman friendship—*amicitia*—and patronage formed the political backbone of Roman society, permitting a Roman citizen of humble background the chance to rise to a relatively more prominent position.

Why Terence?

As mentioned above, a solid friendship between the possessors of the *patria potestas* is vital to a successful marriage contract and the uniting of two households most

²⁸ Treggiari (1991) 125-6. The responsibility for making the initial approach in marriage negotiation, for the most part, rested on the shoulders of the patriarch (senior male). Treggiari (1991) provides an example from Terence *Ad.* 99-102.

²⁹ Terence *Hec.* 210-13; 532-4.

³⁰ Saller (1982).

likely for the purposes of political advancement. Terence's comedies as well as his predecessor's, Plautus', both pose problems for the guardians who wish to find suitable partners for their sons and daughters and simultaneously provide a glimpse into the marriage contract process. Scholarship on friendship in Terence, however, has been scarce at best. The *Phormio*, based on the heroic parasite, for whom the play receives its name, proves to be an exceptional case study for examining Roman friendship. The parasite attempts to ease his way into the family structure by solving the problems for the *adulescentes*, Antipho and Phaedria, who wish to be with young women of their choice. Scholars such as Gowers and Konstan, mentioning the unusual attention to reciprocity and the techniques of the fake friend, the flatterer, have grazed the surface of friendship's importance in this play.³¹ However, all six of Terence's plays are rich with the language of *amicitia*, not just the *Phormio*. Thus, Terence's plays are essential for analyzing Roman friendship and its reciprocal nature.

It is worth noting that since Terence's plays are grounded in the Menandrian tradition, Terence's close association with these Greek versions merits a reference to the Aristotelean Greek ideals of friendship. According to his *Nicomachean Ethics*, friendship was ideally between men of equal or unequal social status. The motives behind this ideal friendship could have been virtue, pleasure or even utility; reciprocity of exchange is expected in this kind of relationship.³² Whether it may have been a subconscious or conscious effort, Terence may have been adopting these Greek ideals too. The tradition

³¹ Konstan (1997) 135; Gowers (2005); Goldberg (1986) 133. Goldberg points out that Charinus is torn between his loyalty to his friend, Pamphilus, and his duty to his family that has arranged a marriage to Philumena, Pamphilus' object of desire in the *Andria*.

³² Blundell (1989) 29n17. "Aristotle takes very seriously the model of friendship as contractual obligation analogous to a financial transaction."

of writing Latin comedy in a Hellenized style in terms of place names and dress—*comoedia palliata*—had been well established by the time Terence arrived on the scene.³³

In spite of Terence’s adherence to the Greek originals, however, his plays exude the spirit of Roman ideals and settings.³⁴ Terence frequently uses the language of Roman friendship and expressions of concrete exchange relevant to this social obligation (*beneficium, officium, meritum*).³⁵ His plays can shed light on the Senecan paradox of friendship in which both parties must negotiate the expectation of services and the appearance of genuine affection. Individuals of unequal status form “friendships” in Terence’s plays and can test this idea that patronage and *amicitia* have the potential of blending. Above all, the pressures to achieve a successful marriage, which form the crux of these plays, can reveal the aspects of the friendship between the guardians. As a result of this problem, Terence’s plays are not only a vital source but a reasonable starting point for exploring more questions concerning mid-second-century Roman friendship.

The problem still remains that our sources for reconstructing friendship during the Republican period come mostly from Cicero, who wrote in the tumultuous late 50s. Treggiari states that the sources for reconstructing the social context of the period of “rising economic prosperity and social unrest which followed in the wake of continued wars and annexation of provinces in the late third and second centuries are scanty and

³³ Goldberg (1986) 15.

³⁴ Goldberg (1986) 21. Karakasis (2005) 2-4. In addition to departing from Plautus’ standard *palliata* comedy and drama, Terence borrowed four plays from Menander and two from Apollodorus of Carystus. Compared to Plautus, Terence’s characters were less exaggerated, more natural and “wry” like Menandrian comedy.

³⁵ Hellegouarc’h (1963) 152 -70. These terms are labeled as concrete because these services exchanged between the parties can be quantified as opposed to the more abstract expressions of *amicitia* (*amare, diligere, caritas*).

unreliable".³⁶ Even after 133BCE, when more evidence begins to emerge, it is still difficult to recreate the social context of private life with the exception of Cicero's speeches and letters in the late Republic.³⁷ In agreement with Treggiari, Brunt acknowledges that in addition to knowing very little of second century Republican Roman friendship, the vast and complicated nexus of friendships in the late Republic leave us to wonder about the complexity of friendship networks from the earlier century.³⁸ Produced circa mid-second century Republican Rome, evidence from Terence's six surviving plays—*Andria*, *Phormio*, *Adelphoe*, *Hecyra*, *Heautontimorumenos* and *Eunuchus*—can help us investigate and come up with new questions about the mechanics of Roman friendship; the language of friendship and *patronus-cliens* relations are central to the playwright's plots. As a result, Terence's plays can shed some light on and ultimately help us consider novel ways of thinking through *amicitia* and clientage.

To sum up this introduction, Roman friendship, *amicitia*, and how it is used in Terence can be a productive lens through which we can understand both the plays and the Roman society in which they flourished. Although *amicitia* can be political, personal or economic in nature, we know at best that reciprocity is necessary for this relationship to thrive. Affection may or may not be involved. *Amicitia* ideally is a relationship between equals whereas patronage forms a bond between unequals. Since both these relationships share similar terminology, patronage tends to be subsumed within Roman friendship. As

³⁶ Treggiari (1991) 14.

³⁷ Treggiari (1991) 14.

³⁸ Brunt (1965) 16.

a result, the language of *amicitia* can potentially demonstrate relations between unequals. Friendship and marriage are inextricably bound because the guardians, who possess the *patria potestas* over the betrothed, must form *amicitia* for the sake of uniting households. Terence's plots provide the necessary familial structure and language to examine this phenomenon. Terence's plays, written during a period that has left very little evidence, can provide more complexity to mid-second century Republican Roman friendship.

Chapter 1: Friendship between Equals

FATHERS/SENES

As mentioned beforehand in the introduction, the elder guardians of young men and women must secure the eventual union of two elite Roman households for political, economic and social reasons. In Terence's plays, the *adulescentes* tend to resist their fathers' wishes by not agreeing to marry a predetermined match of their parents' choosing; the youth, falling in love with women of their own choice, rebel against their guardians' arranged nuptials. This tension and miscommunication between the older and younger generation tends to create the main problem of the storylines Terence neatly resolves by the end of the plays. In this chapter I will examine the friendships between Roman males of relatively equal social rank by evaluating the behavior of the *senes* in the first section of this chapter and then the *adulescentes* in the second section throughout all of Terence's plays. These relationships will supply various case-studies which can assess the paradox of friendship mentioned above. I will first examine the relationships between the *senes* with no familial connections (*Andria*, *Hecyra* and *Heauton Timorumenos*) and then the blood-related *senes* (*Phormio* and the *Adelphoe*). The friendships between nonrelatives will serve as a control to which the *amicitiae* between relatives can be compared. The *senex* in the *Eunuchus* is fairly non-existent. Therefore this play will only be discussed in the *adulescentes* portion.

In the opening scene of the *Andria*, we learn about the various nexus of relationships in the play from a conversation between the *senex*, Simo, and his freedman,

Sosia.³⁹ According to public opinion, Simo has raised a respectable young man, Pamphilus, who is known to fulfill his duties (*officii*) and conduct himself well in society.⁴⁰ Community praise encourages Simo's childhood friend, Chremes, to seek out Simo's son as a prospective son-in-law for his family. As a result of Pamphilus' spotless reputation, the *senes*, Simo and Chremes, have decided to form a marriage alliance between their son and daughter, Pamphilus and Philumena, respectively. We learn, however, that Pamphilus has secretly been in love with another woman, Glycerium—the sister of a well-born female, Chrysis, whose circumstances reduced her to prostitution in order to survive. At the funeral of the famous prostitute, Chrysis, Pamphilus immediately dashes forth to save Glycerium from throwing herself onto Chrysis' funerary pyre. His affection for Glycerium is made known by this gesture. This discovery outrages Chremes, who calls off the wedding. The irony of this conversation, which the audience discovers later on in the play, is that before this scene has taken place, Pamphilus has already united both families by marrying Glycerium—Chremes' long-lost daughter—in a secret ceremony performed by Glycerium's sister, the woman from Andros, for whom the play is named.⁴¹

In addition to providing the audience with the necessary background and main dilemma of this drama, Terence's opening dialogue is an alteration from the previous two

³⁹ McGarry (1978) 107. Besides being a protactic character, Sosia is the only freedman in extant Roman comedy. Therefore, this scene is the only representation of a *patronus-cliens* conversation in Roman comedy and will be discussed more in depth in the next chapter that investigates unequal relationships.

⁴⁰ Ter. *Andria* 96-98: *quom id mihi placebo tum uno ore omnes omnia bona dicere et laudare fortunas meas, qui gnatum haberem tali ingenio praeditum.* Simo beams with pride as he recounts the community's appraisal of Pamphilus. In the face of the allurements of Chrysis' trade, Pamphilus demonstrates self-restraint because his name is lacking from her clientele.

⁴¹ Since Glycerium is also an Andrian woman and a central character, the play's title suggests that Terence may have named the play for both women.

versions of the *Andria* by Menander. In *Perinthia*, Simo is conversing with his wife, whereas in Menander's *Andria* Simo introduces the main points of the plot in a monologue.⁴² The choice of a scene between former master and freedman—patron and client—has been examined and interpreted in various ways.⁴³ I, however, think that this patron-client conversation serves as a fitting backdrop for the discussion of friendship. Simo and Sosia take note of Pamphilus' behavior with his friends as he transitions from an ephebe to a young man. Sosia considers himself indebted to Simo to the extent that he will do any favor Simo requests of him; they employ the language of *amicitia*.⁴⁴ The scene features Simo confiding in his friend, Sosia, as they tangentially discuss proper etiquette of friendship.⁴⁵ In addition to discussing topics dealing with Pamphilus' acquisition of more responsibility and freedom, Simo and Sosia converse about how Simo must convince his friend, Chremes, not to leave the marriage contract. This scene portrays two old friends (albeit patron and freedman) expounding on the main friendships the audience will encounter throughout the play.

When Chremes discovered that Pamphilus has not only been carrying on a relationship with the young girl, Glycerium, but has also been living with her, Chremes

⁴²Anderson (2004) 11; McGarrity (1978) 107n.8. McGarrity cites Donatus' commentary on this change from the previous two plays: *quia conscius sibi est primam scaenam de Perinthia esse translatam, ubi senex ita cum uxore loquitur, at in Andria Menandri solus est senex*.

⁴³ ibid (1978) 106-7; Anderson (2004) 17. The following two interpretations have been offered for Terence's creation of the Sosia character: (1) the wife would have been too intrusive at this point in the plot; (2) Terence's freedman is a dramatic representation of the playwright himself. Anderson is skeptical of the relationship's sincerity because of Sosia's obsequiousness and relative reticence.

⁴⁴ Ter. *Andria* 44-5: [Sosia] *quasi exprobratiost inmemoris benefici\quin tu uno verbo dic quid est quod me velis?* Both Sosia and Simo use the language of reciprocity for *amicitia* in this conversation, which will be examined in the next chapter.

⁴⁵ Ter. *Andria* 67-8: [Sosia] *sapienter vitam instituit; namque hoc tempore obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit.* Sosia claims that obsequiousness will garner friends versus being frank or truthful.

left Simo with the impression that the nuptials were terminated.⁴⁶ Simo, however, convinces his friend to take another chance on Pamphilus by setting up a fake wedding for both his son and Philumena as a means of pressuring his son to leave Glycerium. When Chremes questions the effectiveness of staging a fake wedding, Simo begs his friend to stick with the plan by swearing upon their long-lasting friendship:

SIMO

per te d_{eo}s oro et nostram amicitiam, Chremes,
quae incepta a parvis cum aetate adcrevit simul,
perque unicum gnatam tuam et gnatum meum,
quoi(u)s tibi potestas summa servandi datur,
ut me adiuves in hac re atque ita uti nuptiae
fuerant futurae, fiant.

I beg you, Chremes—by the gods and by our friendship,
which, having begun from childhood, grew with age
at the same time and by your only daughter and my son,
to you for whom the greatest power for protection is given—
to help me in this affair so that the wedding
that had been intended, happens.

Andria 538-43

We learn that Simo and Chremes have been friends since they were boys (*a parvis*), have known each other for many years, and their friendship has developed well into their old age. Upon the discovery of Pamphilus' secret affair, the two men are rather frank and open with each other. It has been rightfully pointed out by McGarrity that although both Simo and Chremes are similarly protective of their own children's welfare and

⁴⁶ Ter. *Andria* 147-9: [Simo] *denique\ita tum discedo ab illo, ut qui se filiam\neget daturum.*

reputation, Simo cares little for Philumena.⁴⁷ I would like to push this further and say that out of the two *senes*, Chremes is decidedly more affectionate and understanding than his friend, Simo, who portrays himself as a selfish man. Chremes endures Simo's tenuous arguments for why Philumena and Pamphilus should get married: (a) Simo says that Pamphilus and Glycerium have had a quarrel (*irae sunt inter Glycerium et gnatum*, 552) to which Chremes replies that lovers' quarrels are but signs of the love's renewal (*amantium irae amoris integratiost*, 555); (b) After Chremes reminds his friend that marriage is rather serious when it involves a daughter rather than a son, Simo responds by arguing that the worst possible outcome of their children's union would be divorce (*nempe incommoditas denique huc omnis redit\si eveniat, quod di prohibeant, discessio*, 567-8). Chremes' reservations are well-founded and rational in the face of Simo's fragile arguments. Chremes, however, continues to listen to his friend's excuses because he cares for him.

Chremes shows concern not only for both his daughter *and* Pamphilus but also demonstrates affection for his old friend's happiness as well. When he responds to the above plea from Simo, Chremes says: *sed si ex ea re plus malist quam commode\utriue, id oro te in commune ut consulas\ quasi si ulla tua sit Pamphiliique ego sim pater*, 548-9. Chremes says that he will not go through with the nuptials if this means that both their children would be harmed in the process. More importantly, he posits a reasonable hypothetical scenario for Simo; he begs his friend to put himself in his own shoes and ask himself if he would allow his own daughter to marry someone like Pamphilus. Simo fails

⁴⁷ McGarrity (1989) 110.

to provide a satisfactory response; he replies using an indirect command and a future less vivid clause: *immo ita volo itaque postulo ut fiat, Chremes, neque postulem abs te, ni ipsa res moneat* 550-1). Simo states that he intends to make himself Philumena's father and Chremes Pamphilus' father at whatever cost necessary; this is a rather indirect reply. Simo does not say that he empathizes with Chremes' reluctance or that he would protect his own daughter's reputation and happiness at any cost, if he were to have a daughter; he skirts the issue and once more thinks only of himself. Later on in the conversation after Simo desperately tries to wear his friend down, Chremes finally says he will go on with this plan not because he thinks it would be beneficial to his daughter, Philumena, but because he knows that this would satisfy his friend's wishes:

CHREMES

quid istic? si ita istuc animum induxti esse utile
nolo tibi ullum commodum in me claudier.

Enough! If you're convinced that your plan is sound
I wouldn't want for me to stand in the way of any convenience for you.

Andria 572-3

This response by Chremes not only demonstrates his willingness to go along with Simo's feeble plan, but also offers substantial evidence that Chremes cares for Simo to the extent that he places his friend's happiness above that of his own daughter. In line 573, Terence literally positions Simo's benefit (*tibi commodum*) before Chremes (*in me claudier*); this exchange between friends goes one way—Simo's way—and there is no mention of repayment. It is worth noting that the term *utile* suggests that Simo's plan will benefit

both of them. Chremes' tone, however, suggests that he gives in to Simo's pleas because Simo is desperate. The phrase, *Quid istuc?* (572), is meant to express a concession roughly meaning: "enough", "well then", or "in that case".⁴⁸ I do not think that Chremes sincerely thinks that Simo's plan will be *utile* for both of them; Simo's determination to see his son married to a respectable girl wins the case. Before Chremes agrees to the marriage plans, he tells Simo that the risk for a daughter's future is severe: *at istuc periculum in filia fieri gravest*, 566. One can surmise from this comment that Chremes thinks he is risking the advantages his daughter may have received from a more secure marriage offer rather than see his old friend lose his son to a dissolute and disadvantageous marriage with a prostitute. In this case, Chremes has more to lose than Simo and could have refused this offer easily because both men may have lingering doubts about this pairing. Otherwise, Simo would not have brought up the possibility of their children separating in the first place.

Chremes' unrelenting patience and affection for his friend is further revealed in the recognition scene at the end of the *Andria* (904-56). Chremes' old Andrian friend, Crito, resolves the play's main crisis by proving not only that Glycerium is a legitimate Athenian Greek citizen woman, but also that she is Chremes' long-lost biological daughter. Apparently, Chremes lost Glycerium in a shipwreck many years ago. As a result of this calamity, the little girl was left in the hands of her uncle, Phania, who eventually died. Falling on hard times, his wife, Chrysis, a well-born Athenian woman, became a high class prostitute and cared for the girl until she informally wed Glycerium

⁴⁸ Ashmore (1908) 48.

to Pamphilus on her deathbed. What makes this scene pleasurable for staging purposes are Simo's constant interruptions during the retelling of this background story. His skepticism both adds a light touch of humor to the scene and permits the audience another chance to see Chremes' patience in spite of Simo's immature behavior:

{CH.} Andrium ego Critonem video? certe is est. {CR.} salvo' sis, Chreme.
{CH.} quid tu Athenas insolens? {CR.} evenit. sed hicinest Simo?
{CH.} hic. {CR.} Simo . . {SI.} men quaeris? echo tu, Glycerium hinc civem esse ais?
{CR.} tu negas? {SI.} itane huc paratus advenis? {CR.} qua re? {SI.} rogas?
tune inpune haec facias? tune hic homines adulescentulos
inperitos rerum, eductos libere, in fraudem inlicis?
sollicitando et pollicitando <eo>rum animos lactas? {CR.} sanun es?
{SI.} ac meretricios amores nuptiis conglutinas?
{PA.} perii, metuo ut substet hospes. {CH.} si, Simo, hunc noris satis,
non ita arbitrere: bonus est hic vir. {SI.} hic vir sit bonus?
itane adtemperate evenit, hodie in ipsis nuptiis
ut veniret, ant(e)hac numquam? est vero huic credendum, Chreme.
{PA.} ni metuam patrem, habeo prō illa re illum quod moneam probe.
{SI.} sycophanta. {CR.} hem. {CH.} sic, Crito, est hic: mitte. {CR.} videat qui siet.
si mihi perget quae volt dicere, ea quae non volt audiet.
ego istaec moveo aut curo? non tu t<uo>m malum aequo animo feras!

[Ch] Is this Crito of Andros that I see? It certainly is!

[Cr] Why, hello, Chremes!

[Ch] What are you doing here? You don't often come to Athens.

[Cr] Oh, it just happened that way. But is this Simo, here?

[Ch] Yes, this is Simo.

[Cr] Were you looking for me?

[Si] Listen, you; do you claim that Glycerium is a citizen of Athens?

[Cr] Do you claim she isn't?

[Si] Is that the way it is? Come with your lines all learned?

[Cr] What do you mean?

[Si] What do I mean! Do you think that you are going to get away with this sort of thing? Are you the fellow who takes young men, inexperienced, brought up like gentlemen, and gets them into traps? Gets them excited, makes them promises, and puts them in turmoil?

[Cr] Have you lost your mind?

[Si] And sticks commercial love affairs together with marriage glue?

[Pa] (*aside*) Oh, dear! I am afraid that Crito may not stand up to this!

[Ch] Simo, if you really knew Crito, you wouldn't think things like that. He's a fine man.

[Si] *He's a fine man? That's why it happened so neatly, that he came here today, on the very day of the wedding, and never before, eh? Yes, he certainly is a man to trust, Chremes.*

[Pa] (*aside*) If I weren't uneasy about father, I have a hint I could drop to Crito that would be to the point.

[Si] You shyster!

[Cr] Well!

[Ch] That's the way Simo is, Crito. Please overlook it.

[Cr] (*to Chremes*) He'd better watch the way he is. If he insists on saying anything he pleases to me, he'll hear a few things that won't please him.

Andria 906-21

Throughout the scene Simo is rather unpleasant and rude to Crito. First, without formally introducing himself to Crito, Simo unabashedly asks him if he has the knowledge to prove Glycerium's legitimacy. It is true that Simo is frightened that this man may sabotage his son's future, but Simo has no excuse to talk to Crito in such a way, seeing that Crito is Chremes' old friend. The easygoing and pleasant introduction between Crito and Chremes in lines 906 and 907 is proof enough that Chremes respects this man. The least Simo could have done would be to treat him with the same courtesy. Then Simo accuses Crito of performing the following inappropriate acts: (1) he accuses him of luring young men into deceits and making false promises to them (910-12) and (2) he accuses Crito of "gluing together" commercial love affairs with legitimate nuptials (*ac meretricios amores nuptiis conglutinas*). The irony of these insults is that Simo is accusing Crito of the very actions he, himself, has demonstrated throughout the play. Simo forces his son into a fake marriage and attempts to legitimize a wedding by calling in a favor from his friend as if it were some backdoor business deal. Simo then tells Chremes in a sarcastic statement that Crito is not the kind of man to be trusted: *est vero*

huic credendum, Chreme, 917. Simo has unconsciously admitted to being an untrustworthy man. Since trust forms the basis of *amicitia*, Simo has just acknowledged his shortcomings as a friend. Out of the two *senes*, Simo proves to be the less faithful friend in the relationship. Despite Simo's less than reputable behavior, however, Chremes tells Crito to overlook his faults and accept him for the overbearing and ill-tempered man that he is: *sic, Crito, est hic: mitte*, 919. Chremes is willing to overlook Simo's faults and will stand up for him, even when he knows that Simo is in the wrong.⁴⁹

McGarrity observes the similarities between Simo and Chremes—the concern for their children's welfare. In addition to this fact, I would like to add that the *senes* of the *Andria* show a realistic portrayal between old friends in which both men are rather dissimilar. Chremes is mild and understanding whereas Simo is cantankerous and controlling. Despite this apparent difference in personalities, Chremes accepts and acknowledges his friend for the man he is. This type of bond exemplifies genuine affection between friends. As for benefaction, Chremes' promise to offer his daughter to Simo as a favor in spite of Pamphilus' behavior demonstrates that tallying of exchange is not a primary concern, but merely that reciprocity exists and can come in various forms.

Before moving onto the *Hecyra*, I would be remiss to overlook a friendship similar to that of Chremes and Simo in the *Adelphoe*. In a confrontation between Demea and Hegio, who happen to be friends since childhood, Hegio demands that Demea's son, Aeschinus, keep his promise to marry his adoptive daughter. Hegio mentions the kind of

⁴⁹ McGarrity (1989) 110. McGarrity also points out that dowries or money are never mentioned until the end of the play. Chremes and Simo are not interested in material exchange because their connection is deeper and more substantial than profit.

relationship he had with his daughter's biological father, which began in childhood (*a pueris parvolis*, 494). Hegio and his old friend were brought up together (*sumus educti*, 495), they traveled at home and abroad (*militiae et domi*, 495). They even endured a life of penury together (*paupertatem una pertulimus gravem*, 496). *Una pertulimus* is positioned between *paupertas* and its adjective, *gravis*, in a chiasmic order to demonstrate how penury surrounds both of them as they suffer together. In an ascending tricolon of future verbs (*nitar, faciam, experiar*, 497), Hegio emotionally declares the lengths to which he will protect and provide for his dead friend's family. Hegio's friendship exemplifies a sincere and affectionate *amicitia* that has developed and matured since boyhood. It is also worth mentioning that Demea has also known Hegio since childhood, as is indicated by the phrase (*a puero*, 441). Demea and Hegio share a similar bond of sincerity and affection.

The friendship of Phidippus and Laches in the *Hecyra* is similar to that of Chremes and Simo because they are both unrelated and care deeply for their children's future and happiness. The plot, however, of the *Hecyra* is different from the *Andria* because Phidippus' and Laches' son and daughter, Philumena and Pamphilus, are already married.⁵⁰ One can view the Pamphilus and Philumena of the *Hecyra* as Simo's wish fulfillment for the Pamphilus and Philumena of the *Andria* just discussed above.⁵¹ Unlike Simo, Laches is successful in pressuring his son to marry a woman for whom he has no affection, because he wished to lure him away from a dangerously close relationship with

⁵⁰ On similarities between the *Andria* and the *Hecyra*, cf. Penwill (2004) 130-149; Braund (2005) 58-62. Braund characterizes the *Hecyra* as a divorce play.

⁵¹ Ter. *Andria* 560-3: *spero consuetudine et \coniugio liberali devinctum, Chremes,\ de(h)inc facile ex illis sese emersurum malis.*

the prostitute, Bacchis. Over time Pamphilus' affection for his wife grows and the newlyweds at first seem at peace with the arrangement. However, we find the children on the brink of divorce at the beginning of the play: while Pamphilus is away on family business, Philumena has left her husband's household for some mysterious reason—Philemuna's excuse is that she has fallen ill. Instead of thoroughly questioning the source of the problem—the children—Laches and Phidippus automatically blame their wives, Sostrata and Myrrina, for causing the new bride's departure and discontent for Laches' family. Later on we learn that the culprit behind Philumena's departure was her own husband, Pamphilus, who impregnated her during a late night drunken bout before they wed, which causes her to leave and have her child in secret to guard her shame.

As opposed to Simo and Chremes, Laches and Phidippus make no mention of a relationship prior to their children's nuptials. Although one cannot firmly assert that they were not friends since childhood, their relationship does not reflect the same type of familiarity that Chremes' and Simo's banter exudes. Thus, it is safe to assume that they maintain a relationship to the extent that their children's marriage and welfare exists. In their attempts to salvage this marriage, the *senes*, Laches and Phidippus, must discuss the necessary steps to take so that their problems can be resolved as quickly as possible. In two encounters between the old men discussed below, Laches and Phidippus are rather candid while maintaining a thin veil of civility that masks an underlying discomfort and disquietude. It is not a surprise, then, that either one could immediately burst off the scene or shamelessly cast an insult at the other because they are treading through a delicate matter—the real possibility of divorce between their children.

In the first meeting, Laches does not refrain from conveying a sense of hostility towards Phidippus. As soon as Phidippus enters the scene, Laches hurls a snide remark at him saying that the women of his household control him (*nunc video in illarum esse te potestate*, 250). This initial “greeting” is indicative of Laches’ tone in the ensuing conversation; Laches is both domineering and quick to dispense blame without knowing the facts. Laches, however, is right to assume that Phidippus is a mild-mannered man. Towards the end of the scene, Phidippus even admits that he has a passive temperament: *ego sum animo leni natus*, 270. Nevertheless, this comment both startles and angers Phidippus (*heia vero!* 250). Laches, however, tells Phidippus to be just as direct with his emotions and thoughts because the former leads the latter to believe that candor will help heal this breach between their families. In the previous scene, Laches has just finished accusing his wife for causing Philumena’s sudden departure. Phidippus enters the scene with Sostrata still present:

LACHES

haud ita decet, si perpetuam hanc vis esse adfinitatem,
celare te iras. siquid est peccatum a nobis profer:
aut ea refellendo aut purgando vobis corrigemus
te iudice ipso. sin east causa retinendi apud vos
quia aegраст, te mihi iniuriam facere arbitror, Phidippe,
si metui' satis ut meae domi curetur diligenter.

It is not fitting for you to hide your anger,
if you want this marital relationship to be lasting.

If any transgression has been committed by us, speak out:
We’ll set these matters right for you either by rejecting or correcting them,
with you yourself as judge. But if the reason for retaining her at your house
is because she is sick, I think you are doing me an injustice,
Phidippus, if you fear that she be attentively
cared for enough at my house.

Hecyra 252-57

Suggesting that Phippidus be open with his emotions (*celare te iras*, 253), Laches shrewdly confronts his in-law. In addition, by posing a series of conditionals (*si perpetuam...siquid est...sin east...si metui*, 252-3; 255; 257), Laches displays his diplomatic side; he tells Phidippus that he should be the judge in this dispute and expresses this with the Ablative Absolute (*te iudice ipso*, 255). The purpose of the Ablative Absolute is to express some action or fact independent from the main sentence without stating who has caused this action or fact to happen. *Te iudice ipso* suggests that Laches hands over a false sense of power to Phidippus. If Laches can convince Phidippus that the decision to resolve the breach in this marriage is in Phidippus' power, then Phidippus will be more compliant as they both navigate their way through this tension-filled matter. Laches is the more imposing out of the *senes*. Unsurprisingly, his initial encounter and thoughts with Phidippus demonstrate an unabashed straightforwardness. The first conditional sentence is indicative of the way Laches processes and interprets the relationships by marriage: *si perpetuam hanc vis esse adfinitatem, \celare te iras*, 252-3; Laches believes that a lasting marital relationship (*perpetuam...adfinitatem*) is grounded in honesty and frankness. *Adfinitas* is strictly reserved for relationships by marriage and does not necessarily involve affection between the two families.⁵² Considering that Phidippus possesses *patria potestas*, he has the right to send Philumena back to Laches' home if he so desires. Phidippus' reluctance to

⁵² Hellegouarc'h (1963) 67.

compel his daughter to return to her husband's household seems like an unusual decision in this case, regardless of whether she has fallen ill. Phidippus then tells his friend that he does not have the power to challenge his own family: *non possum advorsari meis*, 271. This response suggests that his immediate family's concerns or wishes trump the marriage contract established by him and Laches. Their "friendship" can be characterized as tenuous at best.

Phidippus' latent thoughts can also be evaluated when he storms out in a fit of anger after Pamphilus refuses to cooperate with him. Acting as an intermediary between his son and Phidippus, Laches attempts to force Pamphilus to accept Philumena back but Pamphilus walks out of the scene in a melancholic state, leaving Laches and Phidippus nonplussed about the circumstances of the marriage. During this fight, Phidippus' mind seems to be concerned mostly about financial matters. Phidippus first asks for the dowry back should Pamphilus refuse to fulfill his duty as son-in-law: *si est ut velit reducere uxorem, licet; sin aliost animo, renumeret dotem huc, eat*, 501-2. Then after Laches empathizes with Pamphilus' angered reaction, Phidippus replies by saying that Laches' family believes that they are superior now that they have acquired a nice dowry from him: *quia accesit vobis paululum pecuniae\ sublati sunt animi*, 506-7. Phidippus views their relationship as a business transaction, which shows that money as well as his daughter's welfare may have been a latent but primary concern for him.

One can securely conclude from the *Hecyra* that Phidippus can be characterized as the typical doting father, who sincerely cares for his daughter's well-being. He must be civil with Laches because they are technically still family members. Laches comes across

as similarly concerned with his son's welfare and even approves his wife's decision to remove herself from the household to alleviate the rift.⁵³ Laches even threatens his son's former prostitute, Bacchis, against threatening the marriage once Pamphilus and Philumena have recovered their marriage. Despite the fact that Phidippus is portrayed as more lenient out of the two *senes*, both men display similar personalities in the way they chastise their wives.⁵⁴ The irony in this relationship is that both men, who may not have had a previous relationship, share more common character traits than Simo and Chremes. One can, thus, delineate the relationship between Phidippus and Laches as that of obligation. They are connected through their children and the dowry that came along with this agreement.

Moving away from this friendship to the one between the *senes*, Chremes and Menedemus, we find that the two meet each other at the beginning of the play, *Heauton Timorumenos* (H.T.). The prologue of the play pleads for patience because the tone of the H.T. is quieter (*date potestatem mihi\statariam agere ut liceat per silentium*, 35-6) and implies that this play celebrates the stock character of the *senex*. The aged actor, Ambivius, complains that the flashier and fast-paced stock characters are preferred in the new plays rather than the old man like him (*nam nunc novas qui scribunt nil parcunt*

⁵³ Ter. *Hec.* 608-9: *istuc est sapere, qui ubiqumque opu' sit animum possis flectere;\ quod sit faciundum fortasse post, idem hoc nunc si feceris.* As soon as Laches has overheard the conversation between his wife, Sostrata, and his son, Pamphilus, in the previous scene, he says that he not only supports Sostrata's decision to live in the country with him but thought that her departure would have been inevitable.

⁵⁴ Moore (1998) 255n16. Moore acutely observes the parallelisms in the musical stops from Phidippus and Laches in the scenes where they accuse their wives for breaking up the marriage between their children.

seni, 43).⁵⁵ Therefore, this play offers a ripe backdrop in this examination of *amicitia* between *senes*.

The opening dialogue of the H.T. presents a busy-body, know-it-all type in the character of Chremes and the self-tormenter himself, Menedemus. As is customary of a Terentian opening scene, the dialogue between these two informs the audience of crucial background information for the understanding of the play, as well as the present crisis. Apparently, when Menedemus discovered that his son, Clinia, fell in love with a penniless woman, Antiphila, and considered her his wife, Clinia's father became outraged, forbade the pairing, which subsequently caused the son to leave home and join the army. Having realized his mistake in his behavior towards his son, Menedemus has relegated himself to menial work as a way to torture himself for driving his son away, until Clinia returns home. Later on in the play, we learn that Antiphila turns out to be Chremes' long lost daughter—which makes her now respectable—and that Chremes' son, Clitipho has been the profligate son carrying on with a less than reputable high class prostitute, Bacchis, who demands extravagant living arrangements, and for some time has been passed off as Clinia's girlfriend. At the beginning of the play, we learn immediately that these two old men are merely acquaintances. Being the busy bee that he is, Chremes, feels the need to interfere into Menedemus' troubles:

CHREMES

Quamquam haec inter nos nuper notitia admodumst
(inde adeo quod agrum in proximo hic mercatus es)
nec rei fere sane amplius quicquam fuit,

⁵⁵ Ashmore (1908) 85.

tamen vel virtus tua me vel vicinitas,
quod ego in propinqua parte amicitiae puto,
facit ut te audacter moneam et familiariter
quod mihi videre praeter aetatem tuam
facere et praeter quam res te adhortatur tua.

Now, Menedemus, you and I have not known each other for very long.
(In fact, it's just since you bought the farm here next door to me)
and we've never had a great deal to say to each other. Just the same,
your character and your proximity to me, a circumstance that I think
is closest to friendship, compels me
to offer you advice in a bold and friendly way, because you seem to
me to work beyond your age and beyond what your circumstances
encourage you to do at your age.

H.T. 53-60

Chremes insists that they become friends for the following reasons: (a) Chremes admires his *virtus* (“good character”) and (b) because they live very close to one another. Chremes thinks this proximity lends him the opportunity and practically gives him the right to offer advice in his neighbor’s present misfortunes when in fact these are rather flimsy reasons. Chremes uses the terms *audacter* (“boldly”) and *familiariter* (“in a friendly way”) to describe the way in which he thinks he should give advice.⁵⁶ The term *audacter* suggests that Chremes is not only bold but also values a frankness and openness in relationships but unfortunately assumes the privileges of friendship based on improper criteria.

⁵⁶ Hellegouarc'h (1963) 70. Hellegouarc'h emphasizes the fact that no matter how one defines *familiaritas*, and no matter how closely associated the term is to *amicitia*, *familiaritas* denotes a type of relationship where affection does not necessarily have to play a role. *Familiaritas* implies a friendship that is based mostly on interests and the necessity of politics. Cf. Sallust, Cat. XIV.3: *Ei Catilinae proximi familiaresque erant*.

Furthermore, Chremes demonstrates his audacious nature with the need to interfere into everyone's business.⁵⁷ Chremes reinforces this sentiment rather emphatically later on in the conversation:

CHREMES

ingenio te esse in liberos leni puto,
et illum obsequentem siqui' recte aut commode
tractaret. verum nec tu illum sati' noveras
nec te ille; hoc qui fit? ubi non vere vivitur.

I think you show a generous attitude toward children,
and he'd have been a dutiful son, if anybody had handled him
right. But you really did not understand him, or he you.
And how does that happen? It happens when people aren't
frank with each other.

H.T. 151-4

Here, Chremes accuses Menedemus of not knowing his son well enough, which was a major reason for his son leaving his father's home so abruptly. In this statement, both Menedemus and Clinia are represented by the personal pronoun *tu* and the demonstrative *ille* in the interlocked word order of synchysis across lines 153-4 (*t' illum...t' ille*). The personal pronoun *tu* elides into the demonstrative in both cases. The sound effect and positioning of father and son visually counteract Chremes' meaning. Menedemus and Clitipho are particularly close together in the lines, eliding into one entity. The irony in

⁵⁷ In a later dialogue between Chremes and Menedemus where Chremes decides to tell Menedemus that his son is back in Athens and living in his house, we learn at the end of the scene that Chremes is truly the resident busybody, involving himself constantly in neighbors' problems and disputes; apparently Chremes was appointed mediator in a dispute over property lines between his other neighbors, Simo and Crito. Chremes wastes no time in sticking his nose in other people's business. Cf. Ter. HT 497-502: *operam dabo.\paullum negoti mi obstat: Simus et Crito\vicini nostri hic ambigunt de finibus;\me cepere arbitrum: ibo ac dicam, ut dixeram\operam daturum me, hodie non posse is dare:\continuo hic adero.*

Chremes' advice is that he himself does not even know his own son's affairs; Clitipho has been carrying on a secret affair with his mistress and is the best friend of Menedemus's son, Clinia. Chremes is a man who is quick to dispense his wisdom upon others but is incapable of following his own advice. In a later conversation with his own son, Clitipho, he admits that he keeps secrets from *all* his friends: *nemost m<eo>rum amicorum hodie\ apud quem expromere omniā mea ōcculta, Clitipho, audeam*, 574-5. Chremes teaches his son to keep secrets from his friends; he says one thing to his old "friend" Menedemus and then turns around says another thing to his son Clitipho about his friendship etiquette; Chremes is hypocritical in dispensing advice to both his friend and son.

More telling of this busybody trait is during the scene where Chremes reveals to Menedemus that his son is not only in town but momentarily residing at his house, even though he was supposed to keep this a secret from Clinia's father. During this conversation, Chremes advises Menedemus to devise a plan that would prevent Clinia from exploiting his father's excessive beneficence:

{ME.} faciat quidlubet:
sumat consumat perdat, decretumst pati,
dum illum modo habeam mecum. {CH.} si certumst tibi
sic facere, illud permagni referre arbitror
ut ne scientem sentiat te id sibi dare.
{ME.} quid faciam? {CH.} quidvis potiu' quam quod cogitas:
per alium quemvis ut des, falli te sinas
technis per servolum; etsi subsensi id quoque,
illos ibi esse, id agere inter se clanculum.

[Me] She can do anything she likes.
She can eat me out of house and home.
I've made up my mind. I just don't care
as long as I can have my son with me.

[Ch] Well, if you insist on doing it that way,
I think it's terribly important that he shouldn't realize
you're handling him all this with your eyes open.

[Me] What should I do?

[Ch] Anything except what you are planning. Give it
to him through a third party; let a slave figure out a way
to trick you out of it. As a matter of fact, I have a feeling
that's what they are up to, and they are off
in a corner working on it.

H.T. 464-72

Desperate to heal the breach between him and his son, Menedemus will do anything for Clinia, even accept and pay for his mistress' lavish lifestyle. Menedemus' despair is acutely expressed in the ascending tricolon of the following three verbs in asyndeton: *sumat consumat perdat*, 465. Menedemus says that Bacchis can devour, consume and even destroy him if he knew that his son would be returned to him. Clinia's father cries out with these three consecutive hortatory subjunctives, demonstrating his passivity and helplessness. As the ever-overbearing and intrusive *amicus*, however, Chremes convinces Menedemus to re-evaluate his decision; Chremes tells Menedemus to help his son clandestinely by playing dumb so that Clinia cannot be aware of the father's desperation: *ut ne scientem sentiat te id sibi dare*, 468. Otherwise the son will perceive the father as weak and will continue to exploit his feebleness. Considering that Chremes advised Menedemus to be as candid as possible with his son in the earlier conversation just examined above, this plan plays against his prior philosophy; Chremes is a hypocrite.⁵⁸

So far, from the previous three plays, one can see a pattern emerging between these old men and their behavior within their *amicitiae*: (1) at least one of the old men

⁵⁸ Hunter (1985) 100-1. Chremes' character demonstrates the "gulf between theory and practice".

values and/or practices frank and curt communication with the other; (2) the more imposing or bolder *senex* out of these friendships ironically has a child who harbors crucial information from him throughout most of the play; this lack of openness and communication between father and son demonstrates a considerable rift between the older and younger generation of freeborn males; (3) the inner-workings of the old men's friendships are best understood at the point where a crisis occurs and (4) reciprocity is not the fundamental binding force in the friendship; emotional support and unyielding loyalty are present in friendships that are established since childhood. Now I will turn to the two plays in which the old men are related by blood. Where familial relations are concerned, the idea of friendship tends to be taken for granted or subsumed within the family structure. The *senes* friendships in the *Phormio* and the *Adelphoe* can hopefully challenge this idea of frankness and candor as well as evaluate the development of affection between the old men pairs in the plays.

Chremes and Demipho of the *Phormio* are Athenian citizen brothers. In the play, Chremes leads a double life in which he goes by the name, Stilpho, in Lemnos where he manages his Athenian wife's (Nausistrata's) properties. While living in Lemnos, Chremes has been harboring a secret love child by the name of Phanium, whom he begot with a poor woman there. In an attempt to prevent Nausistrata from discovering his secret, Chremes and his brother Demipho devise a plan to marry off Chremes' secret daughter, Phanium, to Demipho's son, Antiphon. Ironically and unbeknownst to Chremes and Demipho, Antiphon falls in love with and marries Phanium, immediately after the girl's mother dies. In order to marry her, however, Antiphon employs the help of the

parasite, Phormio, who hatches a plan, impersonating Phanium's next-of-kin. The law states that the next-of-kin can either marry the female in question or choose her future spouse. In the following scene, in which Chremes tells Demipho his reasons for wanting his son, Antipho, as Phanium's husband, Demipho's loyalty to his brother is tested:

{DE.} quid gnato optigerit me absente audistin, Chremes?
{CH.} quod quidem me factum consili incertum facit.
nam hanc condicionem siquoi tulero extrario,
quo pacto aut unde mihi sit dicendum ordinest.
te mihi fidelem esse aequa atque egomet sum mihi
scibam. ille, si me alienus adfinem volet,
tacebit dum intercedet familiaritas;
sin spreverit me, plus quam opus est scito sciet.
vereorque ne uxor aliqua hoc resciscat **mea**:
quod si fit, ut me excutiam atque egrediar domo
id restat; nam ego meorum solu' sum meus.
{DE.} scio ita esse, et istaec mihi res sollicitudinist,
neque defetiscar usque adeo experirier
donec tibi **id quod pollicitus sum effecero.**

[De] You heard what happened to my son while I was away,
didn't you, Chremes?

[Ch] Yes, and it's made me uncertain what to do next. You see, if I arrange a marriage for my daughter with somebody outside the family, I'll have to explain all the details where she came from, and who her mother is. With you, I knew I could trust you as well as I could myself; with an outsider, supposing I could get him to agree to the match, he'd hold his tongue just so long as we were on good terms. But if we had a falling-out, he'd know entirely too much and I am afraid my wife would find out what I've been doing. If that happens, the only thing left for me will be to shake myself free and be on my way. In my house, I'm all I can call my own.

[De] I understand that perfectly, and I'm worried about the difficulty you're in. Well, I'm not going to give up. I'll keep working at this until I accomplish what I promised you.

Phormio 577-90

Chremes tells Demipho that he wants Phanium to marry a close relative rather than a stranger because he could not trust the stranger with such a secret. In his argument, Chremes considers Demipho's trust binding and implies that the former can rely on the latter to take this secret to his deathbed. Chremes says: *te mihi fidelem esse aequa atque egomet sum mihi\ scibam*, 581-2. Chremes believes that the trust Demipho has for his brother is equal to the trust Chremes has for himself. The elision of *esse, aequa, atque* and *egomet* (*ess' aequ' atqu' egomet*, 581) blends the four words into one sound, reinforcing the idea that the brothers are entwined in this dilemma. The synchysis of *tu mihi...sum mihi* of the same line further supports this image of the brothers, interlocked in the bonds of fraternal trust. The identical syllables of *mea* and *domo* at the end of lines 586-7 demonstrate how the wife controls the household separated from Chremes who would be removed.⁵⁹ *Me excutiam atque egrediar* are verbs that are active in meaning, demonstrating Chremes' active removal of himself from his household. However, his removal in actuality is dependent upon his wife's knowledge of his secret indicated by the fear clause of line 586 (*vereor que ne uxor...*). The *quod* noun clause, which describes his departure, is literally dependent upon this clause of fearing. Chremes can trust his brother unconditionally because they share a familial bond whereas the relationship with his wife heavily relies on fear. The enjambment of the word *scibam* conveys a shockingly assertive tone from Chremes. Chremes knows that his brother's *fidelitas* is unbreakable. The fact that he uses the imperfect tense suggests that Demipho has repeatedly and

⁵⁹ We know that Chremes' property and wealth are derived from his wife. The ring composition of *mea* and *domo* support this fact.

successively helped his brother in the past; Demipho's trust has been tested and proven strong.

Demipho's unyielding faith is further implied when Chremes says: *nam ego meorum solu' sum meus*, 587. Chremes believes he only has power over his own material possessions, indicated by the substantive *meorum*. Demipho allows him to share the burden of this secret because his brother inhabits a perfect position: Demipho is a close enough family member that Chremes can trust him with even the most shameful secrets and yet at the same time he is not too deep within his immediate familial structure. If Demipho were within his household, Nausistrata would most certainly have discovered Chremes' secret sooner than when Phormio divulges the information in the last of the play. As his brother, a trust is inherently built into their relationship as family members. In Demipho's response to Chremes' plea, Demipho says that he will do whatever it takes to keep his brother's secret safe. It is evident in the word *scio* that Demipho highly values the conviction in his brother's words. Also Demipho shoulders the burden and empathizes with his brother's plight: *et istaec mihi res sollicitudinist*, 588. Their *amicitia* goes beyond the mere protocol of exchanging favors; no matter how grave the circumstance, each brother knows the other will eventually pull through.

Although not particularly loyal or even friendly to one another, the *senes* brother pair in the *Adelphoe* exemplifies tolerance between two obviously disparate siblings. Demea, a hard-working and strict Athenian farmer with two sons, Aeschinus and Ctesipho, made a difficult decision by giving up Aeschinus to be raised by his lenient brother, Micio. Aware of his brother's mild methods of parenting, Demea gambles on the

hope that his son will become a decent and honorable citizen. Regardless of either extreme parenting style, Ctesipho and Aeschinus both come off as less than virtuous characters throughout the play.⁶⁰ Demea, being the stronger-willed out of the two, thinks his brother's views and methods of parenting are absurd; Micio holds dear to the spare-the-rod-spoil-the-child mantra, believing that a parent should be a friend to his child instead of guiding the child by fear and sternness.⁶¹ Foolish and highly emotional, Micio constantly clashes with his brother's strict demeanor. Demea, however, demonstrates a patience in spite of Micio's delusional state. In the following dialogue where Demea expresses concern for Aeschinus' welfare, the subtle dynamics of their friendship is revealed:

{DE.} ei mihi,
 pater esse disce ab aliis qui vere sciunt.
 {MI.} natura tu illi pater es, consiliis ego.
 {DE.} tun consulis quicquam? {MI.} ah, si pergis, abiero.
 {DE.} sicut agis? {MI.} an ego totiens de <ea>dem re audiam?
 {DE.} curaest mihi. {MI.} et mihi curaest. verum, Demea,
 curemus aequam uterque partem: tu alterum,
 ego item alterum; nam ambos curare propemodum
 reposcere illumst quem dedisti. {DE.} ah Micio!
 {MI.} mihi sic videtur. {DE.} quid istic? si tibi istuc placet,
 profundat perdat pereat; nil ad me attinet.
 iam si verbum unum posthac . . . {MI.} rursum, Demea,
 irascere? {DE.} an non credi? repeto quem dedi?
 aegrest; alienu' non sum; si obsto . . . em desino.

[De] Oh, my! Learn to be a father from those who know it all!
 [Mi] You're his father in blood; I'm his father at heart.

⁶⁰ Aeschinus has inherited the reputation for his brother's, Ctesipho's, relationship with a prostitute because Aeshcinus already is known to exemplify wild behavior. Cf. Ter. *Ad 261-4*: {CT.} *quid sit? illi(u)s opera, Syre, nunc vivo. festivom caput; \quin omnia sibi post putarit esse praem<eo> commodo; \maledicta famam m<eu>m laborem et peccatum in se transtulit.\nil pote supra.*

⁶¹ Ter. *Ad. 65-7. Et errat longe mea equidem sententia, qui imperium credit gravius esse aut stabilius vi quod fit quam illud quod amicitia adiungitur.*

[De] You and your heart! What good did that ever...

[Mi] Now, look; if you're going to talk like that, I'm leaving.

(He starts to walk away.)

[De] That's how it's to be, is it?

[Mi] But do I have to hear you on the same subject again and again
and again?

[De] Well, I'm worried.

[Mi] And so am I. But, Demea, let's divide the worrying fairly between us;
you worry about Ctesiphon, and I'll worry about Aeschinus.

When you worry about them both you're practically asking me to
give Aeschinus back to you.

[De] But, Micio...

[Mi] No, I really mean it.

[De] Well, why argue? If that's the way you want it, let him throw
money around and lose his last penny and ruin himself. It's none of
my business. And if I say one more...

[Mi] Demea, Demea! Are you losing your temper again?

[De] Don't you believe me? I'm not asking you to give me back my son,
am I? Of course I'm upset. After all, I am his father! If I'm in the way...no,
that's enough. You want me to concern myself with just the one boy?

All right, I will, and I thank God that he's the kind I want him to be.

That boy of yours will find out one of these days...no, I won't say anything
more against him.

Adelphoe 124-37

This dialogue provides two fundamental facts about the brothers: (a) that Micio and Demea have had this fight several times in the past: *an ego totiens de <ea>dem re audiam*, 128; and (b) that Demea shows a sense of tolerance for his brother's frivolous behavior. Every time Demea finds himself criticizing his brother too harshly, he edits himself, holding back any opinion too honest about his brother's lax parenting methods because the conversation could become too volatile. Micio is an emotional man and so can only respond with emotion, not reason. When Micio declares himself to be Aeschinus' father in spirit and emotion, though not biologically, Demea is dismissive of

this thought, which immediately sends Micio storming off. Demea realizes his blunder and immediately asks *sic in agis?* to prompt Micio to return to the conversation. When Demea's anger begins to rise in series of alliterative p's and an ascending tricolon of verbs, enraged by Aeschinus' profligate behavior, his thoughts trail off into silence in aposiopesis: *si tibi istuc placet, \ profundat perdat pereat; nil ad me attinet.\ iam si verbum unum posthac..., 133-5; an non credi'? repeto quem dedi?\ aegrest; alienu' non sum; si obsto . . em desino, 136-7.* Demea exudes both an exasperation and frustration in his responses to his brother's ludicrous viewpoints.

It is not surprising that Demea approaches his brother with such sensitivity considering that the topic of the conversation is a rather delicate matter. Micio is simply a man trying to raise his adoptive son the best way he can, but the operative word here is "adoptive". Any slight to Micio's parenting abilities immediately surfaces any insecurities that are lurking beneath his lackadaisical demeanor. Micio expresses this insecurity when he says: *nam ambos curare propemodum reposcere illumst quem dedisti, 131-2.* Before Aeschinus, Micio was an old bachelor with no one left to prolong his legacy; Aeschinus offers him the opportunity to fill this void. Demea's immediate response to Micio's fear is that of exhaustion and frustration: *Ah, Micio!, 132.* Demea does not wish for his brother to storm off again. Though Demea has had many chances in the past to retrieve his son, he continues to give Micio the benefit of the doubt because Micio is his brother and he feels obligated to him merely because of this fraternal bond. Otherwise, these two men would not be friends or even acquaintances.

The clashing personalities of Demea and Micio can be vividly displayed during a scene in which they discuss the news about Aeschinus' transgression; he has impregnated a respectable young female which has caused her legal guardian, Hegio, to confront Demea about Aeschinus' behavior:

{DE.} sed eccum ipsum. te iamdudum quaero, Micio.
{MI.} quidnam? {DE.} fero alia flagitia ad te ingentia
boni illi(u)s adulescentis. {MI.} ecce autem! {DE.} nova,
capitalia. {MI.} ohe iam. {DE.} ah nescis qui vir sit. {MI.} scio.
{DE.} ah stulte, tu de psaltria me somnias
agere: hoc peccatum in virginemst civem. {MI.} scio
{DE.} oho scis et patere? {MI.} quidni patiar? {DE.} dic mihi,
non clamas? non insanis? {MI.} non: malim quidem . . .
{DE.} puer natust. {MI.} di bene vortant! {DE.} virgo nil habet.
{MI.} audivi. {DE.} et ducenda indotast. {MI.} scilicet.
{DE.} quid nunc futurumst? {MI.} id enim quod res ipsa fert:
illinc huc transferetur virgo. {DE.} o Iuppiter,
istocin pacto oportet?

[De] Aha! There he is! I've been looking for you for a long time, Micio.

[Mi] Why?

[De] I have some bad news for you—positively monstrous—
about that fine young man.

[Mi] (*aside*): Oh, my! Here we go!

[De] It's unheard of! It's positively criminal!

[Mi] Now, now, now!

[De] You just don't know that boy.

[Mi] Oh, yes, I do.

[De] You idiot! You're fondly imagining that I'm talking about that slave girl.
Oh no; this is something he's done to a perfectly respectable young lady.

[Mi] Yes, I know.

[De] Oh, you know, do you? Aren't you going to do anything about it?

[Mi] Why should I do anything?

[De] You mean to say you aren't giving him a tongue-lashing? Aren't you angry
enough to burst?

[Mi] No. Of course, I'd rather...

[De] They've had a baby!

[Mi] Yes, isn't that nice?

[De] But that girl hasn't a penny!

[Mi] So I've heard.

[De] He'll have to marry her without a dowry!

[Mi] Naturally.

[De] Well, what happens now?

[Mi] Well, what the circumstances require, of course. We're going to bring the girl from her house to ours.

Adelphoe 719-32

As soon as Demea finds Micio, he can barely contain himself because he understands the severity of the situation. In a sarcastic tone, Demea says that he bears news of immense disgrace concerning that upright (*boni*) son of his. When Demea says that Aeschinus has committed a crime against a virgin, he states that she is a citizen, placing the term *civis* in apposition to show emphasis (*virginem st civem*, 725).⁶² Since the term *virgo* already implies that the young woman is a citizen, the term *civis* is technically redundant. This emphasis suggests that Demea must point out the gravity of Aeschinus' offense. The humor of this scene lies in the fact that Micio, already aware of Aeschinus' shame, has readily accepted his son's deed. Demea, on the other hand, is infuriated: (1) he calls his eldest son's act *capitalia* ("a capital crime") in an enjambment of line 723; (2) he calls Micio an idiot (*stulte*, 723); (3) surprised at how well Micio accepts this news, Demea asks him a series of questions in shock: *oho scis et patere?...non clamas? non insanis?* 726-7. Demea, dumbfounded at Micio's relaxed attitude, cuts him off by saying that the young girl's child was born (*puer natust*, 728) and then says that she does not have a dowry (*virgo nil habet*, 728). Micio rejoices at the news (*di bene vortant!*, 728) and decides to resolve the problem by having Aeschinus marry her. The different reactions from Micio and Demea further demonstrate their rather dissimilar personalities. As a

⁶² Ashmore (1908) 298.

conservative and responsible man, Demea cannot process the idea that his son has has a child with a freeborn young female out of wedlock. Micio, on the other hand, thinking that this news is a blessing, seems to be detached from reality. The consequences of Aeschinus' actions can irreparably damage his reputation.

As in the case of the brothers, Demipho and Chremes, and even with the life-long friends, Chremes and Simo, familial obligations and close long-lasting connections trump any resentment one party may have towards the other. This deep and binding relationship even causes each person of the two pairs to overlook the less than savory behavior of the other participant. Above all else, candor and trust are essential to the maintenance of any friendship between *senes*, regardless of whether or not affection exists. The exact calculations of reciprocity are not mentioned but the expectation of favor (in the case of Terence's plays—a dowry), if there is any, is implied. I shall now turn to the pairs of *adulescentes* in Terence's plays. The younger generation of relatively social equals can illuminate, challenge and question the concepts of trust, candor, affection and reciprocity exhibited and discussed in the *senes* portion of this chapter.

SONS/ADULESCENTES

The *adulentes* pairs that prominently feature in Terence's works are those in the *Andria*, the *Phormio*, the *Adelphoe* and the *H.T.* The *H.T.* demonstrates less interaction between the young male pairs, Clinia and Clitipho, than the other plays because they speak more through Clitipho's *servus callidus*, Syrus. The young males are worthwhile case studies because they are beginning to understand how to handle their friendships as they try to transition into manhood. I will first appraise the *amicitia* between the nonrelatives of *Andria* and the relatives in the *Phormio* and *Adelphoe* for the same reasons mentioned above in the *senes* portion.

Pamphilus' obligation to the marriage arranged for him by his father places pressure on the friendship between the main *adulescens* and his good friend, Charinus, in the *Andria*. Their rapport reveals that their *amicitia* has a definite openness, but their banter is not as straightforward as that of the *senes* discussed above. The *adulescentes* find it initially difficult to discuss their desires directly because they are both afraid of the other's reaction to their secrets. This initial hesitation suggests that the young men do not necessarily trust each other. In a conversation between Charinus and his slave, Byrria, it is revealed that Charinus is in love with Pamphilus' intended bride, Philumena: [Ch] *nil nolo aliud nisi Philumenam*, 306. Unsure of his friend's feelings for Philumena, however, Charinus divulges his secret affection for the girl to Pamphilus. The following conversation ensues between the two friends, as they discuss this sensitive topic:

{PA.} Charinum video. salve. {CH.} o salve, Pamphile:
ad te advenio spem salutem auxilium consilium expetens.
{PA.} neque pol consili locum habeo neque ad auxilium copiam.

sed ǐstuc quidnamst? {CH.} hodie uxorem ducis? {PA.} aiunt. {CH.} Pamphile,
si id facis, hodie postremum me vides. {PA.} quid ita? {CH.} ei mihi,
vereor dicere: huic dic quaeso, Byrria. {BY.} ego dicam. {PA.} quid est?
{BY.} sponsam hic tuam amat. {PA.} ně ǐste haud mecum sentit. eho dum dic mihi:
num quid nam ampliu' tibi cūm illa f<ui>t, Charine? {CH.} ah[a], Pamphile,
nil. {PA.} quam vellem!

[Pa] I see Charinus. Hello!

[Ch] Oh, hello Pamphilus: I come to you seeking hope, safety, aid, advice.

[Pa] By Pollux, I do not have the position nor the resources to help [you].

But that which you desire, what is it, pray?

[Ch] Are you getting married today?

[Pa] So they say.

[Ch] Pamphilus, if you do this, you are going to see me today for the last time.

[Pa] Why so?

[Ch] Ah me! I am afraid to say: tell him what I ask, Byrria.

[By] I shall tell [him].

[Pa] What is it?

[By] He loves your betrothed.

[Pa] Really, he does not feel the [same] as me. Aha! Tell me then:

You don't have anything more to do with her, do you Charinus?

[Ch] Aha! Pamphilus, nothing.

[Pa] How I wish it!

Andria 318-325⁶³

When Charinus first approaches Pamphilus to discuss his quandary, the former twice refrains from telling his friend that he is in love with his fiancée. After Charinus asks Pamphilus to verify rumors spreading around town about his nuptials, Pamphilus does not clearly deny or confirm the fact. Simo's son says: *aiunt*, 321. Using the third person plural, "they" more than likely refers to common gossip. Pamphilus does not directly say that he is getting married. His vague reply prompts Charinus to respond with his own cryptic reply should Pamphilus go through with his wedding: *si id facis, hodie postremum me vides*, 322. Charinus says, "If you do this, you are going to see me today for the last

time.” Charinus has still not openly expressed his exact problem with his friend’s marriage plans. He threatens to kill himself if Pamphilus marries Philumena. When Pamphilus is taken aback by Charinus’ sudden and unfounded threat, Charinus then uses Byrria as an intermediary to apprise Pamphilus of his true feelings for Philumena: *ei mihi, vereor dicere: huic dic quaeaso, Byrria*, 323. Charinus says that he is afraid (*vereor*) to tell his friend this secret. This feeling of fear is not unwarranted. If Pamphilus were actually in love with his own fiancée, Charinus’ news could elicit a violent reaction and irrevocably damage the bonds of their relationship. Charinus’ initial obliqueness suggests that their *amicitia* is not based on a strong foundation of fidelity.

As the dialogue continues, the two young men further unearth the lack of trust between them. Charinus tests the bonds of their friendship by asking a rather weighty favor from his friend. Charinus wants Pamphilus not only to postpone the wedding but to call the nuptials off altogether:

{CH.} nunc te per amicitiam et per amorem obsecro,
principio ut ne ducas. {PA.} dabo equidem operam. {CH.} sed si id non potest
aut tibi nuptiae hae sunt cordi, {PA.} cordi! {CH.} saltem aliquot dies
profer, dum proficiscor aliquo ne videam. audi nunciam:
ego, Charine, ne utiquam officium liberi esse hominis puto,
quom is nil mereat, postulare id gratiae adponi sibi.
nuptias effugere ego istas malo quam tu adipiscier.

[Ch] Now I beg you, in the name of our friendship and affection, do not marry her.

[Pa] I indeed will do my best.

[Ch] But if it cannot be helped or your heart is set on this wedding...

[Pa] My heart?

[Ch]...at least put it off for a few days while I go off somewhere, so that I can't see it.

[Pa] Listen to what I say: I do not think, Charinus, that this ever should be a duty for a freeborn male, to demand to take credit for a favor on his part, when he doesn't deserve it. I prefer to escape this marriage than to gain one.

Andria 326-32

In addition to swearing upon their friendship, Charinus calls upon his *amor* (“affection”). According to Lewis and Short, the term *amor* can be employed to delineate sexual love and affection between friends. Pamphilus, however, proves to be the more affectionate companion in the relationship. While agreeing to fulfill Charinus’ request, Pamphilus enacts the language of reciprocity specific to *amicitia*: *officium...mereat...gratiae*, 330-2. Pamphilus’ response is indirect but truthful and shows strength of character. Pamphilus rightfully admits that he does not deserve (*merere*) *gratia* from his friend for agreeing to take up this *officium* because he genuinely does not wish to marry Philumena. Simo’s son, however, is still not exactly being honest with his comrade. He fails to declare openly to Charinus *why* he is so eager to call off the wedding; Pamphilus is frightened to disclose his secret about Glycerium because he does not trust his friend with this information. They both are cautious in discussing their thoughts and desires. Thus, at this point we can surmise the following about their *amicitia*: (a) both *adulescentes* do not trust each other to the extent that they can easily disclose their respective needs and (b) they are both self-absorbed young men who treat their relationship as a means to obtain their desires. The betrothed male must withhold information from his friend about his love affair because he does not trust his best friend with the information. Should Charinus divulge his secret, his reputation is irreparably ruined. If Charinus admits that he is in love with his best friend’s fiancée, Pamphilus’ reaction could potentially cast him in a less than virtuous light. Pamphilus’ arranged marriage exposes the weaknesses in their *amicitia*.

This underlying lack of trust brings the relationship of the *adulescentes* to a breaking point in the following scene where they are finally direct with one another. When Charinus learns from his slave, Byrrhia, that Pamphilus has agreed to the wedding, Charinus immediately believes this news, obtained from his slave's eavesdropping instead of his own friend's words. Charinus concludes that Pamphilus has betrayed his trust after his friend sincerely promised that he would call off the arranged marriage:

{PA.} Charine, et mě ēt tě īprudens, nisi quid di respiciunt, perdidi.
{CH.} itane “inprudens”? tandem inventast causa: solvisti fidem.
{PA.} quid “tandem”? {CH.} etiamnunc me ducere istis dictis postulas?
{PA.} quid īstuc est? {CH.} postquam me amare dixi, complacitast tibi.
heu me miserum qui tuom animum ex animo spectavi meo!
{PA.} falsus es. {CH.} non tibi sat esse hoc solidum visumst gaudium,
nisi me lactasses amantem et falsa spe produceres?
habeas. {PA.} habeam? ah nescis quantis in malis vorser miser
quantasque **hic s<ui>s consiliis mihi conflavit** sollicitudines
meu' carnufex. {CH.} quid īstuc tam mirumst de te si exemplum capit?
{PA.} haud istuc dicas, si cognoris vel me vel amorem meum.

[Pa] I have imprudently ruined both you and me, Charinus,
unless the gods do us some friendly turn.

[Ch] Oh, that's it, is it? “imprudently”! Found an excuse at last,
You broke your word.

[Pa] What do you mean, “at last”?

[Ch] Do you expect to fool me with fine speeches even now?

[Pa] What is the matter with you?

[Ch] After I said I was in love with Philumena, you decided to like her. Oh what
a fool I was to judge your heart by my own!

[Pa] You're mistaken!

[Ch] Didn't your happiness seem complete, unless you could torment me,
who loved her, and lead me on with false hope? Keep her.

[Pa] Keep her? Ah, you don't know what a mess I'm in, and what a lot of grief Davus,
here, has stirred up for me with his schemes—my personal executioner!

[Ch] What's so surprising about that, if he takes you for his model?

[Pa] You wouldn't say that, if you really either knew me or my affection.

Andria 642-51

While Charinus abruptly reveals his emotions in this scene, Pamphilus desperately attempts to defend himself and explain the troublesome mess into which Davus put him.⁶⁴ With a temperament typical of a brash youth, Charinus angrily begins their conversation by saying that Pamphilus has broken their trust: *tandem inventast causa: solvisti fidem*, 643. Charinus' distrust for his friend is revealed when he says that Pamphilus has at last (*tandem*) found an excuse to ruin any chances for his happiness. Without hearing Pamphilus's side of the story, Charinus is ready and quick to discard his *amicitia*. Charinus' statement strongly suggests that for some time he has been concealing doubts about Pamphilus' dedication to him. Finally, Charinus says in a rash enjambment, *habeas*, 649. He says, "You can have her [Philumena]." If Charinus was willing to sacrifice his friendship to obtain his beloved, why would he immediately discard her once he assumed Pamphilus loved her? Charinus becomes so frustrated that he hastily discards Philumena. Charinus shows his immaturity and rash, youthful temperament in his behavior.

A similarly self-serving counterpart to Charinus, Pamphilus displays more mature behavior. Pamphilus' series of dumbfounded responses illustrates his shock and hurt: *quid "tandem"?; quid istuc est?*, 644; 645. When Charinus hurls a rather malicious retort at him, claiming that Pamphilus' slave, Davus, learned his inappropriate behavior from his master, Pamphilus finally exposes signs of his emotional investment in the relationship: *haud istuc dicas, si cognoris vel me vel amorem meum*, 651. Pamphilus says, "You wouldn't say that if you either knew me or my affection." The term *amor* here

⁶⁴ Ashmore (1908) 52. Ashmore's commentary observes that the first fourteen lines of this scene contains dactylic, cretic, iambic and bacchiac meters.

could be referring to Pamphilus' secret love for Glycerium or could be referring to the love between the two young men. Regardless of whether or not Pamphilus loves Philumena, Pamphilus is asked to defy his father's wishes to fulfill a favor for his friend. Thinking that their relationship was stronger than the mere exchange of favors, Simo's son is hurt by his friend's careless and insensitive remarks. Pamphilus, however, is still devoted to assuring the outcome of two weddings;⁶⁵ He wants Charinus to marry Philumena so he can free himself up to wed his choice of bride. Therefore, Pamphilus does not altogether view his friendship in purely affectionate terms. His "favor" to Charinus is also a benefit to him and his needs.

The *Andria*, therefore, presents a relationship between two young men who apparently do not trust each other. The *adulescentes* struggle to fulfill their wishes and keep their friendship intact. Pamphilus proves to be the more mature and wiser companion because he attempts to fulfill the desires of both Charinus and himself. Overcome by his love for Philumena, Charinus is too self-involved and rash to put himself in Pamphilus' position. If the former were to do so, then he would not ask his friend to choose between his own desires and his father's. Despite their initial hesitancy, the *adulescentes* are open enough to show dissatisfaction and emotional frustration with one another so that they can discuss their problems and eventually find a solution for said dilemma.

As opposed to the *amicitia* of the young men in the *Andria*, whose reciprocal friendship is cloaked by terms of affection, the actions of Clitipho and Clinia of the

⁶⁵ Ter. *Andria* 673-4: *nam sati' credo, si advigilaveris, ex unis geminas mihi conficies nuptias.* Pamphilus entrusts his slave, Davus, to contrive a plan so that two weddings will happen.

Heauton Timorumenos demonstrate a true authenticity and devotion. I will briefly point out the aspects of this friendship as a contrast to those of Charinus and Pamphilus because (a) Clinia and Clitipho are the only other unrelated pair in Terence's extant plays and (b) the two young companions of the *H.T.* converse more seldom with each other than the *adulescentes* of the *Andria*. Unsure of how Clinia's father, Menedemus, will react to Clinia's homecoming, his good friend, Clitipho, immediately takes him into his home as soon as Clinia returns from his time away in the army. As Clitipho explains the delicate situation to his father, Chremes, we learn crucial information about the *amicitia* of Clitipho and Clinia:

{CH.} quid id est? {CL.} hunc Menedemum nostin nostrum vicinum? {CH.} probe.
{CL.} huic filium scis esse? {CH.} audivi esse in Asia. {CL.} non est, pater:
apūd nos est. {CH.} quid ais? {CL.} advenientem, e navi egredientem ilico
abduxo ad cenam; nam mihi cum <eo> iam inde usque a pueritia
f<ui>t semper familiaritas. {CH.} volūptatem magnam nuntias.
quam vellem Menedemum invitatum ut nobiscum esset, amplius
ut hanc laetitiam necopinanti primus obicerem <ei> domi!
atque etiam nunc tempus est. {CL.} cavē faxis: non opus est, pater.
{CH.} quapropter? {CL.} quia enim incertumst etiam quid se faciat. modo venit;
timet omnia, patris iram et animum amicae se erga ut sit suae.
<ea>m misere amat; propter eam haec turba atque abitio evenit.

H.T. 180-90

[Ch] What is it?

[Cl] You know Menedemus, the man who lives next door?

[Ch] Yes, very well.

[Cl] Did you know he has a son?

[Ch] Yes. I understand he's overseas.

[Cl] No, he isn't, father. He's at our house.

[Ch] What?

[Cl] He just got back. I picked him up the minute he came ashore and brought him home to dinner. We've been friends, you know, ever since we were boys.

[Ch] Well, that's fine! I'm glad to hear it! I wish now I'd pressed Menedemus

a little harder to come to dinner; then I could have been the first to surprise him with the good news. Wait—there's still time. (*He starts towards Menedemus' house.*)

[Cl] No, don't! You mustn't, father.

[Ch] Why not?

[Cl] Well, you see, he hasn't decided yet what he's going to do. He just got back, and heaven knows how his girl feels. He's very much in love with her; in fact she was the reason for all the trouble and for his leaving.

We immediately learn from this dialogue between father and son that Clitipho and Clinia are very close and affectionate friends because (a) the moment Clinia disembarked from the ship, Clitipho was right there to pick him up and immediately looked after his comrade: *advenientem, e navi egredientem ilico\ abduxī ad cenam*, 182-3; and (b) the *adulescentes* have been friends since childhood: *nam mihi cum <eo> iam inde usque a pueritia\ f<ui>t semper familiaritas*, 184. The present participles, *advenientem* and *egredientem*, emphasize the immediacy with which Clinia and Clitipho meet upon his arrival back in town; Clinia's actions were immediately met with Clitipho's hospitality. The adverb *ilico* which literally means “immediately” is met abruptly by *abduxī* in the next line. The participles can be translated temporally meaning “as soon as Clinia arrived and as soon as he disembarked from the ship”. Clitipho fed his friend and gave him a place to stay, giving Clinia time to sort out his problems with his father, Menedemus. Clitipho wastes no time in caring for his friend. Clitipho uses the phrase *a pueritia* to describe the length of their relationship. Similar phrasing has been used to describe the relationship of Chremes and Simo of the *Andria* (*a parvis*, 539) and Hegio and his deceased friend of the *Adelphoe* (*a pueris parvolis*, 494). A friendship developed and

nurtured from childhood carries a familial weight. Hegio called his friend *cognatus* (494).

A *cognatus* is used to describe a relation by blood.⁶⁶

As opposed to all the previous relationships that have been discussed in this thesis, Clitipho uses the word *familiaritas* rather than *amicitia* to describe their friendship. Terence uses the term *familiaritas* only two other times in two of his plays—the *Eunuchus* and *Phormio*. In the *Eunuchus*, the *adulescens* Chaerea chooses this term to describe the type of friend he wishes the courtesan, Thais, to be in the future with him and his family.⁶⁷ Chaerea expresses affection for Thais because she is willing to overlook his transgression; he disguised himself as a eunuch to have the opportunity to get close to and rape the young respectable female, Pamphila. *Familiaritas* is used in an affectionate manner between Demipho and Chremes in the *Phormio* when Chremes wishes to delineate an outsider versus a family member. Chremes needs to find someone trustworthy enough to guard his secret about his double life and daughter by another woman.⁶⁸ According to the evidence from Terence’s other plays, the sparing use of *familiaritas* suggests that this word is applicable to friendships where particularly strong affection and/or loyalty exists. Hellegouarc’h’s evidence from late Republican Rome, however, suggests that affection is not necessarily an inherent aspect of this term. If this is case, then Terence’s plays offer more breadth for the term’s semantic range or can be an indication of how the term may have been used before the late Republican period.

⁶⁶ Lewis and Short. *Cognatus* is the *subst.* derived from the adjective *natus* and the verb *nascor*.

⁶⁷ Ter. *Eunuchus* 873-5: *saepe ex hui(u)smodi re quapiam et\ malo principio magna familiaritas\ conflatast*. Later in the conversation, Phaedria tells Thais that he loves her.

⁶⁸ Ter. *Phormio* 582-3: *ille, si me alienus adfinem volet,\ tacebit dum intercedet familiaritas*. The relationship has been discussed above. Cf. p. 29-30.

Familiaritas in its adverbial form, *familiariter*, means “familiarly”, “intimately” or “on friendly terms”⁶⁹

Clitipho’s dedication to Clinia’s plight can further be shown in his defiant attitude towards his father. When Chremes announces to his son that he will quickly inform Menedemus about Clinia’s arrival, Clitipho goes against his father’s wishes and tells his father to keep the secret a while longer because he thinks Menedemus may cause his friend distress. He says: *timet omnia, patris iram et animum amicae se erga ut sit sua*e, 189. Not only is Clitipho concerned about his friend’s emotional state but he also cares about his girlfriend’s, Antiphila’s, feelings towards him (*se erga*). Chremes’ son mostly cares for Clinia’s happiness to the extent that he would make sure the people closest to him in his life were providing him with the love and care Clitipho thinks Clinia deserves.

While Clitipho, his slave, Syrus, and Clinia hatch a plan to pass off the former’s mistress, Bacchis, as the latter’s to keep the courtesan a secret from Clitipho’s father, we again witness the strong affection between friends. Without a question, Clinia agrees to pretend that Bacchis is his mistress to save Clitipho from his father’s anger and disappointment:

sed ̄stunc exora ut suam ̄sse adsimulet. {CLIN.} scilicet
facturum me esse; in eum iam res rediit locum
ut sit necessu'. {CLIT.} merito t̄ amo, Clinia.
{CLIN.} verum illa nequid titubet.

[Sy] Now go on; ask Clinia to pretend that Bacchis is his.
[Clin] Why, of course, I’ll do that. The way things are,
there’s nothing else to do.

⁶⁹ Lewis and Short s.v. *familiaris*. The term is used adverbially in Plautus plays, a fairly contemporary author: Plaut. *Men* 2.3.23; *Rud.* 2.4.6; *Ep.* 1.1.2 . The term mostly carries a sense of closeness and affection: Plaut *Ep.* 1.1.2: *nihil turpius quam cum eo bellum gerere, quicum familiariter vixeris.*

[Clit] You're a real friend, Clinia.

[Clin] But be sure that she doesn't make any mistakes.

H.T. 358-61

As soon as Syrus tells Clitipho to ask his friend this favor, without a hesitation and doubt in his mind, Clinia says not only that he will do this favor but that more importantly his actions are not simply a favor but are *necessus* (necessary, imperative, unavoidable); there is no other option but to cover for his friend when he is in a compromising position. Clinia's response suggests that he cares his for his friend's problems to the extent that he is willing to risk his reputation to preserve Clitipho's. Clitipho responds by stating that Clinia is "deservedly" (*merito*) a friend. *Merito te amo Clinia* of line 360 demonstrating a synchisis, an interlocking pattern similar to that of the affectionate *senes* brother pair of the Phormio. Clinia has earned the right to be considered a true *amicus* by his actions. Given that they have a history behind them, this statement is all the more meaningful because this feeling would most likely be implied by now in their relationship and not spoken openly. Both *adulescentes* demonstrate an authentic and caring bond.

In comparison to Charinus and Pamphilus, Clinia and Clitipho value the companionship within their friendship beyond the mere benefits they can receive from one another. Exchange of benefaction occurs in Clitipho's and Clinia's relationship but at the risk of them losing important things: (a) Clitipho can potentially damage the relationship between him and his father if he continues to keep his friend's whereabouts clandestine and (b) Clinia can lose his honor and respectability if it is made publicly known that he is Bacchis' paramour. Charinus and Pamphilus of the *Andria*, on the other

hand, driven by their own personal reasons, strive to sabotage Pamphilus' nuptials. Now I shall turn to the related *adulescentes* in the *Phormio* and the *Andria*.

In the *Phormio*, the cousins, Antipho and Phaedria, both are dissatisfied in their respective relationships with women. Through the scheme of the parasite, Phormio, Antipho has secretly married Phanium, the secret daughter of his uncle, Chremes, without his father's permission. Phaedria, on the other hand, is in love with a music-girl, but is unable to procure the money to buy her from the pimp, Dorio. In a fit of panic, Phaedria wonders where he should turn to for help:

{PH.} Quid faciam? unde ego nunc tam subito huic argentum inveniam miser,
quoi minu' nihilost? quod, h̄c si pote fuisset exorarier
triduom hoc, promissum fuerat. {AN.} itane hunc patiemur, Geta,
fieri miserum, qui me dudum ut dixti adiuerit comiter?
quin, quōm opust, beneficium rursum ei experiemur reddere?

[Ph] Now what do I do? Great gods! Where am I going to find the money for him, just like that? I haven't got a penny to my name. And if I could have just persuaded him to give me three more days, I had a promise of all the money.

[An] Geta, are we going to let the poor man go through all this just after he finished really putting himself out for me, as you told me? No, he needs our help. Don't you think we ought to try to pay him back for the favor he did?

Phormio 534-8

Antipho uses the language of exchange in response to his cousin's dilemma. When Antipho sees his cousin in distress, he decides to pay back a favor (*beneficium rursum...reddere*, 538) in return for his cousin's previous kind gesture (*qui me dudum ut dixti adiuerit comiter*, 537). Geta revealed to Antipho in an earlier scene that Phaedria defended him against Antipho's father, Demipho.⁷⁰ Similar to the relationship of Clitipho and Clinia, they both come to each other's aid without suspicion or hesitation.

⁷⁰ Ter. *Phormio* 475: {GE.} nisi Phaedria haud cessavit pro te eniti. {AN.} nil fecit novi.

However, the benefaction between Antipho and Phaedria seems to stem from an expected reciprocity between the cousins, rather than a more obvious affection like that between Clitipho and Clinia. Demipho depicts their relationship as exemplary of all young men: {DE.} *hic ī noxast, ille ad defendundam causam adest; \ quom illest, hic praestost: tradunt operas mutuas*, 267-8. In his rant, he says, “A’s in trouble, B steps up to defend him; B’s in trouble, A’s ready to help. A mutual benefit association!”. Antipho and Phaedria care for each other’s welfare to the extent that Phaedria will face his uncle’s anger to defend his cousin and Antipho will tell Geta to find a way to raise money for the pimp. The important word in Demipho’s observation of the cousins’ behavior is *mutuas*. Antipho performs a favor for his cousin *in return for* service provided, not because a family member should help another family member, regardless of whether services are exchanged between the parties.

Therefore, the *Phormio* presents a pair of cousins, whose friendship is dictated by reciprocity of services and favors. It is not implausible to suggest that genuine mutual affection exists between this familial pair because Phaedria and Antipho do express themselves as overtly as the *adulescentes* pair, Clinia and Clitipho. After all, Antipho fulfills his promise to Phaedria, and obtains the money with his slave’s, Geta’s, help, without acquiring any benefaction for himself.⁷¹ The *adulescentes* of the *Phormio* show that familial bonds do not necessarily obligate one family member to help the other, but favors are expected when family connections are involved.

⁷¹ Ter. *Phormio* 820-22: {An} *Laetus sum, utūt meē res sese habent, fratri optigisse quod volt.\ quam scitumst ei(u)s modi in animo parare cupiditates\quas, quom res advorsae sient, paullo mederi possis!* Antipho is delighted that his cousin has obtained his own benefaction. However, he says that this favor did not particularly pose any problems for him..

The brother pair of the *Adelphoe* presents the protective older brother, Aeschinus, who covers for his younger and more strictly reared younger brother, Ctesipho.⁷² For some time, Aeschinus has been labeled as the profligate son with a bad reputation. As soon as we are introduced to Ctesipho, the first words from his mouth concern the exchange of benefaction and the privileges of friendship between family members:

{CT.} Abs quivis homine, quom est opus, beneficium accipere gaudeas;
verum enimvero id demum iuvat si quem aequomst facere is bene facit.
o frater, frater, quid ego nunc te laudem? sati' certo scio,
numquam ita magnifice quicquam dicam id virtus quin superet tua.
itaque unam hanc rem mē habere praeter alias praecipuam arbitror,
fratrem, hominem neminem esse primarum artium mage principem.

[Ct] When you need a favor, it's a joy to get it from anybody. But what's really nice is to get it from somebody you'd naturally expect it from. Oh, Aeschinus, Aeschinus! Good old brother! What can I say about you? Of this much I am sure: No matter how extravagantly I have praised you, I could never do justice to a man like you. One thing I know I have that nobody else in the world has—a brother who's really a prince.

Adelphoe 254-9

Ctesipho says that *beneficium* is expected from a family member, but that it is much more pleasant when it is actually given by that relative. Before this scene, Aeschinus has just strong-armed the pimp, Sannio, into selling Ctesipho's mistress to him. The news that Ctesipho has a mistress is rather surprising and ironic, considering that Ctesipho has been raised so strictly by his father, Demea. Aeschinus, the adoptive son of the lenient Micio,

⁷² Ter. *Adelphoe* 262-3. {Ct.} *quin omnia sibi post putarit esse prae m commodo; \maledicta famam mm laborem et peccatum in se transtulit.* Ctesipho, himself, admits that his brother was selfless in putting his brother's welfare before his own.

is the playboy out of the brother pair. Aeschinus shows an affectionate and caring side because he is willing to go through the trouble of saving his brother's honor and securing his happiness; seeing that he has already tarnished his own reputation, Aeschinus takes on the task of retrieving Ctesiphon's paramour because preserving his brother's reputation is a true concern for him. However, Aeschinus' bullying tactics in the previous scene with Sannio suggests that Aeschinus is unable to conduct himself properly in society and craves structure from his father, Micio. Beyond the expectation of favor, Ctesiphon appreciates his brother efforts. He is not lacking in hyperbolic praise in the above passage: *numquam ita magnifice quicquam dicam id virtus quin superet tua... hominem neminem esse primarum artium mage principem*, 257; 259. Ctesiphon, however, is not so much grieved that his older brother is gradually ruining his own reputation for him. As the scene continues, signs of Ctesiphon's guilt and remorse surface:

{CT.} ego īllam hercle vero omitto quiquidem te habeam fratrem: o mi Aeschine,
o mi germane! ah vereor coram in os te laudare amplius,
ne id adsentandi mage quam quo habeam **gratum** facere existumes.
{AE.} age, inepte, quasi nunc non norimu' nos inter nos, Ctesiphon.
hoc mihi dolet, nos paene sero scisse et paene in eum locum
redissem ut, si omnes cuperent, nil tibi possent auxiliarier.
{CT.} pudebat. {AE.} ah stultiaſt istaec, non pudor. tām ūb parvolam
rem paene e patria! turpe dictu. d<eo>s quaeso ut īstaec prohibeant.
{CT.} peccavi.

[Ct] After all I have you for a brother: O my Aeschinus, O my brother!
Really, Aeschinus, I'm uneasy about going on like this right to
your face. You might think I was trying to play up to you instead
of express my gratitude.

[Ae] Don't be silly, Ctesiphon, as if you and I didn't know each
other by now! The only thing that bothers me is that I found out
so late. Things had almost gotten to the point where nobody in
the world could have helped you, even if they wanted to.

[Ct] I was ashamed to tell you.

[Ae] Now, look; that's just foolishness, not shame. A little matter of a girl, and you almost left home because of it! That's terrible! I hope nothing like that will ever happen again.

[Ct] I'm sorry.

Adelphoe 268-76

Ctesipho, thinking that he should show gratitude for Aeschinus' favor fears that he may be flattering his brother too much: *ah vereor coram in os te laudare amplius, \ ne id adsentandi mage quam quo habeam gratum facere existumes*, 269-70. Ctesipho's concern with the authenticity of his praise for Aeschinus' actions suggests that they consider exaggerated praise to be artificial. Ctesipho values honesty in his relationship with his brother. However, Aeschinus casts aside any worries his brother may have to put him at ease. He replies: *age, inepte, quasi nunc non norimu' nos inter nos*, Ctesipho, 271. Aeschinus says that the brothers know each other well enough by now which implies that Aeschinus should know the difference between an authentic display of praise versus flattery. Their friendship shows a sincerity and familiarity similar to that of Clinia and Clitipho. Ctesipho and Aeschinus are also as open and direct with each other as the *senes* pairs discussed above in the first section. It is true that Ctesipho waited a long time to tell his brother his crisis with the pimp (*hoc mihi dolet, nos paene sero scisse et paene in eum locum \redissemus*, 272-3). But once Ctesipho disclosed his secret, Aeschinus did not hesitate to help his sibling. Here, we learn that Ctesipho is more reserved out of the two brothers and cares deeply about other people's perception of him. Ctesipho did not wish to disclose his secret to Aeschinus at first because he was ashamed (*pudebat*, 274). Aeschinus' immediate dismissal of his brother's concern for shame shows that Ctesipho's

older brother is more concerned with his little brother's well-being. Nevertheless, they both show affection for one another. Most importantly, we learn that reciprocity of services and favors between this brother pair seems immeasurable. Aeschinus does not accept apologies from his brother for his transgressions. Aeschinus says: *ah stultitiae istaec, non pudor*, 274. There exists an understanding between the *adulescentes* that the bonds of brotherhood are more important than any incurrence of shame. Furthermore, because there is an overt affection between the brothers, the bonds are even stronger between them than the other family pairing of the *Phormio*. Therefore the young men of the *Adelphoe* show that familial connections have the potential to strengthen the bonds of *amicitia*. When affection is present, the service and favors exchanged are guaranteed regardless of whether they are ruinous to either party's honor and reputation.

Therefore, we have learned that *amicitia* between equals encompasses a wide and varied range of dynamics. If the relationships tend to begin from childhood regardless of age, a deep sense of loyalty, affection and frankness exists between the parties because they have developed their relationship over time. Relationships that are bound by marriage ties resemble business transactions where both parties tolerate each other for the sake of peace between the involved households. Familial bonds cannot guarantee that each person will care deeply for another, but can be a factor that strengthens the bonds of trust. Lastly, a strong sense of trust does not necessarily have to be the fundamental factor in a friendship. *Amicitiae* between equals come in various and nuanced shades because Terence's characters are three dimensional, developing and complex.

Chapter 2: Friendship and Clientship

In the last chapter, I have examined the relationships between equals that encompasses men of the elder generation (*senes*) and the younger (*adulescentes*). The types of *amicitia* discussed above, consisted of various types of dynamics: (1) affectionate, authentic and long-lasting; (2) utilitarian and practical with no need or sign of affection; (3) friendships among family members, which could resemble (1) and/or (2). Now I will turn to *amicitia* between unequals. By examining relationships between parties of differing status, I will be able to determine if the dynamics of these “friendships” considerably diverge from or are similar to the case studies above. According to Konstan, when the question of status is involved i.e. if the relationship is between superiors and inferiors, the terms of *amicitia* can mask an implicit patron-client alliance.⁷³ Terence’s *Andria*, *Hecyra*, *Adelphoe*, *Phormio*, and *Eunuch* depict this asymmetrical relationship as nuanced as the equals relationships discussed above: these clientships/friendships can be affectionate, threatening or awkward. This chapter will examine the *amicitia* between unequals in which freedmen, prostitutes, pimps and parasites—lower class individuals, who have the potential to negotiate their way into more prestigious and advantageous positions—become friends with young and old elite males. Most of the following “friendships” have awkward starts because it is difficult to find some mediating factor in an alliance between, for example, an elite Roman citizen male and a hooker. Nonetheless,

⁷³ Konstan (1997) 136. “Interpreted more broadly, however, as an asymmetrical personal relationship involving expectations of reciprocal exchange with a potential for exploitation, patronage certainly played a role in Roman social life, as it did in Greek hierarchies as well.” The operative phrase in Konstans’ definition would be “potential for exploitation” because the inferior participant, as will be explained in the following examples, can at times be at a disadvantage. The superior patron can wrest the *amicus/clients* of lower status into the relationship against their will.

Terence's plays choose to play out these interactions on the stage and provide fruitful and insightful case studies.

The relationship of Simo and his freedman, Sosia, in the *Andria* is portrayed as one between a devoted pair. As mentioned in the chapter above, their conversation introduces the plot of the play, while providing background information about patron and client. As Simo commands his other slaves to carry objects inside the house, he tells Sosia to remain so that he may personally say a few words to him. Being the cook of the house, Sosia is baffled as to what his skills as a cook could provide for the following conversation:

{SI.} Vos istaec intro auferte: abite. – Sosia,
ades dum: paucis te volo. {SO.} dictum puta:
nempe ut curentur recte haec? {SI.} immo aliud. {SO.} quid est
quod tibi mea ars efficere hoc possit amplius?
{SI.} nil istac opus est arte ad hanc rem quam paro,
sed eis quas semper in te intellexi sitas,
fide et taciturnitate. {SO.} exspecto quid velis.
{SI.} ego postquam te emi, a parvolo ut semper tibi
apud me iusta et clemens fuerit servitus
scis. feci ex servo ut esses libertus mihi,
propterea quod servibas liberaliter:
quod habui summum pretium persolvi tibi.

[Si] All right, boys, take those things in; run along! Sosia, come here a minute; I have a few things I want to say to you.

[So] Oh, I know what you want; you want me to prepare a really fine dinner, don't you?

[Si] No, it's something else.

[So] Well, with what I know, what else could I do for you?

[Si] It isn't what you know that I need for the plans I have in mind. No, what I need are two things I've always known I could count on from you: Loyalty and discretion.

[So] This sounds interesting! What is it you want?

[Si] You were a slave in my house for a long time. Well, ever since the day I bought you, when you were little, you know that your servitude has been just and merciful in my establishment.

You know that's so, I'm sure. I gave you freedom
instead of keeping you as a slave, because even
though you were a slave, you always behaved like a gentleman.
I paid you the highest reward that I had in my power.

Andria 28-39

Simo's reply to Sosia's confusion immediately reveals the ways in which Simo values his freedman's additional virtues. Simo says that he does not request Sosia for his cooking skills but for his loyalty and discretion (*fide et taciturnitate*, 34). These ablatives with *opus*, referring back to *eis* in the previous line, are cleverly and unexpectedly delayed to indicate the familiarity and comfort the master, here, has with his former slave. The subordinating relative clause (*quas semper in te intellexi sitas*, 33), which qualifies these character traits provides even more crucial clues about Sosia's demeanor throughout the entire period Simo has known his freedman. Simo tells Sosia that his traits are innate qualities, indicated by the perfect passive participle, *sitas*, and that he has always (*semper*) possessed them. The prepositional phrase *in te* stands in as the center syllables of the line where there are six syllables each surrounding Sosia; this syllabic positioning visually reinforces the idea that Sosia's attributes are inbred.

The phrase *a parvolo* (35), which has been discussed above, indicates that their relationship has spanned and developed over a considerable length of time. Similar to the other childhood *amicitiae* of the equal pairs of Simo and Chremes or Clinia and Clitipho, the connection between Simo and Sosia exudes a profound sense of comfort and duty. Simo says that Sosia's servile lifestyle (*servitus*) has been both *iustus* and *clemens* in Simo's household. If one observes the line more closely, the adjectives *iustus* and *clemens* are situated closer to Simo (*me*) than to *servitus* in line 36. The positioning of the

adjectives nearer to Simo suggests that Sosia's former master embodies these characteristics, which have made Sosia's servitude more than bearable. *Servitus* positioned at the end of the line is separated from the two adjectives by *fuerit*. This distance between *servitus* and its adjectives further implies that Sosia did not necessarily live like a slave although the label is applied to his living situation. The statement immediately following this separation between noun and adjectives reinforces this special type of slavery that Sosia has experienced: *feci ex servo ut essem libertus mihi\ propterea quod servibas liberaliter*, 37-8. Simo says that he emancipated Sosia from his servitude because of the fact that he served his master like a freedman (*liberaliter*, 38). In Simo's view, Sosia has acted like a freedman and therefore merited the title because he naturally possessed these qualities; although Sosia was and still is technically unequal in status, his gentlemanly behavior grants him certain advantages; Sosia's demeanor extends his privileges from that of a mere inferior to that of a confidant, who happens to be of lower status. This complex relationship is visually encapsulated by the juxtaposition of *servibas* and *liberaliter* of line 38. While the difference in status legally exists, they both maintained an intimate and affectionate relationship that men of equal standing should ideally enjoy. Simo and Sosia enjoy the intimacy of equals and yet understand that they are of unequal status.

Lastly, Simo and Sosia enact the technical language of reciprocity. Simo tells Sosia that he has paid the greatest price (*pretium summum*) for his noble behavior—his emancipation (*persolvi*). This exchange of freedom for good behavior shows the first sign of fundamental benefaction between the two men which comes at a price (*pretium*). After

Sosia acknowledges this favor (*in memoria habeo*, 40), Simo replies in agreement (*haud muto factum*, 40). This initial mutual observation of exchange then prompts them to go through the next formal process of reciprocity. If one compares this language of reciprocity to that of Cicero and Curio mentioned above in the introduction,⁷⁴ the discussion of benefaction between Simo and Sosia are similar in the sense that both parties must formally discuss a previous exchange of favors which obligates them into the next round of exchange. The difference in status of Simo and Sosia, however, immediately shows the divergence between the two examples:

{SO.} gaudeo
si tibi quid feci aut facio quod placeat, Simo,
et id gratum f<ui>sse advorsum te habeo gratiam.
sed hoc mihi molestumst; nam istaec commemoratio
quasi exprobratiost inmemoris benefici.
quin tu uno verbo dic quid est quod me velis.

[So] Simo, I am glad, if I've ever done anything
to please you or can do anything now, and it makes me happy
that you haven't been disappointed in me. But now, I'm worried;
your reminding me of your unforgettable kindness sounds like a reprimand.
Why don't you tell me right out what you want me to do.

Andria 40-5

In the exchange between Cicero and Curio of *Ad Familares*, Cicero assumes confusion when he mentions the value of a previous favor exchanged in order to gently and properly ask for another favor. This subtle and cordial approach to the subject suggests that men of equal rank must gingerly ask each other for services for fear that they will offend the other party. Simo's abrupt recollection of his emancipating Sosia—a

⁷⁴ See p. 4 above.

momentous service—suggests that Simo still sees Sosia as his inferior, although affection exists between them. Simo immediately offends his freedman, Sosia, with the manner in which he reminds him of this past favor: *nam istaec commemoratio\ quasi exprobriost inmemoris benefici*, 43-4. Sosia says that Simo’s tone suggests that this *commemoratio* of his previous *beneficium* is similar to a reprimand (*exprobriost*). Sosia even calls this *commemoratio* annoying (*molestumst*, 43). The fact that Sosia calls Simo’s behavior into question suggests that the manner in which one asks favors between friends is just as important, if not even more important, than the favor itself; Simo’s direct and uncouth behavior colors Sosia as ungrateful for the service his master bestowed upon him. As a result of his awkward initiation of this exchange, Sosia is forced to demand that his master disclose his request right away (*dic*, 45). The proper terms of exchange are implemented in this conversation (*gratiam...benefici*, 42; 44), but the inequality in status between both men make the process inelegant and clumsy.

We learn, thus, from the relationship between the freedman and the master of the *Andria*, that they have had a long-lasting and affectionate friendship with one another. Although Simo grants Sosia the privilege of being entrusted with private emotions and information, he still treats Sosia like a slave in the manner he requests favors from him. Sosia’s annoyance in response to Simo’s lack of subtlety suggests, however, that Sosia can speak his mind, should he be offended by his master’s behavior. The fact that Sosia can be frank enough to express his dissatisfaction with Simo’s behavior, however, further supports the idea that in reality Sosia is more of an equal to his master than their disparate

positions may suggest. Overall, the *amicitia* between Simo and Sosia can be characterized as affectionate and open with slight preservation of asymmetrical rank.

Now I will turn to two case-studies concerning lower class women—prostitutes (*meretrices*). Both Bacchis of the *Hecyra* and Thais of the *Eunuch* are high class mistresses, who form alliances of a more political nature with upper class males. Bacchis, however, takes on a more passive role in the formation of her alliance with Laches, whereas Thais proactively seeks connections with elite males. A prostitute's livelihood, if she is of high caliber, depends on obtaining and maintaining clientele with these quasi-economic and political *amicitiae*. Since these women must survive by means of enduring relationships with men, who can afford and support them, these relationships can be characterized as business transactions with the expectation of strong future benefits.

As mentioned in the chapter above, the central crisis of the play revolves around Philumena, who has left her husband's home because she has secretly become pregnant as a result of being raped. The irony of this dilemma is that her husband in a drunken stupor impregnated his future wife, but the evidence of this encounter literally lies in the hands of the prostitute, Bacchis, who eventually saves Pamphilus' marriage from failing;⁷⁵ Bacchis holds the ring Pamphilus stole from Philumena the night he raped his wife. Aware of Pamphilus' redirection of his feelings towards his wife, Bacchis decides to reveal the identity of the baby's biological father after Pamphilus' mother-in-law, Myrrina, recognized the ring on Bacchis' finger (*Hecyra* 828-32). The *amicitia* that forms between the *senex* and the prostitute can be described as initially hostile. After Laches has

⁷⁵ For a discussion of the altruistic *meretrix*, see Crisafulli (1993) 225; 227.

praised the *meretrix*, Bacchis, for agreeing to help preserve the *amicitia* between his household and Phidippus', the *senex* coerces the prostitute into an alliance with him:

LACHES

nunc quam ego te esse praeter nostram opinionem comperi,
fac eadem ut sis porro: nostra utere amicitia ut voles.
aliter si facies – reprimam me ne aegre quicquam ex me audias.
verum hoc moneo unum, qualis sim amicus aut quid possiem
potiu' quam inimicus, periculum facias.

I have found you to be very different from what I expected;
you can just go on being that way and you can count on my
friendship any time. But you do anything else—no, I'll hold
my tongue; I don't want to say anything to upset you. I'll just
give you one piece of advice. Try finding out what friend I can
be rather than what kind of enemy.

Hecyra 763-7

Immediately before this encounter, Laches compels the *meretrix* to promise that she will tell her former lover's wife and mother that she has not been with Pamphilus since his marriage. Indebted to Bacchis' willingness to swear this oath, Laches chooses to bind Bacchis in *amicitia* with the following stipulations: (a) that the *meretrix* continue to perform in the same manner (*fac eadem ut sis porro*, 764) and (b) that if she should upset their *amicitia*, Laches would immediately become just as bad a personal enemy to Bacchis as he is a friend (*qualis sim amicus aut quid possiem, potiu' quam inimicus* 767). This correlative suggests that an *amicus* and *inimicus* are essentially two sides of the same coin; when a relationship goes sour, the vitriol from personal enemies quickly emerges. In addition to this hesitation immediately sensed from the second condition, the fact that Laches so abruptly mentions this threat in the beginning stages of their *amicitia*

implies and even foreshadows a relationship that rests on a volatile foundation.⁷⁶

Considering that Bacchis has the potential to lure the son away from the relationship, the *meretrix* actually has the upper hand in this agreement. Otherwise Laches would not need to have this conversation with Bacchis at all. In the previous part of their conversation, Laches even hints at his own suspicions of Bacchis' intentions: (*quaere alium tibi firmiores amicum dum tibi tempu' consulendi est*, 746). Laches tells Bacchis to seek a stronger alliance; Laches uses the term *amicus* to describe the type of partnership Bacchis is seeking; however, the term *patronus* is more appropriate considering the type of business she conducts. As mentioned above, *amicus* here could essentially be a euphemism for a patron-client relationship because Bacchis needs to sustain her livelihood. The terms of Laches' agreement, however, suggest otherwise since he assures Bacchis that she can use the benefits of their *amicitia* according to her own desires; this sentiment is indicated by the temporal *ut voles* in line 764. Laches here seems to set up an *amicitia* without the sense that he will enumerate every single favor offered. The *amicitia* formed between Bacchis and Laches can be characterized as the beginning stages of a quasi-economical alliance that is based on exchange of services; Bacchis can request as many favors from Laches as possible with the knowledge that the *senex* can act as her protector. Should Bacchis lose his favor, then Laches has the power to do the *meretrix* harm. In this case, the *senex* and the *meretrix*, unequals in status and wealth, create an *amicitia* that resembles a business transaction with potential political and economic

⁷⁶ Burton (2004) 231. Burton states that a friendship could turn into intense hatred very quickly if any *iniuria* ("injury", "offense") were committed by either party involved. However, Laches' mention of this guideline so early in the *amicitia* suggests that Bacchis' and Laches' relationship at this stage is at best tenuous.

benefits for the *meretrix*; Bacchis is now bound in a relationship with a respectable elder man. As a result of this initial transaction, she may come into contact with his elder elite friends, who may desire to contract her into business with them. Bacchis' clientele has the potential to be expanded beyond the current social circle she has at the moment.

Another high class prostitute, Thais, differs from Bacchis in the sense that her goal is to establish a network of friendships. Bacchis stumbles into a beneficial relationship with Laches because of her good behavior. Thais makes her intentions known early in the plot of the *Eunuch* when she tells Phaedria that she needs *amici* for her livelihood:

THAIS

sola sum; habeo hic neminem
neque **amicum** neque **cognatum**: quam ob rem, Phaedria,
cupio aliquos parere **amicos beneficio meo**.

I am alone; I have no one here
neither friend nor relative: for this reason, Phaedria,
I desire to produce some friends with my service.

Eunuch 147-9

The word Thais uses to describe herself is *sola* (147), one who has neither friend (*amicum*) nor relative (*cognatum*) to care for her. Terence reveals the harsh realities of Thais' profession in this very sentiment. The life of the *meretrix* is lonely and lacks stability if one cannot acquire a consistent entourage of "friends" i.e. clientele. Thais says that she seeks friends for this precise reason (*quem ob rem*). Phaedria's name comes directly after the prepositional phrase *quam ob rem*, which suggests that her relationship with this young male in her view comes down to practical reasons, not simply the desire

for an affectionate relationship. The term *beneficium* is in between the *amicus* and *meus*, displaying the idea that her kindness and benefaction is the operative and connecting factor between her clientele and herself.

Thais' powerful and proactive personality in the *Eunuch* is reinforced by the fact that she is a wealthy prostitute for whom clients consistently purchase slaves.⁷⁷ Thais and Chaerea towards the end of the play share terms of reciprocity to begin the stages of a political *amicitia*. When Thais has discovered that Phaedria's brother, Chaerea, impersonating a eunuch, has ravished Pamphila, she believes at this point that her opportunity to use this girl for her personal advancement has been ruined:

{TH.} neque edepol quid nunc consili capiam scio
de virgine istac: ita conturbasti mihi
rationes omnis, ut eam non possim suis
ita ut aequom fuerat atque ut studui tradere,
ut solidum **parerem** hoc mi **beneficium**, Chaerea.
{CH.} at nunc de(h)inc spero aeternam inter nos **gratiam**
fore, Thai'. saepe ex hui(u)smodi re quapiam et
malo principio magna **familiaritas**
conflatast. quid si hoc quispiam voluit deus?
...
{CH.} nunc ego te in hac re mi oro ut adiutrix sies,
ego me tuae commendo et committo **fide[i]**,
te mihi **patronam** capio, Thai', te obsecro:

[Th] I do not know what to do about the girl, now.
You've upset all my plans. I can't give her back
to her people the way she ought to be and the way I
wanted her to be, and that was the only way I could
really put them under obligation to me.
[Ch] No, no, Thais. I think you've done us a favor that
we'll never forget as long as we live. Lots of times
really great friendships have started out of something

⁷⁷ Crisafulli (1993) 224.

like this, bad beginning and all. Maybe the gods wanted it this way.

...

[Ch] Now I am going to ask you to help me out. I put myself entirely in your hands.

I take you as a patroness for myself, Thais; I beg you. I'll just die if I don't get to marry her.

Eunuch 867-75; 885-88

The same language is picked up from the previous statement above where Thais relays her plans to Phaedria (*parere...beneficio*, 149) in line 871 (*parerem...beneficium*). The main goal of the *meretrix* is to use this girl as a means of exchange with her biological family members. Chaerea says that Thais will receive *gratia* (890) from his family if she overlooks his transgression. More importantly, he says that the *gratia* will be long-lasting (*aeternam*). This statement suggests that the benefits Thais will receive for her clemency will contract her into the kind of binding alliance she has been seeking since the beginning of the play. In addition, Chaerea initiates their business partnership by directly stating that *familiaritas*—a more strictly political relationship—usually emerges from adverse beginnings (*malo principio*). In the previous chapter above, *familiaritas*, a term delineated as a relationship that is interchangeable with *amicitia*, can also be affectionate. In this case, however, the semantics of this usage seems to have a more political bent. Ironically, Thais stumbles into a potentially fruitful *amicitia* when her plan has been foiled by Phaedria's brother. Chaerea feels indebted to her once he realizes that he has raped a respectable young woman instead of a slave girl. He implores her to come to his aid (*oro...aduitrix sies*). He puts himself into her care (*ego me tuae commendeo*). The personal pronouns *ego* and *me*, placed side by side at the beginning of line 886,

emphasize how Chaerea doubly entrusts himself to Thais (*tuae*); he heavily relies on her goodwill. Then Chaerea says that he wants Thais to be his patroness (*te mihi patronam capio, Thai'*, *te obsecro*, 888). The synchysis of *te mihi patronam capio* visually interlocks Chaerea and the *meretrix* into an agreement. Also when Chaerea calls Thais his patroness, he takes on the passive role in the alliance, rendering Thais the more powerful out of the two. However, he uses the verb *capiō*, an aggressive term, to describe the action of making Thais his patroness. The action then elevates Chaerea to an active role at the same time. It is worthy to note that in this play Chaerea has emasculated himself by taking on the role of the eunuch in order to overpower Pamphila sexually. Chaerea's simultaneous active and passive role is also a part of his characterization. Nonetheless, Thais holds the more powerful position in this business partnership.

Overall, both *meretrices* from the *Hecyra* and the *Eunuch* bind themselves into *amicitiae* that are political and economic in nature because these relationships sustain their livelihood. Although Bacchis is forced into the bargain by Laches for his personal benefit, this alliance she forms with him, though potentially dangerous, can be advantageous for Bacchis in the long run. Thais, on the other hand, proactively seeking *amici*, unexpectedly finds a momentary client, who immediately becomes obligated to her.⁷⁸ The formal language of reciprocity (*amicitia*) is used by the parties involved in these transactions that have socio-political and socio-economic dimensions.

In a scene between Aeschinus and the pimp, Sannio, a similar type of business transaction takes place. The language of *amicitia* is enacted between the two males of

⁷⁸ By the end of the play, Thais establishes a patron-client relationship with Chaerea's father; she eventually becomes his client.

unequal background. The *leno* is literally beaten into this social agreement by Aeschinus, one of the main *adulescentes* in Terence's *Adelphoe*. The pimp makes his debut at the beginning of the play and is never seen again beyond line 280. More importantly, Goldberg points out that Sannio's main appearance in the first scene is a *contaminatio*—a close adaptation from Diphilus.⁷⁹ Aeschinus, the son of Micio, characterized as a *senex* lenient in his parenting style, brutally forces Sannio to surrender his brother's paramour, Bacchis, for a potentially profitable outcome for the *leno*.⁸⁰ Aeschinus orders his slave and muscle, Parmeno, to grab hold of Sannio as they manhandle the pimp and close out the deal:

[AE.] minis viginti tū illam emisti (quae res tibi vortat male!):
argenti tantum dabitur. [SA.] quid si ego tibi illam nolo vendere?
coges me? [AE.] minime. [SA.] namque id metui. [AE.] neque vendundam censeo
quae liberast; nam ego liberali illam adsero causa manu.
nunc vide utrum vis, argentum accipere an causam meditari tuam.
delibera hoc dum ego redeo, leno.

SANNIO

pro supreme Iuppiter,
minime miror qui insanire occipiunt ex iniuria.
domo me eripuit, verberavit; me invito abduxit meam
(ob male facta haec tantidem emptam postulat sibi tradier);
homini misero plus quingentos colaphos infregit mihi.
verum enim quando bene promeruit, fiat: suom ius postulat.

Adelphoe 191-201

⁷⁹ Goldberg (1986) 97-105. Plautus first adapted the play of Diphilus. Then Terence later adapted this scene (*Adelphoe* 155-196) which was not included in Plautus' play.

⁸⁰ In the following scene, Micio's slave, Syrus, tries to get it through Sannio's brain that loss of monetary profit at the present moment can commence an investment into a more lucrative social economic exchange i.e. *amicitia*. (*quasi iam usquam tibi sint viginti minae, dum huic obsequare!* Ter. *Ad.*, 223-4)

The dramatic ascending tricolon of action (*eripuit*, *verberavit*, *abduxit*, 198) neatly summarizes the violent and quick brute force the *leno* endured throughout the transaction. By blackmailing the pimp into his proposition, Aeschinus offers Sannio the same price the *leno* paid for the girl: (*nam ego liberali illam adsero causa manu\nunc vide utrum vis, argentum accipere an causam meditari tuam*, 194-5). Aeschinus gives Sannio a choice between selling the girl for zero profit or standing trial for selling off a free woman as a low class prostitute. In Sannio's view, this pact is a zero-sum game, a lose-lose situation in which he receives no immediate profit for handing over his property. However, the *leno*'s subsequent monologue echoes the language of *amicitia* in an ironic statement: (*verum enim quando bene promeruit, fiat: s<uo>m ius postulat*, 201). Sannio sarcastically says that Aeschinus earned the girl when in fact the *adulescens* has just arm-wrestled the pimp into this unfair bargain. The verb *promerere*, a cognate of the term *merita*—an interchangeable equivalent to the other terms of reciprocity (*beneficia*, *officia*)—suggests that the transaction just performed was the first reciprocal exchange between patron and client, even if the pimp is unaware of the bargain's existence. More telling of the complexity of this agreement between *adulescens* and *leno* is the fact that this bargain is a favor Aeschinus performs for his brother, Ctesiphon. Similar to Bacchis' circumstance, this business transaction is meant to oblige Sannio into an asymmetrical relationship against his will.

As opposed to being coerced into *amicitia*, the *parasitus*, Phormio, is patient and pre-meditating in his attempts to achieve more prestigious friendships with everyone in

the play. Moreover, this play is based on a “network of mutual benefaction”.⁸¹ Therefore this particular case study provides a rich basis for analysis. Although Phormio is considered the mastermind behind the plot of the play, Goldberg has rightfully observed that the *servus callidus*, Geta, controls the pacing of the play through his asides and incessant running around.⁸² It is in a conversation with Geta concerning Phormio’s course of action to solve Antipho’s problems that one learns Phormio’s philosophy of acquiring friends:

{GE.} quid ages? {PH.} quid vis nisi uti maneat Phanium atque ex crimine hoc
Antiphonem eripiam atque in me omnem iram derivem senis?
{GE.} o vir fortis atque amicus. verum hoc saepe, Phormio,
vereor, ne istaec fortitudo in nervom erumpat denique. {PH.} ah
non ita est: factumst periculum, iam pedum visast via.
quot me censes homines iam deverberasse usque ad necem,
hospites, tum civis? quo mage novi, tanto saepius.
cedo dum, enumquam iniuriarum audisti mihi scriptam dicam?

[Ge] What are you going to do?

[Ph] Well, what do you want? You want Phanium to stay,
don’t you, and me to slip Antipho our from under the
trouble he’s in and get his father to turn all his resentment on me. Isn’t that right?

[Ge] You’ve got courage and you’re a real friend. But
Phormio, I worry for fear that courage of yours is going
to land you on the chain gang one of these days.

[Ph] Oh, no, it won’t. I’ve run the risk; I know
my way around now. How many people do you think
I’ve already thrashed soundly until destruction, foreigners
and citizens, both? The more I learned, the oftener I did it.
Now tell me, did you ever hear of anybody suing me for
damages?

Phormio 322-29

⁸¹ Moore (2001) 257.

⁸² Goldberg (1986) 75-79. Geta is privy to crucial information and “shapes the comedy of the first two confrontations between Phormio and Demipho.”

When Geta questions Phormio's dedication in aiding Antipho's cause, Phormio shows determination to follow through with his plan. Geta then replies by saying that Phormio is both brave and a friend (*fortis atque amicus*, 324). Phormio's first appearance is part of a longstanding comedic trope where the parasite establishes the characterization of the *parasitus*.⁸³ One can hear the internal alliteration of the 's' sound in line 327. The hissing sound alludes to the smarmy and sneaky nature of the parasite slithering his way into exploiting people. *Deverberasse*, a rare term used elsewhere only one other time, carries a particularly weighty hissing sound, expressing the parasitic sucking noise that eats away at a man until nothing is remaining. Phormio boasts of his experience with sucking men dry of their livelihood, while appearing to be an *amicus* in the process.

Geta impersonates Phormio's voice and plan verbatim in the opening of the play. Phormio has contrived a plan to have Antipho marry the penniless orphaned girl, Phanium. There is a law that states the next of kin must marry an orphaned female or find her a husband. As a result of this law, Phormio pretends to be a witness, confirming Antipho's relation to Phanium, in order that they can marry. By the end of the play, it is revealed that the girl's father is Antipho's uncle, Chremes. However, the money secured for Antipho's marriage was mismanaged and given to Phaedria's cause. Phaedria's case adds another problem to the plot until Phormio becomes aware of Chremes' bigamous lifestyle and reveals the truth to his wife, Nausistrata, at the end of the play. Phormio's scheming nature is immediately revealed in the aforementioned scheme and also his intentions for potential friendship with the cousins'—Antipho's and Phaedria's—

⁸³ ibid. 255-6.

family.⁸⁴ Phormio says that he will pretend to be a friend of the girl's father: (*paternum amicum me adsimulabo virginis*, 128). The term *amicus* foreshadows Phormio's tenacious attempts to acquire an advantageous friendship with Antipho's family. Once Phormio has encountered Demipho, who has just found out that his son has secretly wed, he tries to confuse Antipho's father about the legal procedures concerning the next-of-kin law and then immediately asks to be his friend:

[Ph]: quin quod est
ferendum fers? tuis dignum factis feceris,
ut amici inter nos simus [De]: ego tuam expetam
amicitiam? aut te visum aut auditum velim?

[Ph]: Why don't you just accept it? The kind of man you are,
You and I ought to be friends.

[De]: *Me*? Be friends with *you*? I wish I'd never seen
or heard of you.

Phormio 430-3

The irony of this scene is that Phormio has technically already established a friendship with Demipho's family by performing the favor for Antipho. Phormio said that he would "act the part" (*adsimulabo*, 128) i.e. he would become Phanium's legal guardian (*paternum anicum*) in the case. Although Chremes is technically Phanium's biological father, Phormio weasels his way into the role with ease and has become a part of Demipho's and Chremes' family network, whether they like it or not. When Demipho

⁸⁴ Smith (2004) n20. Smith interprets Phormio's contract with Antipho as an investment in a future patron whereas Moore sees Phormio as the slightly more altruistic, not stereotypical parasite who accrues limited benefits. I argue for Phormio's desperation to become a *cliens/amicus* not just of Antipho but the entire family. In his suggestion to ask Phormio for help to obtain money for Phaedria's music girl, Geta points out the longing Phormio has for friendship: (*praestost: audacissime oneri' quidvis inpone, ecferet; solus est homo amico amicus*. == You don't have to worry. Put any load on him that you like; he'll walk away with it. He's a real friend in need, he is. 561-2)

indignantly replies to Phormio's request above, the enjambment of *amicitia* in line 433 catches Demipho off-guard. More telling is the reason Phormio claims they should be friends. Phormio makes a character judgment, saying that he admires Demipho's actions (*tuis...factis*); he flatters Demipho in order to cajole him into becoming his *patronus*. This flattery emerges even more in the following scene at the end of the play after Phormio reveals the secret to Chremes' wife, Nausistrata, that her husband has been leading a double life:

{PH.} enimvero priu' quam haec dat veniam, mihi prospiciam et Phaedriae.
heus Nausistrata, priu' quam huic respondes temere, audi. {NA.} quid est?
{PH.} ego minas triginta per fallaciam ab illoc abstuli:
<ea>s dedi t<uo> gnato: is pro sua amica lenoni dedit.
{CH.} hem quid ais? {NA.} adeo hoc indignum tibi videtur, filius
homo adulescens si habet unam amicam, tu uxores duas?
nil pudere! quo ore illum obiurgabi'? responde mihi.
{DE.} faciet **ut voles**. {NA.} immo ut meam iam scias sententiam,
neque ego ignosco neque promitto quicquam neque respondeo
priu' quam gnatum video: ei(u)s iudicio permitto omnia:
quod is iubebit faciam. {PH.} mulier sapiens es, Nausistrata.
{NA.} sati' tibi<n> est? {PH.} immo vero pulchre discedo et probe
et praeter spem. {NA.} tu t<uo>m nomen dic quid est. {PH.} mihin? Phormio:
vostrae familiae hercle **amicus** et tuo summu' Phaedriae.
{NA.} Phormio, at ego ecastor posthac tibi quod potero, **quae voles**
faciamque et dicam. {PH.} benigne dici'. {NA.} pol **meritumst** tuom.

[Ph] (*aside*): Oh-oh! Before she forgives him,
I'll take care of my own interests, and Phaedria's too. (*To Nausistrata*)
I beg your pardon, Nausistrata! Don't be in too much of a hurry
to answer him. Listen to me.

[Na] What is it?

[Ph] I got three thousand drachmas out of your husband by a little
scheme of mine, and I gave it to your son. He took it and paid it
to a pimp for a girl he was in love with.

[Ch] What? What's that?

[Na] Well! Does that seem so awful to you, Chremes, if your son,
who's a young man, has one mistress, while you have two wives?
Completely shameless, that's what you are! How will

you have the audacity to say anything to him about it?
Just answer me that.

[De] He'll do anything you want.

[Na] No, no, I want you all to know exactly how I feel. I'm not going to forgive him; I'm not going to promise anything; I'm not going to say one word more until I see my son. I'll leave everything for him to decide, and I'll do whatever he says.

[Ph] You're a wise woman, Nausistrata.

[Na] Does that suit you?

[Ph] Suit me? It certainly does! I'm coming out of this very well—much better than I expected.

[Na] Who are you? What's your name?

[Ph] Who am I? I'm Phormio, a true friend to your whole family, madam, and a very special friend of Phaedria.

[Na] Phormio, is it? Well, my heavens! From now on, if there's anything I can do for you, I'll be only happy to do it.

Phormio 1036-51

Before Nausistrata has a chance to subdue her anger in response to the news that her husband, Chremes, has been leading a bigamist lifestyle, Phormio in an aside weasles his way into the conversation so that he may garner benefit for himself and for Phaedria: *enimvero priu' quam haec dat veniam, mihi prospiciam et Phaedriae*, 1036. Then, when Nausistrata decides to let her son, Phaedria, decide how to handle Chremes' shocking news, Phormio flatters Nausistrata, by calling her a wise woman (*mulier sapiens*, 1046). He meanders into her good graces, as she reprimands her husband's infidelity. Phormio, however, protects both himself *and* Phaedria in this process; he does not simply exploit Nausistrata's anger for his personal benefit. He calls Phaedria his best friend (*summu' Phaedria*, 1049) immediately after he tells his future patroness his name. Later in the conversation, he says that she is kind (*benigne dici'*, 1051). When Nausistrata asks Phormio if her decision to leave the decision-making to Phaedria was satisfactory,

Phormio replies with the following: *immo vero pulchre discedo et probe\et praeter spem*, 1047-8. The parasite says that he has received beyond (*praeter*) what he expected; in addition to helping his friend, Phaedria, he is forming an advantageous alliance with Nausistrata against Chremes. Her referral to Phormio's approval in the matter indicates that she is building a trust with him at this very moment (*sati' tibi<n> est?*). After she asks Phormio his name, he replies that he is an *amicus* to both Nausistrata's family and to her son Phaedria in line 1049. Here, *amicus* is situated in the center of the line, surrounded by the family (*vostrae familiae*) and Phaedria (*tuō summu' Phaedriae*), demonstrating that Phormio has been in the thick of the family's dilemmas.

Similar to the scene of Laches and Bacchis mentioned above, the language of political and socio-economic reciprocity is additionally used in this scene. As a response to Nausistrata's question about explaining this situation to Phaedria, Demipho says that Chremes will do whatever his wife wishes (*faciet ut voles*, 1043). Laches tells Bacchis she may have whatever she wishes (*ut voles*, 764), provided that she uses their friendship well. Nausistrata then turns around and says that she will do whatever Phormio desires (*quae voles\ faciam*, 1050-1). The phrase (*ut voles*) suggests that there exists an asymmetrical, quasi-economic relationship between the persons involved: (1) Laches promises to provide as many things as Bacchis wishes, forcing her into his clientele; (2) Since Chremes' wife is wealthier than he is, this makes Nausistrata the more powerful partner in the relationship, though they are husband and wife; (3) Phormio acquires an approving patroness, who believes his words above her own husband's. Phormio can acquire as much as he desires in exchange for the knowledge he reveals to Nausistrata. In

addition, Nausistrata says that Phormio earned (*meritumst*, 1051) her goodwill. This final word of reciprocal exchange between this unequal pair summarizes the efforts a person of inferior rank, such as Phormio, has put forth to obtain an *amicitia* with a patroness as powerful as Nausistrata. Their political ties are established and Phormio has acquired the most adavantageous *amica*.

We learn from the aforementioned pairs of unequal rank that favors, flattery and sometimes coercion are essential to forming these asymmetrical *amicitiae*. These friendships tend to lack affection (although not necessarily), are economic and political in nature, and most importantly benefit the person of inferior rank more because he/she has obtained the opportunity to prolong a continuous quasi-economical and socio-political relationship beyond his/her own rank. These *amicitiae*, especially in the cases of Thais and Bacchis, can: (1) provide future stability for persons with unstable occupations; (2) establish important and durable business relationships such as Aeschinus and the pimp, Sannio; (3) can sustain lackadaisical lifestyles such as Phormio; and (3) can be open and affectionate like Simo and Sosia. It can be concluded that the relationships examined above in this chapter enact the language of *amicitia* but at their foundation and core are utilitarian. By definition, these bonds resemble a patron-client relationship in function. According to Konstan, a patron-client relationship is veiled by the language of *amicitia*. The parties involved in Terence's unequal relationships, however, do not seem to use these terms as merely euphemisms but as a natural part of their daily speech. When Phormio says that he wishes to be an *amicus* to Demipho, it is true that the parasite implicitly means that he wishes to acquire the old man as his patron. However, this does

not mean that their relationship will always remain on a platonic level. Eventually their relationship can evolve into an alliance as loyal and affectionate as the master and freedman, Sosia and Simo, should the alliance endure a long length of time. Trust cannot simply be measured and acquired at the first stages of getting to know a friend. Pamphilus and Charinus of the *Andria* teach us that men of equal rank can maintain an *amicitia* but still not trust each other. However, their friendship cannot be simply categorized as utilitarian. They are young men, trying to negotiate their duties to society and family; they are allowed time to develop a *fides*. Therefore, Terence's unequal relationships tell us that *amicitiae* can encompass both equals and unequals because they share the language of friendship *and* similar features.

CONCLUSION

To reiterate the main terms above from the introduction, *amicitia*—Roman friendship is delineated by the late Republican and high Imperial Roman sources as an ideal reciprocal relationship between elite Roman males. When this relationship is asymmetrical, this relationship is called patronage or clientship. According to these definitions, reciprocity of services is necessary for *amicitia* to exist whereas affection does not necessarily have to be a component. Openness and frankness are characteristics of a true *amicus* whereas flattery marks out a social climber or parasitic individual i.e. a fake friend. According to Treggiari, scarce evidence from the second and third centuries BCE leaves one wondering whether *amicitiae* reflected these ideals or provided more questions or even a more nuanced depiction of friendship during the periods preceding the evidence available to us. Terence's plays, written in mid-second century BCE provide several case studies that can test these ideals presented in the sources of Cicero, Seneca, Caesar and Octavian.

Terence's six extant plays—*Andria*, *Adelphoe*, *Heauton Timorumenos*, *Eunuch*, *Hecyra* and *Phormio*—consist of relationships between equals (fathers/*senes* and sons/*adulescentes*) and unequal (*senes/adulescentes* and prostitutes/pimps/freedmen/parasites). *Amicitiae* between elite Roman males in the plays of Terence presents a variety of nuanced relationships because Terence's plays are interested in character development. Thus, the characters are more fleshed out and three-dimensional, especially in comparison to a fairly contemporary source of *comparanda*, Plautus. For example, Terence's childhood friendships, regardless of status, have a strong sense of affection and loyalty. The *senes* of the *Andria*, Chremes and Simo, exemplify

this type of bond. They grew up together since childhood and, as mentioned above, care deeply for one another partly because their relationship developed over time. Simo, however, can be domineering at times. Nevertheless, Chremes accepts this less than pleasant characteristic of his old friend because they are familiar with each other's idiosyncracies. Simo and Sosia of the same play have also been familiar with each other since childhood. Similar to Chremes' behavior with his old friend, Sosia demonstrates a frankness and comfort with his former master. Therefore Terence broadens and nuances the category of asymmetrical *amicitia* by including an example of an affectionate relationship in his works, not merely the ideal business-oriented and socio-politically charged unequal alliance.

Terence also challenges the idea that socio-economic, practical and utilitarian *amicitia* remain purely at this level. Laches and Phidippus of the *Hecyra* and Micio and Demea of the *Adelphoe* would probably not even be acquaintances were it not for the fact that their children and familial obligations bind them together. Phidippus views Laches and his son as an investment for his dowry; both *senes* are close to business partners. The threat of divorce forces them to converse with each other and develop a relationship beyond the marriage contract, but their *amicitia* begins as mostly utilitarian. Micio and Demea considerably disagree in parenting styles and demeanor. Demea, however, by the end of the *Adelphoe* sees his brother's point-of-view on parenting and becomes a more benign parent. Through this action, Demea could be developing a more than civil rapport with his brother, Micio. *Amicitia* in Terence's play, thus, offers one insight into the varying personalities and character portrayals in his works.

The language of *amicitia* (*amicitia/amicus, familiaritas/familiaris*) and its respective terms of reciprocal exchange (*beneficium, gratia, meritum*) are used by both pairs of equal and unequal status. Terence's presentation of conversations of the terminology supports the conclusion from available evidence that: (1) measurement of benefaction is indeterminate and (2) the terms are interchangeable. The standard term for Roman friendship (*amicitia*) can be interchangeable with other terms such as *familiaritas* and still mean the same type of relationship. Since the language of *amicitia* is fluid across terms and can be used by characters regardless of status, wealth and gender then one learns from Terence's evidence that all his characters broaden the bounds of *amicitia*: a prostitute's client or patron can be an *amicus*, a dear old friend can be an *amicus*, a business partner can be an *amicus*, etc. The underlying meaning of the term can only be determined by context. The interaction of the characters in Terence's plays provides this context in which one can discern the nuanced meanings of these terms.

Bibliography

- Anderson, W.S. 2004. “The Invention of Sosia for the *Andria*”, *Ramus* 33.1: 10-19.
- Arnott, W. G. 1976. “‘Phormio Parasitus’: A Study in Dramatic Methods of Characterization.”, *Greece and Rome* 17.1:32-57.
- Ashmore, S. 1908. *The Comedies of Terence*. Oxford.
- Badian, E. 1958. *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Braund, S.M. 2005. “Marriage, adultery and divorce in Roman comic drama” in *Satiric advice on women and marriage: from Plautus to Chaucer*. University of Michigan Press.
- Burton, P. J. 2004. “Amicitia in Plautus: A Study of Roman Friendship Processes”, *American Journal of Philology* 125: 209-243.
- Brunt, P.A. 1965. “*Amicitia* in the Late Roman Republic”, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* XI: 1-20.
- Copley, F.O.1967. *The Comedies of Terence*. University of Michigan Press.
- Crisafulli, T. 1993. “Representations of the Feminine: The Prostitute of Roman Comedy”, Ancient history in a modern university: proceedings of a conference held at Macquerie University and the retirement from the Chair of Professor Edwin Judge.
- Drummond, A. 1989. “Chapter 4: Early Roman *clientes*” in *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Routledge: London, New York.
- Dunsch, B. 1999. “Some notes on the understanding of Terence, ‘Heauton Timorumenos’ 6: ‘Comoedia Duplex, argumentum simplex’, and Hellenistic scholarship. *C&M* 50: 97-131.
- Fantham, E. 1971. “*Heautontimorumenos* and the *Adelphoe*: A Study in Fatherhood in Terence and Menander, *Latomus* 30: 970-98.
- Fitzgerald, J.T. (ed.) 1996. *Friendship, Flattery and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World*. E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Gelzer, M. 1969. *The Roman Nobility*. Oxford.

- _____. (ed.) 1997. *Greco-Roman perspectives on friendship*. Scholars Press: Atlanta, GA.
- _____. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore, MD.
- Goldberg, S.M. 1986. *Understanding Terence*. Princeton.
- _____. S.M. 1981. "Scholarship on Terence", *Classical World* 75: (84-86; 100-102?)
- Gowers, E. 2004. "The Plot Thickens: Hidden Outlines in Terence's Prologues", *Ramus* 33.1:
- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1963. *Le vocabulaire latin des Relations et des partis politiques sous la république*. La Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Université de Lille.
- Hunter, R. L. 1985. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge University Press.
- Karakasis, E. 2002. "A reading of the introductory scene of Terence' *Heautotimoroumenos*", *Dodone: Filologia* 31: 247-262.
- Konstan, D. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge.
- Lape, S. 2004. "The Terentian Marriage Plot: Reproducing Fathers and Sons", *Ramus* 33.1: 20-34.
- Leigh, M. 2004. *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford.
- McCarthy, K. 2004. "The Joker in the Pack: Slaves in Terence", *Ramus* 33.1: 100-19.
- McGarrity, T. 1978. "Thematic Unity in Terence's *Andria*", *TAPHA* 108: 103-114.
- Moore, T. 1998. "Music and Structure in Roman Comedy", *The American Journal of Philology* 119.2: 245-73.
- _____. 2001. "Who is the Parasite? Giving and taking in "Phormio", *Terence and Roman New Comedy: Translation and Interpretation of Four Representative Plays*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Penwill, J.L. 2004. "The Unlovely Lover of Terence's *Hecyra*", *Ramus* 33.1: 130-149.
- Raccanelli, R. 1998. L amicitia nelle commedie di Plauto: Un' indagine antropologica. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Saller, P. 1982. *Personal patronage under the early Empire*. Cambridge University Press.

- Saylor, Charles. 2008. "Inclusion and exclusion of characters in the New Comedy society in Plautus and Terence" in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman history* 14: 115-30.
- Smith, J. A. 2004. "Buy young, sell old: playing the market economies of Phormio and Terence", *Ramus*, 33.1: 82-99.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (ed.). 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Routledge: London, New York.