

P. G. McC. BROWN

MENANDER, FRAGMENTS 745 AND 746 K–T, MENANDER'S *KOLAX*, AND
PARASITES AND FLATTERERS IN GREEK COMEDY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 92 (1992) 91–107

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

MENANDER, FRAGMENTS 745 AND 746 K-T, MENANDER'S *KOLAX*,
AND PARASITES AND FLATTERERS IN GREEK COMEDY

I. Do fragments 745 and 746 come from Menander's *Kolax*?

I.1 Towards the end of his work 'On praising oneself without giving offence' Plutarch quotes two passages which he says are from Menander. Warning us of the danger that we may be led to praise ourselves when we hear ourselves praised others, he says (*Mor.*547C):

ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν κολακεύοντες αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ
γαργαλίζουσι καὶ φυσῶσιν, ἔνιοι δὲ κακοήθως οἷόν τι δέλεαρ μικρὸν
εὐλογίας ὑποβάλλοντες ἐκκαλοῦνται τὴν περιαιτολογία, οἱ δὲ
προσπυθάνονται καὶ διερωτῶσιν, ὡς παρὰ τῷ Μενάνδρῳ τὸν στρατιώτην,
ἵνα γελάσωσιν·

'πῶς τὸ τραῦμα τοῦτ' ἔχεις;
'μεσαγκύλω.' 'πῶς πρὸς θεῶν;' 'ἐπὶ κλίμακα
πρὸς τεῖχος ἀναβαίνων.' ἐγὼ μὲν δεικνύω
ἐσπουδακῶς, οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἐπεμυκτήρισαν.

(Now some tickle these men as it were by flattery and puff them up; others maliciously throw out a little tribute as a kind of bait to elicit self-praise; still others press for details and interrogate them for the fun of it, as with Menander's soldier:

'What made this scar?' 'A javelin.' 'O please
Tell us the story.' 'I was on a ladder
Scaling a wall.' - I in all seriousness
Proceed to demonstrate; and then once more
They sneered at me.)¹

And a little further on (547D-E) he says:

... ὅπου καὶ κόλακι καὶ
παρασίτῳ καὶ δεομένῳ δύσοιστον ἐν χρεῖα καὶ δυσεγκαρτέρητον ἑαυτὸν

¹ The translation is taken from the Loeb edition of Plutarch by P.H.De Lacy and B.Einarson, with a small adjustment to the punctuation of the third line of the Menander quotation. A more precise translation of ἐπὶ κλίμακα κτλ in lines 2-3 would be 'climbing up on to a ladder against a wall'; I am not convinced that κλίμακα needs to be changed, though Koerte-Thierfelder and Sandbach accept Meineke's correction to κλίμακι (or κλίμακος) in their Menander editions. On the interpretation of δεικνύω ἐσπουδακῶς see below, section I.4.

ἐγκωμιάζων πλούσιός τις ἢ σατράπης ἢ βασιλεύς, καὶ συμβολὰς ταύτας ἀποτίνειν μεγίστας λέγουσιν, ὡς ὁ παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ·

σφάττει με, λεπτὸς γίνομ' εὐωχούμενος·
τὰ σκώμμαθ' οἷα τὰ σοφὰ καὶ στρατηγικά·
οἶος δ' ἀλαζῶν ἐστὶν ἀλιτήριος.

ταῦτα γὰρ οὐ πρὸς στρατιώτας μόνον οὐδὲ νεοπλούτους εὐπάρυφα καὶ σοβαρὰ διηγήματα περαίνοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς σοφιστὰς καὶ φιλοσόφους καὶ στρατηγούς ὄγκωμένους ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ μεγαληγοροῦντας εἰωθότες πάσχειν καὶ λέγειν . . .

Menander quotation line 2 σκώμαθ' G¹H¹Y τὰ στρατιωτικὰ καὶ σοφὰ G, σοφὰ τε καὶ J¹corr-PZ 1-2 εὐωχούμενος τὰ σκωμμάτια τὰ σοφὰ τε καὶ στρατηγικά Meineke, εὐωχ. κομπάσματα vel sim. G.A.Hirschig, *Annotationes Criticae* (Utrecht, 1849), 25-6, εὐωχ. τὰ σκεμμάτια τὰ σοφὰ τε καὶ στρατηγικά ('callida ista et imperatoria consilia') H.van Herwerden, *Mnem.ser.*2.6 (1878), 78, εὐωχ. τὰ σκέμματ' ἀεὶ τὰ σοφὰ καὶ στρατηγικά Kock line 3 οἷς NRh

('Why even a flatterer, a hanger-on, a man in need, finds it hard in his necessity to stomach and endure a rich man or satrap or king bestowing praises on himself, and calls it the most exorbitant reckoning he ever paid. Witness the character in Menander:

He murders me. The feasting makes me thin.
Good God! The wit! The military wit!
What airs he gives himself, the blasted windbag!

These are the feelings and language to which we are prompted not only by soldiers and the newly rich with their flaunting and ostentatious talk, but also by sophists, philosophers, and commanders who are full of their own importance and hold forth on the theme...')²

These two passages appear as frs.745 and 746 respectively in the Koerte-Thierfelder edition of Menander³, among the fragments which cannot be assigned to particular plays, although the editors note the possibility that they might both be from *Kolax* ('The Toady', 'The Flatterer'). This was suggested for the first passage by C.G.Cobet, *Variae Lectiones* (ed.2, Leiden, 1873), 317, a suggestion dismissed by Kock with the enigmatic note 'sed cf. 58. Lucian.Dial.Meretr.9 et 13'⁴. On the second passage Kock notes that it is tempting to assign the lines to *Kolax* or *Thrasyleon*, 'sed non minus incertum'. Similarly D.Del Corno (*Menandro, Le Commedie*, Milan, 1966) notes the possibility that these passages might be

² Again the translation is taken from the Loeb edition. On the text, punctuation and interpretation of the Menander quotation see below, sections I.2 and I.3.

³ = Menander frs. 562 and 563 Kock; Kock takes Plutarch's words συμβολὰς ... μεγίστας to be a further echo of Menander and starts fr.563 with the line ταύτας μεγίστας ἀποτίνω 'γὼ συμβολὰς. On this see Koerte-Thierfelder, vol.2, p.235 top.

⁴ Kock's fr.58 of Menander is fr.942 K-T, regarded by Koerte as more probably from tragedy and included among the tragic adespotas as fr.450 by both Nauck and Kannicht-Snell.

from *Kolax* at p.479 n.21 but does not include them among the fragments of the play in his edition. F.H.Sandbach does not even mention the possibility, either in the Oxford Classical Text of Menander or in A.W.Gomme-F.H.Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary* (Oxford, 1973), although fr.745 is included in the former and discussed in the latter.

Kock is right to point out that *Kolax* is not only the possible play; and Cobet produced no argument to support his assignation to it of fr.745. There is in fact a stronger case for assigning fr.746 to *Kolax*, since there are some close links between it and what we know of the play. Although the case is not conclusive, it may be worth spelling it out, if only to defend the word σκώμματα in line 2 from the suspicion that fell upon it in the nineteenth century.

I.2 First, a few words about the text of fr.746 (the second passage). As can be seen from the apparatus criticus above, Meineke suggested taking εὐωχούμενος together with v.2 ('I grow thin from feasting on his jokes'), and he was followed by Hirschig ('feasting on his boasts')⁵, Herwerden and Kock ('feasting on his plans'). This made it necessary to change οἶα in v.2; but in view of οἶος in v.3 it is preferable to keep οἶα and to take v.2 as a self-contained exclamation, parallel with the exclamation in v.3. Metre then requires the omission of τε.

Hirschig objected to τὰ σκώμματα that it is the soldier's self-praise of which the speaker complains, not his jokes. Herwerden accepted this objection ('Bene enim Hirschigius intellexit *iocis imperatoris* locum non esse') but proposed τὰ σκεμμάτια as a less violent change than Hirschig's κομπάσματα. Kock found Herwerden's (invented) diminutive inappropriate to the context of a soldier's boasting and preferred to read τὰ σκέμματα.

I think it unlikely that Menander would have used σκέμματα (or σκεμμάτια) to mean 'plans'. But more importantly, σκώμματα receives support from fr.3 of Menander's *Kolax* and from Terence, *Eunuchus* 391-433, which make it clear that a parasite might well wish to complain about a soldier's jokes (see below).⁶ Hirschig is right that Plutarch quotes the passage to illustrate how disgusting self-praise can be, not to warn against making jokes; but v.3 is enough to justify Plutarch's inclusion of these lines (he does not have to find a passage in which every detail is relevant), and in any case the distinction is not clear-cut since Terence shows us a soldier praising himself for his jokes.

⁵ Hirschig did not say how he would continue line 2 after the first word.

⁶ If anything is wrong with the line, it is perhaps στρατηγικά; G's στρατιωτικά (though not G's word-order) may be more appropriate.

I.3 Now to the case for supposing fr.746 to come from *Kolax* itself. As Koerte notes, Plutarch knew that play and quotes from it in 'How to tell a flatterer from a friend' (*Mor.* 57A). There too he discusses the danger of praise (the section begins at 56F Διὸ φυλακτέον ἐστὶ μάλιστα τὸν κόλακα περὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους, 'For this reason we must be especially on our guard against the flatterer in the matter of his praises'⁷), and he speaks of the soldier Bias and his toadying sidekick Strouthias who 'walks all over Bias and dances a jig over his stupidity when he praises him' (ἐμπεριπατῶν τῷ Βίαντι καὶ κατορχούμενος τῆς ἀναισθησίας αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐπαίνοις). Again he does not name the play, or in this case even the author, but we know from other evidence that he must be referring to Menander's *Kolax*.

Fr.746 is spoken by a character in the same situation as Strouthias (cf. Plutarch's words κόλακι καὶ παρασίτῳ καὶ δεομένῳ), a parasite who has to put up with the boastfulness (v.3 ἀλαζών) of a soldier (v.2 στρατηγικά). In particular (if we trust Plutarch's manuscripts), this character complains about the soldier's jokes or jibes (v.2 σκώμματα).

Menander, *Kolax* fr.3 is quoted by Plutarch at *Mor.*57A and runs γελῶ τὸ πρὸς τὸν Κύπριον ἐννοούμενος, 'I'm laughing because I'm thinking of that joke against the Cypriot'. It is echoed in Gnatho's remark at Terence, *Eunuchus* 497-8, in response to the soldier Thraso's question *quid rides?* ('What are you laughing at?'), *istuc quod dixti modo. / et illud de Rhodio dictum quom in mentem venit*, 'At what you just said - and because I'm thinking of that joke about the Rhodian'. We know from Terence's prologue (*Eun.*30-3) that Gnatho and Thraso have been imported into his play from Menander's *Kolax*, and they are clearly Strouthias and Bias under different names. *Eun.*391-433 shows Thraso boasting and Gnatho both praising and mocking him, just as Plutarch tells us Strouthias mocked Bias while praising him. Thraso boasts of his charm (395-6), of the fact that he was the trusted confidant and right-hand man of the king with whom he was serving (397-407), and of the trenchant wit with which he scored points off others in the king's entourage (410-433); the climax of his boasting is an anecdote about a display of his wit at a dinner-party at the expense of a young man from Rhodes (419-433), and it is to this that Gnatho refers back at 497-8. Terence has evidently changed Menander's Cypriot to a Rhodian, perhaps because jokes about Rhodians were particularly topical at Rome in the 160s B.C.⁸

In other words, fr.746 fits very well with what we know of Menander's *Kolax*. There is nothing to correspond with it in Terence's *Eunuchus*,⁹ but apart from fr.3 of *Kolax* there is

⁷ Loeb translation by F.C.Babbitt.

⁸ It is generally believed that the soldier's 'joke' against the Cypriot in Menander consisted in addressing him as βούς Κύπριος (*Kolax* fr.8), 'Cypriot bullock', i.e. 'shit-eater'. If so, Terence has changed the joke at *Eun.*425-6. It has been suggested as his reason for doing this that the allusion would not have been intelligible to a Roman audience (cf. Gomme-Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary*, p.432); but the alleged habits of Cypriot bulls had been known to Ennius, *Varia* 26 V.

⁹ The figurative use of *iugularas* at *Eun.*417 is not unlike that of σφάττει in v.1, but the context is quite different.

in fact no overlap in detail between Terence's scene and the little that we know of the equivalent scene in Menander's play; Terence has not reproduced fr.2, where Bias boasts of his drinking ability, nor fr.4, where it is no doubt Strouthias who addresses Bias and lists the girl-friends he has had.¹⁰ On our present evidence, it is rather the general framework of this scene of boasting and flattery that Terence has preserved.

Does εὐωχούμενος (v.l) suggest that this remark is an aside uttered at a dinner which was shown taking place on stage? If so, this could constitute a further link with *Kolax*, though the matter is uncertain. In *Kolax* fr.1 a cook is shown presiding over religious ceremonies for the dining club of τετραδισταί; could Bias and Strouthias have been present at this dinner, and was it shown to the audience in an extended scene? F.Leo ('Menanders *Kolax*', *NGG* 1903, 673-92) believed that this was indeed the case, that the dinner was 'without doubt the central event in the plot'¹¹, and that Bias was the host. This last is an unnecessary assumption¹², and Leo's reconstruction of the plot of *Kolax* is based on a number of assumptions which are not widely shared today. Nonetheless it remains possible that Bias and Strouthias were shown participating in a dinner party on stage; the counter-arguments of G.Jachmann, *NGG* 1921, 75 (and 86 n.2) are not overwhelming.¹³ If there was such a dinner on stage, perhaps it was the context of the famous boasting-scene between Bias and Strouthias which Terence has adapted to a different context at *Eunuchus* 391ff¹⁴; fr.746 would fit very snugly, as would Bias' boasting of his drinking ability in *Kolax* fr.2 and of his wit at another dinner party in Terence's scene.

But a possible alternative interpretation of εὐωχούμενος is that the parasite is here describing in narrative a dinner at which he and the soldier were present; if so, fr.746 comes from a different sort of scene altogether - but it could still come from *Kolax*.¹⁵

¹⁰ I do not know why F.Leo, *NGG* 1903, 687 says that these words can only have been addressed to Bias by the pimp.

¹¹ 'Kein Zweifel, daß das Gelage der Tetradisten im Mittelpunkt der Handlung stand' (p.687).

¹² As far as I can work out from p.683 it is bolstered by his taking ἐστιάτωρ δεσπότης together in v.12, though it is clear that Leo for some reason took it for granted in any case.

¹³ There are party scenes on stage in Plautus, *Asin.*828ff, *Most.*308ff, *Persa* 757ff and *Stichus* 683ff (cf. G.Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952), 126-7), and it is possible - though disputed - that Menander's *Synaristosai* began with a scene or tableau of women taking a meal together (see the discussion in *Ménandre*, ed. E.G.Turner (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique xvi, Vandœuvres-Genève 1970), 35-9).

¹⁴ P.Oxy.3534, included in the 2nd edition (1990) of Sandbach's Oxford Classical Text, p.174, perhaps shows that there was a third person present at this boasting-scene (if indeed there was only one such scene in the play), but does not otherwise help to give it a dramatic context.

¹⁵ Yet another possibility is that εὐωχούμενος applies more generally to the parasite's relationship with the soldier; one could imagine fr.746 coming in a similar context to Ter. *Eun.*1084-5, though we cannot say whether that passage derives from Menander's *Kolax* (see P.G.McC.Brown, 'The Bodmer codex of Menander and the endings of Terence's *Eunuchus* and other Roman comedies' in *Relire Ménandre*, ed. E.Handley and A.Hurst (Geneva, 1990), 37-61).

I.4 In fr.745 the soldier is showing a scar and describing how he was wounded to an audience who jeer at him. Koerte, following Cobet and Kock, takes the speaker of the passage to be a parasite describing how he led the soldier on to boast and make himself look ridiculous. This is supported by Sandbach (Gomme-Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary*, p.720). (In this case, the last four words of the passage must be translated 'and then once more they sneered at him', not 'at me'.) The hardest words to accommodate on this view are, I think, δεικνύω ἐσπουδακώς (vv.3-4); but Sandbach explains: 'the man who is making fun of him can point out the wound in mock-seriousness'.¹⁶ Thierfelder more straightforwardly supposes the soldier to be the speaker, and so evidently do De Lacy and Einarson in the Loeb translation quoted at the beginning of this paper. Against this, Sandbach notes: 'A soldier who recounted his own discomfiture would be an unusual figure'; but that is perhaps not an overwhelming objection. If Thierfelder is right, the questions in vv.1-2 could be asked by the group whose reactions the soldier is describing; we cannot be sure that they are asked by a single Strouthias-like character. On the other hand, if Cobet and the others are right, this is another passage which shows a parasite managing to turn a soldier into an object of mockery while pretending to admire him. It could not easily come from the scene on which Ter.*Eun.*391ff. is based, but it could come from a narrative monologue in the mouth of the parasite at some other point in Menander's *Kolax*.

It may be objected to this that neither Menander's Bias (on our present evidence) nor Terence's Thraso boasts of any military exploits. This is indeed a rather striking gap in their presentation (in comparison with, say, the boasting of Pyrgopolynices in the opening scene of Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*); the nearest we get to it is Thraso's claim at *Eun.*402-3 that the king had entrusted his whole army and all his planning to him. On the other hand, it would certainly not be surprising if Menander's Bias did boast of his military achievements among other things; and at Ter.*Eun.*480-3 it is assumed to be characteristic of Thraso to boast of his battles and show off his scars. Here a contrast is made between Thraso and his rival for the love of the prostitute Thais, in the following terms (480-3): 'And the man who sent these gifts doesn't demand that you should live for him alone and that everyone else should be shut out on his account. He doesn't recount his battles or show off his scars or cramp your style, as a certain person does'.¹⁷ Did Terence include this detail because he had found it in Menander's *Kolax*, in a passage which he did not himself use when he adapted some scenes from that play in his *Eunuchus*? The case is not compelling, and altogether fr.745 does not

¹⁶ Less plausibly, Cobet suggested that δεικνύω ἐσπουδακώς means δεικνύω ὅτι ἐσπούδακα ('*serium vultum ostendo quasi his omnibus habeam fidem*'), as in the construction δείξω ἔτι ζῶν. Kock quotes Cobet, apparently with approval, and Liddell & Scott take the passage thus at δεικνύμι 4.

¹⁷ atque haec qui misit non sibi soli postulat
te vivere et sua causa excludi ceteros,
neque pugnas narrat neque cicatrices suas
ostentat neque tibi obstat, quod quidam facit.

fit as neatly as fr.746 with the rest of what is known of Menander's *Kolax*. Nor does Plutarch say that the two passages come from the same play. Nonetheless, there is a case for assigning both (however tentatively) to *Kolax*, particularly if fr.745 is thought to be spoken by a parasite. I certainly think there is a stronger case for these fragments than for fr.520 K-T, attributed to *Kolax* by H.J.Mette, *Lustrum* 25 (1983), 19¹⁸, or even for *Kolax* fr.9 Sandbach = Menander fr.907 K-T.¹⁹

18 πᾶς ὁ μὴ φρονῶν
ἀλαζονεῖα καὶ ψόφοις ἀλίσκεται,

quoted by Stobaeus, *ecl.*3.22.12. I am not entirely sure what ἀλίσκεται means, but I think it suits the context in Stobaeus best if we translate 'Every fool gets caught out thanks to his loud self-promotion'. No doubt this could be said of Bias (and the soldier in fr.746 v.3 is said to be an ἀλαζών, but it could apply equally to any number of frauds in any number of plays. If it means 'Every fool can be caught by means of loud sales-talk', then it could come in the mouth of the parasite boasting of the effectiveness of his fraudulent patter; in this case he is the ἀλαζών. But this is not very close to Gnatho's boasting at *Eun.*232ff, which is where Mette seems to think it belongs. (On ἀλαζών, see D.MacDowell, 'The Meaning of ἀλαζών, in *Owls to Athens*, ed.E.M.Craik (Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover, Oxford, 1990), 287-92. L.Gil, 'El 'Alazón' y sus variantes', *EClás.*25 (1981-3), 39-57 is essentially a study of the *sykophantes*, *kolax* and *parasitos* in Comedy (see section II below), rather loosely attached to the term *alazon*. But Gil does refer to Cratinus fr.227 K-A (not mentioned by MacDowell), from which it seems that Cratinus called Amynias an *alazon*, *kolax* and *sykophantes*.)

¹⁹ This consists of the word σανδάλιον ('slipper'), which Pollux7.86 tells us was used by Menander. It is assigned to *Kolax* on the basis of Ter.*Eun.*1025-8,

GN. Quid nunc? qua spe aut quo consilio huc imus? quid coeptas, Thraso?

TH. egone? ut Thaidi me dedam et faciam quod iubeat. GN. quid est?

TH. qui minus quam Hercules servivit Omphalae? GN. exemplum placet:

utinam tibi conmitigari videam sandalio caput!

('GN. What now? What are you hoping for? What's our plan in coming here? What are you up to, Thraso? TH. Me? I've come to surrender to Thais and do what she commands. GN. What? TH. Why not? Hercules was Omphale's slave, wasn't he? GN. A good model! I'd just like to see your head being softened up by her slipper!')

Terence uses the same word, *sandalium*, in 1028, and for good measure Lucian also uses it in talking of Omphale's treatment of Hercules at *hist.conscr.*10: 'I am sure you have seen pictures of Herakles in slavery to Omphale which show them wearing each other's clothes and Herakles being hit by Omphale with her slipper (παιόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς Ὀμφάλης τῷ σανδαλίῳ)'. But is it likely that Bias in Menander's *Kolax* planned to surrender himself to the girl he loved? As Sandbach says (*BICS* 25 (1978), 127), 'in that play the soldier's love was a slave-girl whose favours were to be bought, not won, so it would be surprising if he thought of making himself her slave'. The mythological parallel fits better the context of *Eunuchus*, where Thais is an independent operator. (Two further points: (i) it has been suggested, on the basis of Persius 5.169 *solea, puer, obiurgabere rubra* ('You will be punished, my lad, with her red slipper', in a passage modelled on the opening of Menander's *Eunouchos*) that Terence may have transferred the motif – and with it the word? – from the opening scene of Menander's *Eunouchos* to this entirely different context in his play; see U.Knoche, *NGG* 1936, 180 n.2. The suggestion is neat but unnecessary; as Sandbach says (*loc.cit.*), Terence could well have invented the reference to Hercules and Omphale at this point. *sandalio* need not be transliterated from a Greek original. (ii) Fr.1 R of Naevius' *Colax* (also probably modelled on Menander's play) seems to show that the soldier there compared himself with Hercules in dialogue with the parasite. But the context is quite different from that of *Eun.*1025-8.)

II Parasites and Flatterers

II.1 So far I have assumed that there is no essential difference in Greek New Comedy between a *parasitos* and a *kolax*, but that they had come to be used as alternative names for the same stock character and either term may be applied equally well to both Menander's Strouthias and Terence's Gnatho. This has been the general view of scholars (at least since O.Ribbeck, *Kolax* (Leipzig, 1883)), but H.- G.Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog* (Berlin & New York, 1985), 88-121 has argued that it was true only for a brief period in the first half of the fourth century (the period during which the term *parasitos* was first applied to a dramatic type at all), and that thereafter a (more or less) clear distinction evolved between the two types.²⁰ Essentially the same case has also been argued by L.Gil, 'El 'Alazón' y sus variantes', *EClás.25* (1981-3), 39-57 (cf.n.18), who claims that the two types tend to be confused in Middle Comedy but are differentiated in Menander. Nesselrath is even tempted to believe that part of the entertainment-value of Menander's *Kolax* consisted in its presentation of *both* types in contrast with one another. In this way he accounts for the fact that the play seems to have included a character called Gnathon (named in the fragmentary lines 67 and 68, from P.Oxy.1237), as well as the toadying Strouthias. Opinion has been divided on whether these were in fact two separate characters or two different names used by one and the same character in the course of the play;²¹ on p.109 Nesselrath argues against the latter view and suggests instead that Gnathon was portrayed as a *parasitos* and Strouthias as a *kolax*. Gil p.55 tentatively makes the same suggestion, though he also believes that Gnathon supplanted Strouthias at some point in the play.²²

Nesselrath does not explore the implications of this view for Terence's *Eunuchus*, but I think it is clear from a number of things he says (especially on pp.69-70) that he would have to regard the character of Gnatho in that play as a conflation of the two separate characters in Menander's *Kolax* (and perhaps also a third character from Menander's *Eunouchos*), with Gnatho's great introductory monologue (232-264) belonging to the *parasitos*-character (Menander's Gnathon) and the scene which shows him fawning on the soldier (391-433) to the *kolax*-character (Strouthias). In general, Nesselrath regards a *parasitos* as a relatively harmless and even positive character (and Gnathon as a particularly fine specimen of the type), and a *kolax* as far more dangerous and objectionable. The hallmark of the *parasitos* is his obsession with food; he may fawn and flatter in order to get it, but he has no further

²⁰ The same assumption underlies the discussion of parasites in Middle Comedy in Nesselrath's more recent book, *Die attische mittlere Komödie* (Berlin & New York, 1990), 309-317, which provides a very convenient survey and summary of the evidence for comic parasites in the fourth century, without going into much detail about the relationship between *parasitōi* and *kolakes*.

²¹ See C.Austin, *CGFP* p.175 (ad v.67), Gomme-Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary*, pp.420-1.

²² 'Quizá el primero [Strouthias] fuera un *kólax* y el segundo [Gnathon] el verdadero parásito que, en un momento dado, le suplantaba la personalidad.'

aim than to line his stomach.²³ The *kolax*, by contrast, though he often appears at the dinner-table, has more sinister aims (to gain wealth and power) and a more corrupting effect. For New Comedy, Gil is very much in agreement with this.

It is certainly possible to make a conceptual distinction between parasitism and toadying, and it is true that *kolax* is often a more derogatory term than *parasitos*. Gil and Nesselrath also draw attention to the following: (i) Athenaeus has separate discussions of *parasitōi* at 6.234C-248C and *kolakes* at 6.248C-262A (Nesselrath p.88); (ii) at 6.258E Athenaeus says 'Menander has given us a particularly detailed picture of the *kolax* in the play of the same name, just as Diphilus has of the parasite in *Telesias*'²⁴, a formulation which suggests a clear distinction between the two types (Gil p.53, Nesselrath p.107); (iii) Pollux's catalogue of the masks of New Comedy lists separate masks for *kolax* and *parasitos*, and surviving terracotta masks confirm that the two types were distinct (Nesselrath pp.110-1).

Nonetheless, I am not convinced that the distinction between the two terms was anything like as clear as they claim, either in Menander's lifetime or later; and Terence's *Eunuchus* creates difficulties for their thesis (and for Nesselrath's view of Menander's *Kolax*) that I think are worth pointing out. Athenaeus and Pollux show that it was possible to distinguish between *parasitōi* and *kolakes*. But their testimony should not blind us to the evidence that there continued to be a great deal of common ground between the two types and that there was not always any clear distinction between them.

II.2 It is agreed that at some point in the fourth century B.C. someone had the bright idea of applying the term *parasitos* to the comic type that had previously been called *kolax*.²⁵ *Kolax* had been used indiscriminately of both toadying and parasitic behaviour; *parasitos* was introduced as an alternative but (at least at first) equally indiscriminate term. Alexis fr.262 K-A shows the two terms being applied to the same person in successive lines and thus clearly treated as more or less synonymous. Nesselrath claims that this passage is unique in this respect (p.104); but he overlooks some further examples, particularly in Plutarch's *Moralia*. (i) Although he refers to [Plut.]*Mor*.5B on p.119 he does not quote it. It runs κόλακας καὶ παρασίτους ἀναλαμβάνουσιν, ἀνθρώπους ἀσήμους καὶ καταράτους καὶ καὶ τῆς νεότητος ἀνατροπέας καὶ λυμεῶνας ('they take up with toadies and parasites, nonentities and abominations, destroyers and corrupters of youth'), not only

²³ J.C.B.Lowe has argued that Plautus (perhaps influenced by the Atellana) adds details which exaggerate the element of gluttony in the character of some of his parasites, and that the *parasitos* in Greek Comedy was typically driven less by greed than by poverty and hunger ('Plautus' Parasites and the Atellana', in *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom*, ed. G.Vogt-Spira (Tübingen, 1989), 161-9. But see also Nesselrath p.31.

²⁴ κεχαρκτήρικε δὲ ὡς ἔνι μάλιστα ἐπιμελῶς τὸν κόλακα Μένανδρος ἐν τῷ ὁμωνύμῳ δράματι, ὡς καὶ τὸν παράσιτον Δίφιλος ἐν Τελεσίῳ.

²⁵ W.G.Arnott argued that it was Alexis who did this ('Alexis and the Parasite's Name', *GRBS* 9 (1968), 161-8); Nesselrath argues against this at p.102 n.314 and revives the claim of Aristophanes' son Araros.

treating the two terms as more or less synonymous but also clearly regarding these *parasitōi* as very dangerous. (ii) In discussing *Mor.*50C-D on pp. 118-9 Nesselrath rightly points out that Plutarch distinguishes the 'true *kolax*', who is really dangerous, from other relatively harmless people whom we may reasonably call *parasitōi*. But it is surely significant that Plutarch here tells us that 'most people' (οἱ πολλοί) apply the term *kolakes* to this latter group. (iii) In his discussion of Plutarch's use of the word παράσιτος on p.119 he omits *Mor.*547D (the start of the second passage quoted at the beginning of this paper), where I think the Loeb translation correctly conveys that the first καὶ means 'even' and that Plutarch is referring to one and the same person as 'a flatterer, a hanger-on and a man in need'. The last of these three terms (δεομένω) is unlikely to represent a separate category in addition to the *kolax* and the *parasitos*; *kolakes* and *parasitōi* are themselves men in need, and Plutarch is essentially repeating the same idea three times. He is certainly not making any sharp distinction between the *kolax* and the *parasitos*. On the other hand, Nesselrath also omits *Mor.* 54B, where (although the text is uncertain) it is generally thought that Plutarch does distinguish between the *kolax* and the *parasitos*, as he had done at 50C-D.²⁶ I conclude that Plutarch himself sometimes made the distinction and sometimes did not, and that his contemporaries (if we can trust *Mor.*50C-D) did not generally do so. (Plutarch otherwise uses παράσιτος at 46C and the verb παρασιτεῖν at 220C; neither passage helps with our enquiry.)²⁷

To return to the period of Middle Comedy, Nesselrath himself draws attention to Antiphanes fr.142 K-A and Alexis fr.233 K-A where the term *Kolax* is used of someone whose only interest is in food and who is not portrayed as fawning or flattering in order to get it. He accepts these as further evidence that the two terms were not always differentiated in Middle Comedy, and he believes that there was a period of transition and uncertainty after the term *parasitos* had been applied to the type previously called *kolax*. but he also believes that before long a distinction had evolved as outlined above; the introduction of the new term enabled the character to be subdivided. He tries to show that distinctions were beginning to be made between the two types already in the period of Middle Comedy. But in fact the passages he adduces do not support him. (i) Alexis fr.121 K-A distinguishes two classes of *parasitōi* (δύο γένη παρασίτων), each of which operates by means of *kolakeia*; clearly

²⁶ Most MSS read οὕτως ἄπειρος ἦν κόλακος ὁ νομίζων τὰ ἰαμβεῖα ταυτὶ τῷ καρκίνῳ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κόλακι προσήκειν ('Thus that man had no experience of a flatterer who thought that these iambic lines applied to a crab rather than to a flatterer'), adding παρασίτου γὰρ ὁ τοιοῦτος εἰκονισμὸς ἐστὶ ... (For such a description is that of a parasite ...'), with *parasitos* being used as the equivalent of *kolax* in the previous sentence. Editors (including K-A on Eupolis fr.374) prefer the reading τῷ κόλακι μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ καρκίνῳ ('to a flatterer rather than to a crab'), so that the following sentence distinguishes the *kolax* from the *parasitos*. The similarity with 50C-D is probably decisive in favour of this.

²⁷ It is perhaps significant that Athenaeus 6.250E, in the course of his discussion of *kolakes*, remarks of one man 'he too was a parasite' (παρασίτος δ' ἦν καὶ οὗτος), as if *kolax* and *parasitos* were interchangeable terms.

there is no distinction being made here between the terms *parasitos* and *kolax*²⁸; (ii) Anaxilas fr.32 K-A is very critical of *kolakes* for eating a man out of house and home, behaviour which on Nesselrath's view is entirely characteristic of *parasitōi*.²⁹ ³⁰ It is better to accept Gil's view (p.46) that the two terms tend not to be distinguished in Middle Comedy.³¹

For New Comedy, Gil and Nesselrath are able to show that *kolakes* are given a bad press as being a danger to cities, rulers and leaders in Diphilus fr.23 K-A and Menander, *Kolax* 85-94, and that they are also disapproved of by the speaker of Men.*Theoph.*fr.1.14ff. K-T. Nesselrath suggests that a harmless sponger would have been called a *parasitos* (p.108), and it is true that *parasitōi* are not criticised in such strong terms or presented as dangerous in the same way. Timocles fr.8 K-A praises the life of the *parasitos*; it is hard to imagine the *kolax* being praised like this. Also, as noted in section II.1, Athenaeus and Pollux suggest that *kolakes* and *parasitōi* could be distinguished not only conceptually but as comic types. But I do not know of any evidence from the fragments themselves to support this. We simply cannot say how clear-cut the distinction became, or at how early a stage.

Apart from his reconstruction of Menander's *Kolax* (on which see below, section II.4), Nesselrath adduces from the surviving fragments of New Comedy only Diodorus fr.2 K-A, where a distinction is made between 'those who can bring themselves to flatter' (τοὺς κολακεύειν δυναμένους, v.34) and those parasites (such as the speaker himself) who still maintain the high standards set by Zeus when he invented the parasitic art. But Nesselrath himself acknowledges that οἱ κολακεύειν δυνάμενοι are here classified as parasites, and this evidence tells against the idea that they had by now developed into distinct comic types.

Gil p.55 and Nesselrath p. 110 both mention Chaireas in *Dyskolos* (called ὁ παράσιτος in the cast-list in the Bodmer codex) and Theron in *Sikyonios* (who appears to be the παράσιτος of this play who, according to Pollux 4.119, plans to marry) as characters whom it would be inappropriate to label as *kolakes*. Chaireas plays a very small part in *Dyskolos*, and we cannot say much about the (larger) part played by Theron in *Sikyonios*. But I do not see why *kolax* would not have been just as appropriate a label as *parasitos* in the case of Chaireas; Gil rather misses the comic effect when he claims that Chaireas' advice at

²⁸ Nesselrath stresses that *kolakeia* is merely the means to an end for the *parasitos*, and that his aim is merely to fill his stomach (p.105). This is true, but we should note that *kolakeia* is said to be *the* means to his end.

²⁹ Nesselrath is impressed by the fact that this passage is critical of *kolakes* (p.105), but that in itself does not show that they are conceptually distinct from *parasitōi*.

³⁰ Nesselrath also adduces Anaxandridas fr.35.7 K-A (pp.105-6); but I cannot see any indication here that the *kolax* is on the way to becoming established as a separate type.

³¹ Dr.Nesselrath himself, with a characteristic blend of learning and fair-mindedness, draws my attention to Crates fr.351.3 Suppl.Hell. μωρὸς παράσιτος ('a stupid parasite'), perhaps written shortly before Menander began putting on his plays; *parasitos* is here clearly a critical term, not in any sense representing an ideal.

125-35 stems from sincere friendship.³² Both also refer to T.B.L. Webster in support of the idea that Menander in general ennobled the figure of the *parasitos* (*Studies in Menander* (2nd ed, Manchester, 1960), 75f, 113, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (2nd ed, Manchester, 1970), 223). But Webster bases this view almost entirely on Kuiper's reconstruction of *Kolax*, according to which Gnathon disguised himself as Strouthias (see the first paragraph of section II.1). Nesselrath himself rejects this reconstruction on p.109, and it is too speculative and uncertain to be used as the basis for any general claim about Menander's portrayal of *parasitoi*. (It is unclear to me whether Webster wished to distinguish between *parasitoi* and *kolakes* in this context.) I shall return to Menander's *Kolax* in section II.4.³³

II.3 The passages from Diphilus and Menander that are so critical of *kolakes* do not say that they are motivated by a desire for wealth and power; they are concerned only with the effects of *kolakeia*, not with its motives.³⁴ As far as the evidence of Comedy goes, *kolakes* and *parasitoi* are all motivated by a desire to do the best they can for themselves materially that is not more closely defined; Nesselrath's distinction between their motives (summarised above in the second paragraph of section II.1) seems not to apply here.³⁵ He does point out on p.107 that *kolakes* acquired a particular topicality in Menander's lifetime as hangers-on at the courts of Alexander the Great and his successors; most of Athenaeus' discussion of *kolakes* (6.248C-262A) consists of anecdotes from these courts. In this sense the *kolax* is a political figure; unlike *parasitoi*, and unlike the *kolakes* of earlier Comedy, he is not part of the Athenian political scene.³⁶ But is this the kind of *kolax* that we find in New Comedy? Athenaeus' discussion does not suggest that it is. But perhaps there is a sense in which we do find one, though you will probably feel that I am making things unnecessarily complicated by pointing it out. The case I have in mind is the soldier Thraso in Terence's *Eunuchus*. I have already remarked that Thraso boasts of how he managed to ingratiate

³² Theophrastus' *kolax* (*char.*2, written probably within a few years of *Dyskolos*) tries to ingratiate himself with his patron by deeds as well as words. Why should not the same be true of a *kolax* in Comedy?

³³ Nesselrath p.107 also claims it as significant for the period of New Comedy that we know of plays with the different titles *Parasitos* and *Kolax*, and that the latter title is not known from Middle Comedy. But we know only of Menander's *Kolax* (for Philemon see below, section II.5.iv) and Diphilus' *Parasitos*, as well as plays called *Parasitos* by Alexis and Antiphanes. This is slender evidence for his thesis.

³⁴ Nesselrath refers on p.112 to Aristotle, *EN* 4.6.1127a7-10, where the *kolax* is said to be concerned with χρήματα καὶ ὅσα διὰ χρημάτων, and on p.90 to passages in Lucian where he is characterised by φιλαργυρία.

³⁵ From earlier in the fourth century, Lesley Brown draws my attention to Plato, *Sophist* 222e5ff, where the only reward sought by the *kolax* is his own upkeep.

³⁶ Alexis fr.121 K-A probably calls this kind of figure a *parasitos* (cf.D.Bain, *Actors and Audience* (Oxford, 1977), 214-5, Nesselrath p.20 n.16), but in contrast with the type of *parasitos* normally shown in Comedy (τὸ κοινὸν καὶ κεκομωδημένον (γένος)), Nesselrath calls this 'an ad-hoc invention of no further significance', and we do not know that this kind of 'parasite' actually appeared on stage in this play. (It is perhaps worth adding that there is a sense in which political *kolakeia* was topical at Athens in Menander's lifetime; see Athen.6.252f-254a on Athenian flattery of Demetrios Poliorketes.)

himself with the king with whom he was serving; and we have seen that the climax of his boasting is an anecdote about a display of his wit at a dinner-party, precisely the expected sphere of activity of a parasite and also a context in which characters called *kolakes* are commonly presented to us. We could say that Gnatho in Terence's play is parasite to a parasite, or *kolax* to a *kolax*; in this sense, the play can be said to portray two contrasting toadies or parasites. But this is not what Nesselrath has in mind for Menander's *Kolax*, when he suggests that the characters Strouthias and Gnathon were there contrasted as *kolax* and *parasitos* respectively. Nor, I think, does Terence see Thraso as a *parasitos* or *kolax*, rather, he applies both labels to Gnatho (in his Prologue; see below) and leaves Thraso with the more obvious designation of 'boastful soldier'.

II.4 But Terence's *Eunuchus* is altogether difficult for Nesselrath's view of Menander's *Kolax*. As noted above in the second paragraph of section II.1, Nesselrath must regard Terence's Gnatho as a conflation of Menander's Strouthias and Gnathon (to simplify matters, I shall say no more about the possibility that he also represents a character from Menander's *Eunouchos*), with Gnatho's monologue at 232-264 deriving from Menander's *parasitos* Gnathon, and his part in the scene with the soldier at 391-433 deriving from Menander's *kolax* Strouthias.

If this is right, Terence's conflation of the two characters has been very skilfully managed; you would never guess that his Gnatho in these two scenes derived from two characters who had been *contrasted* with each other in the Greek original.³⁷ Gnatho describes his *modus operandi* as follows in his monologue (248-253):

est genus hominum qui esse primos se omnium rerum volunt,
nec sunt: hos consector, hisce ego non paro me ut rideant,
sed eis ultro adrideo et eorum ingenia admiror simul.
quidquid dicunt laudo; id rursum si negant, laudo id quoque;
negat quis, nego; ait, aio; postremo imperavi egomet mihi
omnia adsentari. is quaestus nunc est multo uberrimus.

('There's a class of men who want to pass as outstanding in everything, but who aren't; they're the ones I hunt down. I don't lay myself on as entertainment for them; I'm the one who laughs at their jokes, and I praise their wit at the same time. Whatever they say, I express my approval; if they then say the

³⁷ The point is well discussed by E. Dieffenbach, *Die Komposition des Eunuchus des Terenz* (Diss. Köln, 1949), 52-4 (e.g. p.52: 'In Eun.II.2 haben wir es mit einem ausgesprochenen Schmeichler zu tun, dessen Züge mit dem Struthias übereinstimmen').

opposite, I approve of that too. If a man says no, I say no; if he says yes, I say yes. In short, I've given orders to myself to agree to everything. That's the trade with much the fattest profits nowadays.')

This is exactly what we then see in action in his scene with the soldier at 391ff, and it is clear that (to this extent at least) that scene faithfully reproduces the behaviour of Strouthias in Menander's *Kolax*; for I have already (in section I.3) quoted Plutarch's description at *Mor.57A* of how 'Strouthias walks all over Bias and dances a jig over his stupidity when he praises him'. It also finds a parallel in Theophrastus' account of the character he calls *kolax* (*char.2.4*, more or less contemporary with the start of Menander's career as a playwright at Athens): 'When the great man stops speaking, he expresses his approval with "Quite right"; when he has made a bad joke, he laughs at it and stuffs his cloak into his mouth as if he could not restrain his laughter'.³⁸ (The similarity with Eupolis' chorus of *Kolakes* (fr.172 K-A) has long been noted; but Nesselrath would claim that the use of the term *kolax* in Comedy had changed by the time of Menander. Theophrastus shows that, outside Comedy at least, the behaviour described by Gnatho in his monologue could be seen as characteristic of a *kolax* at that time.) Finally, we may note that *Plut.Mor.52F-53B* (cf. 63C) characterises the *kolax* as a man who will change his views as you change yours; this is what Gnatho boasts of doing in v.251.

Gnatho's treatment of Thraso is in fact central to his presentation throughout Terence's play, and it fits with what we know of Strouthias' treatment of Bias in Menander's *Kolax*. It is prepared for by Gnatho's words at 248-253, a passage which forms the natural climax to the anecdote which Gnatho has been relating since his arrival on stage at 232.³⁹ Nothing suggests that this passage is in any way alien to its context, or that Terence has inserted an account of behaviour which characterised Menander's *Kolax* Strouthias into the monologue of his (differently characterised) *parasitos*. Nor does Terence say anything of any such procedure in the Prologue to his *Eunuchus*, where he tells us that he has added characters from Menander's *Kolax* to his adaptation of Menander's *Eunouchos* (*Ter.Eun.30-3*):

Colax Menandrist; in east parasitus colax
et miles gloriosus. eas se non negat
personas transtulisse in Eunuchum suam
ex Graeca...

³⁸ καὶ ἐπισημήνασθαι δέ, εἰ παύσαιτο, ὀρθῶς, καὶ σκόψαντι ψυχρῶς ἐπιγελάσαι τό τε ἰμάτιον ὄσαι εἰς τὸ στόμα ὡς δὴ οὐ δυνάμενος κατασχεῖν τὸν γέλωτα.

³⁹ W.E.J.Kuiper finds it remarkable that Gnatho nowhere mentions the soldier in this monologue ('De Menandri Adulatore', *Mnem.n.s.* 59 (1931-2), 165-183, at p.166). But this leads him to exaggerate the discrepancies he claims to find between the monologue and some details in the rest of Terence's play.

('There's a play called *The Toady* by Menander; in it there's a parasite (the Toady of the title) and a boastful soldier. The author does not deny that he has transferred those characters to his Eunuch, from the Greek play ...')

Parasitus is the Latinisation of the Greek παράσιτος. It had already become the familiar term at Rome for one of the stock characters of New Comedy, and Terence evidently thinks it the appropriate term for the character after whom Menander's *Kolax* was named (who must be Strouthias in Menander's play). In other words, Terence sees *parasitos* and *kolax* as interchangeable terms to designate the same dramatic character; Greek Comedy had used both terms, but only *parasitos* had been transplanted into Latin.⁴⁰ Terence says nothing to suggest that his *parasitus* is based on two quite distinct characters in Menander's *Kolax*, nor that he is aware of any significant distinction in the application of the terms *parasitos* and *kolax*.

Nesselrath lays some stress on the notion that Menander's *Kolax* contained a positive presentation of a *parasitos*; on pp.69-70 he argues that Menander's play was an important model for Lucian's *Parasitos*. Although he refers to Webster in support of this view (see the final paragraph of section II.2 above), Nesselrath in fact has different reasons for taking a positive view of Menander's Gnatho, namely his belief that Gnatho's monologue at Ter.*Eun.*232-264 preserves some highly favourable traits which Menander had given to that character: wit, a sharp understanding, and an outward appearance that leaves nothing to be desired ('Gnatho verbindet Witz und scharfen Verstand mit einer nichts zu wünschen übrig lassenden äußeren Erscheinung'). He is also impressed by Gnatho's claim of self-sufficiency at v.243, *omnia habeo neque quicquam habeo; nil quom est, nil deficit tamen* ('I have everything without having anything; although there's nothing in the bank, there's no shortage either'). And it is true that Terence's play presents Gnatho as a highly successful operator. But how can we know that Gnatho is not in all these details a faithful reproduction of Menander's Strouthias? Why should not a *kolax* be shown as sharp-witted and successful?⁴¹

It is plausible to suppose that in Menander's *Kolax* there was some contrast between Gnatho and Strouthias, if they were separate characters (as they may well have been). But it is not clear that the contrast could be usefully expressed by labelling one of them as a *parasitos* and the other as a *kolax*, except perhaps in the sense that the label *kolax* may have been applied to one of them by some other character(s) as a term of criticism; it would not

⁴⁰ *Colax* is otherwise found in Latin only as the title of Menander's play and those by Naevius, Plautus and Laberius, and twice as the cognomen of freedmen, at *CIL* VI.5682 (from the time of Augustus) and 22495 (from the first century A.D.). Neither Plautus nor Terence has a noun *adsentator* or *adulator*, though both use the verb *adsentari* with reference to the behaviour of a *parasitus* (*M.G.*35; *Eun.*253, 490; and cf. *Sti.*228 *adsentatiunculas*).

⁴¹ According to Gil p.55, we can deduce from Terence's Gnatho that Menander's *parasitos* was the sincere friend of his patron ('amigo sincero de su protector'). This is incredible; cf. *Cic.Lael.*93, 98.

follow from this that *kolax* and *parasitos* were clearly differentiated comic types. And I see no reason to doubt that Terence's Gnatho is modelled (as far as Men.*Kolax* is concerned) on Strouthias alone.

II.5 I have in the above not questioned the assumption that Ter.*Eun.*232-264 derives from Menander's *Kolax*; if you do not share that assumption, then of course you cannot begin to use this passage as evidence for Menander's play. I do in fact believe it to be a reasonable assumption, though I see no way of telling how faithfully Terence may have reproduced his Greek original in detail. It is perhaps worth mentioning briefly the main pieces of evidence.

(i) We know from Terence's Prologue (19-26) that he was accused of having taken the characters of the parasite and soldier from 'the *Colax* of Naevius and Plautus, an old play' (v.25).⁴² Terence denies the charge, but perhaps it was true; that is to say, perhaps important elements of the portrayal of Gnatho and Thraso were recognisably derived from the earlier Latin play, whatever the relationship may have been between that play and its Greek original (which is generally assumed to have been Menander's *Kolax*).

(ii) Terence himself claims to have taken the characters from Menander's *Kolax* and to have been unaware of the *Colax* of Naevius and Plautus (Prologue, 30-34). We cannot tell how truthful he is being.

(iii) Donatus comments on v.228 *haec apud Menandrum in Eunuchis non sunt, ut ipse professus est ('parasiti personam et militis'), sed de Colace translata sunt* ('These things are not in Menander's *Eunuchus*, as he himself declared (Prologue v.26 'the characters of the parasite and of the soldier'), but have been transferred from *Colax*'). This presumably applies to Gnatho's monologue at 232ff, since 228-231 are closely linked to the plot of *Eunuchus* and presumably not to that of Menander's *Kolax* (cf. K.Büchner, *Das Theater des Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1974), 245). But did Donatus have independent evidence for Menander's *Kolax*, or did he simply base himself on Terence's Prologue? If the latter, his testimony adds nothing.⁴³

(iv) Erotian quotes a two-line fragment from Philemon's *Kolax* which has some similarity to Ter.*Eun.*438 *omnes noti me atque amici deserunt* ('All my friends and acquaintances abandon me').⁴⁴ Philemon is not otherwise known to have written a *Kolax*,

⁴² 'Colacem esse Naevi et Plauti, veterem fabulam' (this must be the correct punctuation). Probably Plautus had revised Naevius' *Colax*, cf. F.Ritschl, *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz* (Berlin, 1845), 99-104.

⁴³ Cf. A.Klotz, *Würzb.Jahrb.*1 (1946), 5. This passage is not discussed by P.Puppini, 'Menandro in Donato', *Quad.di Filol.Class.* (Trieste) 4 (1983), 61-75.

⁴⁴ ἄλλ' οὐδὲ γεννήτην δόναμ' εὐρέϊν οὐδένα
ὄντων τοσοῦτων, ἄλλ' ἀπείλημμαι μόνος.

('But I can't even find a single relative, although there are so many of them; I've been set aside all on my own.') The similarity is even closer if we read ἀπολέλειμμαι ('I've been abandoned') for ἀπείλημμαι, with A.Barigazzi, *Sileno* 1 (1975), 65.

and because of the similarity Meineke assigned the fragment to Menander's play, of which it appears as fragment 5 in Sandbach's Oxford Classical Text. If this is right, this fragment constitutes our strongest piece of independent evidence that Menander's *Kolax* included a monologue similar to Gnatho's in Terence's *Eunuchus*.⁴⁵

A.Klotz argues against this that we should accept Erotian as evidence that Philemon did write a *Kolax*, and (as a consequence) that Gnatho's monologue derives from Philemon's play, not from Menander's ('Der Eunuchus des Terenz und seine Vorlagen', *Würzb.Jahrb.* 1 (1946), 1-28, at p.7). But, if Gnatho's first speech is taken from Philemon, why does Terence say in his Prologue that the character comes from a play by Menander? Klotz claims that Gnatho shows more wit here than later in the play, but I have already argued in section II.4 that there is no significant split in Gnatho's character in Terence's play.

Klotz is right to draw attention to the danger of arguing in a circle. But it remains most likely that Gnatho's monologue is modelled (whether closely or not) on a speech by Strouthias in Menander's *Kolax*.⁴⁶

Trinity College, Oxford

P.G.McC.Brown

⁴⁵ It has been suggested that Men.*Kolax* fr.7 'might have a place in the scene where Gnathon recounted his popularity with the fishmongers, cf.Ter.*Eun.*256-7' (Gomme-Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary*, p.433). But this list of fish does not actually correspond with anything in Gnatho's monologue in Terence's play (and it is possible that Athenaeus was wrong to assign this fragment to Menander's *Kolax*; see Gomme-Sandbach ad loc.).

⁴⁶ I am very grateful to Dr.Nesselrath for discussing section II with me and pointing out some errors and confusions in earlier drafts.