University of Cincinnati

Date: 3/7/2024

I, Allie M Pohler, hereby submit this original work as part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics.

It is entitled:

Terence's Offstage Virgo: The (De)construction of a Stock Character

Student's name: **Allie M Pohler**

This work and its defense approved by:

Committee member: Kelly Shannon-Henderson, Ph.D.

Committee member: Anna Conser, Ph.D.

Committee chair: Caitlin Hines, Ph.D.

Committee member: THM Gellar-Goad, Ph.D.

47905

Terence's Offstage *Virgo*:

The (De)construction of a Stock Character

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate College

of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Department of Classics

of the College of Arts and Sciences

by

Allie Pohler

B.A., B.S. Grand Valley State University

M.A. University of Cincinnati

March 2024

Committee Chair: Caitlin Hines, Ph.D.

Abstract

This dissertation offers the first focused scholarly analysis of the understudied and, as I demonstrate, misunderstood *virgo* stock character of republican era *fabulae palliatae*. The generic plot structures of Roman Comedy consistently circulate around a young man's desire to possess this *virgo*, the revelation of her true status, and the securing of her socially desirable marriage to a citizen man. In the works of the playwright Publius Terentius Afer (also known as Terence), the *virgo* is nearly always an offstage character—she is named and central to the plot, but almost never appears or speaks for herself. Because she is absent, I argue, the audience's view of the *virgo* is necessarily indirect, accumulative, and contradictory, shaped by the perceptions, motives, and experiences of the onstage characters who describe her and attempt to control her future. Although scholarship on these plays typically treats the lovesick young man as the genre's protagonist, my approach decenters the *adulescens* and reveals instead the extent of the physical and emotional suffering that he inflicts upon the *virgo*, such that any testimony that he provides about the mutuality of their affection is inherently untrustworthy (Chapter 1). I therefore focus on the speech, characterization, and identities of the plays' onstage women (*matronae* and *ancillae*), applying feminist standpoint theory to demonstrate how the epistemic advantage of their intersectional, marginalized identities positions them to recognize the complex social risks that citizen girls must navigate and to assess and reject the young man's abusive behaviors (Chapters 2 and 3). Through female characters across social classes, I conclude, Terence frames the citizen girl's marriage not as a happy ending but as a pragmatic survival response to rape (Conclusion); the result is a serious indictment of Roman citizen values concerning marriage and girls.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Acknowledgements

I cannot begin to fully express the enormity and depth of the gratitude I feel while reflecting on this project and the faculty, friends, and family who have supported me through it. It is thanks to them that I have been able to spend the past seven years at the University of Cincinnati, learning and growing as a student, teacher, and scholar.

I came to the study of Classics, as many undergraduates do, under the compulsion of an enthusiastic Classics professor. The exceptional faculty and staff at Grand Valley State University introduced me to the study of antiquity and, even more importantly, showed me that there is room for me in it. Thanks are especially owed to Peter Anderson, Diane Rayor, Chuck Pazdernik, William Levitan, David Crane, Charles Ham, Melissa Morison, Bea Peruzzi, Quinn Griffin, Ginny Klingenberg, and Fred Antczak.

My studies at the University of Cincinnati have been made possible by Louise Taft Semple and Albert C. Yates Fellowships. The John Miller Burnam Classics Library and its diligent stewards (Rebecka Lindau, Mike Braunlin, Shannan Stewart, and the student workers) have made conducting research for this project a seamless experience. My gratitude extends also to John Wallrodt, Joe Katenkamp, Charlie Kocurek, Kathy Ahern, Sarah Wenner, and Jolie Katenkamp. The kindness of Emilie Pierce and Alisha Fowler make Blegen a brighter place.

The Classics faculty at the University of Cincinnati took a chance on me back in 2017, when I was only a senior in college. Since then, they have supported me both inside and outside of the classroom. I would not be the scholar I am today if it were not for Daniel Markovich, Susan Prince, Kathleen Lynch, Lauren Ginsberg, Marion Kruse, Kathryn Gutzwiller, Calloway Scott, and Steven Ellis. My deepest gratitude extends toward the members of my dissertation committee. Caitlin Hines, Kelly Shannon-Henderson, Anna Conser, and T. H. M. Gellar-Goad

have been extraordinarily generous with their time and energy; they have lent their expertise to this project, challenged me, and remained enthusiastic about my work every step of the way. My work is stronger because of each of them (and any mistakes remaining in this dissertation are, of course, my own). Among their countless other contributions, Kelly Shannon-Henderson pushed me to ground my work in the historical record, Anna Conser guided me through the daunting terrain that is statistical analysis, and T. H. M. Gellar-Goad reminds me not to forget the humor (even though Plautus is funnier than Terence) and has gone above and beyond what any person could reasonably expect from an external committee member. Caitlin Hines teaches me how to dig deeper, ask new questions, articulate my ideas more clearly, and value my work. She introduced me to Roman Comedy (in Latin) and *never* let me doubt that studying Terence's plays or the women in them was worthwhile. Caitlin Hines is more than an advisor to me, she is a mentor, a sponsor, a collaborator, a teacher, and a friend. To be her first doctoral student is the greatest honor.

Studying Classics has allowed me to travel to exciting new places and introduced me to lifelong friends. I am grateful to Denise Demetriou and Amalia Avramidou, the directors of a stellar summer seminar hosted in 2022 by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and to T. H. M. Gellar-Goad and Christopher Polt, the directors of the 2023 Institute on the Performance of Roman Comedy, funded by a National Endowment for the Humanities Grant. To spend time in the company of those who love what you love is a gift, indeed. In Cassandra Tran, Hannah Sorscher, and S. B. Breitenfeld, I am fortunate to have had exceptional role models who became dear friends. I have found community through the Asian and Asian American Classical Caucus and the Women's Classical Caucus; I owe special thanks to Chris Waldo, Sonia Sabnis, and Joseph Romero for their mentorship. Thank you, Alex Reese, Luiza Dos Santos Souza, and

Michelle Lessard for absolutely everything (I cannot begin to list it all). I started this program with Alessandro Battaglia and Cecilia Cozzi by my side; they made Cincinnati a joyful place to live from day one. My friends and colleagues from the Classics Department at the University of Cincinnati make Blegen not just a workplace, but a community; I especially thank Simone Agrimonti, Sarah Beal, Haley Bertram, Ted Boivin, Maura Brennan, Mitch Brown, Alice Crowe, Andy Lund, Austin Hattori, Rebecca Kerns, Carina Moss, Giulia Paglione, Kimberly Passaro, Heather Richard, Christine Weber, Christine Wong, Tianqi Zhu. My teachers Pam Foster, Doug Dewey, and Darrin Batdorff inspired me to teach since I was young. My brilliant and creative students remind me why I started this journey in the first place. My life is fuller because of my friends who remind me that there is a whole world beyond classics: Molly, Robson, Will, Neil, Elliott, Drew, Devin, Rachel, and Derek.

Finally, I owe thanks to my family. My parents Shirley and Steve DeBruine taught me to trust myself and aim for the stars. I will always be grateful for their unconditional love and support. The Hilers accepted me as a member of their family from the day I met them; Todd, Sherry, Megan, and Spencer are top-tier in-laws. Last, but certainly not least, I must thank Alec Hiler, who has been by my side for the last eight years. Thank you for believing in me, for celebrating with me during the highs, for keeping me sane and fed during the lows, for making me laugh, for moving to Cincinnati, for adopting three dogs with me, and for everything else you do. Your love and support made this possible.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to the memory of Sharon L. James, who knew that Terence's *virgines* were something special long before I started this project. I will be eternally grateful that she was able to read the first two chapters of this dissertation before her death. Thank you, Sharon, for the lessons. I will pay it forward.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Don.	Donatus
Ad Ad.	*Ad Adelphoe*
LSJ	*Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon*
Pl.	Plautus
Epid.	*Epidicus*
Merc.	*Mercator*
Ter.	Terence
Ad.	*Adelphoe*
An.	*Andria*
Eun.	*Eunuchus*
Heaut.	*Heautontimorumenos*
Hec.	*Hecyra*
Ph.	*Phormio*
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*

List of Tables

Introduction

Content forecast: abuse, enslavement, sexism, sexual violence

The playwright Publius Terentius Afer (also known as Terence) wrote six plays in the 2nd century B.C.E. to be performed on the Roman stage, all of which center around a young citizen girl (a stock character generally labeled the *virgo*) and a conflict that complicates her chances of securing a marriage with a young citizen man (a stock character generally labeled the *adulescens*). Despite her centrality to the plot, the *virgo* appears on the stage in a speaking role only once across Terence's six plays.[1] In the remaining five plays, then, the audience's reconstruction of the *virgo* must rely on the speech and actions of the onstage characters who interact with her and claim to represent her interests. Although absent from the stage, the *virgo* is the linchpin of the comic plot—the *adulescens* obsesses over her, mother figures take drastic measures to protect her, and enslaved characters demand accountability from those who do her harm (typically including the very *adulescens* who claims to love her). By putting characters on the stage who voice empathy for the *virgo* and critique her mistreatment, Terence foregrounds the vulnerability of her social position and invites a critical perspective on the social structures that create these conditions.

Terence wrote *fabulae palliatae*, plays belonging to the genre of dramatic performance defined by Greek settings, characters, and dress (*pallium*), but composed in Latin for Roman

[1] The *virgo* Antiphila appears briefly in a speaking role in *Heautontimorumenos* (*Self-Tormentor*). For discussions of the absence of unmarried citizen women from the stage as a generic convention of Greek and Roman New Comedy, see Pomeroy (1995: 139–40), Hunter (1985: 90), Anderson (1993: 69), and Rosivach (1998: 7).

audiences.[2] The genre is distinct for its use of recurring character types (also known as "stock" characters), who present as recognizable caricatures typically defined by an exaggerated personality trait, as in the stern old man (*senex durus*), the young man in love (*adulescens amans*), the so-called "clever slave" (*servus callidus*), and the dishonest sex worker (*meretrix mala*).[3] In the extant record, full *palliatae* survive from only two playwrights: Terence and his renowned predecessor, Titus Maccius Plautus.[4] The public performances of these plays likely attracted diverse audiences from a range identities and civic statuses: women and men, enslaved, freed, and free persons, Romans and non-Romans, wealthy and poor.[5] Terence's plays were performed between 166–160 B.C.E. at Roman festivals, including the Ludi Megalenses and Ludi Romani, and at the funeral games of the Roman aristocrat Aemilius Paullus. Details about these performances, including dates of production, venues, musicians, and their Greek models, are recorded in *didascaliae* (production notes) preserved by Aelius Donatus, a fourth-century C.E. grammarian who wrote commentaries on Terence's plays (among other works).[6]

The focus of this dissertation is the *virgo* of Terence's *fabulae palliatae*, a decidedly understudied character in Roman Comedy studies. A note on terminology is necessary here, as the Latin word *virgo* has been variously translated into English as "maiden," "young girl," and

[2] In English, the genre is called Roman Comedy or sometimes New Comedy (a category which includes also the works of the Greek playwright Menander, whose comedies differed significantly from the earlier political plays of, e.g., Aristophanes). For a thorough overview of the history of the *palliata* and crucial discussions of the contemporary conditions (i.e., enslavement, wartime) at Rome while these plays were being produced, see Richlin (2017: 9–43).

[3] These character types (among others) and their characteristic traits are discussed in detail by Duckworth (1952: 236–7).

[4] Twenty plays (plus some titles and fragments) of Plautus survive. Ancient sources agree that Terence composed six plays, all of which survive (Duckworth 1952: 61).

[5] Plautus often directly addressed this diverse array of theatergoers, most notably in the prologue of *Poenulus* (see Richlin 2017: 89–90) and in the choragus' curiously positioned monologue in *Curculio* (see Gellar-Goad 2021). For a discussion of the "mixed" audience at Rome and consideration of the diversity of civic status, gender, ethnicity, and class among theatergoers, see the authoritative accounts provided by Richlin (2005: 21–30) and (2017: 2–3).

[6] For a discussion of the tradition of the *didascaliae*, see Goldberg, who argues that these records were created not by the magistrates and aristocrats who funded the productions, but by the professionals (i.e. actors and musicians) who dealt with their minutiae (2005: 69–75).

"virgin." While the English noun "virgin" (etymologically derived from *virgo*) describes the social construction of an individual of any gender who has not had sexual intercourse, the Latin *virgo* simply refers to "a girl of marriageable age" (*OLD s.v.* 1); it is gender-specific. Therefore, a girl who has reached the proper age for marriage is called a *virgo*, regardless of her sexual history. In Roman Comedy studies, the term *virgo* is even more specific: its application is restricted to girls of marriageable age who were born into citizen families.[7] Freeborn status, then, is an additional defining quality of the *virgo* in Roman Comedy.[8] Throughout this dissertation, I use the term *virgo* as shorthand to refer to the girls around whom Terence's plots revolve. They are always born to citizen families (from whom they are often displaced); most of them are unmarried (excepting only the recently married Philumena of *Hecyra*); all are of marriageable age; many of them are sexually assaulted before or during the events of the play; they are always guaranteed to marry (or remain married to) a young citizen man (*adulescens*) at the play's end. Their names are Pamphila (*Adelphoe*), Glycerium (*Andria*), Pamphila (*Eunuchus*), Antiphila (*Heautontimorumenos*), Philumena (*Hecyra*), and Phanium (*Phormio*).

A generally unfavorable attitude toward the *virgo* prevailing among early scholars of Roman Comedy is exemplified by Henry: "The other heroines are lifeless and dumb, introduced as useful to the plot but providing no variety. They are as monotonous as the nurse who appears in every play—a stock character" (1915: 95). Although Henry's assessment is now more than a

[7] Surveying the uses of *puella* and *virgo* in Latin literature across time, Watson identifies social position as the main determinant of whether a girl can be called a *virgo* or not—while any girl can be a *puella*, only a citizen is a *virgo* (1983: 143). Packman (1999) discusses the inconsistencies of the feminine role designations reported authoritatively in the *dramatis personae* (character lists) that accompany modern editions of these plays. She shows that these role designations, because they are modern inventions, they tend to reflect twentieth-century attitudes about class and gender distinctions, which are not necessarily the same as those of Plautus and Terence. In particular, she argues that the designation of a married citizen woman as *matrona* or *uxor*—when the scene headings from antiquity introduce her with the neutral *mulier*—is an act of interpretation (often presented as authoritative fact) that characterizes her in terms of her marital status, rather than as an independent individual with her own identities and motivations (256–57).

[8] Enslaved girls of comparable age fall into the category of *ancilla*.

century old, its essential claims are still advanced in current scholarship, albeit with less force. One century later, Fantham—a pioneer in the study of women in antiquity—concludes her essay about the ways in which women exercise control in Roman Comedy with disapproval for the women of Terence's plays: "When our interest is in fully developed female personalities in comedy, we have to admit that Terence represents a step backward from Plautine comedy, and even the beginning of comedy's decline" (2015: 104).

It seems likely that the almost universal absence of *virgines* from the stage in Roman Comedy has discouraged scholars from seeking a more complex understanding of this character. In his discussion of Plautus' *Aulularia*, Rosivach concludes that the *virgo* is so insignificant as a character that the audience would have been entirely unmoved by her cries of anguished childbirth, delivered from off stage (1998: 16):

> Euclio's daughter is never asked what she thinks about the marriage. In fact, she is so unimportant that the play does not even give her a name. Nor does she ever appear on the stage. The audience hears her cries as she gives birth offstage to Lyconides' child by the rape (691–2), but these cries are hardly meant to elicit audience sympathy for the young woman. Rather they are a simple stage convention which we see in other plays, meant to announce the birth of the child.

Similarly, Goldberg suggests that Philumena's absence in *Hecyra* makes it difficult for the audience to feel sympathy for her (2013: 21):

> Even audiences well versed in the tradition may be unsure where to invest their sympathy. The young people at the centre of the action are problematic. Philumena remains out of view, her hopes and fears left remote and unexpressed as if she were not a wife but the wronged *virgo* of plays like *Andria* and *Adelphoe*. Her very name declares her passivity.

In contrast, scholars like Gruber and Brown view absence and muteness as important features of offstage space and audience imagination. Gruber examines ancient and modern plays (including Terence's *Andria*) that have absent characters at their center, demonstrating that playwrights use the speech and actions of onstage characters to construct a world of offstage action that exists only in the spectator's imagination. In his discussion of the relationship between narrative report (*diegesis*) and scenic enactment (*mimesis*), Gruber maintains that *diegesis* "can be every bit as dramaturgically complex as enactment" (2010: 7). Absence, then, is a tool not a defect. He argues that Terence's use of narrative report in *Andria* is a "productive, positive artistic strategy" (144) that positions Glycerium "among the several astonishingly 'sympathetic' images of women in ancient drama" (144) and that "it is precisely [Glycerium's] absence that makes … her a rich object of speculative thought" (149–50). Brown, meanwhile, investigates the ways in which Menander constructs unseen action and characters in the offstage space that he calls the "Elsewhere" (2017: 8). The Elsewhere, he shows, is a dramatic tool that can perform a variety of functions, such as building suspense, transforming spaces, granting plausibility to a situation, and providing space for generic interplay between comedy and

tragedy.[9] According to Gruber and Brown, then, the events that take place offstage and the characters involved in them are no less important to the play than those that appear on the stage.

Sexual Violence in Roman Comedy

In the absence of the *virgo*, there has been a tendency among scholars to privilege the perspective of the *adulescens amans* uncritically. This tendency becomes particularly apparent in scholarly treatments of the comic rape motif. In their essays on Terence's *Eunuchus*, Kraemer and Rand both praise the character of the *adulescens* Chaerea and minimize the rape he commits in the midst of the play's action. Kraemer concludes that it is Chaerea, rather than the woman he rapes (Pamphila), who elicits the audience's sympathy (1928: 667):

> [Chaerea] is a young, likable boy, with an impetuous, passionate, rather self-centered disposition. Impulses which he has the ability to translate into action, and which he has no desire to control, involve him in a misdeed for which, with the same impulsiveness, he is eager to make generous amends.

Similarly, Rand commends Chaerea as "one of the most charming scapegraces in all comedy…impulsive, passionate, tender, resourceful, manly, pious, true, a Catullus in action, scandalously indecorous, irresistibly lovable, as even the maid Pythias, despite her horrified denunciations, would confess" (1932: 58–9). Rand's suggestion that Pythias, who makes physical threats against Pamphila's rapist and openly critiques Chaerea on stage, could feel any

[9] The offstage household is an example of a transformed space; the imaginary interior of the home is a space in which women have power and exert control over the play.

positive emotion toward the young man provides a clear example of a scholarly interpretation that ignores the accounts of characters of marginalized gender and civic status. These scholarly works, dated as they are, exerted measurable influence on the trajectory of Roman Comedy studies with regard to the privileging of citizen male perspectives on sexual violence.

Most scholarship on Roman Comedy continues to be prioritize (consciously or unconsciously) the standpoint of the wealthy, citizen man, including studies that meaningfully incorporate consideration of the experiences of women and enslaved characters. This approach is not without justification; Greece and Rome were patriarchal societies, so interpretive focalization according to the plays' male characters (and, by extension, male audience members) seems a natural inclination. Pierce, for example, describes the fictional world of New Comedy as "a man's world, in which women received minimal consideration" (2002: 179). Even scholars actively aiming to read Roman Comedy with resistance remain vulnerable to the primacy of the citizen male perspective.[10] For example, in his comprehensive survey of the rape and exploitation of women in the surviving works of Menander, Plautus, and Terence, Rosivach nevertheless introduces the genre from the perspective of the *adulescens* (1998: 1):

> Most New Comedies have plots which are built around a young man's sexual affair. These affairs are always presented from the point of view of the young man, whose emotions are continually on display as the plot determines whether or not he will get (or keep or regain) the object of his attentions. The woman who is the object of his attentions is usually just that, the object of his attentions. Her own emotions are infrequently

[10] On this topic, see Fetterley 1978, who introduces the theory of "immasculation," a process whereby "women are taught to think as men, to identify with a male point of view, and to accept as normal and legitimate a male system of values, one of whose central principles is misogyny" (preface: xx). According to Fetterley, then, women, too, must consciously resist focalization through male perspectives.

> explored, her character is rarely developed beyond the needs of the male-centered plot, and in some plays she does not even appear on stage.

His conclusion similarly privileges the genre's male characters: "Put simply, the fantasy world of New Comedy is a world that revolves around its wealthy young men, privileging male over female, but equally privileging rich over poor" (141). Though Rosivach's study focuses on the episodes involving the plays' women, his assessment of the genre remains bound to an assumption that the New Comic storyworld only concerns itself with its men, to whom female characters are necessarily secondary.

Rosivach describes rape as "both a chaotic act which marks the young men's temporary existence outside society and its norms, and a figure of the domination of female by male in marriage, the ritual which will reintegrate the young man into society as an adult" (1998: 38–9). Rosivach's approach to this question seeks to recover what function the rape fulfills for the *adulescens*; as far as the girl's perspective is concerned, he accepts the prevailing interpretation that the plays present her as no more than an object to be dominated: "We never hear how women feel about what has happened to them, because—the [rape] motif tells us implicitly—what they feel does not matter" (38). This conclusion certainly holds when one privileges the *adulescens*' own restricted vision of the world he moves through, but, as this dissertation will demonstrate, subaltern characters on the Terentian stage offer plentiful testimony of how these women feel about their own rapes.

Recent studies of Roman Comedy confront trauma and sexual violence in the genre with more clarity and specificity than ever before.[11] In her survey of the occurrences of rape across a selection of comedies from Menander, Plautus, and Terence, Pierce investigates the extent to which each playwright evokes sympathy for the rape victim. Both Menander and Terence, she observes, describe the violence of rape in such a way as to showcase the victim's distress and evoke sympathy for her (2002: 176). Plautus, by contrast, "seems to have a light-hearted attitude" toward rape and portrays it as a "petty insult" without descriptions that might elicit pity for the victim (173). Despite her observations about the potential for sympathy in Menander and Terence, Pierce concludes that the rapes of New Comedy "are generally no more than catalysts in plots" (179). In his survey of rape in extant New Comedy, Leisner-Jensen arrives at similar conclusions about the practical function of rape to the comic plot, maintaining that the rape-to-marriage plot is a generic convention used as a "handy and intelligible way of connecting two young people" and "neither society nor Menander and his colleagues can be accused of having had a cynical view of the sufferings of the young girls" (2002: 196).[12] Sommerstein argues that rape fulfills additional functions beyond putting the *virgo* and *adulescens* in proximity; these include preserving the girl's respectability, offering the audience a model for dealing with the real-life predicament of having an unmarried pregnant daughter, and establishing the masculinity, youthful vigor, and superiority of men (1998: 109–12).

While some scholars focus on the practical functions that the rape motif serves for advancing the comic plot, others investigate how it is characterized. Pearson Smith considers

[11] As Pierce remarks, "we must remember that the study of such trauma, and even male acknowledgement of it, is only a recent development" (2002: 178). Studies on trauma and rape in ancient drama include Packman 1993, 1999; Smith 1994; James 1998, 2015, 2016, 2020; Rosivach 1998; Sommerstein 1998; Deacy and Pierce 2002; Leisner-Jensen 2002; Pierce 2002; Dutsch 2008; Gardner 2012 (on Greek New Comedy); Witzke 2015; Feltovich 2020; Karanika and Panoussi 2020; and Weiberg 2024 (on Greek tragedy).

[12] As I argue in this dissertation, Leisner-Jensen's conclusion is wrong for Terence and, I suspect, for Plautus, too.

how the contemporary audience of Terence's *Eunuchus* would have responded to the most jolting rape in the comic corpus, taking into account the audience's negative impression of Chaerea before the rape (as an ephebe who has abandoned his post and as a eunuch impersonator), real-life legal attitudes toward rape, and how characters within the play react to it (1994: 21–5). She concludes that at the plays' end the audience is still left with "many questions and doubts about the arrangements made by the powerful," resulting in a state of discomfort that undermines the sexual aggression they have just witnessed (31). James demonstrates that the women of Terence's *Eunuchus* and *Hecyra* voice critique of the "unsavory aspects of the processes by which *adulescentes* become Roman men and of Roman adult masculinity itself" (1998: 32). She argues, furthermore, that the plays present the female perspective as the dominant mode for interpreting the rapes and the rapists. From this perspective, the rapes "are characterize[d] as criminal acts perpetrated on unsuspecting, helpless girls" (41); they harm her in the present and threaten her future. By taking the distress of female characters seriously, James delivers a nuanced assessment of not only the function of rape in developing masculinity but also how "[Terence] is presenting his own critique, in the female voices, of adult Roman masculine sexuality and its method of acquiring wives" (45). In her more recent study on the mothers of Plautus' *Casina* and *Epidicus* and Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*, James again demonstrates the importance of attentively listening to the plays' women. Focusing on the speech of the mothers, particularly when they use their speech to influence or persuade others, James identifies "daughter anxiety" (fear for the safety of one's daughter) as their central drive (2015: 121):

> We should pay attention to what these mothers care about. If we see them only from the perspective of their husbands or in terms of formal speech markers, we do the entire genre a disservice by failing to recognize the urgency of this situation, which recurs almost obsessively: the need that occupies every citizen family to see its daughters safely married.

As it turns out, readings of Roman Comedy that consider the perspective of the comic mother—and indeed, the perspective of almost any character besides the *adulescens*—disclose the extent to which the citizen girl as the focal point of Terence's comedies is vulnerable and structurally endangered. James has advocated for a new way of describing the marriage plots of Roman Comedy, through the perspective not of the *adulescentes* (as Rosivach above), but of the mothers (2015: 121):

> The basic plot of Roman Comedy is usually described as focused on the love interests of an *adulescens*, and its generic imperative is understood as procreative citizen marriage, sought and achieved as part of the young man's love plot. But if we listen to citizen mothers, we could equally describe comedy as acutely aware of the risks to citizen girls and as seeking, often against absurdly unrealistic obstacles, to assure their safe marriage, ideally to young men who value them.

Readings from the dominant male perspective additionally fail to account for the presence of subaltern individuals in Terence's audience. As Richlin (2005) and James (2020) stress, the traumas performed on the New Comic stage are reflections of real-life circumstances

likely to have been feared or experienced by women and enslaved individuals. Building upon their foundational work, my study aims to provide a reading of Terence's plays that more closely approximates how the subaltern members of the audience may have reacted to viewing them. To the extent that it is possible in her near total absence from the stage, my approach privileges the perspective of the victim, rather than the perpetrator, of sexual violence. For this reason, I consciously use language for rape and abuse that is clear and direct.[13] By investigating the ways in which subaltern characters react to the violence experienced by the *virgo* and seek to protect her, I aim to further develop our understanding of this mostly offstage character and those who claim to care most about her.

Methodology and The World of "Terentopia"

This dissertation is first and foremost a philological study built upon close readings of the plays of Terence. Its primary observations and conclusions arise, therefore, directly from the storyworld of the plays. This project does not aim to reconstruct a social history nor to comment on real-life social practice at Rome, though its conclusions will be contextualized against the contemporary practices and ideologies that dominated Roman social life during Terence's lifetime and thus informed his composition of (and his audience's reception of) these plays. In recognition of the limitations and parameters of this literary study, I here offer a distinction between the real, historical world of Rome at the time that Terence was composing his plays and the fictional, play world that is created by the playwright's act of composition. The conclusions I

[13] I do so following Packman (1993), who demonstrates the harmful consequences of using euphemistic language to describe sexual assault. For further discussion of this terminology, see below.

draw in this dissertation are specific to the latter, a world for which I propose the designation "Terentopia."[14]

The portmanteau Terentopia blends the playwright's name with the term 'utopia,' a coinage which was itself constructed out of (double) wordplay to describe a fictional world. The term originates with Sir Thomas More, who in 1516 published a work of political satire in Latin titled *Utopia*. The word is Greek, combining the negative οὐ with the noun τόπος ("place, region") to mean "No-Place." A second etymology is also activated by the similar sounds of οὐ and εὖ (an adverb meaning "well"), which would read (e)utopia instead as "Good Place." My proposed designation Terentopia engages with both etymologies. Terentopia is a fiction that exists on the stage (or, for modern readers, on the page). It is also a world marked by hyperfortuitousness (excessively good timing or luck), as it is filled with incredible coincidences, near misses, and accidental reunions, to the extent that the motif of the "happy ending" is a standard generic convention.[15] Resistant readings of Terence's plays, however, reveal that these seemingly "neat" resolutions are more complicated than they first appear, presented with a tension and discomfort that undermines their apparent simplicity. From a certain perspective—especially one foregrounding the experiences of those of marginalized status—Terentopia really is too good to be true.

The value of applying the conceptual framework of "play worlds" to Roman Comedy studies has been firmly established by Mazzara (2021), who argues that this interpretive tool reveals new dimensions of Plautus' self-referentiality, metatheatricality, and metageneric play

[14] I owe this brilliant term to Caitlin Hines, who first suggested it while we were discussing Terence's storyworld.
[15] The term "hyperfortuitous" is first used by Mazzara 2021 to describe the abundance of fortunate coincidences in Plautinopolis, the storyworld of Plautus' plays.

without introducing anachronistic models of the so-called "fourth wall."[16] Mazzara applies the framework of Secondary Worlds—theorized by Tolkien (1947) and Wolf (2012)—to explain the relationship between Plautus' fictional world (the Secondary World; also known as Plautinopolis) and Plautus' real, contemporary world (the Primary World), whereby the rules of the Primary World are assumed in the Secondary World until they are broken.[17] Mazzara demonstrates that, in Plautinopolis, time, space, weather, probability, and stereotypes are distorted when compared with the Primary World but not unrecognizably so; furthermore, these distortions are internally consistent and recognizable to the Plautinopolitans who inhabit it.

As an interpretive tool, the concept of "Terentopia" serves three primary functions for the present project: (1) to maintain a distinction between Terence's storyworld and the real-world conditions at Greece and Rome; (2) to provide a model according to which the rules of Terence's play world can be accumulated and organized; and (3) to highlight Terence's skill with metagenre, an interest of the playwright which has been underappreciated in scholarship.[18] An overview of the most relevant and salient features of Terentopia is appropriate. First, Terentopia is neither entirely Greek nor entirely Roman.[19] Gratwick describes the hybridity of the part Greek, part Roman play setting, for which he coins the term Plautinopolis: "Plautus' plays are nominally set in 'Athens,' 'Epidamnus,' even 'Aetolia,' but in fact we are always in the same

[16] Plautus' use of metatheater, defined by Slater as "theatrically self-conscious theater" (1985: 14), has been much explored by scholars of Roman Comedy; see, e.g., Barchiesi (1970); Petrone (1983); Frangoulidis (1993, 1997); Moore (1998: 67–90); Marshall (2006); and Christenson (2019: 136–150).
[17] Plautinopolis is so named by Gratwick 1982: 113. The term has been generally adopted by scholars of Roman Comedy since.
[18] Underappreciated, perhaps, but not unrecognized. See, for example, Frangoulidis 1993, Knorr 2007, and Germany 2016: 11–16.
[19] For example, the playwrights retained Greek names for their characters (see Fontaine 2010) but at the same time they replaced Greek locations with Roman ones and modified jokes so as to be comprehensible and funny to Roman audiences (Gellar-Goad 2021: 7–8). One of the most remarkable examples of distinctly Roman elements within a Roman Comedy comes from Plautus' *Curculio*, when, partway through the play, the Choragus comes on the stage and directs the audience on an aural tour of the Roman forum. For an in-depth discussion of the Choragus' speech and its metatheatricality, see Gellar-Goad (2021: 101–116).

civitas graecoromana, a universal city as large as the civilized world, the contemporary *oecumene*" (1982: 112). Even though Plautinopolis is Greek, Roman laws and customs appear in the plays, sometimes hidden, sometimes exaggerated (113).[20] In Terentopia, too, it is Roman attitudes toward citizenship, marriage, and the production of heirs that predominate.

The major rules and trends of Terentopia observed in this dissertation concern the *virgo*. In Terentopia, *virgines* are displaced from their natal families—whether intentionally or unintentionally—at a high rate, but they are always reunited with them by the play's end. Accordingly, displaced *virgines* always come into the care of an adoptive family member who loves them. They rarely become enslaved (the exception is Pamphila of *Eunuchus*) and are never forced to engage in sex labor with more than one client.[21] Under this stipulation, a *virgo* never compromises her *ingenium* (used in Terence as shorthand for an innate nobility tied to the civic status she inherited by birth) by having sex with a man who will not eventually become her husband.[22] This does not mean that *virgines* do not have sex before marriage; in fact, there is a high incidence of rape committed against citizen girls. These assaults always result in pregnancies and the birth of a child, usually a son.[23] For unwanted pregnancies that result in the birth of a daughter, infant exposure is a normal solution. *Virgines* who are raped are always

[20] Examples of influential studies that use Roman Comedy as a source for actual Roman thought and practice include, for example, Treggiari (1991), who cites Terence and Plautus as evidence for Roman marriage, and James, who argues that "the men of Roman New Comedy…cohere to certain normative standards of Roman masculinity" (1998: 31).
[21] This rule differs from Plautinopolis, where citizen women and men can become enslaved through kidnapping (in e.g., *Captivi*, *Persa*, and *Rudens*).
[22] This use of *ingenium* comes from its meaning "natural disposition, temperament" (*OLD*).
[23] When the birth takes place *during* the play, the child is always a son. When an assault leads to a pregnancy and birth *before* the events of the play, the child is often a girl. For discussion of the latter, see Chapter 2.

promised in marriage to their rapists at the end of the play. Every *virgo* is guaranteed to marry a citizen man by the play's end, making her a *matrona* and ensuring the legitimacy of her child.[24]

As I show throughout this dissertation, the residents of Terentopia exhibit varying degrees of consciousness about the unwritten rules of the play world they inhabit and their roles within it, an awareness best described by the term "generic competence."[25] The chapters that follow reveal a link between generic competence and character type, where marginalized characters typically demonstrate a higher degree of awareness about the structural rules that govern their lives than those in more privileged social positions. In Chapter 3, I apply the

[24] It is not uncommon for modern scholarship to refer to these circumstances as something like a "happy ending" (so Frye: "We are simply given to understand that the newly married couple will live happily ever after, or that at any rate they will get along in a relatively unhumorous and clear-sighted manner," 1957: 169), but we should remember that the apparent "happiness" of this ending is true in an uncomplicated way only for the *adulescens*. In his monograph about the exploitation of citizen girls, Rosivach argues that the integration of the *adulescens* rapist into the resolutions of comic plays suggests an "unconscious tolerance" of violence among Greek and Roman audiences: "The frequent use of the rape motif in New Comedy banalizes the reality of rape, making it less shocking and thus more acceptable. A body of literature that makes the fact of rape a prominent part of its plots and then, even while censuring the fact of rape, nonetheless welcomes the rapist into every happy ending inevitably sends a message to its audience that self-serving violence of the powerful against the vulnerable, especially violence of male against female, is permissible despite any public protestations to the contrary" (1998: 41–42). Brown seeks to provide a rationale for construing plays that end with girls married to their rapists as "happy": "Nonetheless we may feel that the boys get off very lightly, and we may find it hard to accept it as a happy outcome for the girl that she ends up marrying her attacker. It is in fact probably the best outcome she can hope for, since as 'damaged goods' she would find it hard to attract any other husband (and to remain unmarried would not be regarded as satisfactory for her); but we seem to be invited to regard it more positively as a happy ending to the play when the marriage is secured (or, in *The Mother-in-Law*, restored). We know the boy is delighted, but we learn nothing about the girl's feelings" (2006: preface: xx). Anderson, in contrast, suggests that Terence purposefully created endings that left the audience with complicated feelings about the plays resolution: "The ending of [*Adelphoe*] once again shows Terence at work to upset any neat feeling of 'they lived happily ever after'"(2001: 19).

[25] In his discussion of Athenian drama of the fifth- and fourth-century B.C.E., Revermann defines "theatrical competence" as the ability to decode and encode a complex exchange of signs between actors and audience (2006: 105). He uses the term as a "loose umbrella-notion which encompasses a multitude of (sub) skill-sets, be they of linguistic, visual, behavioural, intertextual (or rather inter-theatrical), cognitive or broadly cultural nature" (106). Revermann uses the concept to investigate the ways in which the varying levels of theatrical competence among Athenian theatergoers "made the medium of mass entertainment in Greek culture amenable to layers of connoisseurship which reiterate social and educational differences of society-at-large" (107). Building on Revermann's notion of theatrical competence, Mazzara discusses the extent to which Plautus' *Captivi* plays with the audience members' familiarity with and competence in the conventions of Roman Comedy as a genre. Mazzara demonstrates that competence in generic conventions is built by the process of viewing the play and that, in return, the competent audience member is rewarded with the ability to appreciate the playful self-referentiality of *Capitivi* and, in fact, any Roman Comedy (2022: 178–80). Following Mazzara, my discussions of competence refer to knowledge about the generic conventions of Roman Comedy and skill in navigating them. My focus, however, is not on the competence of the spectators viewing these plays, but rather on the characters within them.

framework of feminist standpoint theory to better understand the relationship between marginality and access to such knowledge. It is not by accident, I argue, that characters who exhibit high degrees of generic competence also deliver insightful critiques of the individual actors and social conditions that endanger the *virgo*.

Terminology

The question of terminology is crucial for any scholar or student of texts that deal with enslavement, sex labor, sexual violence, and physical and emotional abuse. Roman Comedy, then, calls for special care, given the ubiquity of such themes in the genre. Since the use of imprecise or euphemistic language can produce a misleading minimization or erasure of the conditions faced by the marginalized characters of Roman Comedy, it is my intention to select clear and precise English translations or, when necessary, to leave select words untranslated altogether.

Packman (1993) demonstrates that scholars frequently misrepresent episodes of rape by obfuscating their inherent violence with euphemistic translations like "seduce," "sleep with," and "go to bed with" for verbs like *stuprare*, *vitiare*, and *comprimere* which connote unambiguous violence. Witzke sheds light on a terminological problem of another nature: the introduction of pejorative or otherwise loaded English terms as translations of Latin designations for sex laborers that are mostly neutral. She discusses, for example, the translations of *meretrix* and *scortum* as "tart," "whore," "hussy," "harlot," "mistress," "slut," "wench," etc., all of which have moral connotations in the English-speaking world that do not match attitudes toward sex work in

the worlds of Plautus and Terence (2015: 12–14).[26] Following Packman and Witzke, I aim for precision and transparency in my translation and discussion of sex labor, sexual violence, and enslavement. I prefer to leave designations in Latin wherever possible. In particular, in my discussions of sex labor and the sex trade—again following Witzke (2015: 14–17)—I retain the term *meretrix* (plural *meretrices*) for the free sex laborer and *leno* (plural *lenones*) for men who enslave or control sex laborers.[27] Other terms left untranslated throughout this dissertation include *virgo* (as discussed above), *ancilla* (enslaved woman), *nutrix* (enslaved nurse), *matrona* (married woman), *servus* (enslaved man), *adulescens* (young man), and *senex* (old man). All translations of Latin text within this dissertation are my own unless otherwise noted.[28]

Structure of the Dissertation

In Chapter 1, I demonstrate that the *adulescens amans* deploys a lexicon of suffering that both exaggerates his own emotional distress—triggered by obstacles that block him from his love interest—and obfuscates the traumatic past of the *virgo*. By highlighting the *adulescens*' generic and amatory overuse of four common expressions of despair (*formulae desperantis*), I identify the ways in which this character is revealed to be an unreliable source of information about the *virgo*. I perform my own compilation and statistical analysis of this lexicon of misery with new attention to character type and to the distinction between empathetic and self-concerned pity. My analysis reveals that the *adulescens* uses these *formulae desperantis* more times than any other character type and that he overwhelmingly uses them to express pity for

[26] The perhaps less morally-loaded terms "courtesan" and "prostitute" still generate problematic mismatches, as does the translation "pimp" for *leno*, as Witzke discusses (2015:13).
[27] Following Witzke (2015: 9–11), I avoid the term "sex work," which in modern parlance connotes a level of autonomy and agency that is not always applicable to the sex laborers of antiquity.
[28] For the Latin text, I use the editions by Barsby (2001a, 2001b) and de Melo (2011a, 2011b).

himself. By contrast, when these expressions are spoken by women characters like *matronae*, *meretrices* (who are often adoptive mothers or foster sisters to the *virgo*), and *ancillae*, they additionally communicate distress on another character's behalf—usually on behalf of the *virgo*. Additional close readings of the *adulescens*' descriptions of the *virgo* confirm his attention to her physical beauty (to the exclusion of other qualities) and a pattern in which her emotional distress (e.g., grief over the death of her mother) amplifies his attraction to her. The *adulescens*, I argue, is an entirely untrustworthy source of information about the *virgo*, because his claims are skewed by a combination of self-pity, class blindness, and denial about his role in her suffering.

In Chapter 2, I address the generic prevalence of the comic mother's support for her daughter's marriage to her own rapist, establishing the extent to which the underlying motivation of all mothers in Terence's comedies is maternal love and a determination to protect their daughters within the constraints of a society where marriage is the only solution to rescue a raped girl's reputation. I argue that the mother's approval of the marriage is the result not of ignorance or apathy, but of careful calculation, through which she prioritizes her daughter's long-term security over her immediate physical and emotional well-being. Furthermore, my philological analysis investigates the ways that the mother is presented as a temporally-removed mirror image of the *virgo*—a feature of what I call "the regenerative plot." Because they share identities (i.e., gender and social position) with their daughters, mothers are uniquely positioned to act as social models for the *virgo*; some of Terence's *matronae* even experienced rape and its socially ruinous consequences in their distant pasts. The citizen mother (*matrona*), therefore, embodies the socially "happy" ending by her onstage presence as wife to a citizen man and as mother to a daughter whom she expects to reproduce her past experiences. Non-citizen mothers, in contrast, provide cautionary tales of women who never obtained the financial, social, and legal benefits of

citizen marriage. The displaced *virgo* is intimately connected to both types of mothers: although the conventional ending of the play ensures that she will become a *matrona*, her original displacement from her natal family means that, before the *anagnorisis*, she occupies a social position closer to that of her adoptive, non-citizen mother. In the end, I show that maternal empathy is sublimated to a preoccupation with institutional safety, and argue that maternal approval of the marriage resolution does not justify the assumption that the *virgo* herself is happy or satisfied with this result.

In Chapter 3, I apply the framework of feminist standpoint theory to demonstrate that enslaved characters, especially women, possess an epistemic advantage whereby they have more thorough and nuanced understandings of the systems that marginalize and oppress them within Terentopia than is possible for their enslavers. *Ancillae* are arguably the most important characters to my study, because they are in a unique position as enslaved, non-citizen women are positioned both to see the citizen society of Terentopia for what it is and to speak out about it, often in the form of criticism, from an outsider position. James remarks, "For all the grim realities of life for its female slaves, usually shown in quick sidelong glimpses, Roman Comedy also allows these women to speak their own minds and show their perspectives on citizen society" (2012: 236). I aim to take this conclusion a step further, arguing that the enslaved women of comedy speak their minds not only for themselves, but also for the benefit of the citizen girls who cannot. I return to my statistical analyses from Chapter 1 to contextualize the expressions of despair voiced by enslaved characters, demonstrating that enslaved women use these *formulae desperantis* primarily when they perceive that the *virgo* is in danger. These enslaved characters, I argue, deftly navigate the intense and contradictory expectations of their enslavers, negotiating the barriers of their social circumstances to support and protect the *virgo*.

This is especially the case for Pythias of *Eunuchus*, who offers a nuanced assessment of guilt and accountability in the aftermath of rape, gives a voice to the *virgo*'s suffering, and uses her own speech as a tool for active intervention on the *virgo*'s behalf. I conclude that, due to the epistemic advantage of their social position within Terentopia, enslaved attendants serve as the most reliable onstage proxies for the *virgo's* emotional state, especially when she experiences pain or distress.

The Conclusion presents a case study that reevaluates prevailing scholarly opinion on the only *virgo* to appear onstage in a speaking role in all of Terence's comedies: Antiphila of *Heautontimorumenos*. This case study reveals the consequences of interpretive approaches that automatically privilege the perspective of the *adulescens*, a tendency to which most current scholarship on the genre still conforms. While scholars and translators have traditionally interpreted the scene in which Antiphila appears as a joyful reunion with the *adulescens*, I recontextualize the *virgo*'s response by considering the sum of evidence about the *virgo* recovered in the body of my dissertation and the force of Terence's broader social criticism of her exploitation. I argue that the *virgo*'s response to seeing the *adulescens* is dictated not by love but by fear and self-preservation, as demonstrated by her readiness to express vulnerability with her female companion and the adaptive behavior of masking her distress in the *adulescens*' presence. My new interpretation exposes the limitations of scholarship that uncritically accepts the perspective of the *adulescens* and situates Antiphila within the playwright's broader social commentary on the vulnerabilities of citizen girls.

Chapter 1. *Nemost miserior me*: Articulations of Self-Pity by the *Adulescens*

The present study aims toward a more nuanced and complex understanding of Terence's offstage *virgo*. Since she is mostly absent from the stage and speaks only once, the audience must rely upon the reports of onstage characters who provide information about her. I begin my study with the *adulescens amans*, the young man who claims to love her. I argue that to construct a nuanced image of this character, one must first *de*construct the shallow and superficial image of her presented by the *adulescens*. By closely analyzing the speech of the *adulescentes* of Terence's comedies, I assess this stock character's claims to knowledge, identifying the ways in which he is revealed to be an unreliable and superficial source of information about the *virgo*.

As he enters the stage in search of a girl whom he has just seen escorted through the streets, the young man Chaerea exclaims, **"**I'm dead! The girl isn't anywhere, and neither am I, since I've lost her from my sight," (*occidi! neque virgost usquam neque ego, qui illam a conspectu amisi meo*, *Eun.* 292–93). Chaerea—as is typical for the *adulescens*—has become desperately infatuated with a *virgo* at first sight.[29] During the course of the play, Chaerea shows that he is willing to take any means necessary to gain access to this girl so he can have sex with her—he infiltrates her sister's home disguised as a eunuch and sexually assaults her after she has been entrusted to his protection. After Pamphila is recognized to be the long-lost daughter of a citizen family, the play concludes with an agreement—arranged between Chaerea and Pamphila's adoptive sister Thais—that Pamphila will marry Chaerea. No further mention is made of the rape. While this is the most overt manifestation of the rape motif across Terence's

[29] The *virgo* of *Eunuchus* is named Pamphila. At this point in the play, her status is unconfirmed; she is described by some as a pseudo-*meretrix*.

six plays, it is not the only one; the motif appears also in Terence's *Adelphoe* (475), *Hecyra* (572, 828, 832), and *Phormio* (1018).

In this chapter, I demonstrate that Terence's stock *adulescens* is characterized by his egocentrism, superficiality, and fixation on power. I begin with a survey of scholarly attitudes toward the *adulescens*, which have turned a more critical eye to the character in recent decades but, nevertheless, continue to depend on him as a source of reliable information about the offstage *virgo*. I next show that the *adulescens* consistently uses language that flattens the *virgo* into a one-dimensional figure, valued only for her beauty and civic status. The *adulescens* conceptualizes her as a resource (*copia*) to which he seeks access and control. Next, I demonstrate that the *adulescens* deploys a lexicon of suffering that exaggerates his own distress and obscures the trauma of the *virgo*. I perform my own statistical analyses of the occurrences of four common expressions of despair (*formulae desperantis*) across Terence's corpus with attention to character type and whether the expression of pity is self-directed or directed to another character. In the end, I confront the scholarly consensus about elevated emotion and self-pity in Roman Comedy by showing that the speech of *adulescentes* is the most self-pitying of all of Terence's stock characters. I conclude, therefore, that a fuller, more nuanced picture of Terence's *virgo* must resist focalization through the perspective of the superficial and self-interested *adulescens*.

The *adulescens* in scholarship

The *adulescens* has been a divisive character in Roman Comedy studies. Henry considered the *adulescens* to be as a rule "disappointing" and "too stupid to be interesting" (1915: 71). According to him, the only admirable quality of the character is his loyalty to his

friends and to the girl of whom he is enamored (69–71). Critiquing the most notorious *adulescens* in Terence's corpus, Norwood provides evidence that contradicts even this one positive trait that Henry identifies in the *adulescens* (1923: 60–1):

> This play, however, is named, not after Thais, but after Chaerea in his assumed character. His detestable behaviour provides a passage which is the most brilliant and perhaps the most objectionable feature of the whole, though the final scene where Thraso is adopted as a butt and source of income may well be regarded as running it close. It must be confessed openly that here for once Terence presents us with pictures which are or may be deleterious. The objection is not mainly that sexual misconduct is treated with sympathy. It lies herein, that both Chaerea and Phaedria obtain their desires by frankly, casually, and callously using fellow-creatures as mere material…There lies the condemnation of these elegant youths.

Norwood thus identifies a crucial character flaw in the *adulescens*: his uncaring attitude that disregards the humanity of the girl he loves and leads him to "deliberately and skillfully" take advantage of her (62).

In response to this unflattering assessment of the *adulescens*, Kraemer and Rand advanced arguments in defense of the *adulescens*, praising Chaerea in particular for his charisma. Rand offers a complimentary description of Chaerea, calling him "one of the most charming scapegraces in all comedy, […] impulsive, passionate, tender, resourceful, manly, pious, true, a Catullus in action, scandalously indecorous, irresistibly lovable" (1932: 58–9). Similarly, Kraemer describes the *adulescens* of *Eunuchus* as a "clever, witty rogue," "charming,"

and "likeable." He continues, "One ought not, possibly, to like him for this, but then one *does*" (1928: 667).[30] Kraemer further suggests that Chaerea is representative of the "thousands of boys like him" both in Athens and into the current day (665):

> It has not been sufficiently noted, I think, that Terence has a special fondness for the adolescent youth; that his 'weak young men' are not merely characters drawn without accuracy or interest, but are the results of exact observation of youth in all the turmoil of transition from boyhood to manhood. Chaerea might well find his present-day counterpart on any college campus or, with some little additional vulgarity, on any street corner in a modern city. He certainly is not unnatural in his enthusiastic attention to female beauty.

In his attempt to normalize Chaerea's behavior, Kraemer provides an illustrative example of the lack of care with which scholars have traditionally approached women's trauma. This quotation—though dated—provides an example of a scholarly approach that has shaped the study of Roman Comedy with lasting consequences. By downplaying the violence committed by the *adulescens* and focusing instead on ascribing indefinable and unquantifiable qualities such as likability and charm to this character, scholars risk overlooking the negative characteristics that Terence imbues in this character.

Perhaps the harshest censure of the *adulescens* from the first half of the twentieth century comes from Dunkin, who described two versions of the character type: the "Spineless Young Man" and the "Good Young Man." Plautus' Spineless Young Man is "slinking, whining,

[30] Italics preserved.

sensual," (1946: 73) "a mere lay figure that shows up to wail and weep now and then" (64–65), while Terence's Good Young Men, in contrast, are "actual lovers," "ennobled by genuine love," and respectable (110–11).[31] In general, the reputation of the *adulescens* remained mostly positive throughout the twentieth century. The influence of Kraemer and Rand can still be detected in Duckworth, who describes Chaerea as an "impulsive and likable young rascal" (1952: 242). His interest in the stock character, however, is limited. He describes the *adulescens* as "the least vivid and the least interesting" (242) of the major characters of comedy and recommends focusing on other characters. Still, in his discussion of the character he views the *adulescens* as a sympathetic character, neither caricatured nor ridiculed, and in comparing Terence's young men to those of Plautus, he finds them "more normal and decent" and "more respectful and respectable" (237–41).

As scholarly interest turned away from producing individual portraits of Terence's *adulescentes*, it turned toward discussions of rape.[32] Sommerstein analyzes the various functions of the rape motif, including (1) maintaining an image of a chaste *virgo*; (2) offering the audience a model for dealing with unmarried pregnant daughters in real life; and (3) establishing masculinity and superiority (1998: 109–112). Pierce concludes that rapes in New Comedy "are generally no more than catalysts in plots" that bring about a sexual encounter between the young man and girl without diminishing her respectability and marriageability (2002: 179). Leisner-Jensen arrives at a similar conclusion, arguing that the rape-to-marriage plot is a "typical convention" of the genre primarily used as a "handy and intelligible way of connecting two young people," and suggests that "neither society nor Menander and his colleagues can be

[31] Dunkin finds redeeming qualities even in Terence's most controversial *adulescens*, Chaerea of *Eunuchus*, whose wrongdoing is excused because of his promise to marry the girl whom he has raped (1946: 111).
[32] For a more thorough review of the literature on this topic, see Introduction.

accused of having had a cynical view of the sufferings of the young girls" (2002: 196). While these studies represent an important step in normalizing the scholarly discussion of rape in New Comedy, they nevertheless tend to excuse the violence committed by the *adulescens* as a mere plot device, precluding any discussion about social critique by the playwright and dismissing the suffering of the *virgo*.

In recent decades, scholars have adopted a more critical approach to violence and rape in the ancient world generally and in New Comedy specifically.[33] Their work has been especially important in offering fresh and nuanced interpretations of Terence's *Eunuchus* and *Hecyra*, which most explicitly spotlight the violence of rape. Focusing on these two plays, James supposes that one reason for the formerly "generous reaction of critics to these rapists" is that the *adulescens* is never punished for assaulting the *virgo* (1998: 37). She shows, however, that this lack of punishment "does not mean that the playwrights are presenting the rapists in a positive, or even neutral, light;" on the contrary, the rapes "are designed to disturb, not to amuse, and they deliver a powerful critique of the coercive, self-centered masculine sexuality that characterizes Roman marriage" (46). I build upon James' conclusions, arguing that Terence uses the self-pitying speech of the *adulescens* to characterize him in a negative light, revealing the unreliability of his testimony.

Vidi Virginem: Vision and Power

Vision is conceptualized as a resource and mechanism of power in Terence's *Phormio* and *Eunuchus*. By imagining the *virgo* as visual sustenance (*copia*) to which he seeks unlimited

[33] Packman 1993, 1999; Smith 1994; Pierce 1997 (revised 2002); Rosivach 1998; Sommerstein 1998; James 1998, 2005, 2015, 2016, 2020; Leisner-Jensen 2002; Dutsch 2008; Gardner 2012; Dutsch, James, and Konstan (eds.) 2015; Witzke 2015; Feltovich 2015, 2020.

access, the *adulescens* objectifies her and inextricably links her value to her physical appearance. The *adulescentes* of *Phormio* and *Eunuchus* provide no further descriptions of the *virgo* beyond her appearance. Spectatorship, additionally, is framed as a mechanism of control, one which the *adulescens* seeks to wield and simultaneously fears becoming subjected to himself.

It is typical for the *adulescens* of Roman Comedy to "fall in love" with the *virgo* at first sight (Copley 1949: 70).[34] His feelings for the girl are better described as infatuation, sometimes to the point of obsession, and he tends to hyper-focus, to the point of exclusion, on her physical beauty and youth. When the *adulescens* does shift his focus toward the *virgo*, his interest in her lies primarily in her appearance and secondarily in her civic status. In addition to self-pitying language (discussed in the next section), themes of vision and sight further characterize the speech of Terence's *adulescentes*.

Vision in Phormio

Phaedria, a young man in love with a *meretrix* named Pamphila, is without funds to engage her services, so instead he spends his days following her around and gazing at her: "Nothing else remained for him but to feast his eyes on her, to follow her, and to bring her to school and back" (*restabat aliud nil nisi oculos pascere, sectari, in ludum ducere et redducere*, 85–6.) The vivid image of "feasting eyes" (*oculos pascere*) frames Phaedria's relationship with Pamphila as one of consumption; Phaedria is nourished by the sight of Pamphila, yet he declines to render payments for her services, which would in turn contribute to her own livelihood. Phaedria thus takes advantage of the resource to which neither Pamphila nor the *leno* can deny

[34] On the superficiality of the young man's love, Rosivach states, "When one of these young men falls in love, what he falls in love with is the physical appearance of the young woman, as a host of texts make clear" (1998: 5).

him access, that is, the sight of her body. Because Pamphila, as a non-citizen woman, will never be eligible to marry Phaedria, her worth remains inextricably tied to her beauty.[35]

Antipho is first made aware of the existence of the *virgo*, Phanium, after he hears a report of her beauty from a young man who observed her mourning her late mother. The *servus*, Geta, recalls the pity-stirring scene described by the anonymous *adulescens* (93–100):

> **GET.** "…numquam aeque," inquit, "ac modo
> paupertas mihi onus visumst et miserum et grave.
> modo quandam vidi virginem hic viciniae
> miseram suam matrem lamentari mortuam.
> […] miseritumst.
> virgo ipsa facie egregia…"

> **GET.** "Never before," he said, "has poverty seemed to me to be such a pitiable and heavy burden. I just saw a girl here in the neighborhood, the poor thing, she was mourning her late mother. […] It stirred me to pity. The girl was extraordinarily beautiful..."

This *adulescens*, in contrast to the young men so far discussed, feels sympathy for *virgo* to the point that he himself weeps (*adulescens quidam lacrumans*, 91–2) as he describes how he watched her lamentations. His description expresses and evokes further pity for the girl with the emphatic repetition of *miser* and its verbal cognate (*miserum…miseram…miseritumst*). Yet,

[35] The name Pamphila typically suggests that the name-holder is a citizen or will be revealed to be by the end of the play, as in *Adelphoe* and *Eunuchus*. Terence's choice to give the name to a *meretrix* who will not be discovered to be a citizen may be an acknowledgement of the precariousness of the situations of *virgines*/*pseudo-meretrices* and the potential outcome for their lives if they are never discovered to be a citizen.

following this sympathetic portrayal, the young man's attention abruptly shifts to praise of the girl's physical appearance (*facie egregia*). The girl's hardship is overshadowed by her beauty almost immediately.

It is Antipho who suggests that they seek out the girl to see her for themselves (101–8):

GET. …ibi continuo Antipho
"voltisne eamus visere?" alius "censeo:
eamus, duc nos sodes." imus, venimus,
videmus. virgo pulchra, et quo magis diceres,
nil aderat adiumenti ad pulchritudinem:
capillus passus, nudus pes, ipsa horrida,
lacrumae, vestitus turpis, ut, ni vis boni
in ipsa inesset forma, haec formam exstinguerent.

GET. Then Antipho immediately said, "Do you want to go take a look for ourselves?" The other one said, "I suppose. Let's go, please, lead the way." We go, we arrive, we see her. A beautiful girl, and you could say all the more so because there are no enhancements to her beauty: her hair is let loose, her feet bare, she herself is unkempt and tearful, and her clothes are filthy; such that, if the strength of her good nature were not contained in her very appearance, these features would extinguish her beauty.

Like Phaedria, Antipho too seeks to derive pleasure from viewing a beautiful girl. *Visere* ("to go in order to look at, to look attentively")—stronger than *videre* ("to see")—emphasizes the

intentionality of the men's efforts to see Phanium. The men go see her (*videmus*) and this yields the description of the girl's appearance that follows. Geta describes both her appearance and the "strength of her goodness" (*vis boni*), which manages to preserve her natural beauty despite her disheveled state of mourning. This use of the adjective is established earlier in *Phormio*, when Geta reports being told that "[Phanium] was an Athenian citizen, a good girl born to a good family" (*illam civem esse Atticam, bonam bonis prognatam,* 114–5). The apposition of the two phrases links the quality of goodness (*bona*) with possessing Athenian citizenship. The men, therefore, admire the girl for both her beauty and her civic status, but their interest in her remains restricted to this superficial level. In contrast to the anonymous *adulescens* who initially expressed sympathy for the girl, neither Antipho nor Phaedria express pity for her.

After Antipho has fallen in love with the girl, he immediately approaches her caretaker, the nurse Sophrona, to seek access to the girl: "He begs to get his fill of her" (*obsecrat ut sibi eius faciat copiam*, 112–3). Just as the sight of Pamphila nourishes Phaedria (*oculos pascere*, 85), Phanium, too, is envisaged as an abundant resource (*copia*) from which Antipho may derive his own pleasure. The image is later picked up by Phaedria as he engages in an argument with Antipho about whose romantic situation is more fortunate. Phaedria tells Antipho: "Besides, compare what I have now out of my scarcity and what you have out of your abundance" (*tu conicito cetera, quid ego ex hac inopia nunc capiam et quid tu ex ista copia*, 166–7), where *inopia* stands in for Pamphila and *copia* for Phanium. Antipho's response, a rejection to Phaedria's argument, continues to conceptualize Phanium as a resource (*copia*) as he complains that he lacks the choice to reject or keep her: "It is not in my power to send her away or keep her" (*ut neque mihi sit amittendi nec retinendi copia*, 176). The speech of the *adulescentes*

dispossesses the women of their personhood and reduces them to sources of pleasure for the young men.

The descriptions of Phanium at *Phorm*. 93–100 and 101–8, focalized through different *adulescentes*, are the only portrayals of her physical appearance in the play.[36] Since the character of Phanium is never embodied on stage, the descriptions provided by the young men are fundamental to how the audience imagines her. From the perspective of the *adulescentes* of *Phormio*, then, Phanium's and Pamphila's value is rooted in their appearance and, in the case of Phanium, her citizenship. The repetition of forms of *visere* (102) and *videre* (94, 95, 104) and the emphasis on her beauty (100, 104, 105, 108) frame her as an object for viewing. Although the unnamed *adulescens* briefly expresses sympathy for the girl, his interest lies only in her appearance, status, and sexuality.

Vision and Power in Eunuchus *and* Adelphoe

The *Eunuchus* stands out for being the only play of Plautus' or Terence's to feature a rape scene that takes place during the events of the play. After seeing a young girl (Pamphila) being brought through his neighborhood, the *adulescens* Chaerea becomes infatuated with her and contrives a plan to gain access to her. Having disguised himself as a eunuch who is enslaved in the household in which Pamphila resides, Chaerea infiltrates her private room and rapes her. The violent scene itself is not staged, but the aftermath of the attack is described in detail. Like his counterparts, the *adulescens* Chaerea is driven to action by the mere sight of the *virgo* Pamphila;

[36] Both descriptions are spoken by Geta but are focalized through an *adulescens*. The first account, which is provided by the unnamed *adulescens*, occurs in reported speech. The second is offered by Geta. Though not technically reported speech, Geta here describes a scenario in which Antipho has taken the lead (101–2). Geta conceives of the three men as joint agents, evidenced by repeated first-person plural verbs (*imus, venimus, videmus*, 103–4). Since Geta is explaining the source of Antipho's attraction to the girl, his description is felt to be more strongly focalized through Antipho than Geta himself.

he is characterized by his fixation on her appearance, his violent behavior, and his lack of sympathy for Pamphila.

Chaerea's first appearance on the stage is motivated by his search for Pamphila; his entrance monologue is filled with language about beauty and spectatorship (292–97):

> **CHAE.** occidi!
> neque virgost usquam neque ego, qui illam a conspectu amisi meo.
> ubi quaeram, ubi investigem, quem perconter, quam insistam viam,
> incertus sum. una haec spes est: ubi ubist, diu celari non potest.
> o faciem pulchram! deleo omnis dehinc ex animo mulieres.
> taedet cotidianarum harum formarum.

> **CHAE.** I'm dead! The girl isn't anywhere, and neither am I, since I've lost her from my sight. Where I should look, where I should search, whom I should interrogate, which way I should take, I am uncertain. There is this one hope alone: wherever she is, she is not able to be hidden for long. O beautiful face! From this point on, I am erasing all women from my mind. I am tired of these ordinary women's appearances.

Because he has lost sight of the *virgo* (*a conspectu amisi meo*), Chaerea cries out with an expression of exaggerated despair (*occidi*) that is typical of *adulescentes*. Unsatisfied with only a short glimpse of Pamphila, whose identity is at this time unknown to him, Chaerea expresses a dogged determination to see her again, using an emphatic repetition of verbs of searching (*quaeram…investigem…perconter*, 294). Chaerea's confidence that she will be unable to remain

hidden from his sight for long (*diu celari non potest*, 295) foreshadows the active role that he will eventually play in pursuing and overpowering her. Without knowledge of Pamphila's name, Chaerea invokes the *virgo* instead by her appearance (*o faciem pulchram*) and rejects all other women, claiming that he is tired of their mundane appearances (*cotidianarum harum formarum*).

Later in the play, when asked why he considers the eunuch, whom he will soon impersonate, to be extremely fortunate (*o fortunatum istum eunuchum*, 365), Chaerea explains that he envies the eunuch's proximity to Pamphila and, more specifically, his ability to gaze at her: "At home he will always look at, talk with, and be beside his fellow slave, with her supreme beauty, together in one house" (*summa forma semper conservam domi videbit, conloquetur, aderit una in unis aedibus*, 366–67). After Chaerea has successfully infiltrated the women's quarters of Thais' house and raped Pamphila, he again refers to spectatorship as he explains his motive for dressing as a eunuch to his friend: "So I could see, hear, be with the girl I desired, Antipho" (*viderem, audirem, essem una quacum cupiebam, Antipho*, 574).

Chaerea's infatuation with Pamphila's appearance is made apparent further as he describes the rareness of her beauty to Parmeno (313–20):

> **CHAE.** haud similis virgost virginum nostrarum quas matres student
> demissis umeris esse, vincto pectore, ut gracilae sient.
> si quaest habitior paullo, pugilem esse aiunt, deducunt cibum.
> tam etsi bonast natura, reddunt curatura iunceam.
> itaque ergo amantur. **PAR.** quid tua istaec? **CHAE.** nova figura oris. **PAR.** papae!
> **CHAE.** color verus, corpus solidum et suci plenum. **PAR.** anni? **CHAE.** anni? sedecim.
> **PAR.** flos ipse. **CHAE.** nunc hanc tu mihi vel vi vel clam vel precario

fac tradas. mea nil refert dum potiar modo.

CHAE. The girl is not like our girls here, whose mothers are eager for them to have low-lying shoulders with bound chests, so they are slender. If any of them is a little fuller, they say she is a boxer, they restrict her food. Though her nature is good, the treatment makes her slim. For this they are loved. **PAR.** What of your girl? **CHAE.** The shape of her face is new. **PAR.** Pah! **CHAE.** Her complexion is real, her body solid and full of vivacity. **PAR.** Age? **CHAE.** Age? Sixteen. **PAR.** The flower of youth itself. **CHAE.** Now make sure you hand that girl over to me, by force or by stealth or by entreaty. It doesn't matter to me at all as long as I get possession of her.

The sustained comparison of Pamphila's beauty to that of other girls suggests that Chaerea is accustomed to surveying women's bodies. When he hears mention of his neighbor Thais, an independent sex laborer and the adoptive sister of Pamphila, Chaerea responds by lamenting that he has not yet seen the woman who is rumored to be beautiful: "I'm destroyed! I've still never seen her! Ah, tell me, is she a beauty, as it is said?" (*perii! numquamne etiam me illam vidisse! ehodum, dic mi estne, ut fertur, forma?* 360–61). Later, Chaerea explicitly characterizes himself as a *spectator* of women's beauty as he proudly describes how he raped Pamphila to Antipho: "Why should I now describe or praise her appearance to you, Antipho, seeing as you know what a refined spectator of the female form I am?" (*quid ego eius tibi nunc faciem praedicem aut laudem, Antipho, quom ipsum me noris quam elegans formarum spectator siem?* 565–66).

Chaerea's resolve to take possession of Pamphila by any means necessary is somewhat atypical for *adulescentes*. Chaerea explicitly orders the enslaved attendant Parmeno to take

whatever action is necessary in order to help him gain access to Pamphila: "I beg you by Hercules, Parmeno, make sure I get possession of her" (*obsecro hercle, Parmeno, fac ut potiar*, 362). Chaerea's lack of sympathy for Pamphila is consistent both before and after his attack, as is made clear by his single-mindedness about overpowering (*potiar*, 320, 362) her and his lack of concern for how it might be achieved (*mea nil refert*, 320). These explicit and implicit suggestions of violence are not typical of the *adulescens* in that they indicate premeditation and intentionality, neither of which are associated with any other rape in Terence's plays.[37]

Chaerea is entirely without remorse or sympathy as he emerges from Thais' house after he has raped Pamphila. He outwardly expresses his joy both in isolation ("Is it now okay for me to burst with happiness? By Jupiter, now indeed I can bear being killed, in order that life not contaminate my happiness with any sorrow," *iamne erumpere hoc licet mi gaudium? pro Iuppiter, nunc est profecto interfici quom perpeti me possum, ne hoc gaudium contaminet vita aegritudine aliqua*, 550–2) and in the company of his friend ("ANT. Chaerea, what happened to make you so excited? What are you happy about?... CHAE. O festive day," ANT. *Chaerea, quid est quod sic gestis?...quid est quod laetus es?*... CHAE. *o festus dies!* 558–60). Leaving no doubt about his intent or remorse, Chaerea immediately returns his attention to plotting how he can rape Pamphila again: "Let's head out and talk more about the girl on our way, I want to come up with a plan with you as to how I can continue to possess her" (*eamus, et de istac simul, quo pacto porro possim potiri, consilium volo capere una tecum*, 613–4).

With Antipho as his audience, Chaerea describes the circumstances leading up to the assault in vivid detail, concentrating again on vision and images as he does so. He begins by

[37] For a discussion of the typical rape plot in Terence's plays, see Chapter 2.

narrating how he infiltrated the women's quarters and successfully gained the women's trust by impersonating the eunuch gifted to his neighbor Thais (578–80):

> **CHAE.** edicit ne vir quisquam ad eam adeat et mihi ne abscedam imperat,
> in interiore parte ut maneam solus cum sola. adnuo
> terram intuens modeste. **ANT.** miser! …

> **CHAE.** She announced that no man should approach the girl, and she ordered me not to leave her but to remain alone with her isolated in the inner quarter. I nodded, looking modestly at the ground. **ANT.** Poor you! …

Chaerea's impersonation of the eunuch, this passage shows, is not limited only to his physical dress; in addition to donning his disguise, Chaerea also alters his behavior to mimic that of the eunuch. Temporarily suspending his role as *spectator*, Chaerea now averts his gaze away from the girl and instead stares modestly (*modeste*) at the ground. Chaerea calls attention to this behavioral shift and thereby indicates a conscious effort on his part to hide the characteristic behavior (i.e., gazing at a *virgo*) that would reveal him to be an *adulescens*. By associating restriction of vision with modesty and the eunuch, he, too, links voyeurism with immodesty and *adulescentes*.

Pamphila's location in the women's quarters is significant; she is placed their specifically to ensure her safety and security.[38] After the enslaved women in Thais' household have entrusted

[38] Like Danae, Pamphila's location does not grant her the privacy and safety it was intended to. In her discussion of the lived realities of abusive treatment in ancient Rome, Witzke argues that the home was the location where enslaved girls and women were at their most vulnerable to sexual assault, torture, accusations, and the general whims of the enslaver (2016).

Pamphila into the protection of the man they believe to be a eunuch, Chaerea sheds his feigned persona and resumes the role of *adulescens*. He vividly describes the scene to Antipho: how he gazed at Pamphila while she looked on at a painting depicting the rape of Danae by Jupiter and how it empowered him to do the same to Pamphila (583–91):[39]

> **CHAE.** adhortor properent. dum apparatur, virgo in conclavi sedet
> suspectans tabulam quandam pictam. ibi inerat pictura haec, Iovem
> quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum.
> egomet quoque id spectare coepi; et, quia consimilem luserat
> iam olim ille ludum, impendio magis animus gaudebat mihi,
> deum sese in hominem convortisse atque in alienas tegulas
> venisse clanculum per impluvium fucum factum mulieri.
> at quem deum, qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit!
> ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego illud vero ita feci ac lubens.

> **CHAE.** I urged them to hurry. As things are being prepared, the girl sits in the room gazing at a certain painted tablet. There was this picture was on it: how, as they say, Jupiter sent a golden shower to Danae's lap. I also started to gaze at it; and, since he back then had played the same game, my spirit was all the more greatly delighted, the god had turned himself into a human and on another person's roof he had secretly come through the skylight to play a trick on the woman. What a god! Who shakes the highest precincts

[39] For the most thorough discussion of the painting and Terence's use of ekphrasis, see Germany, who investigates how seriously the audience is meant to take Chaerea's excuse that the painting of Jupiter raping Danae compelled him to rape Pamphila. He argues that the play "is carefully structured to reinforce the unexpectedness of the rape" (2016: 5).

of heaven with his thunder! Was I, a mere human, not to do the same? I did it and I enjoyed myself.

Now as *adulescens*, Chaerea reclaims the role of spectator (*egomet quoque id spectare coepi*, 586). Through this detailed portrayal—an *ekphrasis* of both a painting and an offstage comic scene—Chaerea makes Antipho and the comic audience themselves into spectators of the absent *virgo* and of the rape. Chaerea stops short of describing his own attack on Pamphila and instead substitutes the painting of Danae and Jupiter, a *mise en abyme*, which both foreshadows and stands in for the attack. For Chaerea the painting serves to embolden him to follow through with his plan to rape Pamphila; for the audience the painting is a placeholder of offstage characters and action. Although the viewers do not see Pamphila for themselves, they are primed to imagine Danae in her place. The ekphrasis frames Pamphila as an object for viewing, a victim trapped in a portrait at the moment of her assault. From the perspective of the *adulescens*, she is an unrestricted source of visual and sexual pleasure.

Although Chaerea lacks remorse for his violence, he is conscious of being seen in the act. Chaerea tells Antipho how, moments before the attack, he thoroughly surveyed his surroundings to confirm that he and Pamphila were alone (601–3):

CHAE. interea somnus virginem opprimit. ego limis specto
sic per flabellum clanculum. simul alia circumspecto,
satin explorata sint. video esse. pessulum ostio obdo.

> **CHAE.** Meanwhile, sleep overcomes the girl. I look sideways through the little fan, like this, with stealth. At the same time, I'm looking around to see whether the rest of the room has been sufficiently inspected. I see that it has been. I slip the bolt in the door.

This passage, again notable for its abundance of verbs of seeing (*specto*; *circumspecto*; *explorata sint*; *video*), reinforces Chaerea's role as *spectator*. The emphasis here is not on Chaerea's spectatorship of Pamphila but on his own preoccupation with not being seen. As *spectator*, Chaerea holds power over Pamphila by reducing her to an object for his viewing pleasure. This passage reveals that Chaerea is also at risk of losing this power, should he himself be seen and no longer be *spectator*. Even after the assault, Chaerea further expresses his anxiety at being seen by his brother, father (610–11), or anyone else he knows (840–7) while still disguised as the eunuch. Chaerea's fear of being seen is proven to be valid when he is eventually caught and confronted by Thais and Pythias. Still costumed, Chaerea continues to impersonate the eunuch (851–58) and briefly forgoes the privileges of male citizenship. He is forced to feign enslavement under a *meretrix* (851), bear threat and insults from an enslaved woman (856–60), and is figuratively castrated (955–58).[40] As a result of being seen, Chaerea is temporarily stripped of his civic status, his masculinity, and ultimately his power.

Chaerea's obsession with beauty and vision is an obsession with power and control. Throughout the play, Chaerea is depicted as a *spectator* and critic of women's beauty. His repeated statements of intent to take possession of Pamphila (320; 362; 613–4), his violent assault, and his lack of remorse in the aftermath (550–2; 558–60; 591) objectify the *virgo*. Chaerea's single defense of his actions, "Know this one thing: I did not act for the sake of

[40] Tran (2021) argues that the imaginary punishment of Chaerea turns him into the very thing he pretends to be, metaphorically castrating him and temporarily prolonging his powerlessness.

causing injury but because of love" (*unum hoc scito, contumeliae me non fecisse causa sed amoris*, 877), dangerously relabels violence as "love" (*amor*) and shows that—even after Pamphila has been recognized as a citizen—his lack of sympathy for her has not changed. Spectatorship is another tool by which the *adulescens* asserts control over the *virgo*.

Self-pity in Terence's comedies

The *adulescens* might at first seem an obvious character to look toward for information about the *virgo*, given his self-proclaimed "love" for her. However, the speeches of the *adulescens* reveal an self-interested and self-pitying character who shows little to no regard for the suffering of the *virgo*. During happiness and hardship he expresses his own elation or misery—the latter often exaggerated—and he acknowledges only the consequences that he himself will have to face. This broad yet consistent characterization of the *adulescens* through his speech patterns is a reminder that the selfish young man of Roman Comedy is as much a stock character as the stern *senex* or the greedy *leno*.

In this section, I trace the occurrences of several recurring words and phrases that express self-directed sympathy in order to determine patterns of speech across different categories of comic stock characters. I focus on the following words: *perii* ("I've perished, I'm dead," *OLD* 3a), *disperii* ("I've perished, I've been destroyed" *OLD* 1a), *interii* ("I'm dead," *OLD* 1a), *occidi* ("I'm dead," *OLD* 3a), and *miser*(*a*) ("of a person that is to be pitied, poor, wretched, unfortunate," *OLD* 1a). The exclamations (*dis*)*perii*, *interii*, and *occidi* are spoken frequently throughout the plays of Terence by various character types.[41] The three verbs are synonymous,

[41] For this word study, my calculations exclusively represent occurrences of these verbs in the given forms (i.e., 1st person singular perfect active indicative): (*dis*)*perii*, *interii*, and *occidi*. I treat these forms as exclamations, rather than statements of fact.

with the literal definition "to die" and the abstracted meaning "to be ruined or done for."[42] The adjective *miser*(*a*) is used to describe a person who is to be pitied.[43] *Miser* can express pity for oneself when used reflexively (e.g., *me miserum*) or, unlike the first-person verbs *perii*, *interii*, and *occidi*, sympathy for another person. In both cases, the descriptor implies an outsider's perspective that judges the person being described as someone who deserves sympathy.[44]

My analyses reveal that the *adulescens* as a character type uses self-pitying language more than any other stock character of Terence's comedies and only rarely to express concern for another character's wellbeing. My findings add another layer of detail to the current consensus in scholarship on Roman Comedy, which suggests that women's speech in comedy is more "emotional" than that of men, particularly with reference to the use of the descriptor *miser*(*a*).[45]

Hecyra

In the *Hecyra*, the recently married Philumena returns to her parents' home in order to conceal her pregnancy from her new husband and his family. Since the pregnancy resulted from a rape that took place two months before she married Pamphilus (and nine months prior to the events of the play), Philumena knows that the birth of her child will be a threat to her marriage. By the play's end, Pamphilus will be recognized as the rapist and, therefore, the father of

[42] The close semantic range of these three verbs is illustrated by the *senex* Euclio of Plautus' *Aulularia*, who strings all three exclamations together in his state of high emotion after he has discovered that his pot of gold is missing ("I'm destroyed, I'm ruined, I'm dead," *perii, interii, occidi*, Pl. *Aul*. 713).
[43] Terence rarely uses the adjective *miser* to describe non-human objects. These infrequent occurrences are not included in my calculations.
[44] Dutsch emphasizes the role of the viewer that is implicit in the use of *miser*: "To state that a person is to be pitied, one must look at him or her from the outside, comparing his/her situation against some common standards. *Miser* thus denotes pain as seen by the other. When uttered to describe oneself, this adjective denotes self-pity, the strange condition in which the sufferer splits into two parts, one part experiencing the pain, the other contemplating and describing it" (2008: 108).
[45] This view is represented, in particular, by Adams (1984) and Dutsch (2008).

Philumena's newborn son. The discovery ensures that their marriage will remain intact and their son recognized as a legitimate citizen.

Throughout the play, Pamphilus' speech is notable for its repetitive use of words and phrases that express self-pity: the synonymous verbs *perii*, *interii*, and *occidi*, and the adjective *miser*. Adams (1984) and Dutsch (2008) argue that women's speech is more emotional than that of men; my analysis shows, however, that Pamphilus employs key emotional phrases and words more times overall than the women of *Hecyra* and, additionally, that Pamphilus' emotional distress is primarily self-directed, in contrast to Sostrata and Myrrina, whose concerns revolve around their children. My analysis reframes the parameters of "emotional" language to account for its prevalence also in the speech of the plays' *adulescentes*. While I examine the same vocabulary as Adams and Dutsch, by examining the data through the model of inward-facing pity vs. outward-facing pity, my study yields new interpretations and insights about the dimensions of women's emotional language. My analysis reveals that emotional language is an important feature of the speech of *adulescentes*, too; the nuance, therefore, lies in the contexts of emotional language, where women are more prone to empathy for others and *adulescentes* to self-directed pity.

Pamphilus uses, or is described as using, the adjective *miser* to refer to himself ten times, *perii* four times, and *interii* and *occidi* each once (see table below). For each of these words, Pamphilus represents at least half of their total occurrences within the play.

Table 1.1 Occurrences of self-pitying language in *Hecyra* (by speaker)					
	Miser(*a*)[46]	*Perii*	*Interii*	*Occidi*	

[46] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).

Pamphilus	**10**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**16**
Sostrata	4	1	0	0	5
Myrrina	3	2	0	0	5
Other	3[47]	1[48]	0	0	4
Total occurrences	20	8	1	1	30

At the beginning of the play, the *servus* Parmeno describes a series of events that took place before the events of the play. Recalling how poorly Pamphilus had received his father's orders that he marry Philumena (*ibi demum ita aegre tulit*, 128), he reports how Pamphilus twice likened his marriage to destruction: "Parmeno, I'm destroyed! What have I done! What a mess I've thrown myself into! I can't bear it, Parmeno. Poor me, I'm destroyed!" (*Parmeno, perii! quid ego egi! in quod me conieci malum! non potero ferre hoc, Parmeno. perii miser!* 132–3). Pamphilus is said to be especially distressed because his marriage to Philumena means the end of his romantic relationship with the *meretrix* Bacchis. His reaction is exaggerated: Pamphilus' separation from Bacchis and subsequent marriage to Philumena, of course, do not lead to his demise. Furthermore, Pamphilus' hopes of maintaining his relationship with Bacchis and avoiding marriage to a citizen girl are naïve and unrealistic, since a long-term arrangement of this kind would directly contradict the social expectations put upon him as a citizen man.

By the start of the events of the play, Pamphilus has come to terms with his marriage to Philumena (169–70), though he soon returns to catastrophizing about his circumstances. His first appearance on stage begins with a long and piteous speech about Philumena's withdrawal from their home (281–85):

[47] Syra, Philotis, Sosia.
[48] Parmeno.

> **PAM.** Nemini plura acerba credo esse ex amore homini umquam oblata
> quam mi. heu me infelicem! hancin ego vitam parsi perdere!
> hacin causa ego eram tanto opere cupidus redeundi domum! hui!
> quanto fuerat praestabilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem
> quam huc redire atque haec ita esse miserum me resciscere!
>
> **PAM**. I believe that no man has ever experienced more bitterness brought on by love than me. Oh, unlucky man that I am! I refrained from destroying *this* life! For *this* I so eagerly desired to return home! Ah! How much better it would have been to live out my life anywhere else in the world than for miserable me to return here and find out how things are going.

The audience's first onstage introduction to Pamphilus thus reinforces the image created by Parmeno's report of the events preceding the play. Pamphilus defines himself by the emphatic expression of his misery (*me infelicem*; *miserum me*) as he bewails his destruction and then claims that he is worse off than anyone else (281).[49] The irony of Pamphilus' inflated claim will soon be revealed when the audience learns that Philumena has become pregnant as a result of rape—an event which seriously threatens her physical safety and the security of her marriage—

[49] Many of Terence's young men make similar claims of hardship using comparatives and superlatives to compare themselves to others ("Oh countrymen, is there anyone alive who is luckier than me today?" *o populares, ecquis me vivit hodie fortunatior?* Ter. *Eun*. 1031; "Who is more fortunate than me, indeed who has a greater fill of pleasure?" *quis mest fortunatior venustatisque adeo plenior?* Ter. *Hec*. 848). They always consider themselves to be the worse/worst off (cf. Pamphilus and Charinus of *Andria*; Clinia and Clitipho of *Heautontimorumenos*; Antipho and Phaedria of *Phormio*). They also use similar comparative expressions in moments of extreme happiness; James notes, "The two young rapists [Chaerea of *Eunuchus* and Pamphilus of *Hecyra*] use remarkably similar language to describe themselves" (1998: 34).

and again even further when Pamphilus is recognized as the rapist. While Pamphilus bewails his circumstance, of which he himself is ultimately the cause, it is undeniable that no one within the play experiences more hardship brought about *ex amore* than Philumena.

The social status of Pamphilus' interlocutor in this scene, the *servus* Parmeno, is also notable. Pamphilus (like many other *adulescentes*) makes his complaints to a character who has suffered the tangible hardships of physical and verbal abuse at the hands of his enslavers, likely including Pamphilus. Although Parmeno tries to console Pamphilus, he also undermines the young man's claims stating, "Trivial are these matters which you make out to be highly important in your mind" (*levia sunt quae tu pergravia esse in animum induxti tuom*, 292). Parmeno's advice falls on deaf ears as Pamphilus continues with his complaints (293–36, 300):

> **PAM.** quid consolare me? an quisquam usquam gentiumst aeque miser?
> prius quam hanc uxorem duxi habebam alibi animum amore deditum.
> tamen numquam ausus sum recusare eam quam mi obtrudit pater.
> iam in hac re, ut taceam, quoivis facile scitust quam fuerim miser.
> […] quod quom ita esse invenero, quid restat nisi porro ut fiam miser?

> **PAM.** Why comfort me? Is there anyone anywhere in the world as miserable as me?
> Before I married my wife my heart was devoted elsewhere in love.
> Even so, I never dared to reject the girl whom my father forced upon me.
> By this time in the matter, though I am silent, it is easy for anyone to know how miserable I have been. […] When I do discover the state of things, what awaits me hereafter other than that I become miserable?

Pamphilus thus repeats his assertion that he is the worst off and he thrice more projects the image of himself as *miser* into the past, present, and future.

Parmeno declines to commiserate with Pamphilus, reframing the situation as a small matter (*parvom*, 306), and attempts again to offer a more realistic, albeit oversimplified, outlook concerning the conflict that has arisen between Philumena and her mother-in-law Sostrata after the former has fled from their home without explanation. Parmeno compares the behavior of women to that of children who become angry over trivial matters: "How children bear grudges between themselves for trivial offences! Why? Because those whose heart steers them have light-minded spirits. Those women are just the same as children with their trifling opinions" (*pueri inter sese quam pro levibus noxiis iras gerunt! quapropter? quia enim qui eos gubernat animus eum infirmum gerunt. itidem illae mulieres sunt ferme ut pueri levi sententia*, 310; 312). This criticism, though primarily directed toward the women, more subtly undercuts the reliability of Pamphilus, whom Parmeno has also just accused of making things out to be *pergravia* when they are actually *levia*.

Pamphilus becomes extremely distressed when he suspects that his wife is sick and when, soon afterward, he learns of her pregnancy. His distress, however, is framed not in terms of fear for Philumena but rather for himself. When he hears his wife screaming in pain from inside her parents' home, he exclaims, "I'm nothing! I'm destroyed! I'm ruined! (*nullus sum! perii!…interii!* 319; 322), and he equates Philumena's pain with his own ruin: "If some danger is upon you, there is no doubt that I am also destroyed" (*nam si periclum ullum in te inest, perisse me una haud dubiumst*, 326). Pamphilus, in expressing concern for Philumena, ultimately redirects it back onto himself.

Pamphilus' egocentrism is further demonstrated by his subsequent monologue, in which he reveals how he learned of Philumena's pregnancy. Pamphilus begins his retelling by framing the events as misfortunes that have happened to him (*mearum rerum*, 361) rather than to Philumena. He describes the moment he spotted Philumena in arduous labor followed by his abrupt exit (373–77):

> **PAM.** postquam intro adveni, extemplo eius morbum cognovi miser;
> nam neque ut celari posset tempus spatium ullum dabat
> neque voce alia ac res monebat ipsa poterat conqueri.
> postquam aspexi, 'o facinus indignum' inquam et corripui ilico
> me inde lacrumans, incredibili re atque atroci percitus.
>
> **PAM.** After I came inside, poor me, I immediately recognized her 'illness,'
> since the timing did not provide any opportunity in which it could be concealed,
> and she herself could not cry out any sound other than what her condition demanded.
> After I saw this, I said, 'Oh shameful crime!' and I immediately got myself out of there
> in tears, struck by the unbelievable and cruel situation.

In his hasty retreat from the house, Pamphilus shows no inclination to check on the physical or mental state of his crying wife.[50] He, instead, prioritizes his own distress (*miser*).[51] Furthermore, Pamphilus calls Philumena's pregnancy a crime (*facinus*). Knowing that he chose not to have sex

[50] Anderson, similarly, notes that Pamphilus keeps his attentions turned inward: "As for all that [Pamphilus'] wife has endured, he is too selfish to imagine or feel guilty about it" (2001: 14–5).
[51] Of this occurrence, Goldberg remarks that Pamphilus "continues to think first of himself" (2013: 142).

with Philumena in the first months of their marriage, Pamphilus logically—though incorrectly—assumes that he cannot be the child's father and that Philumena is guilty of infidelity. Pamphilus thus frames Philumena's pregnancy as a transgression on her part.[52]

The irony of this scene is two-fold; it is created both by Pamphilus' perceived victimhood and his designation of the situation as *incredibilis* (377). In identifying Philumena's pregnancy as a crime, Pamphilus recasts himself as its victim and Philumena its perpetrator. His assessment of the situation, however, is almost immediately challenged by Philumena's mother, Myrrina. In a private conversation, she reveals that the pregnancy resulted from rape by an unidentified assailant: "For the rape was inflicted upon her back when she was unmarried by some shameless man" (*nam vitiumst oblatum virgini olim a nescioquo improbo*, 383). Myrrina thus offers an alternative to Pamphilus' egocentric perspective. In no uncertain terms Myrrina removes blame from her daughter and reassigns it to the perpetrator of the assault (*improbo*). Pamphilus' reliability is promptly undermined and invalidated. The effect is felt even more strongly when Pamphilus is later identified as the man who raped Philumena and as the father of her child (830–2). The postponement of this identification allows Myrrina to voice criticism against her daughter's attacker with impunity; had Pamphilus been recognized previously, his privileged status as a male citizen would have prevented Myrrina from denouncing him freely.

Given his involvement in the crime, Pamphilus' shock and dismay (*incredibili re atque atroci percitus*) when faced with the consequences of rape is also ironic.[53] The effect is not fully

[52] Donatus (*ad loc.*) suggests that Pamphilus' outcry (*o facinus indignum*) referred to the rape rather than the pregnancy (*non ad illam, hoc est Philumenam, sed ad auctorem vitii refertur*). Pamphilus, however, would not yet have been aware of the rape at the time of his outburst. Even when he speaks of the rape, Pamphilus simply narrates the words of Myrrina, and does not remark upon it himself.

[53] Rosivach suggests that this irony is "unconscious, and we should not suppose that Terence was aware of it, much less that he wished to call it to his audience's attention" (1998: 28). Rosivach's assessment, unduly, does the playwright a great disservice by precluding the possibility—indeed, the likelihood—that this dramatic effect is intentional. Penwill also refutes the claim by Rosivach: "This suggests that Terence had no idea of what he was

realized until Pamphilus later admits that he raped *a* girl (*homo se fatetur vi in via nescioquam compressisse*, 828), whom he does not recognize to be Philumena. Aware of this assault, then, Pamphilus should recognize the possibility that he could have—and, in fact, did—put his victim into the same situation in which Philumena finds herself. His incredulity demonstrates an extreme degree of cognitive dissonance as he fails to recognize his own role as a perpetrator of violence.

Perhaps surprisingly, Pamphilus openly expresses sympathy not for Philumena but for Myrrina. Pamphilus describes how Myrrina pursued him out from her house and begged that he keep Philumena's pregnancy a secret: "Her mother followed. When I crossed the threshold, she fell to my knees crying, the poor woman" (*mater consequitur. iam ut limen exirem, ad genua accidit lacrumans misera*, 378–9). It is this image, rather than that of Philumena's painful labor, that finally stirs pity in Pamphilus (*miseritumst*, 379). This is the first and only time in the play that Pamphilus describes someone other than himself as *miser*(*a*).[54] Although Pamphilus here acknowledges the suffering of his mother-in-law, he quickly returns to prioritizing his emotions over hers. He now reclaims the descriptor *miser* as he recalls the piteous image of Myrrina begging at his knees: "But when I remember her pleas, I am not able to stop from crying, poor me" (*sed quom orata huius reminiscor nequeo quin lacrumem miser*, 385). Just as Pamphilus reframed Philumena's pregnancy as his own misfortune, he, too, appropriates this image of his mother-in-law's suffering (*lacrumans misera*, 379), by repeating the syntax to describe himself (*lacrumem miser,* 385). Later, Pamphilus shows resolve to keep his promise to Myrrina, and he

doing, or that he is as insensitive as the character that he has created. On the contrary, as I am attempting to show, Terence knew exactly what he was doing and how he wanted his audience to respond" (2004: 145). Goldberg credits the playwright with the creation of dramatic irony, but suggests that he limits "his most potent tool for bringing the play's meaning home to his audience" by delaying the revelation of Pamphilus' identity as the rapist (1986: 162).

[54] The only other character to use *miser*(*a*) to describe another character in *Hecyra* is Myrrina as she talks about her daughter and the concealment of her (allegedly) illegitimate pregnancy: "…and you will have covered up the shameful wrong done to the poor girl" (*et illi miserae indigne factam iniuriam contexeris*, 401).

restates his pity for her, though still with emphasis on his own misfortune: "What am I going to do, unlucky man? I really do not know how I can keep secret what Myrrina begged me to: her daughter's pregnancy. Since I feel pity for the woman, I will do what I can, as long as I am preserving my duty" (*quid agam infelix? prorsus nescio quo pacto hoc celem quod me oravit Myrrina, suae gnatae partum. nam me miseret mulieris. quod potero faciam, tamen ut pietatem colam*, 444–7).

While it is not impossible that *mulieris* refers to Philumena, Myrrina is the more likely candidate for three reasons. First, grammatically the focus is on Myrrina, with Philumena here referred to as an extension of her mother. Secondly, Pamphilus has already used the root *miser-* to express sympathy for Myrrina (379), something he has not done for Philumena.[55] Finally, in the *Hecyra*, *mulier* consistently refers to Sostrata, Myrrina, or women as a collective; Pamphilus opts for *uxor* when he speaks of Philumena.[56]

Pamphilus repeatedly uses the adjective *miser*(*a*) and its related verbal forms in a wide range of contexts of varying degrees of severity. *Miser* describes Pamphilus in his aversion to marriage, in his anxiety concerning the stability of his marriage, in his shock and anger at the birth of Philumena's child, and even in his own reaction to witnessing his mother-in-law's suffering. Pamphilus almost exclusively uses *miser* to describe himself and never uses it to describe his wife, for whom the pregnancy poses the greatest physical and social threat. Philumena's pregnancy is a danger not only to her physical health, as her painful labor indicates,

[55] There is only one explicit indication in the play that Pamphilus has ever felt pity for Philumena, and it is voiced not by Pamphilus but by Parmeno. As Parmeno provides background to the events that took place before the start of the play, he suggests that Pamphilus became amiable to his wife for two reasons: (1) he pitied her and (2) he grew tired of how the *meretrix* Bacchis was treating him: "Partly because his spirit was bound by pity for his wife, and partly because he was overcome by the increasingly common affronts from Bacchis, he slipped away from Bacchis and transferred his love here [i.e., to Philumena]" (*hic animus partim uxoris misericordia devinctus, partim victus huius iniuriis paullatim elapsust Bacchidi atque huc transtulit amorem*, 167–70).
[56] *Hec*. 294, 299, 302, 366, 602, 614.

but also to her legitimacy as a wife within the household and as a citizen woman within her society at large. Philumena has the most to lose but she receives the least amount of sympathy and care from her husband.

Andria

The *Andria* circulates around a *virgo* named Glycerium who was separated from her citizen family at a young age and raised by an adoptive sister named Chrysis. After her sister's death, Glycerium is pregnant and must depend on an *adulescens* named Pamphilus, who has promised to marry her, even though she is not (at this point) recognized as a citizen. In the meantime, Pamphilus' father, a *senex* named Simo, makes arrangements for Pamphilus to marry another *virgo* named Philumena, the daughter of Simo's neighbor Chremes. The play's resolution is brought upon by the recognition that Glycerium is the long-lost daughter of Chremes and can, therefore, marry Pamphilus, thereby ensuring the legitimacy of their newborn son.

The relationship between Pamphilus and Glycerium appears to be mutual. The *senex* Simo claims that he could easily recognize the love (*amor*) Pamphilus feels for Glycerium as he describes Chrysis' funeral (127–36):

> **SIM.** …funus interim
> procedit. sequimur, ad sepulcrum venimus.
> in ignem impositast, fletur. interea haec soror
> quam dixi ad flammam accessit imprudentius,
> satis cum periclo. ibi tum exanimatus Pamphilus

bene dissimulatum amorem et celatum indicat.
accurrit, mediam mulierem complectitur.
'mea Glycerium,' inquit 'quid agis? quor te is perditum?'
tum illa, ut consuetum facile amorem cerneres,
reiecet se in eum flens quam familiariter!

SIM. The funeral continued in the meantime. We followed and approached the burial. She was placed in the fire, and there were lamentations. Meanwhile, the sister, whom I told you about, rather impulsively approached the flame with plenty of risk. Alarmed, Pamphilus then revealed his well-hidden secret love. He ran and embraced the woman. 'My Glycerium, ' he said, 'What are you doing? Why are you trying to kill yourself?' Then she threw herself onto him in tears so familiarly that you could easily tell their love was nothing new.

Though Glycerium does not appear onstage, her actions, as Simo describes them, suggest that she reciprocates Pamphilus' love and has reached such a level of affection with him as to seek comfort from him in her grief.

Pamphilus, too, makes explicit reference to his love and pity (*misericordia*) for Glycerium as he remarks upon the conflicting emotions which urge him to reject the marriage arranged by his father: "So many concerns entangle me, which drag my heart in different directions: love, pity for her, anxiety about marriage, on the other hand respect for my father" (*tot me impediunt curae, quae meum animum divorsae trahunt: amor, misericordia huius,*

nuptiarum sollicitatio, tum patris pudor, 260–2). Love and pity, therefore, are driving forces for Pamphilus, which come into direct conflict with his sense of *pudor* for his father.[57]

Despite his love for Glycerium, Pamphilus reveals that he is still conflicted as to whether he should obey his father's orders that he marry Philumena (264). It is only in response to a confrontation with Mysis, an *ancilla* in Chrysis' household who doubts his loyalty to Glycerium, that Pamphilus becomes more resolute about his devotion to her. Mysis offers the following sympathetic image of Glycerium: "She is suffering labor pains and the poor girl is anxious for the reason that your marriage was arranged for today. What's more she is afraid that you will abandon her" (*laborat e dolore atque ex hoc misera sollicitast, diem quia olim in hunc sunt constitutae nuptiae. tum autem hoc timet, ne deseras se*, 268–70). Mysis emphasizes Glycerium's pain, suffering, and fear, and she makes it clear that Pamphilus is the cause of the girl's hardships. As a representative for the *virgo*, Mysis demonstrates her keen awareness of the nuances of the relationship between Glycerium and Pamphilus. She advocates for Glycerium at key moments in order to prompt Pamphilus' sympathy (268, 693, 719) and explicitly attributes Glycerium's suffering to Pamphilus' actions: "Truly, what hardship the poor girl suffers because of him!" (*verum ex eo nunc misera quem capit laborem*, 719)

Mysis is successful in her attempt to influence Pamphilus.[58] He now reiterates his motives in a series of rhetorical question aimed to assuage Mysis' distrust (270–80):

PAM. hem! egone istuc conari queam?

egon propter me illam decipi miseram sinam,

[57] Pamphilus of *Hecyra*, too, is described as being driven by *misericordia* (see *Hec*. 167–70 above). *Misericordia*, when it is formulated by the *adulescens*, is often an expression of obligation.
[58] The *senex*, Simo, suggests that women consciously stir pity in young men with tricks and fabricated tears (*scelera et lacrumae confictae dolis*, *An*. 558).

quae mihi suom animum atque omnem vitam credidit,
quam ego animo egregie caram pro uxore habuerim?
bene et pudice eius doctum atque eductum sinam
coactum egestate ingenium immutarier?
non faciam…
adeon me ignavom putas,
adeon porro ingratum aut inhumanum aut ferum,
ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor
commoveat neque commoneat ut servem fidem?

PAM. Oh! Could I attempt that? Could I allow that poor girl to be cheated because of me, she who entrusted her heart and her entire life to me, whom I myself with an honorable heart has treated dearly in place of a wife? Could I allow her nature, which has been taught and raised well and chastely, to be altered driven by poverty? I will not do it. Do you think I am so cowardly, or besides so ungrateful or inhuman or cruel, that neither our history nor love nor shame could move me or impress upon me to keep my promise?

Pamphilus' response expresses sympathy for Glycerium, but it is primarily a defense of his own character. The abundance of first-person verbs and pronouns foreground Pamphilus, though Glycerium is ostensibly the object of concern.[59] Still, there is evidence that Mysis has, at least temporarily, influenced Pamphilus' attitude toward Glycerium. Pamphilus now describes

[59] Goldberg points out the hypocrisy of Pamphilus' stated concern for Glycerium's *ingenium*, when he has himself put her at risk by impregnating her without marrying her (2019: 42–3). Calling Pamphilus' reliability into question, he states, "There is no reason to think [Pamphilus] a particularly reliable narrator, and his description is not entirely in line with the reality of the situation" (43).

Glycerium as *misera* (271), which directly echoes Mysis only a moment before ("The poor girl is anxious," *misera sollicitast*, 268).[60] Additionally, Pamphilus reevaluates his concept of *pudor*, which in his earlier monologue he describes as respect he owes to his father (*patris pudor*, 262). After being confronted by Mysis, Pamphilus redefines *pudor* as something owed to Glycerium instead. Pamphilus' response also demonstrates that he is conscious of the negative consequences that Glycerium will face if he abandons her: the corruption of her *ingenium* (i.e., the quality of her being a free and noble citizen). Mysis alerts Pamphilus to the girl's fear, but it is Pamphilus who defines it and recognizes that he is responsible for her future stability and status. In the face of Mysis' criticism, Pamphilus thus proves his capacity for pity, when pushed, or otherwise the ability to perform the emotions expected of him. He demonstrates, in addition, his practical knowledge of the social pressures put upon both him and Glycerium.

Pamphilus describes Glycerium as *misera* once more, again only after being confronted by Mysis. As Mysis begs Pamphilus to come to the home in order to reassure Glycerium of his loyalty, he turns his attention instead to Davos. With Mysis as witness, Pamphilus assigns blame to Davos for his and Glycerium's distress: "Ah! I'm destroyed! This trouble is starting up anew! How distressed she and I are now, poor us, because of your doing!" (*vah! perii! hoc malum integrascit. sicin me atque illam opera tua nunc miseros sollicitari*, 688–89.) Using the plural *miseros*, Pamphilus recasts himself as a fellow victim of Davos' plotting, and once again declines to accept responsibility for Glycerium's suffering. Pamphilus grammatically joins himself to Glycerium's suffering and, with his use of the first-person *perii* and the advanced

[60] In contrast to Pamphilus, Mysis uses *misera* to describe Glycerium a total of four times, and on three of the occasions on which she uses *misera* self-referentially it is a direct response to overhearing Pamphilus' doubts about rejecting the marriage his father has arranged for him (240, 251, 264). In sum, seven of the ten occurrences of *misera* in Mysis' speech are made in reference to Glycerium's pregnancy or the possibility that Pamphilus will abandon her. Only three of these occurrences indicate distress at her own plight (743, 761, and 788) as she fears punishment from being tricked into participating in Davos' scheming.

position of *me* before *illam*, he continues to prioritize himself. Mysis similarly unites herself with Glycerium under the plural *nos miseras*, as she tells Crito that Chrysis' death has led to their shared suffering and destruction: "Indeed, by god she destroyed us, poor us" (*nos quidem pol miseras perdidit*, 803). However, in contrast to Pamphilus who maintains linguistic separation from Glycerium with the conjunction *atque* (*me atque illam*), Mysis inextricably connects herself to Glycerium by her use of the first-person plural *nos*.[61]

While Pamphilus expresses sympathy for Glycerium under pressure from Mysis in this early scene, for the remainder of the play he refocuses his pity upon himself. Like Pamphilus of *Hecyra*, Pamphilus of *Andria* expresses his anguish with the first-person verbs *perii* and *interii*, as he fears his arranged marriage, the failure of Davos' scheming, and his father's anger (346, 688, 872, 914). The two *adulescentes* (Pamphilus and Charinus) use the adjective *miser* nine times to express pity directed at themselves (243, 302, 351, 617, 646, 649, 689, 702, 882).

Charinus, whose romantic interest in Philumena constitutes the secondary plot of *Andria*, uses *miser* in the same circumstances as Pamphilus (i.e., when he fears that he will lose his beloved Philumena to another man). Furthermore, Charinus' confrontations with Pamphilus explicitly call attention to the common personality and behaviors shared by the young men. When he fears that Pamphilus has fallen in love with Philumena and betrayed him, Charinus woefully says that he had expected that he and Pamphilus have a shared character: "Oh poor me, who judged your character based on my character" (*heu me miserum qui tuom animum ex animo*

[61] Dutsch (2008) observes a similar effect in Plautus' *Amphitruo*. Stepping away from Alcumena's labor, the *ancilla* Bromia cries, "No woman is more miserable than me, nor could any woman seem to be. So today has fallen upon my mistress" (*nec me miserior femina est neque ulla videatur magis. ita erae meae hodie contigit*, Pl. *Am*. 1060–1). Dutsch suggests that Bromia's expression of solidarity is motivated by a "comically distorted perception" of herself and a "false opinion of her own importance" that reveals Bromia's inability to distinguish herself from Alcumena (119). Citing examples of other enslaved women who associate themselves with enslavers in this way and noting that enslaved men do not, Dutsch concludes that these instances "constitute a stylized discourse of intimacy and compassion gendered as feminine" (119). On this point, I see no need to minimize expressions of solidarity with the implication that empathy on the part of enslaved women must arise out of a false sense of importance.

spectavi meo, 646). Ironically, Pamphilus responds by resisting the identification with his fellow *adulescens*, instead suggesting that Charinus simply does not understand his romantic problems: "You don't know how many hardships I, poor me, am twisted up in" (*nescis quantis in malis vorser miser*, 649). In the case of the *adulescens*, misery does not love company. In a later dialogue, again highlighting their shared identity as *adulescentes miseri*, Charinus suggests that he and Pamphilus are equals in their misery: "PAM. How do I seem? CHA. Miserable, just as much as I am" (PAM. *quis videor?* CHA. *miser, aeque atque ego*, 702). When these scenes between like character types are read as metageneric references to stock character type, they establish the *adulescens* as a definable character type, one which is repeatedly associated with self-pity and which resists sympathizing with even one another.

The occurrences of self-pitying language spoken by the primary characters of *Andria* break down as follows:

Table 1.2 Occurrences of self-pitying language in *Andria* (by speaker)

	Miser(*a*)[62]	*Perii*	*Interii*	*Occidi*	
Pamphilus	6	**4**	**1**	0	**11**
Charinus	3	0	0	0	3
Davos	0	2	0	**2**	4
Mysis	**7**	0	0	0	7
Other	1[63]	1[64]	0	0	2

[62] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).
[63] Simo (*senex*).
[64] Crito (male relative of Chrysis).

Total occurrences	17	7	1	2	27

As the table shows, Pamphilus expresses self-directed pity through the words *miser*, *perii*, and *interii* more than any other character of *Andria*, and, as a category, the *adulescentes* use the adjective *miser* to express self-pity the most. Although Mysis describes herself as *miser*(*a*) seven times, the context of her pity is crucial. Three of the seven occurrences of *miser*(*a*) in Mysis' speech represent her response to hearing about Pamphilus' alleged betrayal of Glycerium. Her concern, though it is articulated with the implicitly self-directed *misera*, is expressed on Glycerium's behalf rather than Mysis'.

Civic status and enslavement are critical to this discussion, given that *miser*, *perii*, *interii*, and *occidi* express not only self-directed pity but also distress and fear. Davos, an enslaved man, uses *perii* and *occidi* a total of four times throughout the play, always in expectation of the possible failure of his plan and subsequent physical punishment. For Davos, *perii* and *occidi* take on a literal meaning as he fears the tangible consequences to his scheming. He describes his vulnerable position and his dependence on not only the success of his plans but also the fickle disposition of his enslaver: "If he finds out, I'm destroyed; or if he wants to, he'll come up with a reason by which rightly or wrongly he will throw me headlong to the mill" (*si senserit, perii; aut si lubitum fuerit, causam ceperit quo iure quaque iniuria praecipitem in pistrinum dabit*, 213–4). Brown considers the logical problem introduced by *aut*, which implies that the protases "*si senserit*" and "*si lubitum fuerit*" are different. making reference to the relationship between the verb *perii* and physical abuse as a condition of enslavement, and explains that being sent to the mill is an "amplification" of the idiomatic *perii* (2019: 193). *Perii* foreshadows the real

consequence of being sent to the mill, a notoriously grueling and dangerous form of enslaved labor.

Verbs like *perii* and its synonyms are out of place in the speech of a freeborn *adulescens* for whom there is virtually no risk of harm besides being separated from his love interest, an outcome which has no effect on his legitimacy or status. Later, after Glycerium has been recognized as the lost daughter of Chremes, Davos succinctly summarizes how the typical comic plot ends—that is, with bad outcomes (*mali*) for enslaved characters and good ones (*boni*) for *adulescentes*: "It happened in the usual way: that you learned what bad things I was met with before I learned what good happened for you" (*more hominum evenit ut quod sim nanctus mali prius rescisceres tu quam ego illud quod tibi evenit boni*, 967–68). While the *adulescens* worries the most about his circumstance, it is the *servus* who risks the most. This language of suffering (*miser*, *perii*, *interii*, *occidi*) represents physical consequences for the enslaved characters of comedy. For the *adulescens*, suffering is merely an abstraction. This imbalance, though it occurs to the detriment of enslaved characters, is also what uniquely positions them to undermine and challenge the expressions of self-pity made by the plays' *adulescentes*.

Heautontimorumenos

The *Heautontimorumenos* circulates around a displaced *virgo* named Antiphila who is engaged in a sexual relationship with the *adulescens* Clinia.[65] Antiphila is the only *virgo* to appear on stage in a speaking role in all of Terence's plays. She is accompanied by Bacchis, a *meretrix* whose services are engaged by the *adulescens* Clitipho. By the play's end, Antiphila is

[65] For an in-depth discussion of Antiphila, see Conclusion.

discovered to be the long-lost daughter of Clitipho's parents, thereby restoring her citizen status and clearing a path for her marriage to Clinia.

Like Pamphilus and Charinus of *Andria*, the *adulescentes* Clinia and Clitipho also fail to sympathize with one another, despite the similarity of their circumstances.[66] As the table below shows, Clinia and Clitipho use *miser* to express self-directed pity more than any other character of *Heautontimorumenos*, including Menedemus, the self-tormentor for whom the play is named. Of the thirteen occurrences of *miser*(*a*) more than half are spoken by the *adulescentes*, and all of these are reflexive.

Table 1.3 Occurrences of self-pitying language in *Heautontimorumenos* (by speaker)

	Miser(*a*)[67]	(*Dis*-)*perii*	*Interii*	*Occidi*	
Clinia	**5**[68]	1	0	0	6
Clitipho	**3**	4	0	0	**7**
Antiphila	1	2	0	0	3
Syrus	0	**5**	**1**	0	6
Sostrata	1	1	0	0	2
Menedemus	2	0	0	**1**	3
Chremes	1	1	0	0	2

[66] Goldberg remarks on the stereotypicality of these *adulescentes* and their lack of nuance: "These young men [Clinia and Clitipho] are not very interesting in themselves. They have no depth and show no growth. The dilemmas they face are too typical of the comic genre and resolved too conventionally to arouse deep interest" (1986: 141).
[67] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).
[68] One of these occurrences is reported speech (by Clitipho); when asked how Clinia is faring, Clitipho responds, "He says that he is miserable" (*miserum se esse*, 192). In this table, I count this as a self-directed use of *miser* by Clinia, since it is not Clitipho who expresses sympathy.

Total occurrences	13	14	1	1	29

As the young men reflect on their distress, each *adulescens* argues that he himself is worse off. While Clitipho reflects on his tenuous relationship with the *meretrix* Bacchis, he suggests that Clinia is the better off since his love interest (Antiphila) has not taken up the lifestyle or attitude of a *meretrix* (224–27):

> **CLIT.** …neque me quisquamst miserior.
> nam hic Clinia, etsi is quoque suarum rerum satagit, at tamen
> habet bene et pudice eductam, ignaram artis meretriciae.
> meast potens, procax, magnifica, sumptuosa, nobilis.

> **CLIT.** …and no one is more miserable than me. For Clinia here, although he also has his hands full with his own matters, at least he has a girl who was brought up properly and chastely, unexperienced in the ways of a *meretrix*. My girl is bold, pushy, proud, extravagant, and notorious.

Clitipho thus demonstrates a level of recognition of Clinia's troubles (*suarum rerum*), but he is explicit in his belief that his own suffering is worse (*miserior*) than that of his friend or indeed than anyone at all (*quisquam*).[69] Furthermore, the concessive *etsi…tamen* suggests that Clitipho

[69] Cf. Pamphilus of *Hecyra*, who asks, "Is there anyone anywhere in the world as miserable as me?" (*an quisquam usquam gentiumst aeque miser? Hec.* 293). No women in Terence's plays make such an assertion. However, Bromia of Plautus' *Amphitruo* does: "No woman is more miserable than me, nor could any woman seem to be. This is how things turned out for my mistress today" (*nec me miserior femina est neque ulla videatur magis. Ita erae meae hodie contigit*, Pl. *Am*. 1060–1).

does not regard Clinia's unhappiness to be as justified as his own, so his acknowledgement of Clinia's circumstance stops short of genuine sympathy.

On the other hand, as Clinia reflects on his own situation in fear that Antiphila has taken up the lifestyle of a *meretrix*, he repeats Clitipho's exaggerated declaration of self-pity almost verbatim: "No one is more miserable than me" (*nemost miserior me*, 263). The repeated comparative in such close proximity to Clitipho's speech emphasizes the similarity of the two young men's self-aggrandizing and self-interest. Clinia's pronouncement is promptly undermined and contradicted by the *servus* Syrus, who confirms that neither Antiphila's lifestyle (*vita*) nor attitude (*animus*) has changed (263–6). In this way, Clinia's estimation of his own suffering is immediately revealed to be exaggerated and unreliable.

Phormio

The two *adulescentes* of *Phormio* are emphatic that their own suffering is worse than that of anyone else. Phaedria longs for an enslaved music girl, while Antipho must find a way to convince his father to accept the girl whom he has already married in secret. Overall, self-pitying language is less prevalent in *Phormio*, but the redundancy of the argument between Phaedria and Antipho regarding who is less fortunate emphasizes the young men's—especially Antipho's—self-absorption, egocentrism**,** and lack of empathy for others. As with Clinia and Clitipho of *Heautontimorumenos*, a direct comparison is made between the two *adulescentes*. The interactions between Phaedria and Antipho reinforce the characterization of the *adulescens* as egocentric and self-pitying, and a metageneric reading of their speech further suggests an internal awareness that this mindset and behavior is characteristic of the stock *adulescens*.

Antipho first appears onstage expressing regret and anxiety concerning his marriage to Phanium, as he fears that his father will end the marriage when he learns that it has occurred without his consent (153–61). In contrast to the *adulescentes* who catastrophize when they fear the loss of their love interests, Antipho suggests that the loss of Phanium would have caused him less suffering than his prolonged possession of her has (159–61):

> **ANT.** non potitus essem: fuisset tum illos mi aegre aliquot dies,
> at non cotidiana cura haec angeret animum– **PHAE.** audio.
> **ANT.** —dum exspecto quam mox veniat qui adimat hanc mi consuetudinem

> **ANT.** I would not have gained possession of her. It would have been bad for me for those few days, but this daily anxiety would not be tormenting my heart— **PHAE.** I hear you.
> **ANT.** —while I wait for the one who will take away my relationship as soon as he arrives.

Antipho compares his current suffering against his own hypothetical suffering that he would have faced had he been barred from marrying Phanium in the first place. Antipho's hypothetical scenario is, of course, spoken from a position of hindsight and security knowing that he has already married Phanium. In the same way that *adulescentes* often exaggerate their anticipated suffering, here Antipho seems to downplay what his reaction would have been if he had been kept from Phanium.

In response to Antipho's complaints, Phaedria tells him that he is ungrateful for the good things in his life, juxtaposing Antipho's circumstance with his own romantic plights (162–72):

PHAE. aliis quia defit quod amant aegrest: tibi quia superest dolet.

amore abundas, Antipho.

nam tua quidem hercle certo vita haec expetenda optandaquest.

ita me di bene ament, ut mihi liceat tam diu quod amo frui,

iam depecisci morte cupio. tu conicito cetera,

quid ego ex hac inopia nunc capiam et quid tu ex ista copia,

ut ne addam quod sine sumptu ingenuam ac liberalem nactus es,

quod habes, ita ut voluisti, uxorem sine mala fama palam,

beatus, ni unum desit, animus qui modeste istaec ferat.

quod si tibi res sit cum eo lenone quo mihist, tum sentias.

ita plerique ingenio sumus omnes: nostri nosmet paenitet.

PHAE. Others suffer because they lack what they love; you feel sorry for yourself because you have it in abundance. You are overflowing with love, Antipho. Indeed, by Hercules, your life is certainly one to be coveted and wished for. May the gods so love me, I would willingly make a bargain at the price of my death today that it be permitted for me to enjoy what I love for so long. Besides, compare what I have now out of my scarcity and what you have out of your abundance, and I won't add that you obtained a free-born and honorable girl without expense, whom you openly possess, as you wished, without negative judgment. A fortunate man, if not wanting for one thing: a mind which could bear these things in due measure. But should you be in the situation with the *leno*

> that I am, then you would understand. Most all of us are this way with respect to our character: we are dissatisfied with our own lot.

Phaedria contrasts the good fortune of abundance with the misfortune of scarcity, implying that the only thing Antipho lacks is the ability to acknowledge and appreciate that he is fortunate. Not only does Antipho fail to recognize his own good fortune, but, as Phaedria points out (171), his complaints also reveal that he lacks empathy for his fellow *adulescentes* who desire exactly what he has. Phaedria expresses pity for himself as he uses his own conflict with the *leno* as a comparison to highlight the good in Antipho's situation. Perhaps in defense of Antipho (and himself) Phaedria suggests that Antipho's behavior is characteristic of the *adulescens* as a type (172). The repetition and emphasis on the plurality of *nos* (*plerique*; *omnes*; *nostri*; *nosmet*) puts the two *adulescentes* into a shared category, which is foreshadowed by *aliis* (162) at the beginning of Phaedria's speech. Phaedria explains that the common trait (*ingenium*) shared by *adulescentes* is to feel dissatisfaction with their situation. His metageneric allusion to this stock characteristic (i.e., self-pity) offers a definition of the stock character type and locates both Phaedria and Antipho securely within the category.

In response to Phaedria's critique, Antipho adopts the same strategy and now turns it against Phaedria (173–76):

> **ANT.** at tu mihi contra nunc videre fortunatus, Phaedria,
> quoi de integrost potestas etiam consulendi quid velis,
> retinere, amare, amittere. ego in eum incidi infelix locum
> ut neque mihi sit amittendi nec retinendi copia.

> **ANT.** On the contrary, to me you seem the fortunate one, Phaedria, for whom there is still the opportunity to consider afresh what you want: to keep her, to love her, or to send her away. Unlucky me, I have fallen into the position that it is not in my power to send her away or keep her.

Both *adulescentes* exhibit similar behaviors: pitying themselves above all and failing to empathize with others. Consistent with their character type, neither young man successfully evokes pity from the other or feels empathy for him. The persistence of the young men's the-grass-is-always-greener attitude is made evident by yet another iteration of their earlier argument (504–7):

> **PHAE.** o fortunatissume Antipho. **ANT.** egone? **PHAE.** quoi quod amas domist,
> neque umquam cum huius modi usus venit ut conflictares malo.
> **ANT.** mihin domist? immo, id quod aiunt, auribus teneo lupum.
> nam neque quo pacto a me amittam neque uti retineam scio.

> **PHAE.** O Antipho, you most fortunate man. **ANT.** Me? **PHAE.** Since the object of your love is at your home, and never has the sort of occasion come that you would face this problem. **ANT.** At my home? On the contrary, as they say, I have the wolf by the ears. For I don't know either how I can send her away from me or keep her.

Both young men stand firm in their belief that they are the worse off, and their failure to communicate and empathize with even one another categorically isolates them.

I have traced the occurrences of four words commonly used across Terence's plays to express self-directed sympathy (*miser*(*a*), *perii*, *interii*, *occidi*) in order to demonstrate how self-pitying language characterizes the speech of *adulescentes*. In tracing these specific words, I have also identified a theme that is typical of the speech of Terence's *adulescens*: the assumption that his own suffering is always worse than that of anyone else. In this section, I have focused on the most robust examples of Terence's self-pitying *adulescentes*, isolating specific scenes that exemplify their selfishness and lack of empathy for others.[70] Consolidating the evidence across Terence's plays, I now look at self-pitying language broadly, in order to build upon scholarship that has traditionally associated expressions of pity primarily with the women of Roman Comedy. Additionally, I show that a comparison of the broader contexts in which different stock character types employ pitying language reveals a number of key differences between expressions of self-pity and sympathy for another.

Formulae Desperantis*: *Miser,* (*Dis*)*perii*, *Interii*, *Occidi

Since at least the fourth century C.E., it has been suggested that elevated emotion and self-pity is characteristic of women's speech. In his commentary on Terence's *Adelphoe*, the fourth-century Roman grammarian, Aelius Donatus, remarks (*Ad Ad.* 291.4.2):

[70] These examples have been drawn from Terence's *Hecyra*, *Andria*, *Heautontimorumenos*, and *Phormio*. Similar self-pitying behaviors are also observed in *Eunuchus* and *Adelphoe*.

> proprium est mulierum, cum loquuntur, aut aliis blandiri…aut se commiserari…nam haec omnia muliebria sunt…enumerantur nullius momenti querelae.
>
> It is characteristic of women, when they speak, either to use blandishments with others, or to pity themselves…for all this is womanly…complaints of no import are recounted.

This view remains widely accepted in scholarship on Roman Comedy. The argument has been further advanced by Adams, who argues that "women in Terence are more prone to expressions of self-pity than men" and calculates that women in Terence's comedies use *miser*(*a*) to convey self-pity 40 times in 670 lines of female speech or once every 16.7 lines and men do so 45 times in 5404 lines of male speech or once every 120 lines (1984: 73).[71] Building upon Adams, Dutsch argues that the idiom *me miseram* is used "far more often" in the feminine form and that "Terence seems to resort almost automatically to this idiom when he wants to signal a woman's distress" (2008: 108–9). Dutsch calculates that women in Terence's plays use the expression *me miseram* seven times more often than men, or a ratio of 1:538 compared to 1:3,838. However, her absolute count of the occurrences of the idiom reveal that women use the expression only one more time overall than men (an absolute total of 12 times compared to the 11 times it is spoken by men).[72] Following Adams, Dutsch, therefore, relies on the relative frequency of the idiom as it compares to the number of lines spoken by women and men.

[71] Adams's calculations can be found at 1984: 73. Adams specifies that his count includes the attributive use of *miser*(*a*) in apposition to the subject of a first-person verb, the exclamation *me miseram*, dative expressions of distress, *me miserum* as the object of a verb or in the accusative-infinitive construction, the comparative *miserior*, and plural uses.

[72] Dutsch arrives at a different count for occurrences of the expression *me miserum/-am* than Adams, who records a total of 15 uses of the idiom by women and 11 by men.

While relative frequencies illuminate the prevalence of pity and distress in the speech of Terence's women, they diminish the pervasiveness of these same emotions in the speech of Terence's men, especially *adulescentes*. In general, the women of Roman Comedy are allotted significantly less time to speak than men and more frequently occupy spaces that are shaped by highly stressful events such as death, childbirth, abduction, and rape. It is, therefore, unsurprising that a higher ratio of their speech expresses suffering on behalf of themselves and other women.[73] The men of Terence's plays, on the other hand, use forms of the self-pitying *miser* in many different contexts with varying degrees of severity. As has been shown, the young men of Terence's plays describe themselves as *miser* when they fear that they will be separated from their love interest, when they worry their fathers will discover their scheming, and when they are compelled by their fathers to marry unwillingly.

Having already surveyed Terence's *adulescentes* who are characterized by self-pitying language, I now present my own calculations of the occurrences of *miser*, (*dis*)*perii*, *interii*, and *occidi* in Terence's corpus. In Table 1.5, I provide the absolute count of occurrences of formulations of *miser*(*a*) throughout the corpus, categorized by speaker (according to character type).

Table 1.5 Occurrences of *miser*(*a*)

Speaker by character type	Refers to self	Refers to someone else	Total	Percentage of total usages referring to self	Total lines[74]	Frequency of usage within

[73] These precise circumstances lead James to note: "I do think that female suffering in Terence is more serious than male suffering, much of which is self-imposed and easily solved" (2005: 12).
[74] Lines were counted using Timothy Moore's web tool, "The Meters of Roman Comedy."

						character's total lines
Adulescens	34	7	41	**38%**	1653[75]	2%
Servus	8	8	16	9%	1829[76]	<1%
Ancilla	17	7	24	19%	341[77]	5%
Matrona	14	1	15	16%	237	6%
Virgo	2	0	2	2%	10[78]	20%
Senex	6	3	9	7%	2610	<1%
Other[79]	9	5	14	10%	957[80]	<1%
Total occurrences	90	31	121			

Table 1.6 provides the occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that refer to the speaker, presented by play and arranged by character type:

Table 1.6 Occurrences of *miser*(*a*) used reflexively by play

Speaker by character type	*Andria*	*HT*	*Eun*	*Ph*	*Hec*	*Ad*	Total
Adulescens	**9**[81]	**8**	2	**3**	**10**	2	34
Servus	0	0	3	1	1	3	8

[75] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *adulescens* and *adulescens amans*.
[76] This includes the following from Moore's categories: eunuch, *servus*, and *servus callidus*.
[77] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *ancilla*, *anus*, *nutrix*, and *obstetrix*.
[78] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *mulier* and *virgo*.
[79] This category is comprised of stock characters who do not appear across all six of Terence's plays (e.g., *meretrix*, *leno*, *parasitus*).
[80] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *leno*, *libertus*, *meretrix*, *miles*, and *parasitus*.
[81] Pamphilus six times, Charinus three times.

Ancilla	7	—	**7**	**3**	0	—	17
Matrona	—	1	—	2	7[82]	4	14
Virgo	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Senex	1	3	0	0	0	2	6
Other	0	0	4	0	2	3	9
Total occurrences	17	13	16	9	20	15	90

My accounting reveals that the *adulescens* uses *miser* to express self-pity more times than the second most frequent user of the adjective (*ancillae*). The *adulescens*' self-referential use *miserum me* represents 38% of its total occurrences in the corpus, while the speech of *ancillae* represents 19%. Overall, in Terence, *miser*(*a*) is used more to refer to oneself than another person (out of 121 occurrences, 90 are self-referential). It should be noted, however, that while the expression *me miserum/-am* is inherently self-reflexive, it is still spoken in contexts where the speaker is distressed on behalf of another person. This occurs especially in the case of speakers who are women, and it is rarely the case for *adulescentes*.[83]

A similar pattern is observed across the first-person usage of the verbs (*dis*)*perii*, *interii*, and *occidi*, where the *adulescens* is again the most frequent user of all three verbs. *Perii*, *interii*, and *occidi* are *formulae desperantis* used to express distress in a wide range of contexts.[84] The synonymous verbs can have the literal meaning "I've perished, I'm dead," but as exclamations

[82] Split among two *matronae*: Sostrata uses the adjective self-referentially four times; Myrrina three.
[83] For example, Mysis of *Andria* exclaims "This speech has scared the life out of poor me" (*oratio haec me miseram exanimavit metu*, 250) when she fears that Pamphilus has betrayed Glycerium and plans to marry another woman. The expression *me miseram* itself denotes self-pity, but in the larger context Mysis' concern is felt on Glycerium's behalf.
[84] So common are the exclamations that they are considered "a stock expression of comic despair" (Goldberg 2013: 135).

they also have the idiomatic, often hyperbolic, meaning "I'm ruined, I'm done for."[85] In certain contexts, *perii* and its synonyms are considered "weak" exclamations, and are translated with softened expletives such as "damn it!," "hell," or (in women's speech) even "oh dear."[86] As this wide range of translations attests, context is key to interpreting these exclamations, which are used to express fear of physical abuse, fear of loss, and fear of reprimand, among a number of other anxieties. Exclamations of this type are so commonly spoken by the major stock characters of Roman Comedy that they are considered "stereotypical" of enslaved characters (Brown 2019: 250), "typical" of young lovers (Goldberg 2013: 107), and "characterizing" for *matronae* (Goldberg 2013: 158). The chart below represents the occurrences of (*dis*)*perii*, *interii*, and *occidi* in Terence's six plays categorized by character type.[87]

Table 1.7 Occurrences of (*dis*)*perii*, *interii*, and *occidi*

Speaker by character type	(*Dis*)*perii*[88]	*Interii*	*Occidi*	Total	Percentage of total occurrences	Total lines[89]	Frequency in character's lines
Adulescens	**22**	**2**	**5**	**29**	**40%**	1653[90]	2%
Servus	15	1	2	18	25%	1829[91]	<1%

[85] *OLD* s.v. *perii*; *interii*; *occidi*.
[86] Such as in, e.g., Brothers 1988; Barsby 1999; Goldberg 2013.
[87] This chart exclusively represents occurrences of *(dis)peri*, *interii*, and *occidi* in the first-person active indicative form, all but one of which occur in the singular. The plural exception, *periimus*, is found at *Adelphoe* 324, and is reflected in this count.
[88] *Disperii* occurs only 3 times, *perii* constitutes the remaining 55 occurrences.
[89] Lines were counted using Timothy Moore's web tool, "The Meters of Roman Comedy."
[90] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *adulescens* and *adulescens amans*.
[91] This includes the following from Moore's categories: eunuch, *servus*, and *servus callidus*.

Ancilla	3	0	0	3	4%	341[92]	<1%
Matrona	6	0	0	6	8%	237	3%
Virgo	2	0	0	2	3%	10[93]	20%
Senex	4	0	2	6	8%	2610	<1%
Other[94]	6	0	2	8	11%	957[95]	<1%
Total occurrences	58	3	11	72			

It is particularly notable that the *adulescens* uses these three synonyms more times than both categories of enslaved characters (*servus* and *ancilla*) combined. Enslaved characters, especially men, often use *formulae desperantis* to express fear of their enslavers in anticipation of physical abuse. In this context, the idiomatic and literal meanings combine, as *perii* and its synonyms do not indicate that the speaker has actually died, but they do envisage bodily harm that could plausibly lead to death. The use is non-literal, but it is hardly hyperbolic. In *Eunuchus*, for example, after Parmeno has revealed Phaedria's spending and Chaerea's alleged arrest to the young men's father (971–1001), he predicts with complete certainty that he will be beaten by his enslaver: "There is no doubt that there will be an intense beating for me because of this" (*non dubiumst quin mi magnum ex hac re sit malum*, 997).[96] Parmeno thus makes the implicit explicit: the *servus* does not fear the discovery of his plotting *per se*, rather he fears the physical abuse that follows as a consequence of his enslaver's knowledge. Shortly thereafter, Parmeno uses

[92] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *ancilla*, *anus*, *nutrix*, and *obstetrix*.
[93] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *mulier* and *virgo*.
[94] This category is comprised of stock characters who do not appear across all six of Terence's plays, (e.g., *meretrix*, *leno*, *parasitus*).
[95] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *leno*, *libertus*, *meretrix*, *miles*, and *parasitus*.
[96] *Malum* is a common euphemism for the physical abuse of enslaved persons in Terence's plays (*An*. 179, 431; *Phorm.* 851; *Eun*. 968, 997).

perii to reflect on the violence he will later suffer: "By my own confession, poor me, just like the shrew I've destroyed myself today" (*egomet meo indicio miser quasi sorex hodie perii*, 1024). Here, *perii* is less an exclamation of fear, than a somber prediction of the imminent harm that he expects to face.

In contrast to enslaved men like Parmeno, the *adulescens* exclaims *perii* in a wide range of contexts, including but not limited to fear of admonishment by his father, fear of losing access to his love interest, and fear of his way of life. The range of severity and emotion in these experiences has led translators to variously translate *perii* in the mouths of *adulescentes* as literally as "I'm ruined!" and as casually as "damn it." As the examples of self-pitying language spoken by *adulescentes* in the previous section have shown, even in his most emotional moments, the *adulescens* never risks his physical safety, nor is the punishment he fears from his father ever realized. The *adulescens* thus appropriates the language used by enslaved characters to predict physical injury and he instead uses it to express mental anguish in social predicaments. As I have shown in my discussion of *Phormio*, while many of the *adulescentes* of Terence's plays equate separation from their love interest with destruction, Antipho of *Phormio* undermines the validity of this reaction as he reflects on the short-lived pain of heartbreak (*aegre aliquot dies*) compared with the daily anxiety of disappointing his father (159–60). In this way, Antipho undermines the exaggerated speeches of his fellow *adulescentes*, by describing the situations that lead them to exclaim *perii* merely as short-lived discomforts.

Terence's *Andria* provides an example of the two scripts (i.e., that of enslaver and enslaved) crossing and the different connotations of *perii* within. After Davos' plotting to help Pamphilus unite with Glycerium has seemingly backfired, Pamphilus seeks out Davos for punishment (607–11):

> **PAM.** ubi ille est scelus qui perdidit me? **DAV.** perii! **PAM.** atque hoc confiteor iure mi obtigisse, quandoquidem tam iners tam nulli consili sum.
> servon fortunas meas me commisse futtili!
> ego pretium ob stultitiam fero. sed inultum numquam id auferet.
> **DAV.** posthac incolumem sat scio fore me, nunc si devito hoc malum.

> **PAM.** Where is that villain who destroyed me? **DAV.** I'm dead! **PAM.** I admit that I deserved this to happen to me, since I am so idle and planless. That I entrusted my fate to an undependable slave! I am paying the price for my foolishness. But he will never get away unpunished. **DAV.** I know well enough that I'll be unharmed after this, if I avoid this punishment now.

The verbs *perdidit* and *perii* express different types of destruction: emotional vs. physical. Pamphilus uses *perdidit* to describe the unwanted consequences of Davos' plan (i.e., his marriage to a girl other than Glycerium), while Davos uses *perii* in anticipation of the physical harm he expects to experience at the hands of Pamphilus. For Davos, destruction is directly tied to the physical realm, that is to punishment (*sed inultum numquam id auferet*) and beating (*hoc malum*), while for Pamphilus, it is but the fear of heartbreak—not heartbreak itself—that amounts to his destruction.

Building upon the conclusions of Adams and Dutsch, in this section, I have provided a fuller picture of self-pitying language in Terence's comedies, with new categories of quantitative evidence. First, I expand my statistics to include the common *formulae desperantis perii*, *interii*,

and *occidi* as additional markers of self-pitying language. Second, I break down my results not just by gender, but by stock character type. The resulting data reveals that among all characters, it is the *adulescens* who stands out for his use of self-pitying language. Turning to the phrases *perii*, *interii*, and *occidi*, I found that the *adulescens* speaks 40% of the total occurrences, a significantly higher percentage than all female character types combined.

This new method of analysis highlights that, while women might have a higher rate of usages within their speech—see, for example, the *virgo*—these expressions of self-pity are not associated primarily with female characters. Instead, the large majority of usages appear in the mouth of the *adulescens*. In other words, women's speech may be characterized by self-pitying language, but self-pitying language is not primarily associated with women.

When we examine the contexts in which self-pitying language arises, we see that the *adulescens* uses these expressions hyperbolically, usually in amatory contexts. An important consequence of earlier scholarship's tendency to accept uncritically the self-indulgent speeches of the *adulescens* is that the (often traumatic) experiences of the *virgo* are easily overlooked. Because the *adulescens* provides unreliable testimony about the *virgo*, a thorough study of her character must resist focalization through his biased perspective. In order to do this, I now turn to the mothers of Terence's comedies.

Chapter 2. *Misericordia, Animus Maternus*: Securing Marriage and the Regenerative Plot

Terence's *Adelphoe* (*The Brothers*), *Eunuchus* (*The Eunuch*), and *Hecyra* (*The Mother-in-Law*) all conclude with the promise that the *virgo* will soon marry the *adulescens* who has previously raped her.[97] In the imaginary world of the play, the marriage between the rape victim and rapist is seen as not only a socially acceptable outcome, but a socially preferred one, inasmuch as it "preserves" the citizen girl's chastity by ensuring that she has had sex with only her husband.[98] The *adulescens* who raped the *virgo* is always pleased with this outcome.[99] Although the mothers of raped *virgines* show empathy for their daughters' pain, nevertheless they consistently support her marriage to the *adulescens*. This is not to say that mothers do not recognize the potential harm inflicted by these marriages; they certainly do. Rather, as I will demonstrate, Terence shows that comic mothers are intimately aware of the alternative, more socially precarious outcomes that the *virgo* would face if she were not to marry the *adulescens*. The mother's approval of the marriage, then, is the result not of ignorance or apathy, but of

[97] A note on the terminology of sexual assault in Terence's plays: in her influential article "Call it Rape: A Motif in Roman Comedy and Its Suppression in English-Speaking Publications," Packman surveys the minimization of the rape motif in English translations of and scholarship on Roman Comedy (1993: 44–9). Packman identifies the tendency among scholars to misrepresent and obfuscate episodes of unambiguous rape in the plays with English euphemisms like "seduce," "sleep with," and "go to bed with" as substitutes for the verbs *stuprare*, *vitiare*, *comprimere* (all of which denote sexual assault). Following Packman, I aim to translate and discuss instances of sexual assault responsibly and accurately. To do otherwise is to do a disservice to my readers, to Terence, who deliberately holds a critical lens to rape, and to anyone who has experienced sexual assault.

[98] Romans highly valued sexual fidelity on the part of wives, on and off the stage (Treggiari 1991: 232–6); this is reflected in the world of Terence's comedies, where after giving birth to a child and being divorced by her husband, a citizen *virgo* had virtually no chance of remarrying a citizen man.

[99] Chaerea of *Eunuchus* and Pamphilus of *Hecyra* celebrate the news of their upcoming marriages with emphasis on their good fortune: "Oh countrymen, is there anyone alive who is luckier than me today?" (*o populares, ecquis me vivit hodie fortunatior?* Ter. *Eun*. 1031; "Who is more fortunate than me, indeed who has a greater fill of pleasure?" (*quis mest fortunatior venustatisque adeo plenior?* Ter. *Hec*. 848). Aeschinus of *Adelphoe* expresses his joy as gratitude directed toward his father for agreeing to the marriage: "May all hate me, if I don't now love you more than my own eyes" (*omnes oderint ni magis te quam oculos nunc amo meos*, 701).

careful calculation, through which she prioritizes her daughter's long-term security over her immediate physical and emotional well-being.

I argue that Terence, through comic mothers, explores the alternate outcomes that would arise from the rape plot if the generic world of the play did not guarantee its resolution through marriage.[100] Because they share identities (i.e., gender and social position) with their daughters, mothers are uniquely positioned to act as social models for the *virgo*; every mother was once an unmarried girl and every *virgo*—at least in Terentopia—is destined to become her mother. The citizen mother (*matrona*), therefore, embodies the socially "happy" ending by her onstage presence as wife to a citizen man and as mother to a daughter whom she expects to reproduce her past experiences. Non-citizen mothers, in contrast, provide cautionary tales of women who never obtained the financial, social, and legal benefits of citizen marriage.[101] The displaced *virgo* is intimately connected to both mothers; the idealized play ending ensures that she will become a *matrona*, but her displacement from her natal family at a young age means that, before the *anagnorisis*, she occupies a social position closer to that of her adoptive, non-citizen mother.[102] In the end, I show that maternal empathy is sublimated to a preoccupation with institutional

[100] In Chapter 1, I coin the term "Terentopia" for the play-world constructed by Terence in his *fabulae palliatae* (comedies with Greek costumes and settings but written and performed in Latin at Rome). In doing so, I follow Mazzara (2021: 24–55), who applies the framework of "Secondary Worlds" borrowed from the literary criticism of science fiction and fantasy to conceptualize the play-world of Plautus' comedies, which she calls "Plautinopolis" following Gratwick (1982: 113).

[101] These mothers are always adoptive parents (and sometimes sex workers) who have taken the *virgo* into their care after she has been displaced from her natal family. Because they have always died before the events of the play, these mothers only exist offstage; this is convenient to the plot inasmuch as the *virgo*, after being recognized as a citizen, can be incorporated into her natal family without complication.

[102] Crucially, the *virgo* never engages in sex labor, or, if she does, she takes on only one client (the *adulescens* whom she will marry at the end of the play). For this reason, the *virgo* is sometimes referred to as a pseudo-*meretrix*. Traill discusses the functions of the citizen girl's mistaken or "double" identity that likely made it such a popular plot device: while mistaken identity serves the practical purposes of (1) explaining and excusing a citizen girl's involvement in social situations that would otherwise be considered inappropriate for a girl of her status and (2) creating the possibility of social mobility for the girl, mistaken identity also serves as a locus for Menander to delve into the psychology of his characters, permitting them to make errors of judgement on stage without losing audience sympathy (2008: 72–78).

safety and prove that maternal approval of the marriage resolution does not justify the assumption that the *virgo* herself is happy or satisfied with this result.[103]

The institution of marriage (*matrimonium*) was perhaps the principal factor that structured gender and private social relations in Roman life.[104] Citizen wives and mothers (and the girls who would grow up to be them) were recognized as fulfilling a crucial role in the household and Roman society generally as marriage had the express purpose of producing further generations of Roman citizens.[105] The importance of marriage and reproduction is reflected in the plays of Terence, all of which end with the promise that the play's *virgo* protagonist will marry the *adulescens* and give birth to a legitimate heir.[106]

Hallett (1984) argues that daughters occupied a central position in Roman society and the Roman elite family fulfilling roles in various social institutions, especially religious ones, and strengthening kinship ties through marriage and reproduction.[107] Hallett demonstrates that, in performing the cultural role of the model elite daughter from girlhood through maturity, daughters were expected to act with compliance, deference, and allegiance to their fathers, to

[103] In answer to the question of why the *virgo* enters into marriage with the *adulescens*, Packman suggests a number of motivations ranging from emotional to pragmatic: "True love is certainly part of the answer, and perhaps the prospect of companionship in her marital household; maybe above all the impending birth of a child, whom she will find it easier to raise in an environment that is stable and well-provisioned" (2013: 206). While I reject Packman's notion that true love can be assigned to any of Terence's *virgines*, I build upon the latter suggestion arguing that the need for a stable and well-provisioned household is in fact *the* decisive factor in the mother's—rather than the *virgo*'s—acceptance of the marriage.

[104] Treggiari (1991) provides a comprehensive study and foundational work on the Roman institution of marriage. Throughout her analysis of historical, literary, legal, and epigraphic sources, Treggiari discusses the legal, moral, and affective aspects of marriage as the institution developed from the 1st century B.C.E. through the 3rd century C.E.

[105] Motherhood was inherent in the concept of Roman marriage. The term *matrimonium* is a combination of *mater* and the suffix *-monium* (defined as "enlargement of -IVM" *OLD*). For Roman attitudes about the wife's role as strengthening her family unit, see Treggiari 1991: 11.

[106] Treggiari states that in the literary tradition the creation of *affinitas* between families (especially the men therein) seemed to be a chief purpose of marriage (1991: 108). Concerning the marriage arrangement between his newly rediscovered daughter and future son-in-law, Chremes of *Heautontimorumenos* states that he is pleased by his new son-in-law and family connection (*immo et gener et affines placent*, *Heaut*. 936).

[107] To describe the phenomenon of the daughter's centrality in the Roman family and society Hallett coins the term "filiafocality," "daughter-focus" (1984: 64–69).

maintain a high standard of moral and sexual conduct before and after marriage, and to remain dependent on their fathers for support and protection even after marriage.[108] Daughters, in return, were meaningfully connected to their fathers through naming practices, sentimental bonds, and the legal rights they possessed (1984: 62–149).[109]

The recognition of the Roman daughter's importance was accompanied by a cultural anxiety concerning the preservation of her premarital virginity and, relatedly, marriageability. Roman legends that tell of women who died by suicide and filicide in response to rape reflect the strict attitude toward women's premarital virginity that persisted in Roman thought.[110] The primary mechanism by which parents could protect their daughter's virginity was by arranging marriages for them at a young age. Arranging a suitable marriage for one's daughter was a responsibility shared by fathers and mothers. In *Phormio*, a remark from Chremes that conversations concerning marriage—and, in this case, separation—are better discussed "woman to woman" (*mulier mulieri magis convenit*, *Ph.* 726) further promotes a gendered approach to marriage negotiations, and an observation from Davos of *Andria* suggests that that citizen women took an active role in the day-of marriage preparations (363–64).[111]

[108] Treggiari adds that support and protection through shared partnership was occasionally offered by Roman authors as an additional purpose of marriage, in addition to procreation (1991: 12). Wedded daughters were expected to depend on both their fathers and husbands for support after marriage. If there was ever a conflict among the desires of a woman's father and her husband, however, Hallett notes that the father's wishes were expected to take precedence (1984: 137–78).

[109] While Hallett's study primarily focuses on the father-daughter relationship, in her brief treatment of the relationship between mothers and daughters, Hallett suggests that daughters depended on their mothers for models of proper conduct and that their bond was so close as to resemble that of sisters due in part to the typical daughter's proximity in age and legal status to her mother (1984: 259–62).

[110] These are Lucretia and Verginia, respectively. Caldwell discusses the function of these exemplary stories in Valerius Maximus' *Memorable Deeds and Sayings* (2015: 67–73). Caldwell argues that these stories were not meant to be suggestions of action to be taken by fathers in response to the loss of their daughter's virginity but rather as "a forceful reminder of the importance of virginity to matchmaking" and an "underlying message to fathers to beware of daughters' exposure to men" (72–73).

[111] During marriage arrangements it was appropriate for women to negotiate with women and men with men (Treggiari 1991: 134).

In Terence's comedies, the responsibility of negotiating the citizen daughter's marriage belongs primarily—though not exclusively—to the father.[112] Chremes of *Andria* is exemplary in his proactive efforts to see his daughter Philumena married to a respectable husband.[113] Simo, the father of the *adulescens* protagonist Pamphilus, reports how Chremes approached him of his own accord to offer his only daughter's hand in marriage along with a sizable dowry specifically because he was influenced by reports of Pamphilus' good character (*hac fama impulsus Chremes ultro ad me venit, unicam gnatam suam cum dote summa filio uxorem ut daret*, 99–101). Consequently, Chremes retracts this very marriage offer upon learning that Pamphilus has begun treating another woman as his wife, an act which he labels a "shameful crime" (144–9):

SIM. venit Chremes postridie ad me clamitans
indignum facinus: comperisse Pamphilum
pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam. ego illud sedulo
negare factum, ille instat factum. denique
ita tum discedo ab illo ut qui se filiam
neget daturum.

SIM. Chremes came to me the next day calling it a shameful crime and saying that he found out that Pamphilus has a foreign woman in place of a wife. I adamantly deny it, he

[112] In this section I am primarily interested in how fathers treat their own daughters. In general, fathers-in-law to the *virgo* are more interested in their own sons; they give little, if any, consideration to the *virgo* as anything more than a potential wife for their sons. Goldberg (2001) argues that the tensions in the father-son relationship of *Andria* is the play's focal point. Fantham discusses Terence's portrayals of fathers and their conflicting values in *Heautontimorumenos* and *Adelphoe*, which she states are "clearly the real focus of interest for [the] playwright and audience" (1971: 978).

[113] Notably, Philumena is not the *virgo* protagonist of *Andria*, though her name (shared with the *virgo* of *Hecyra*) would suggest this. Rather, Philumena is another daughter of Chremes, who unlike Glycerium was not separated from her birth family.

> insists that it is fact. Finally, when I left him he was denying that he would give away his daughter in marriage.

Chremes' express motives for seeking and subsequently denying his daughter's marriage to Pamphilus demonstrate that he cares not only about finding a husband for his daughter but also about the quality of her husband.

Chremes is at once exemplary in fulfilling his parental responsibilities with respect to his daughter's marriage and exceptional in his consideration of her emotional wellbeing. In response to pressure from Simo to move forward with the marriage arrangement despite Pamphilus' involvement with another woman, as a concerned father Chremes explicitly says that he considers his daughter's marriage to be a serious matter (*at istuc periclum in filia fieri gravest*, 566). Chremes further emphasizes the gravity of the situation as he remarks on how close he came to placing his daughter in a doomed marriage: "In trying to gratify you, I nearly made a mockery of my daughter's life" (*dum studeo obsequi tibi, paene illusi vitam filiae*, 822). Beyond his acknowledgement of the social consequences of a failed marriage, Chremes also points out the inequity of causing his daughter hardship and pain (*eius labore atque eius dolore*) in order to benefit another man's son (*gnato…tuo*) (828–31):

> **CHR.** at rogitas? perpulisti me ut homini adulescentulo
> in alio occupato amore, abhorrenti ab re uxoria,
> filiam ut darem in seditionem atque in incertas nuptias,
> eius labore atque eius dolore gnato ut medicarer tuo.

> **CHR.** You ask? You pushed me into giving my daughter to a young man engaged in another love affair, averse to marriage, putting her into discord and an uncertain marriage, so that I could cure *your* son by means of *her* hardship and *her* pain.

Observing the absence of women in *Andria*, Goldberg suggests that the play lacks sympathy for its female characters and states that "whether Terence at this point in his career was simply incapable of representing [women] or uninterested in doing so remains unknown" (2019: 36–40). Although Philumena is physically absent from *Andria*, Chremes' advocacy on his daughter's behalf presents her as not only a socially vulnerable bride-to-be but also as a human being liable to emotional harm. Phidippus of *Hecyra* demonstrates a similar concern for his daughter's emotional wellbeing after she has returned to her parents' home in her husband's absence. Though Phidippus recognizes that he has the authority to force his daughter to return to her new husband's home, he allows her to remain, admitting that he is compelled by paternal instinct (*patrius animus*): "Although I know, Philumena, that it is within my rights to force you to do whatever I order, nevertheless, because I am overcome with paternal spirit, I will give in to you and I will not go against your wishes" (*etsi scio ego, Philumena, meum ius esse ut te cogam quae ego imperem facere, ego tamen patrio animo victus faciam ut tibi concedam neque tuae lubidini advorsabor,* 243–45).[114]

Finally, when Glycerium is discovered to be a second, long-lost daughter of Chremes, the happy father immediately consents to her marriage with Pamphilus and offers a generous dowry of ten talents unbidden (948–51). While this large sum displays Chremes' wealth, on the one

[114] Cf. *Heaut*. 637, where Chremes states that Sostrata was motivated to protect her daughter by her "maternal spirit" (*animus maternus*).

hand, it also reaffirms his strong sense of parental duty.[115] Although he had believed only moments before that his second daughter had been permanently lost to him, he at once reassumes responsibility for her.

In contrast to Chremes' proactive approach to fatherhood in *Andria* stands Chremes of *Heautontimorumenos* who, because he was unwilling to raise a daughter (625–27; 665), ordered his wife Sostrata to have his newborn girl exposed. While Chremes is pleased by the rediscovery of his daughter (*nunc ita tempus est mi ut cupiam filiam, olim nil minus*, 667), he nevertheless begrudges his parental responsibility of having to find a husband and provide a dowry for her (835–41):

> **CHR.** minas quidem iam decem habet a me filia,
> quas hortamentis esse nunc duco datas.
> hasce ornamentis consequentur alterae.
> porro haec talenta dotis apposcunt duo.
> quam multa iniusta ac prava fiunt moribus!
> mihi nunc relictis rebus inveniundus est
> aliquis, labore inventa mea quoi dem bona.

> **CHR.** Indeed, my daughter has ten minas from me, which I consider having now provided for her maintenance. More minas will follow these ones for her attire. Then in addition to those they demand two talents for a dowry. How many injustices and

[115] Barsby notes that the sum is very generous compared with the two talents offered by the father of *Heautontimorumenos* and with the sum of one talent, which was considered acceptable in real-life Athens (2001a: 163).

> improprieties occur because of our customs! Leaving everything else aside now I must find someone to whom I'll give my property that I earned at my own exertion.

Preoccupied with the pragmatic demands of fatherhood—both at the time of his daughter's birth and upon her return—Chremes speaks of his daughter as no more than a financial liability.

In *Adelphoe*, Sostrata is left to take care of her daughter and household on her own after the death of her husband. Without the support of her husband or another network, the two quickly fall into poverty.[116] The lack of financial resources threatens not only their wellbeing but also Pamphila's marriage prospects, since her mother will have no dowry to offer. Furthermore, after the *adulescens* Aeschinus rapes and impregnates Pamphila, Sostrata's only means of protecting her daughter is to ensure that he marries her and provides the security they currently lack. When she fears that Aeschinus has changed his mind about marrying her daughter, Sostrata calls upon Hegio, a male relative and close friend to her late husband, to call Aeschinus to court on her and her daughter's behalf (348–50). Despite her husband's death, which is likely the primary cause of her current poverty, Sostrata still retains her legal right to summon a party to court (with a male advocate) and can depend on her familial connection to Hegio, who has reliably supported her household in the past (*nos coluit maxume*, 352) and will do so in her husband's place.

Overall, the father-daughter relationship in Terence's comedies is predominantly characterized by the social and financial dependency of the *virgo* upon her father. Chremes of *Andria* and Phidippus of *Hecyra* show some concern for her emotional wellbeing, but arranging

[116] Feltovich discusses the importance of women's social networks and the negative consequences that Sostrata and her daughter Pamphila face because they lack them after relocating to a new town (2020: 271–76).

her marriage remains their ultimate priority. For the remainder of the chapter, I now turn my attention to the mothers of Terence's comedies.[117]

Although no monograph-length study comparable to Hallett (1984) has yet focused on the relationship between Roman mothers and daughters, discussion on the topic is rich (Caldwell; Dixon; Dutsch; James 2005, 2015, 2020; Phillips; Strong; among others). Phillips identifies two main types of maternal behavior by upper-class Roman mothers in their adult daughter's lives: (1) that of the decisive mother who exerts control over her daughter's engagement and marriage, and (2) that of the participatory mother who supports her daughter out of concern for her wellbeing (1978: 78). In both cases, the Roman mother is shown to be "a powerful character, deeply involved in her daughter's life" (79). Although Phillips does not find sufficient evidence to conclude that the mother-daughter relationship was mutually supportive, she nevertheless allows the possibility that daughters performed a domestic support role that overall remained unacknowledged in the sources.

Dixon, on the other hand, argues that the mother-daughter relationship was one of reciprocal duty, where mothers acted as authority figures, moral and practical educators, and protective agents for their daughters in marriage and law; daughters in return owed their mothers respect, obedience, and visits (1988: 227–28). This austere portrait of motherhood supports Dixon's conclusion that the Roman mother was viewed "primarily as the transmitter of traditional morality—ideally, a firm disciplinarian" (233). Caldwell further discusses the cultural role that mothers and grandmothers performed in the informal socialization of Roman elite daughters; because children were understood to shape their behavior by watching older

[117] Terence's treatment of father-daughter relationships is rather brief compared to his treatment of mothers and their daughters. So is mine accordingly.

generations, mothers were expected to be involved in their children's lives and to model good conduct for them (2015: 35–38).

While the mothers of Roman Comedy are broadly recognized as sympathizing with their daughters, there is some disagreement concerning the source of their sympathy. Dutsch argues that comic mothers pathologically confuse the boundaries between self and other and as a result overidentify with their daughters and perceive their pain as their own in a way that is portrayed as "fearful, negative, and ultimately selfish" (2008: 117).[118] Contra Dutsch, however, James interprets the comic mother's suffering on behalf of her daughter as a genuine expression of maternal love (2005: 12). According to James, the daughter's importance to her mother cannot be overstated: "Anxiety and vulnerability are the defining characteristic of these mothers, and their overwhelming need to help and protect their daughters drives their every speech and action. It is the only thing they care about" (2015: 121). She concludes that the daughters of Roman Comedy are shown, through patterns of maternal speech, to be at risk "so repeatedly and insistently that we might designate her a permanently, structurally endangered species in the social organization of the citizen classes of antiquity" (122).

Following James, I view mothers as being driven by a pervasive anxiety over the safety of their daughters and a categorical need to protect them. I add that a further source of the comic mother's keen awareness of her daughter's vulnerability and suffering is the mother's shared identities and experiences with her daughter. Rather than being liable to catch her daughter's "contagious" vulnerability, the comic mother has already been inoculated from when she herself was a young, vulnerable girl.

[118] James, similarly, notes, "The citizen daughter's vulnerability is repeatedly staged as contagious, and her mother is the person most likely to catch, and suffer, the flu" (2015: 122).

The scholarship so far discussed has exclusively focused on Roman citizen mothers of the middle and upper classes. I extend my study to include not only citizen *matronae*, but also the adoptive mothers of varying status who raise and care for the protagonist foundlings of Terence's comedies. In general, these adoptive mothers tend to be free(d) non-citizen women who earn their livelihoods as *meretrices*.[119] Ancient and modern stereotypes about sex labor and greed have negatively colored the perception of these mothers.[120] While current scholarship tends to adopt a more sympathetic view of these mothers by taking into consideration the practical need to provide for themselves, some scholars still assign selfish motives to adoptive mothers that allegedly seek to adopt foundlings to act as "economic substitutes" from whom they can profit in their old age.[121] Analyzing the relationship between *hetaira/meretrix* mothers and their daughters in legal cases and comic dialogues, Strong nuances this portrait of the "greedy" *meretrix* mother by locating among her economic motives a genuine and practical anxiety concerning her and her daughter's long-term financial security (2012: 136). She notes that the plots of both Terence's *Andria* and *Eunuchus* contradict the stereotype of the *meretrix* mother, since neither adopted daughter takes up her mother's profession in order to support the household (136). In this chapter, I look further at these contradictions in order to demonstrate that Terence's comic mothers—birth and adoptive, citizen and non-citizen, *matrona* and *meretrix*—consistently exhibit maternal care and protection for their daughters by seeking to

[119] Philtera, the adoptive mother of *Heautontimorumenos*, appears to be an exception to this.
[120] Within the plays, *adulescentes* accuse the adoptive mothers of their love interests of exercising excessive control over their daughters out of greed. In *Heautontimorumenos*, the *adulescens* fears that his "girlfriend" has taken on new clients during his absence as a result of "opportunity, her situation, her age, and that awful mother who controls her and who considers nothing sweet besides a payday" (*occasio, locus, aetas, mater quoius sub imperiost mala, quoi nil iam praeter pretium dulcest*, 233–4). *Meretrix* mothers who raise daughters to fill their shoes (and wallets) are found in e.g., Plautus' *Asinaria*, *Cistellaria* and *Truculentus*. For the influence of modern attitudes on interpretations of sex labor in antiquity, see Witzke (2015).
[121] See, for example, Fantham (2015: 98).

place them in secure marriages that are likely to provide them with long-term social and economic security.

Becoming Your Mother: The Regenerative Plot

To illustrate the self-duplicating relationship between generations of comic women, which I call "the regenerative plot," I turn now to Terence's *Phormio*.[122] The rape plot in *Phormio* occurs as follows: one night, the *adulescens* gets drunk and goes out for a night on the town. In his drunken stupor, the young man happens upon a vulnerable girl and rapes her. An unspecified time later, the girl learns that the rape has resulted in a pregnancy. Thereafter, the girl's security and that of her child are inextricably tied to the young man, but he is unable to marry her.[123]

This basic sequence of events—young man assaults vulnerable woman, who will later end up as his wife—is not unique to *Phormio*; it also appears in *Adelphoe* and *Hecyra*. The narratives of rape in these three plays constitute a stock plot that follows a generically prescribed sequence of events with predictable outcomes: assault, pregnancy, marriage.[124] In all three plays, select characters excuse the sexual advances of the *adulescens* as being motivated by a set of

[122] Packman discusses "mirrored experiences" in Terence's comedies, where aging fathers acknowledge that they once had similar experiences to those that their sons face during the course of the play (2013: 206). By analogy, Packman suggests that this must hold true also for the plays' generations of women. I demonstrate in this section that the self-duplicating relationship between mothers and daughters is represented through consistent and specific verbal parallels in the articulations of their assaults, and I show that this relationship shapes how mothers approach their daughters' circumstances.

[123] The barriers to marriage in the genre are numerous and varied, though they often involve a stern father (*pater durus*), as is the case in *Adelphoe*, *Andria*, *Phormio*, and *Heautontimorumenos*.

[124] Cf. the same sequence and articulation of events in Plautus' *Cistellaria*: "This man raped the *virgo*, he was a young *adulescens*, he was drunk, it was late in the night, he was in the streets" (*isque hic compressit virginem, adulescentulus, <vi>, vinolentus, multa nocte, in via*, 158–59)

circumstances outside of the young man's control.[125] Night, love, wine, and youth are offered as rational causes for the rapes perpetrated by Aeschinus of *Adelphoe* (*persuasit nox, amor, vinum, adulescentia*, *Ad*. 470), Pamphilus of *Hecyra* (*in tenebris*, *Hec*. 572; *vini plenum*, *Hec*. 823), and Chremes of *Phormio* (*vinolentus fere*, *Ph*. 1017). Furthermore, Terence's unambiguous articulation of these encounters as sexual assaults is consistent across these three plays, because of the recurrence of the verb *comprimere* and its derivatives, which emphasize the violent, nonconsensual nature of the intercourse: *virgo ex eo compressu gravida factast*, *Ad*. 475; *compressast gnata, Hec*. 572; *nescioquam compressisse*, *Hec*. 828; *Philumenam compressam*, *Hec.* 832; *mulierculam eam compressit inde haec natast*, *Ph*. 1018.[126] Finally, all three assaults result in pregnancies that expose the expectant or new mothers to physical and social risks.

Although the rape narrative in *Phormio* corresponds with those of *Adelphoe* and *Hecyra* in its structure, it differs in two meaningful ways. First, this narrative is reported by the *senex* (old man) Demipho in defense of his brother Chremes. After Chremes' wife, Nausistrata, has learned that her husband has been covertly siphoning money from her estate to support a secret daughter and wife on the island of Lemnos, Demipho attempts to mollify Nausistrata's anger by

[125] While pre-marital sex (consensual or not) was irreparably harmful to the reputations of citizen women, the same social consequences did not apply to men, who were free to engage in sex before marriage with no threat to their marriageability (Treggiari 1991: 233).

[126] In Terence's corpus, *comprimere* describes sexual intercourse by force. In Plautus, the meaning of the verb is less restricted and used to refer to various forms of compulsion (e.g., sexual assault, repression of speech or emotion) (Packman 1993: 43). Of the seven occurrences of this verb in Terence, five belong to contexts where the speaker emphasizes that the *virgo* was unwilling and was overtaken by force. The two outliers appear at *Phormio* 868, where Terence uses the verb in an idiom for holding one's breath (*animum comprimo*, *Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v. comprimo* 8a) and at *Heautontimorumenos* 590, used of controlling one's own hands. The noun *compressus* ("sexual intercourse" *Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v.* 2), derived from *comprimere*, occurs four times in Plautus and Terence, three of which explicitly refer to nonconsensual sex (Plaut. *Am*. 109, *Epid*. 542, *Truc*. 498; Ter. *Ad.* 475). The *Oxford Latin Dictionary*'s treatment of *comprimo* is unsatisfactory in its inclusion of explicit rapes (in Terence's *Hecyra*, in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*) under the definition "to copulate, have intercourse with" and no separate definition for rape itself; but cf. subentries 1a ("to exert strong pressure on, compress, crush"), 7a ("to curb, subdue, cow, restrain (persons)"), and 7b ("to compel, constrain"). Goldberg states that the verb is "a polite euphemism for rape" (2013: 164).

presenting the act of infidelity in accordance with the stock rape plot (1016–20).[127] Demipho thus excuses adultery with rape (which he further justifies by Chremes' inebriation at the time of the assault) and exploits the plot to benefit his brother.[128] Second, this narrative constitutes not the main plot of *Phormio* but the decades-earlier events which ultimately led to the play's current conflict. Accordingly, the rape victim of *Phormio* is not the play's *virgo* protagonist, Phanium, but her mother (who dies before the play begins and remains unnamed). By describing the mother's assault according to the generic script of the *virgo-adulescens* rape plot, Terence blurs the distinction between mother and daughter and shows that time alone separates their experiences; in generic terms, this *matrona* was once a vulnerable *virgo*, cornered by sexual assault and pregnancy into a socially necessary but ultimately deceptive and damaging relationship. Furthermore, since Chremes was already married at the time of the assault and could not be present as true husband or father for the Lemnian woman, she was left to raise her daughter primarily on her own in a non-citizen household. Inevitably, her daughter Phanium, who has a claim to citizenship through Chremes, becomes the center of a new romantic plot (i.e., the main plot of *Phormio*) and the social instabilities generated by the original assault are finally resolved by Phanium's marriage to the *adulescens* Antipho. The women in Terence's plays, then, live through socially regenerative plots that reproduce for daughters the same precarious circumstances that their mothers once experienced: just as the comic mother begets the *virgo*, the

[127] In his attempts to incite Nausistrata to anger at her husband, Phormio (the titular parasitic hanger-on) refers to the Lemnian woman as Chremes' "wife on Lemnos" (*uxorem Lemni aliam*, 941–2; *in Lemno uxorem duxit*, 1004–5). Following suit, Nausistrata rebukes her husband for having two wives (*uxores duas*, *Ph*. 1041). Elsewhere Chremes expresses fear that his "other wife" (*aliqua uxor*, *Ph*. 585; 746) (i.e., Nausistrata) will learn of the woman on Lemnos, implying that he also conceives of the Lemnian woman as an *uxor*. Maltby explains why it is so important for Chremes to hide his second family: Nausistrata is a richly dowered wife (*uxor dotata*) meaning that her wealth would follow her if she were to divorce Chremes (2012: 176).

[128] Either Demipho comes up with this plot on his own *ex tempore* (cf. *nunc ego poeta fiam*, Plaut. *Ps*. 404) or his account draws on the truth (or his report is a hybrid of truth and fabrication). Although this rape narrative is deployed rhetorically by Demipho, I do not find sufficient evidence to rule out the possibility that the relationship between Chremes and the Lemnian woman was initiated by sexual assault.

unresolved comic plot begets another comic plot. Stock characters and stock plots are destined to reproduce themselves, and the past experiences of older generations on the comic stage anticipate what could or will become of the next ones.

As a non-citizen mother and illegitimate wife, the *muliercula* of *Phormio* offers Terence an opportunity to explore what happens when rape is not resolved by marriage. There is some inconsistency in the play's various descriptions of Chremes' involvement in the lives of this so-called "other wife" and her daughter.[129] After Nausistrata learns about her husband's affair, she reveals that Chremes frequently spent extended periods of time on Lemnos and suddenly understands that dwindling income from her father's estate was the result of thefts committed by Chremes: "These were the frequent trips and long stays at Lemnos? Were these the low prices that diminished our profits?" (*haecin erant itiones crebrae et mansiones diutinae Lemni? haecin erat ea quae nostros minuit fructus vilitas?*1012–13).[130] A remark from Chremes, on the other hand, suggests that his visits to Lemnos and the financial support he had been giving the Lemnian woman had slowed before the events of the play. When asked why his secret daughter has not travelled with him back to Athens, Chremes tells his brother that upon his arrival in Lemnos he learned that Phanium and her mother had traveled on their own to Athens to find him: "They told me that the girl's mother set forth with the entire household to find me, after she saw that I was staying here for a long time and recognized that the girl's advancing age could not be delayed to accommodate my neglect" (*postquam videt me eius mater esse hic diutius, simul autem non manebat aetas virginis meam neglegentiam, ipsam cum omni familia ad me profectam*

[129] Maltby notes the inconsistency and states that Demipho's account is trying to minimize and excuse Chremes' offense (2012: 205–6). He includes the use of the diminutive *muliercula* ("little woman") as part of Demipho's rhetorical strategy.
[130] Maltby takes Nausistrata's quick response as an indication that she long had suspicions about Chremes' activities on Lemnos (2012: 205).

esse aibant, 569–72). The Lemnian mother's decision to uproot her family to find Chremes indicates how fraught their position had become because of his absence.[131] Her readiness to put herself and her entire household at risk also reveals the importance she assigned to providing Phanium with the security that she herself had lacked.[132]

Furthermore, when the enslaved attendant Sophrona happens upon Chremes in Athens and learns of his true identity, she reports to him the conditions of poverty that his secret wife and daughter have been living under since Chremes stopped supporting them. After the death of Phanium's mother, it was Sophrona who took charge of making arrangements for Phanium's future.[133] Sophrona tells Chremes: "Poverty drove me to do it; even though I knew the marriage was not secure, I considered it necessary to put her into a safe situation in the meantime" (*quod ut facerem egestas me impulit, quom scirem infirmas nuptias hasce esse, ut id consulerem, interea vita ut in tuto foret*, 733–34).[134]

The extreme distress experienced by Sophrona and Phanium also manifests in their physical appearance. Phanium's destitution is further exacerbated by her mother's death. The enslaved character Geta reports the reaction of a (lovestruck) young man to Phanium's impoverished and friendless condition (93–9):

[131] Gellar-Goad discusses the crucial functions, especially religious ones, that the *paterfamilias* contributes to the establishment of functioning citizen families (2013: 173). Chremes' prolonged absences from both households preclude him from fulfilling most of his domestic responsibilities, including arranging a suitable marriage for Phanium.
[132] Feltovich identifies a parallel to Phanium's circumstances within Terence's *Adelphoe* (2020: 271–76), where the women suffer from social isolation and "the audience learns the important of social networks by seeing the consequences of not having one" (272).
[133] Packman suggests that, with the exception of Chaerea's marriage in *Eunuchus*, Clitipho's in *Heautontimorumenos*, and Pamphilus' in *Hecyra*, every marriage in Terence's comedies "develop[s] out of relationships established by the young couple themselves (consensually, as it appears)" (2013: 203). I think this is not the case in most, if not all, of Terence's marriages. Here, Sophrona claims agency in securing a marriage for Phanium and she makes it clear that her concern was not love but poverty.
[134] It is typical for the nurse figure to help bring about the recognition of displaced children (Maltby 2012: 186).

GET. "…numquam aeque," inquit, "ac modo
paupertas mihi onus visumst et miserum et grave.
modo quandam vidi virginem hic viciniae
miseram suam matrem lamentari mortuam.
ea sita erat exadvorsum neque illi benivolus
neque notus neque vicinus extra unam aniculam
quisquam aderat qui adiutaret funus. Miseritumst.

GET. "Never before," he said, "has poverty seemed to me to be such a pitiable and heavy burden. I just saw a girl here in the neighborhood; the poor girl was mourning her deceased mother. She [the mother] was laid out, and not a single friend, acquaintance, or neighbor was there to help with the funeral except one little old woman. It stirred me to pity."

Multiple sources therefore report the extremely vulnerable position into which Chremes' neglect put Phanium and her late mother: poverty, loneliness, and an urgent need to secure safety and social support through rapid marriage to an unfamiliar man.

In addition to exposing the negative consequences of the unresolved rape plot, the young man's speech and a remark from Sophrona reveal the close bond between mother and daughter. As she reveals to Chremes that Phanium's mother died sometime after their arrival at Athens, Sophrona implies that the mother cared for her daughter to the point of self-affliction and attributes the cause of her death to mental anguish: "Death caused by grief overtook that poor

mother" (*matrem ipsam ex aegritudine hac miseram mors consecutast*, 750).[135] Phanium, for her part, is portrayed primarily as a grieving daughter. In this, the play's sole description of the *virgo*, her suffering is the focal point.[136] Phanium's physical appearance matches the intersecting circumstances of poverty and deep sorrow: "Her hair is let loose, her feet bare, she herself is unkempt and tearful, and her clothes are filthy" (*capillus passus, nudus pes, ipsa horrida, lacrumae, vestitus turpis*, 106–7). The emphatic repetition of words with the *miser-* stem (connoting pitiable or wretched condition, *visumst miserum*, 94; *miseram*, 96; *miseritumst*, 99) further underscores the depths of Phanium's grief, in stark contrast with the hyperbolic *miser-* language that typically populates the *adulescens*' expressions of self-pity over superficial (often romantic) troubles. The intensity of connection between mother and daughter extends even to the grammatical level at *Phormio* 95–6, where the attribution of the adjective *miseram* is ambiguous, modifying either *virginem* or *matrem* given its form and line placement: "I just saw a girl here in the neighborhood; the poor girl was mourning her (poor) deceased mother" (*modo quandam vidi virginem hic viciniae | miseram suam matrem lamentari mortuam*, 95–6). These speeches characterize the mother-daughter relationship as one of mutual love and affection disrupted by grief and underscore the depths of the girl's vulnerability in the wake of her mother's loss. Chremes' neglect made her needy, but only her mother's death left her truly destitute.

The rape narrative in *Phormio* reveals both the continuity of the comic roles of mother and daughter (*virgo*) and the regenerative nature of the comic plot. By positioning the unresolved rape plot as a backdrop to *Phormio* and exposing the negative consequences disproportionately

[135] *Aegritudo*: "mental distress or anguish, grief, sorrow, anxiety" *Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v.* 2. Maltby notes "*aegritudo* is always used of mental anguish rather than physical distress in Terence, cf. *And*. 962, *Heaut*. 123, *Eun*. 552, *Adelph*. 312" (2012: 188).

[136] The description of Phanium's natural beauty, as discussed in Chapter 1, directly follows (and seems connected to) the young man's observation of her emotional suffering, which apparently amplifies his attraction to her.

affecting Phanium and her mother, Terence highlights how vulnerable young women become—especially those with absent or neglectful fathers—without the social and financial securities granted by their marriage to a citizen man.

Infant Exposure in *Hecyra* and *Heautontimorumenos*

Infant exposure—the act of leaving a newborn out in the wilderness to die or to be discovered and raised by a foster parent—is a common motif in New Comedy, typically used to explain how the *virgo* protagonist came to be estranged from her citizen family.[137] In Terence's comedies, I argue, the motif of infant exposure generates opportunities for exploring motherhood across social class. In *Hecyra*, the exposure of an infant is framed as an act of protection that is necessary to ensure the long-term security and wellbeing of the *virgo* protagonist; in *Heautontimorumenos*, a father's choice to have his daughter exposed because of her sex leads to two instantiations of motherhood, for the natal mother forced to abandon her child and the adoptive mother who accepts the child into her care.[138] In both plays, Terence emphasizes the centrality of maternal care to extraordinarily painful decisions; as with mothers who push for the security of citizen marriage, mothers forced to expose children do so always out of necessity and often for the survival and protection of their daughters.

As Philumena of *Hecyra* attempts to conceal her pregnancy from her husband and thereby preserve her marriage, her own mother Myrrina proposes infant exposure as a practical

[137] The real-world practice was attested too (Treggiari 1991: 407), but rates of infant exposure—and especially of miraculous survival and reunification after exposure—are exaggerated on the comic (and tragic) stage. For the relationship between the literary motif of infant exposure and real-world practice, see Patterson (1985: 115–16), Harris (1994: 12–15), and Scafuro (1997: 272–78).

[138] Brothers suggests that financial concerns motivated Chremes to order that his daughter be exposed, implying that he could not afford to raise the child (1988: 206). But Sostrata's conditional statement, "[You said that] if I were to give birth to a little girl, you did not want her to be raised" (*si puellam parerem, nolle tolli*, *Heaut*. 627), makes it clear that the deciding factor was the newborn's sex, not money.

solution.[139] The play features motherhood at two stages. In actively seeking to protect her daughter Philumena, even when it means putting herself at risk, Myrrina exemplifies maternal care between a mother and her adult daughter; Philumena, in turn, represents motherhood at its very beginning, when childbirth and the consequent revelation of her compromised chastity pose equal threats to her physical and social health.[140]

Although Philumena's pregnancy means that Myrrina is not only a mother but also a grandmother, the *matrona*'s concern and affections remain exclusively focused on her daughter; importantly, she prioritizes the preservation of her daughter's marriage above even her grandson's life. Recognizing the significant risk that Philumena's pregnancy carries for her future, Myrrina advocates for her daughter in her absence and plans to take drastic action to guarantee her safety. After Pamphilus discovers Philumena's pregnancy and (incorrectly) concludes that the child cannot be his, Myrrina tries to control the situation by appealing to his sympathy (378–9), stressing her daughter's blamelessness (383), and promising to expose the infant in secret herself (395–401):[141]

> **MYR.** nunc si potis est, Pamphile,
>
> maxume volo doque operam ut clam partus eveniat patrem

[139] Philumena has become pregnant after being raped by an as-yet unidentified attacker; her husband Pamphilus will later be recognized as the rapist.

[140] Recognizing the central role that the mothers (i.e., Myrrina and Sostrata) occupy in the play, Norwood calls *Hecyra* a "woman's play—not feminist, not expounding any special doctrine, but with women as the chief sufferers, the chief actors, the bearers here of the Terentian *humanitas*" (1923: 91). Goldberg agrees with Norwood and argues that, although the plot circulates around Pamphilus and Philumena, the *Hecyra*'s priorities are the two women: "[Sostrata and Myrrina] are the characters whose anguish is most fully portrayed, and they are the ones who move us" (1986: 152–57). In contrast, Knorr argues that the audience's sympathies lie with Pamphilus who is the "main focus of the play" and paradoxically stands in the way of his own happiness (2013: 316).

[141] Pamphilus believes that he cannot be the father of Philumena's child because he abstained from having sex with her for the first several months of their marriage, which has now lasted nine months. For Roman understandings of gestational time and its implications for paternity and legal inheritance, see Hines 2023.

atque adeo omnis. sed si id fieri non potest quin sentiant,
dicam abortum esse: scio nemini aliter suspectum fore
quin, quod veri similest, e te recte eum natum putent.
continuo exponetur: hic tibi nil est quicquam incommodi,
et illi miserae indigne factam iniuriam contexeris.

MYR. Now, if it is possible, Pamphilus, I really want—and I'm putting in the effort—for the birth to happen in secret from her father and indeed from everyone. But if it can't happen that folks don't figure it out, I will say that there was a miscarriage. I know this will not provoke suspicion in anyone, but they will believe that it was fathered by you, since that is the likeliest explanation. It will be exposed immediately. The situation will cause no inconvenience for you, and you will have covered up the injustice improperly done to this poor girl.

While Myrrina hopes to conceal the birth from Philumena's father and others, the success or failure of this plan has no tangible bearing on the outcome for the infant. If Philumena's pregnancy and labor are discovered, Myrrina will claim that her daughter has miscarried and then expose the infant.[142] If the birth is not discovered, the baby will still be discarded and Myrrina will be saved the trouble of fabricating the miscarriage.[143] There is no circumstance

[142] Although this action may seem drastic, the exposure of an infant is common in Terentopia. As Goldberg states this is "the usual solution in drama for the problem of an unwanted child" (2013: 145).
[143] In her discussion of the relationship between gender, speech, and power in Athenian drama, McClure argues that "fifth-century literary sources frequently represent women's verbal activities [esp. gossip] as dangerous and subversive of political stability" (1999: 68–69). Notably, Myrrina's speech actions are in service of restoring domestic harmony by concealing knowledge from the men of both households. For an in-depth discussion of the social function of gossip in creating solidarity among groups of women, see McClure (1999: 56–62).

under which Myrrina expects Pamphilus to accept and raise Philumena's child, and, accordingly, the wellbeing of the newborn is not among Myrrina's concerns.

The infant's personhood is further obscured by Myrrina's evasive discourse. While sharing her plan with Pamphilus, Myrrina avoids making the newborn a grammatical subject; instead, she prefers impersonal constructions: "the birth happens" (*partus eveniat*) and "there was a miscarriage" (*abortum esse*).[144] When the indirect statement *eum natum putent* ("they will think it was born") requires an expressed subject, Myrrina prefers the demonstrative pronoun *eum* in place of a noun that personifies the newborn.[145] When Myrrina promises to undertake the unsavory task of exposing Philumena's newborn, Myrrina uses an impersonal passive construction (*exponetur*) that obscures her agency and omits any stated subject.

Myrrina's commitment to exposing the newborn for the sake of preserving her daughter's marriage is an indicator of the high value that she ascribes to the marriage. As a citizen woman herself, Myrrina is positioned to understand and weigh the two alternatives that Philumena faces: to expose her child and preserve her marriage or to keep the child and be rejected from her husband's household, inciting a public scandal that would ruin her reputation and prevent her from any secure marriage in the future. Driven by maternal devotion, Myrrina prioritizes her daughter's future without hesitation above her grandchild's.[146]

---

[144] Goldberg identifies the distancing effect of the impersonal expression: Myrrina grammatically separates the actor from the action (2013: 145).

[145] Although *eum* is properly a masculine form, the demonstrative here stands in for the noun *puer* (Goldberg 2013: 145), which can be used without obvious reference to the sex of a child (*OLD s.v. puer* 4), as when Parmeno accuses women (*mulieres*) of thinking like children (*ut pueri*, *Hec*. 310,), where the masculine plural is in apposition to the group of matured women. Here *eum* cannot refer to the unborn child's gender, since Myrrina does not know that the child will be a boy.

[146] Goldberg emphasizes Myrrina's suffering, caused not only by her recognition of the risks that she and her daughter are facing—divorce for Philumena and having to raise an illegitimate child (571)—but also by her husband's obstruction of her plans: "Myrrina, already in anguish over her daughter's difficulty, must add the reproaches of an angry husband to her misery. Terence has her end the scene with a monologue that works on several levels (566–576). It is not simply an expression of anguish, but a genuine evaluation of the situation that threatens her. Phidippus' adamant, tyrannical insistence that they must keep the child has only increased her burden.

In *Andria*, a young couple's commitment to raise their child even though they are not married is openly criticized by the enslaved man Davos. Gesturing toward the uncertainty of the young couple's relationship, where the *virgo* Glycerium is treated as a wife (*uxor*) even though her status limits her to the position of girlfriend (*amica*), Davos explains that the young couple has already decided to raise the child without regard for the impracticalities (215–219):

> **DAV.** …haec Andria,
> si ista uxor sive amicast, gravida e Pamphilost.
> audireque eorumst operae pretium audaciam.
> nam inceptiost amentium, haud amantium.
> quidquid peperisset decreverunt tollere.

> **DAV.** This Andrian girl, whether that girl is a wife or a girlfriend, is pregnant by Pamphilus. It is worth your time to hear about the audacity of those two. For theirs is the undertaking of the demented, not the devoted. Whatever she gives birth to, they've decided to raise it.

By presenting the couple's decision to raise the child as overconfident (*audacia*) and senseless (*amentium*), Davos implies that the more rational choice would be to expose the infant, since neither the pregnant woman nor her child can be recognized as a legitimate member of the father's family due to her unconfirmed status. Furthermore, the neuter indefinite pronoun *quidquid* calls attention to the unknown gender of the expected child and implies that the gender

She voices concern for herself and her daughter, for the marriage, and for the family that faces the possible acceptance of a child whose paternity is uncertain" (1986: 155).

should influence the parents' decision about whether to raise the child or not. It is important to note that, in Terence's comedies, infant exposure is exclusively a feminine experience, where only daughters, never sons, are exposed and mothers are the ones responsible for seeing the exposure through.[147]

The long-term consequences of infant exposure are explored onstage in *Heautontimorumenos*, which features three women who have been affected by the exposure of an infant: the birth mother, the daughter she exposed, and the surrogate mother who adopted her. As in *Phormio*, the events of *Heautontimorumenos* follow upon an unresolved plotline from the elder generation. Some fifteen or sixteen years before the onstage events of the play, a young woman named Sostrata gave birth to a daughter. The girl's father, a man named Chremes, was unwilling to raise the infant because she was a girl (627–8), and so he ordered Sostrata to expose the child. In carefully calibrated partial compliance with her husband's wishes, Sostrata entrusted her daughter to another woman named Philtera, who chose to raise the girl as her own (629–30). Years later, the events of the play turn on Sostrata's and Chremes' recognition of the *virgo*, Antiphila, as their once exposed daughter, a revelation which restores Antiphila's freeborn status and thereby paves the way for the marriage resolution.

The details of Antiphila's exposure are revealed in a conversation between Sostrata and Chremes after she has come to suspect that Antiphila is their long-lost daughter (626–630):

SOS. meministin me gravidam et mihi te maxumo opere edicere,
si puellam parerem, nolle tolli? **CHR.** scio quid feceris: sustulisti…
SOS. minume. sed erat hic Corinthia anus haud impura. ei dedi

[147] It seems that girls were more likely to be exposed in real-life practice as well (Treggiari 1991: 407).

exponendam.

SOS. Do you remember when I was pregnant and you made it very clear to me that, if I gave birth to a little girl, you did not want her to be raised? **CHR.** I know what you did: you raised it… **SOS.** Not at all. But there was an old Corinthian woman, not impure. I gave the girl to her to be exposed.

In the absence of any clear indication that Sostrata and Chremes were married at the time of her pregnancy, Sostrata's situation more closely resembles that of an unmarried expectant *virgo* than a *matrona*; like the at-risk *virgo*, Sostrata is apparently powerless to influence Chremes, who has made his unwillingness to raise a daughter explicit.[148] However, although the choice belonged to Chremes, he made it Sostrata's responsibility to see it through.[149]

In defiance of her husband's instructions to expose their daughter, Sostrata exercised autonomy and performed an act of protection by entrusting her to another woman ("I gave the child to her to be exposed," *ei dedi exponendam*, 629–30), who chose to raise the girl as her own.[150] Sostrata's response to Chremes' accusation that she raised her daughter in secret is deliberately concise.[151] Though her use of the gerundive *exponendam* implies that she

[148] In the Roman family, the *paterfamilias* held the decision over the life or death of his children (Treggiari 1991: 16). That Chremes entrusted the task to Sostrata, such that the outcome remained concealed from him for over a decade, is a comic convention.

[149] Brothers 1988 provides the following, puzzling defense of Chremes: "Chremes is not necessarily being as heartless as to suggest that Sostrata should have actually put the child to death; he merely means that she should have seen to it that it did not survive" (205).

[150] James demonstrates that Sostrata speaks with performed deference during the confrontation with her husband because it concerns her daughter; when she speaks to her husband on her son's behalf, by contrast, Sostrata is less deferential and more forceful (2005: 13). Sostrata's language is as strategic as her actions.

[151] On women's speech in Roman Comedy, James shows that mothers perform perceptive and strategic lexical shifts depending on the contexts in which they speak (2015: 119–121). When context demands it, they use female speech markers of *blanditia,* deference, and conciliation. The demand for such language, James argues, is not only created by the gender and status of her interlocutor but also from the mother's wish to influence or persuade her to or from

communicated a sense of obligation to the Corinthian woman, her act of delegating the task to another woman undercuts her commitment to the act of exposure. Rather, I find it more likely that Sostrata's report to Chremes emphasizes what she knows he will want to hear. Passing on the responsibility of the girl's exposure deflects blame from Sostrata for the girl's survival and minimizes her central role in protecting her daughter's life by placing her in the care of another.

Chremes perceptively frames Sostrata's secret rebellion as an act of maternal care, one that he considers foolish. After learning that Sostrata did not properly expose their daughter according to his wishes, he accuses his wife of stupidity and ignorance: "Oh Jupiter, how ignorant she is" (*o Iuppiter, tantam esse in animo inscitiam*, 630); "I know confidently that everything you say and do is a result of your ignorance and lack of foresight" (*certo scio te inscientem atque imprudentem dicere ac facere omnia*, 633–4). He also suggests that entrusting their daughter to the Corinthian woman could have led the infant to a fate worse than death (638–43):

> **CHR.** quam bene vero abs te prospectumst quod voluisti cogita.
> nempe anui illi prodita abs te filiast planissume,
> per te vel uti quaestum faceret vel uti veniret palam.
> credo, id cogitasti: "quidvis satis est dum vivat modo."
> quid cum illis agas qui neque ius neque bonum atque aequom sciunt?

action. The comic mother's speech patterns, therefore, reveal what drives her: her categorical need to protect her daughter or son. Gender is again significant; James observes that mothers are concerned with their son's proper upbringing, but they are extremely anxious about the physical and sexual vulnerability of their daughters. In her study, James exposes an underlying, yet pervasive, anxiety not only of mothers but also of Roman Comedy as a whole: the safety of the citizen daughter. Of Sostrata specifically, James shows that the "powerless" mother speaks deferentially on her daughter's behalf and more assertively on her son's (113–6). Brothers also notes that "Sostrata knows when to give in to her husband, and when to hold out against him" (1988: 205).

> melius peius, prosit obsit, nil vident nisi quod lubet.
>
> **CHR.** Consider how well you saw to it that what you wanted would actually happen. It is clear that our daughter was fully transferred over to that old woman by you, with the result that, because of you, she either would have to make a living [selling herself] or be sold as a slave on the open market. I believe you thought: "Anything is fine as long as she lives." What are you to do with people who do not understand justice or respectability or fairness? Better or worse, helpful or harmful, those people see nothing they don't want to see.

In his admonition of Sostrata, Chremes lists two other outcomes that were probable for young girls without the protection of citizenship: sex labor and enslavement, both of which, he implies, are worse than death.[152] Chremes suggests that Sostrata's mercy, in saving her daughter's life, is an act against justice (*ius)*, respectability (*bonum*), and fairness (*aequom*) and again accuses her of ignorance by grouping her among those guided by willful blindness (*nil vident nisi quod lubet*). In acknowledging the alternative outcomes that their daughter could have faced, Chremes briefly shatters the glass of Terentopia, disrupting the imaginary play world where the realities of sex work and enslavement never truly impact the *virgo*. Although Chremes' envisioned outcomes are undoubtedly more probable in the real world, in Terentopia, a hyperfortuitous reunion is guaranteed to occur.

[152] Chremes' acknowledgement of these potential consequences is a rare occurrence in Terentopia. Although enslavement was a probable outcome faced by exposed children in antiquity (Treggiari 1991: 407), it is always avoided in Terence's comedies. The enslavement of displaced children does occur in a number of Plautus' comedies (e.g., *Captivi*; *Rudens*; *Persa*), but by the end of the play these children are guaranteed the restoration of their freeborn status.

Although he is inflexible, it is Chremes who attributes Sostrata's motivation for saving her daughter to "pity and maternal spirit" (*misericordia, animus maternus*, 637). Sostrata's happiness (664–65) and gratitude (879–80) at being reunited with Antiphila further reinforce the emotional bond that the mother feels toward her lost daughter. Although, Sostrata, as a young mother, was powerless to defy Chremes' wishes outright, she nevertheless exercised independence and control by entrusting her daughter to the care of another woman. Even though she is deprived of the opportunity to raise her daughter, Sostrata fought with the limited means at her disposal to protect her daughter from the death her husband had prescribed.

Sostrata does not lack knowledge or foresight as Chremes suggests; rather, in entrusting her infant daughter to the care of the Corinthian woman and providing her with a unique ring (649–52) that eventually facilitates the discovery that Antiphila is her child, she strategically and deliberately lays the groundwork for the recognition plot against her husband's wishes.[153] Sostrata proves herself to hold both the epistemic advantage and the metageneric competency that Chremes lacks: she sees clearly the world of Terentopia and defiantly provides for her daughter's safety within it.

Adoptive Mothers in *Heautontimorumenos* and *Eunuchus*

As noted above, it is expected in Terentopia that citizen foundlings will be adopted into new families after being displaced from their birth families, whether this displacement occurs as a result of a natural disaster, kidnapping, or rejection by a parent (*Andria*, *Eunuchus*,

[153] Brothers attributes Sostrata's decision to plant the token that will one day facilitate her daughter's recognition to "superstitious piety" (1988: 205). I have aimed to show that her actions are far more strategic than Brothers gives her credit for.

Heautontimorumenos, respectively).[154] Although adoptive mothers and fathers themselves do not appear onstage, they are consistently described as treating their daughters as their own, while seeking extra protections for them in order to preserve their freeborn status.[155] Contrary to the stereotypical image of the greedy aging *meretrix* (sex laborer) who exploits her daughter for profit, the *meretrices* who adopt citizen foundlings in Terence's comedies actively prevent their adopted daughters from engaging in sex labor.[156]

The limited information given about the adoptive mother of *Heautontimorumenos*, including her social status and livelihood, is contradictory. Sostrata is careful to assure her husband that the woman to whom she entrusted their daughter was "not impure" (*haud impura*, 629). This is perhaps another instance of deliberately concise and elusive language on Sostrata's part. Clinia, the lovestruck *adulescens* obsessed with erotic ownership over the body of the *virgo*, projects an assumption onto Antiphila's relationship with her adoptive mother that is predicated upon the stereotype that *meretrices* are motivated first and foremost by greed. Fearing that Antiphila has engaged in sex labor while he was abroad, Clinia alleges that she was driven to accept new clients by "opportunity, her situation, her age, and that awful mother who controls her and who considers nothing sweet besides a payday" (*occasio, locus, aetas, mater quoius sub imperiost mala, quoi nil iam praeter pretium dulcest*, 233–4). This allegation is promptly proven

[154] In reality, it was more typical for an adult man to adopt another man for inheritance purposes (Treggiari 1991: 409). This is never the case in Terence's comedies, however, where only young citizen girls are displaced from their birth families and adopted into new ones.

[155] In Terence, adoptive parents have always died in advance of the play's events. Their deaths are generically convenient, because in their absence the displaced *virgines* can be reincorporated back into their birth families without complication. Notably, the adoptive parent of *Andria* is not a mother, but a father. The man who is said to have raised Glycerium and her adoptive sister Chrysis was likely of citizen status, given his friendship with Crito who speaks of him with high esteem (*bonus est hic vir*, 916).

[156] Strong argues that the relationships between *meretrix* mothers and their daughters are "ones of mentorship and love as well as economic dependence" (2012: 136). The distinction between adopted and biological daughters is key. Thais of *Eunuchus* is the natural daughter of a Samian *meretrix* (unnamed) and makes her livelihood as an independent sex laborer (i.e., she is not enslaved to a *leno* or *lena*).

false by Syrus (an enslaved attendant of Clinia's father), who reassures Clinia that Antiphila has maintained a lifestyle befitting her character and status. Syrus reveals also that the woman thought to be Antiphila's mother has died and is not her natal mother after all (*quaest dicta mater esse ei antehac, non fuit. ea obiit mortem*, 270–1).[157] However generically appropriate, Clinia's distrust of the adoptive mother and his suspicion that Antiphila's exclusive commitment to him has been compromised are shown to be unfounded.

Antiphila's adoptive mother, Philtera, is the only adoptive parent in all of Terence's comedies to be given a name. This detail is significant also because character names in Terence tend to be generic and repetitive (e.g., the Sostratae of *Adelphoe*, *Heautontimorumenos*, and *Hecyra* or the Chremetes of *Heautontimorumenos*, *Andria*, *Phormio*, and *Eunuchus*).[158] Furthermore, the meaning of the name Philtera ("more beloved one" or "dearer one") is a marker of the mutually loving relationship between the adoptive mother and her daughter.[159] Read in this light, the name Antiphila, also formed from φίλος and more specifically ἀντιφιλέω ("to love in return") is a marker not of the *virgo*'s affection for Clinia but of Antiphila's reciprocal love for her mother Philtera.[160] The name has added significance given Sostrata's absence and sudden reappearance in her estranged daughter's life. Philtera is loved by Antiphila and as an adoptive

[157] Following her adoptive mother's death, Antiphila wears mourning garments in the privacy of her home (*mediocriter vestitam veste lugubri*, 286).
[158] Comparing Terence's repetitive character names with the rich, comical names coined by Plautus, Duckworth states, "[Terence's] plays suffer from the fact that the same names reappear in different plays" (1952: 346–47). Fontaine, whose interest is primarily in Plautine comedy, analyzes two examples of Terence's verbal punning and artistry, i.e., in the puzzling "*parasitus colax*" of *Eunuchus* (30) and in the masculine form *Epidicazomenon* (2010: 11–20). Brothers notes that Terence "had a liking for certain names" including Chremes, Sostrata, Bacchis, Syrus, and Dromo (1988: 160). Curiously, in Brothers' character list, the only names that he does not remark on are Antiphila's and Philtera's.
[159] The name Philtera is transcribed from Greek. It is the comparative form of φίλος ("beloved, dear").
[160] Importantly, Antiphila's name fits both contexts. In the same way that Antiphila's polite interaction with Clinia accommodates the *adulescens*' expectations of her, so, too, does her name. While some *virgines* have two names, one given by the birth parents and one by the adoptive parent (e.g., Glycerium a.k.a. Pasibula of *Andria*), logically Antiphila would only have one name (given by her adoptive mother), since Chremes and Sostrata would not have named the infant they intended to forfeit.

mother she is more loved than the birth mother whom the girl has never known. In the absence of explicit declarations of maternal and filial love in *Heautontimorumenos*, Philtera's and Antiphila's names communicate an underlying message about their love for one another.[161]

In *Eunuchus*, the *virgo* Pamphila is meaningfully integrated into her adoptive family, as both her mother and sister perform acts of devotion and protection on her behalf. After being kidnapped from Attica as a small child (108–110), Pamphila was given as a gift to a Samian woman (unnamed) who adopted her: "The mother received [her] and began to devotedly teach her everything and raise her as though she were her own daughter" (*mater ubi accepit, coepit studiose omnia docere, educere, ita uti si esset filia*, 116–7).[162] *Docere*, *educere,* and *studiose* emphasize the active role the Samian mother took in Pamphila's rearing and education, while the conditional clause of comparison (*ut si esset filia*) speaks to the mother's treatment of her adopted daughter. In addition to being treated like a daughter at home, Pamphila's adoptive sister Thais reports that, from an outsider's perspective, Pamphila was perceived to be a member of her family: "Most people believed that she was my sister" (*sororem plerique esse credebant meam*, 118). Thais admits that there is one key difference in how she and her adoptive sister were treated by their mother: Pamphila had been raised in a way that befitted her freeborn status (*educta ita uti teque illaque dignumst*, 748) and has not engaged in sex labor. Thais' remark that she and Pamphila were raised like sisters, then, must refer to their mother's similar emotional treatment of them and their mutual affection for each other.

[161] In this one instance, the alternative outcome to marriage and coparenting is portrayed as potentially positive, but still the socially "happy" ending is not possible for the *virgo* until her adoptive mother's death paves the way for the recognition of her true status.

[162] Barsby takes *dono…dedit* as confirmation that the Samian woman was a *meretrix* (1999: 107). Cf. *Hecyra*, where Sostrata privately defends herself against the accusation that she is the reason her daughter-in-law has absconded from their house: Sostrata explains that she has treated Philumena as though she were her own: "I've treated the girl as though she was born of my own flesh and blood, and I don't understand why this is happening to me" (*habui illam ac si ex me esset nata, nec qui hoc mi eveniat scio*, *Hec*. 279)

The (Un)happy Ending of *Hecyra*

As a recently married citizen woman, Philumena seamlessly shifts between the roles of *virgo* and *matrona* throughout the *Hecyra*. As a married woman and expectant mother, Philumena has seemingly reached the idealized comic resolution before the play's opening scene; the unknown identity of her child's father, however, threatens to return her to the vulnerable position of a young unmarried and/or unmarriageable mother.[163] With these circumstances forming the backdrop to *Hecyra*, Terence demonstrates that even after her marriage to the *adulescens*, the *virgo*'s security depends on the preservation of that marriage.

For Pamphilus and Philumena, marriage is hardly a solution to their troubles. Even before Philumena's pregnancy is discovered, Pamphilus' treatment of her is characterized as improper and unfair. Having been forced into the marriage by his father (142), Pamphilus is far from the generically lovestruck *adulescens*; instead, for a significant period of time after the marriage, Pamphilus has tried to drive his new wife away by ignoring and otherwise mistreating her (155–6), all while continuing his sexual relationship with the *meretrix* Bacchis. While the enslaved attendant Parmeno describes Pamphilus' treatment of Philumena as increasingly harmful, he indicates that Philumena was not only blameless but also exceptionally tolerant of her husband's maltreatment: "As is becoming of someone with a freeborn nature, she was modest and calm; she tolerated all the troubles and injustices done by her husband and she concealed his insults from others" (*haec, ita uti liberali esse ingenio decet, pudens, modesta, incommoda atque iniurias viri omnis ferre et tegere contumelias*, 164–5).[164] Philumena's tolerance of Pamphilus' increasingly

[163] Packman states, "Not even these stay-at-home citizen-class girls have had a sheltered life: we are told that both [Philumena and Pamphila] have been victims of sexual assault" (2013: 205). Even though Philumena's citizenship is never in question, she is still vulnerable to the same physical dangers as the displaced *virgo*.
[164] These "wifely virtues" contrast Philumena with the description of Bacchis at *Hec*. 159 (Goldberg 2013: 111).

disrespectful treatment and especially her concealment of it indicate that she, too, assigns great importance to the preservation of her marriage.[165] This ultimate prioritizing of marriage reaches its climax when the recognition of Pamphilus as the man who raped Philumena (831–2) functions not to threaten the marriage but to preserve it and bring about the play's final resolution.[166]

With Philumena's marriage secured, her transition to *matrona* is complete. Although the play ends here, Terence provides no indication that this will amount to a happy ending for Philumena.[167] The young *matrona* avoids single motherhood at the cost of remaining married to her rapist.[168] The resolution is twice described as joyful for Pamphilus (833, 842). In fact, his identification as the rapist is the only ending that could be joyous for him, as it dismissed his fears that his wife had been raped by another man and legitimated his son's birth; Pamphilus' relief is derived directly from Philumena's pain and suffering.[169] At the play's end, the women are nowhere to be found; they express neither joy nor relief at the play's disturbing resolution.[170]

---

[165] Although Parmeno does not give precise details about Pamphilus' mistreatment of Philumena, the progression from *incommoda* to *iniuriae* to *contumeliae* (described as "mounting moral outrages" by Goldberg 2013: 111) indicates that Pamphilus' behavior was escalating.

[166] Goldberg notes that the term Terence uses for the recognition (*cognitio*) may be the playwright's coinage (2013:194–95). The Greek equivalent ἀναγνώρισις (*anagnorisis*) is a technical term used in literary criticism. Although Goldberg does not find the term to be convincing evidence for a metatheatrical allusion here, I have shown in my discussion of *Heautontimorumenos* and in Chapter 1 that Terence deploys many metageneric allusions, including ones explicitly about recognition scenes; the interpretation, then, is possible.

[167] This does not stop Rosivach from describing the end of *Hecyra* as a "happy ending, focused as it is on a rich young man and his reintegration into normal society through marriage (and not focused e.g. on punishment of the rapist or the exaction of vengeance)" (1998: 41).

[168] James states that, in *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*, "Terence breaks with the traditions of rape in Roman Comedy and presents rape in the worst possible light, showing it as a violent act that injures its victims physically as well as seriously threatening their futures" (1998: 31–32). Witzke calls this play an "unfunny showcase of domestic abuse" (2024: 121).

[169] James points out this disturbing detail that is shared also with *Eunuchus*: "Pamphilus and Chaerea not only fail to perceive (let alone repent) having injured their beloveds: they actually exult upon learning whom they have raped" (2013: 187).

[170] The women's absence at the play's end implies that the women accept the resolution, but we need not imagine that they are enthusiastic about it. James shows that earlier in the play the mothers voice critique of rape and thereby undermine the supposed "social harmony" that is later brought about by the girl's marriage to her rapist (1998: 41–45). James concludes that the rape plots of Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus* "are designed to disturb, not to amuse,

The mothers of Terence's comedies are keenly aware of their daughters' physical and social vulnerabilities and therefore seek to provide them with long-term security through marriage to *adulescentes*, even if this decision risks their immediate physical safety and emotional wellbeing. Mothers' memories of their past experiences when they were unmarried *virgines* position them to empathize with their daughters; their anticipation of what *could* happen to their daughters leads them to exert careful control over what *will* happen. Although they recognize the suffering and abuse that the *virgo* experiences because of the *adulescens*, they nevertheless support her marriage to him as the best-case scenario for ensuring her financial and social stability in the future. The "regenerative plot," a self-duplicating relationship between generations of citizen women, motivates *matronae* to push their daughters into reproducing their own experiences. This feature of Terence's comedies means that one need only turn to the illegitimate wife of *Phormio* or the adoptive mothers of *Andria* and *Heautontimorumenos* to understand what is in store for the *virgo* if she does not marry the *adulescens*.

Citizen marriage, the idealized ending that most plays in the genre of New Comedy aspire to and eventually reach, is presented with troubling complications in Terence, where even successful marriages scarcely resemble a happy ending. Rather, these marriages are characterized by the husbands' antagonism and abusive treatment of their wives.[171] Although characters like Philumena and Sostrata are themselves blameless, they are victims of harsh stereotypes about married women. *Virgines* like Philumena narrowly avoid the financial and

and they deliver a powerful critique of the coercive, self-centered masculine sexuality that characterizes Roman marriage" (46).

[171] James states, "Terence shows [wives] through a double prism: the audience first learns about them through the vituperation of the old men, a characterization that turns out to be false…After seeing the women on stage, viewers must adjust their expectations and recognize that these women are highly sympathetic and almost always suffering inexcusable abuse from their husbands" (2013: 181).

social hardships of single motherhood only at the cost of remaining married to their rapists. Although the social risks faced by women within the household are presented as a better outcome than poverty and isolation, Terence's representations of mother-daughter relationships within citizen families demonstrate that married citizen women never cease to be vulnerable to male harm. In Terence's comedies, then, marriage is never a straightforward, happy ending—not for the *adulescens* who will soon follow in his father's footsteps and resent his once longed-for wife and certainly not for the *virgo* whose only chance at long-term security actively endangers her immediate physical safety. The only choice available to the *virgo* is an impossible one. When scholars assign to her feelings of love and contentment for the man whom she is compelled to marry, they fail to consider Terence's implicit and explicit critique of Roman social values regarding women's bodies, sex, and marriage. In his study of sex laborers in New Comedy, Marshall explains that declarations of love cannot be considered to be mutual when they are spoken by a woman to the man who enslaves or frees her; in the context of enslavement and manumission, sexual acquiescence is a "necessary, defensive, survival response" (2013: 192–94). In this chapter, I have shown that a similar terminological imbalance occurs between the *virgo* and *adulescens*. The *virgo* never voices love to the *adulescens*; her acquiescence to marriage, too, I argue, should be considered a necessary, defensive, survival response in the wake of sexual violence or coercion.

Chapter 3. All in the *Familia*: Articulations of Empathy by Enslaved Characters

In Chapter 3, I apply the framework of feminist standpoint theory to demonstrate that enslaved characters, especially women, possess an epistemic advantage whereby they have more thorough and nuanced understandings of the systems that marginalize and oppress them than is possible for their enslavers.[172] I return to my discussion of *formulae desperantis* from Chapter 1 to demonstrate that enslaved women use expressions of despair primarily when they perceive that the *virgo* is in danger. These enslaved characters, I argue, deftly navigate the intense and contradictory expectations of their enslavers, negotiating the barriers of their social circumstances to support and protect the *virgo*. This is especially the case for Pythias of *Eunuchus*, who offers a nuanced assessment of guilt and accountability in the aftermath of rape, gives a voice to the *virgo*'s suffering, and uses her own speech as a tool for active intervention on the *virgo*'s behalf. I conclude that, due to the epistemic advantage of their social position, enslaved women provide the most reliable accounts of the *virgo's* emotional state, especially when she experiences pain or distress. My study analyzes women's expressions of misery in their immediate contexts within the plays and demonstrates how Terence foregrounds and critiques sexual violence in his corpus.

[172] Though the title of this chapter, by way of its allusion to the American television sitcom *All in the Family* (1971–1979) plays on the cognate relationship between the Latin *familia* and English "family," the term *familia* represents something very conceptually different from any modern conception of its English cognate. In antiquity, *familia* can describe "all persons subject to the control of one man, whether relations, freedmen, or slaves" (*OLD s.v.* 1); it is more often used with the restricted meaning of "the slaves of a household" (*OLD s.v.* 2) or "a group of servants domiciled in one place" (*OLD s.v.* 3). Discussing the semantic range of the terms *familia* and *domus*, Saller states: "While *familia* is frequently used for the group of slaves under a *dominus*, to the exclusion of the free members of the household, *domus* is often rather broader, including the wife, children, and others in the house" (1984: 343).

Constructing Knowledge in the Margins: Speech as Power

In Terence, speech is the tool of the oppressed.[173] Although they are the characters most vulnerable to physical abuse, enslaved characters in Terence deliver the harshest critiques of their enslavers, especially when they believe that a transgressive and harmful act has been committed against the *virgo*. In the aftermath of rape in particular, enslaved characters deliver emotional monologues that express anger directed at the *adulescens* and empathy for the *virgo*. Additionally, they use their speech as a tool for active intervention to make the experiences of the offstage *virgo* visible on the stage, speak on her behalf, and seek accountability from the *adulescens* by openly critiquing his transgressive behavior.

Why Enslaved Characters? An Introduction to Feminist Standpoint Theory and Epistemic Advantage

It may seem surprising that the characters who are most at risk of bodily harm are able and willing to speak up against violence, especially since, in Terence, they do so almost always on behalf of another individual: the *virgo*.[174] I argue, however, that it is precisely because of the marginality of their social position that enslaved characters are the best poised to voice critique of violent and exploitative hierarchies of power and domination. This happens for the following reasons: (1) the movement of enslaved characters is unrestricted—they operate inside and outside of the household and are, therefore, present both to witness the experiences of the *virgo* and to talk about them on the stage; (2) because the social status of enslaved characters is fixed

[173] For public performance as a venue for delivering powerful critique of the state, see Richlin (2017: 40–3).
[174] Critical engagement on the part of women and enslaved characters in Terence is recognized also by Copley, who states, "Apart from providing a morally proper ending to his plays, [Terence] creates characters all of whom—particularly the slaves and the women—show evidence of social protest. Whoever the formal protagonist in any of the plays may be, the real hero in every instance is a slave" (1967: xvii).

in Terentopia (see Introduction), their social position is not diminished by their choice to speak out against the violence of their oppressors; and (3) because at all times enslaved characters must protect their bodies and minds from harm, they are more perceptive and knowledgeable about the systems that disadvantage them than are those who oppress them.

The first point is straightforward: the movement of enslaved characters is unrestricted both on and off the stage. In contrast to the *virgo*—who is kept off the stage in all but one scene in Terence's entire extant corpus—enslaved characters are not merely allowed to travel within the play, but expected to. Outside of the home, enslaved attendants deliver messages, summon midwives, witnesses, and relatives, and offer advice and consolation to their enslavers; inside they prepare accommodations, aid in childbirth, and engage in private conversations. They witness public and private moments and report them on the stage.[175]

The second point is related to the first: like their movement, the speech of enslaved characters is also remarkably unrestricted in Terentopia.[176] Enslaved characters openly express joy, sadness, fear, and even anger (often directed at the play's citizens) to one another and the audience. The paradoxical "freedom of speech" that Terence's enslaved characters exercise can be accounted for by their fixed social status. Their social position is not lowered by their choice to speak out against the violence of their oppressors because it cannot be: first, there is no lower social position than enslavement, and second, manumission (formal release from enslavement) is nearly always a fiction in Terentopia. Enslaved characters do not expressly seek freedom with

[175] To name a few examples: in *Hecyra*, Parmeno gossips with the *meretrix* Philotis about Pamphilus' affair with Bacchis (76–197), in *Phormio*, Sophrona laments the precarious marriage in which she has placed the *virgo* (728–39), and in *Adelphoe* and *Eunuchus*, respectively, Geta (299–304) and Pythias (643–48) express extreme anger at the *adulescentes*.

[176] This is, strictly speaking, a generic convention. The real-life conditions of enslavement demanded submission from enslaved persons under the constant threat of physical and mental abuse. For a comprehensive survey of enslavement and the institutional violence that seeks to alienate the enslaved individual from their kin, see Patterson (1982).

the same frequency as they do in Plautus.[177] The one exception occurs in *Adelphoe*, where Syrus and his *contubernalis* Phrygia are told that they will be manumitted (970; 976–77). Even here, however, although manumission is promised, it is not achieved before the play's end.[178] The promise of manumission, which is motivated by the *senex* Demea's desire to teach his financially lenient brother a lesson, functions not as an example of upward social mobility for the enslaved characters but as a mechanism for punishing the undesirable behavior of a citizen.[179] With manumission off the table, enslaved characters have both the least to lose by speaking out against violence (with respect to their social position) and the least to gain by maintaining the citizen status quo.[180] It is not that enslaved characters have *nothing* to lose—enslaved bodies are under

[177] Richlin demonstrates that freedom from enslavement—through manumission or fantasies of escape—is, in fact, a central concern for the enslaved characters in Plautus (2017: 417–34). Her argument diverges here from the many influential scholars who have argued that manumission is not an aim for Plautus' *servus callidus* (Segal 1968: 159–69; McCarthy 2000: 212; Kurke 2011: 12; duBois 2009: 99; Stewart 2012: 189).

[178] Leigh describes the repetition and permanence experienced by the enslaved characters in Plautus: "First, the classic Plautine slave lives to deceive his master day after day; he may threaten to become a runaway but his flight is as permanently postponed as the beating or the crucifixion with which he is menaced. This, then, is entirely consonant with his status as a man without a past: he always was a slave and he always will be" (2004: 85). The enslaved characters in Terence suffer from the same fixed temporality and status that Leigh here describes.

[179] Nevertheless, Syrus and Phrygia are both (promised to be) freed. Demea's treatment of these two characters as mere pawns in his game of punishment communicates an underlying message about the arbitrariness of enslavement in Terentopia—it really is *that* easy for enslavers to promise manumission, they simply choose not to. Therefore, when Anderson remarks that the two enslaved characters who are promised to be freed are "hardly worthy of emancipation" (2001: 19), he introduces a correlation between "worthiness" and civic status that is simply not consistent with Terentopia.

[180] Harding explains that members of oppressed groups have both little to gain by maintaining the status quo and little to lose by distancing themselves from it, and, for this reason, "the perspective from their lives can more easily generate fresh and critical analyses" about the social order (1991: 125–26).

constant threat of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse.[181] What they do not risk is a gain or loss of status.[182]

A brief introduction to feminist standpoint theory will elucidate my third point, that, because enslaved characters must protect their bodies and minds from harm, they are more perceptive and knowledgeable about the systems that disadvantage them than those who oppress them.[183] Feminist standpoint theory concerns the relationship between the production of knowledge and systems of power and oppression. As a branch of epistemology, standpoint theory emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, tracing its origins back to Hegel's *Herrschaft und Knechtschaft* dialectic, concerning the conflict between social classes (lords and bondsmen) and the realization of self-consciousness. Hegel's framework was further advanced by Marx, who argued that the working class collectively develops "class consciousness" about their role in capitalist society and that it is from this "proletarian standpoint" that they derive an epistemic advantage in the form of insights about their oppression.[184] From these insights, a feminist branch of standpoint theory has emerged.[185]

---

[181] For example, in *Phormio*, the enslaved man Geta describes the types of punishments he could expect at the hands of his enslaver: "I've reflected on every hardship that will come my way if my master returns: grinding in the mill, beatings, being constrained by shackles, working out in the country" (*meditata mihi sunt omnia mea incommoda erus si redierit: molendum esse in pistrino, vapulandum, habendae compedes, opus ruri faciundum*, 248–50). It is worth noting that physical abuse on the stage is significantly less frequent in Terence than in Plautus. The verb *vapulo* ("to be beaten or thrashed, suffer blows"), which is used by comic characters to indicate that they are beating someone or that they themselves are being beaten, occurs only five times in Terence's corpus (compared to forty in Plautus'), only one of which refers to an enslaved person being beaten as punishment (at *Ph*. 249 above). The others, notably, refer to the beating of a *miles*, a *leno*, and a stranger of unknown status. This is not to say that the enslaved characters of Terence's comedies did not fear that they would be physically abused, but these harsh realities are more restricted from the stage than they are in Plautus. For a discussion of the prevalence of onstage beatings in Plautus, see Richlin (2017: 90–104).

[182] On the dangers of underrepresenting the risks (physical and psychological) that individuals from marginalized groups carry by exercising a critical stance, see Narayan (2004: 221–23).

[183] As a starting point, I recommend Harding (2004) for a general introduction to feminist standpoint theory. For the application of feminist epistemology to the study of antiquity, see Bowen, Gilbert, and Nally (2024).

[184] For a thorough introduction to feminist standpoint theory and a summary of its historical origins and controversies, see Harding (2004: 1–15). For a discussion of the specifically Marxian influence on standpoint theory, see Hartsock (2004: 35–53).

[185] This feminist branch has been especially influenced by Hartsock 1983, Rose 1983, Collins 1986, Smith 1987, and Harding 1991.

Feminist standpoint theorists make two major claims about the production of knowledge (Harding 2004: 7):

> (1) Knowledge is socially situated, and
>
> (2) Each oppressed group can learn to identify its distinctive opportunities to turn an oppressive feature of the group's conditions into a source of critical insight about how the dominant society thinks and is structured.

In other words: an individual's perception and knowledge of themself and the world around them is shaped by their social position, and individuals from marginalized groups—precisely because they are oppressed—are better equipped to see, understand, and develop critical insights (a.k.a., an epistemic advantage) about the structures and mechanisms of power that seek to oppress them than members of the dominant group.[186] Narayan uses the term "double vision" to describe the marginalized individual's ability to understand oppressive practices from contexts of both the oppressed and the oppressors (2004: 221).[187]

Witzke (2024) fruitfully applies aspects of feminist epistemology and theories of epistemic injustice to argue that Plautus and Terence, in *Truculentus* and *Hecyra*, respectively, demonstrate and critique how citizen and non-citizen women's knowledge is undermined, discredited, and ignored by the plays' citizen men. Witzke focuses on the ways in which

[186] While it is not the case that members of the dominant group *cannot* have knowledge about oppressive contexts, it is *easier* for members of the non-dominant group to learn about and understand them (Narayan 1989: 264). For the idea that the knowledge of members of the non-dominant group represents a more objective view of the world and the systems that operate within it than those in dominant positions, Harding coins the term "strong objectivity" (1991:142). The corollary to this claim is that individuals who occupy dominant positions have a less objective view of the world. So, Harding explains, "The view from the perspective of the powerful is far more partial and distorted than that available from the perspective of the dominated; this is so for a variety of reasons. To name just one, the powerful have far more interests in obscuring the unjust conditions that produce their unearned privileges and authority than do the dominated groups in hiding the conditions that produce their situation" (59).

[187] Importantly, Narayan cautions against expressing unqualified enthusiasm about the insights that can derive from double vision (2004: 221–23). She emphasizes that critical insights on behalf of the marginalized individual are not a guarantee and that the individual who does exercise a critical stance may face great personal harm for doing so. She concludes: "The thesis that oppression may bestow an epistemic advantage should not tempt us in the direction of idealizing or romanticizing oppression and blind us to its real material and psychic deprivations" (223).

epistemic tools of marginalization (i.e., willful hermeneutical ignorance, systematic silencing, and testimonial injustice) work together to oppress the plays' women and accept their speech only when it is in service to the "masculine citizen status quo" (125–34). She concludes that the choice of the two playwrights to highlight this epistemic injustice faced by these women exposes and critiques the inequities they experience (136–37). I build upon Witzke, applying feminist standpoint theory in my analyses of the enslaved women and men in Terence's *Adelphoe*, *Andria*, and *Eunuchus* to demonstrate that Terence has his subaltern characters achieve a unique standpoint from which they empathize with the *virgo* and critique the acts of violence against her.

Feminist standpoint theory is relevant to my study of the marginalized characters of Terence's comedies because it offers a framework for understanding why the playwright's enslaved characters are the best positioned to develop valuable insights about their oppression and use their knowledge to critique their oppressors. To state the obvious: enslaved individuals occupy a disadvantaged social position in Plautinopolis and Terentopia. Many scholars have shown that Plautus and Terence are interested in creating enslaved characters who challenge, reinforce, or otherwise negotiate the systems that oppress them. McCarthy argues that depictions of clever slaves with childlike qualities who were content in their servitude in Plautus' plays function to "justify [the enslaver's] mastery, and is also a reaction to the tiring labor of that mastery" (2000: 212–13). McCarthy's study, which has been highly influential among Anglophone scholarship, assumes that the target audience of Plautus' comedies was the Roman ruling class of citizens and slave-owners and that the plays formed part of the "public transcript" that "expresses the dominant's view of their own domination" and "preserve[s] a view of the existing social order as both natural and just" (18). Given this assumption, McCarthy seeks to

explain why Roman elites would have funded performances that featured a "picking, grinning, scheming, charming, deceptive fictive slave" (213) and the ideological functions they served that made them acceptable to the ruling class. Stewart (2012) similarly concludes that Plautus' plays reinforced the logic of enslavement rather than critiquing it. Stewart seeks to reconstruct the experience of historical enslaved people in antiquity and "evaluates Plautus' representations of masters and slaves and their interactions as a reflection of the arbitrary logic that defined the forcible subordination of the slave as natural, normal, and moral, and silenced the counter-narrative of the slave's humanity" (16). By contrast, Amy Richlin's (2017) landmark study calls for a total paradigm shift, arguing that the early Roman *palliata* were performed by and for enslaved people—hence, her designation of the *palliata* as "slave theater." Richlin's study is particularly relevant, as she argues "not only did slave characters in the *palliata* tell how they thought and felt, but the *palliata* itself constituted a reservoir of anger, helping audience members to keep alive the memory and hope of freedom, of wholeness" (26). She further highlights the social function of Plautus' *palliata* by and for the enslaved individuals who shared a collective memory of war, enslavement, and forced migration as well as a desire for escape and manumission (478–80). The public performances of these narratives of enslavement, then, were so effectively able to speak truth to power because they were performed by and for those who were already intimately familiar with these conditions due to their social position.

Richlin demonstrates that enslaved characters in Plautus's plays construct socially specific knowledge out of their conditions of enslavement and use this knowledge to critique dominant society on the stage. She, however, intentionally restricts her study to the plays of Plautus, appealing to a significant change that occurred by Terence's time: "Then things changed; the plays of Terence in the 160s bear eloquent testimony to the kind of change it was,

for the *palliata* is now a Menandrian revival, and the language is suddenly subdued, and the slave is upstaged" (479). While I concede that Plautus' plays provide enslaved characters more stage time to speak about their own experiences, I argue that the enslaved characters in Terence's comedies are no less knowledgeable about and no less influenced by their experiences of oppression. Rather, the knowledge and experiences of enslaved characters in Terence's plays are deployed for a different, yet consistent, purpose: instead of speaking out about their own experiences, enslaved characters demonstrate their epistemic advantage by critiquing acts of violence committed not against themselves but against the *virgo*, around whom Terence's plots consistently circulate.

Critical insights do not automatically happen because one occupies a socially marginalized position. In this way, a standpoint differs from a "perspective" (what one sees); a standpoint, rather, is the position from which knowledge *can* be built through experience and struggle. Hartsock explains (2004: 37):

> The vision available to the oppressed group must be struggled for and represents an achievement which requires both science to see beneath the surface of the social relations in which all are forced to participate, and the education which can only grow from struggle to change those relations.

Standpoint theorists emphasize the crucial roles that experience and learning play in the production of knowledge and consciousness; they make the crucial distinction that not every individual from a marginalized group will achieve a standpoint from which they may derive critical insights about the systems that oppress them.

Differences in standpoint, knowledge, and behavior can also be explained in part by the plurality of marginalized identities (e.g., enslaved; women; financially disadvantaged) and the multiplicity of their intersections (e.g., an enslaved woman; a free, non-citizen woman experiencing financial disadvantages).[188] Because different groups are oppressed in different ways, there is no singular oppressed standpoint. Rather, marginalized identities layer and overlap to create myriad standpoints from which distinct insights and critiques may emerge.[189] For the present study, this distinction helps explain the differences between the responses of enslaved women and enslaved men to the same circumstance.

While enslaved characters constitute an oppressed group in Roman Comedy, enslaved women (*ancillae*) form an even smaller sub-group of individuals who are oppressed also in gender-specific ways. At the intersection of their marginalized identities (i.e., enslaved and woman), *ancillae* are poised to best perceive, understand, and critique the systems of oppression that harm themselves and the *virgines*, with whom they share similar experiences of marginalization arising from their common gender and non-citizen status.[190] Not only do they share this knowledge, the enslaved women of Terence's plays leverage the epistemic advantage that their experiences of marginality afford to them to intervene on behalf of the offstage *virgo*;

[188] Theorists are careful to note that differences in standpoints and, therefore, in knowledge are "differences" not "inferiorities" (Harding 1991: 122).
[189] Collins (1986) demonstrates how Black women in academia have embraced the creative potential of their "outsider within" status to produce insightful analyses of race, class, and gender.
[190] While mothers—citizen and adoptive—share many experiences with the *virgo* (as I argue in Chapter 2), they are still temporally separate from her. Their ability to empathize with the *virgo* and their ultimate prioritization of marriage is influenced also by their own later experiences of, e.g., marriage and family building. Gardner demonstrates that, in Menander's *Epitrepontes*, the enslaved *hetaira* Habrotonon speaks as a surrogate for the raped citizen girl Pamphile; this is made possible, in part, because the two women share some elements of cultural identity (2012:123). By ventriloquizing a rape victim's response to rape through an enslaved woman on the stage, the play blurs the distinction between citizen and enslaved bodies and reveals a "discomforting distinction between the experiences of a woman for whom rape can be readily resolved (at least in the contrived realm of Menandrian comedy) and one for whom no such resolution is offered" (127). Gardner argues that "by assigning to the slave girl Habrotonon the part of responding to Pamphile's rape and acting out a hypothetical confrontation with her rapist, Menander offers an especially vivid articulation of the experience of rape" (123).

they make the offstage suffering of the *virgo* visible on the stage by describing it to the audience, they advocate for her best interests and take action to better her circumstances, and they deliver insightful critiques against those who do her harm. All this they accomplish through their speech—the best tool at their disposal—which they deploy strategically and purposefully, always demonstrating a keen awareness of their internal audience(s) and the social boundaries that they dare not cross.

An Outsider Within: Terence the Freed Playwright

Before I turn to my analysis, I will explore one more way in which the application of feminist standpoint theory can enrich our interpretations of Terence's comedies and our understanding of the playwright himself.[191] According to Suetonius' *Vita Terenti*, Terence was enslaved and trafficked into Rome after being abducted from his home in northern Africa:

> Publius Terentius Afer, Karthagine natus, serviit Romae Terentio Lucano senatori, a quo ob ingenium et formam non institutus modo liberaliter sed et mature manumissus est.
>
> Publius Terentius Afer, born at Carthage, was enslaved at Rome to the senator Terentius Lucanus, by whom—because of his *ingenium* and beauty—he was not only educated like a free person but was also manumitted when he was the proper age.

[191] This route of inquiry involves considering Terence as person and playwright and, therefore, will necessarily involve a modest degree of speculation. There is precedent for doing so, primarily in Anderson (2001).

By reporting this biographical event in his narrative (itself an act of literary reception), Suetonius intimately—and permanently—connects Terence to his subject material.[192] As a man who was born free, then enslaved, and eventually freed, Terence had a wide range of experiences from which he might draw when creating his enslaved characters. Anderson uses this biography to explain Terence's interest in the domestic disputes between fathers and sons and his apparent disinterest in portraying enslavement with humor (2001: 20):

> Terence, an ex-slave, did not, perhaps could not, follow Plautus in his Italian comic view of the slave. From his perspective apparently, the proper source of interest in the domestic plots he adapted from the Greeks was now the way the dynamics of the family emerged in the painful tensions between domineering fathers and selfishly irresponsible sons pursuing their amatory goals. In such families, the women and slaves are victimized and ignored. I suggest that this is what Terence learned as a slave, a restless and critical member of an aristocratic household, alienated by definition and more than ready to see the faults in family life. The failure of reconciliation, the rejection of responsibility and guilt in the families he represents might symbolize the process of degeneracy that Roman moralists later detected in the culture of Terence's time, but it might also suggest the extent to which a sensitive soul could be twisted by the brutal experience, no matter how temporary, of slavery. It was impossible for the Hebrews under slavery to sing by the waters of Babylon; it seems to have been impossible for Terence, coming from slavery, to approximate even briefly the humor of Plautus or the other comic poets.

[192] Suetonius' biography (written around 100 C.E.) is transmitted in Aelius Donatus' commentaries on Terence. As a source, the biography is not without its problems, as Beare (1942: 20–9), Duckworth (1952: 56–61), Prete (1961: 112–14), Arnott (1975: 46–47), and Forehand (1985: 1–8) discuss. From the outset, the chronological distance between Suetonius and Terence introduces some degree of unreliability, as Suetonius himself confesses.

Anderson thus argues that Terence's former conditions of enslavement made him both capable of viewing the elite Roman family through a critical lens and incapable or, perhaps, unwilling to portray enslavement with humor on the comic stage. Similarly, Witzke argues that both Plautus and Terence were non-citizen outsiders who did not come from wealth and privilege and that this perspective "allows them to comment critically on, or show disdain for, the customs, morality, and injustices of the citizen elite" (2024: 124–25).

Terence's insightful representations of elite power and violence on the comic stage are shaped by his identity as an individual from a marginalized group. Suetonius further reports that, following his manumission, Terence associated with men of extremely high rank: "He lived on friendly terms with many noblemen, but most of all with Scipio Africanus and Gaius Laelius" (*Hic cum multis nobilibus familiariter vixit, sed maxime cum Scipione Africano et C. Laelio*, Suet. *Vita Terenti* 1). As a formerly enslaved man who operated within Roman elite circles, Terence was positioned to achieve a standpoint of not only an outsider but that of the "outsider within." Black feminist critic bell hooks illustrates the standpoint of the outsider (1984: vii):

> To be in the margin is to be part of the whole but outside the main body. As black Americans living in a small Kentucky town, the railroad tracks were a daily reminder of our marginality. Across those tracks were paved streets, stores we could not enter, restaurants we could not eat in, and people we could not look directly in the face. Across those tracks was a world we could work in as maids, as janitors, as prostitutes, as long as it was in a service capacity. We could enter that world but we could not live there. We had always to return to the margin, to cross the tracks to shacks and abandoned houses on the edge of town.

> There were laws to ensure our return. Not to return was to risk being punished. Living as we did—on the edge—we developed a particular way of seeing reality. We looked both from the outside in and from the inside out. We focused our attention on the center as well as on the margin. We understood both. This mode of seeing reminded us of the existence of a whole universe, a main body made up of both margin and center. Our survival depended on an ongoing public awareness of the separation between margin and center and an ongoing private acknowledgement that we were a necessary, vital part of that whole.
>
> This sense of wholeness, impressed upon our consciousness by the structure of our daily lives, provided us with an oppositional world-view—a mode of seeing unknown to most of our oppressors, that sustained us, aided us in our struggle to transcend poverty and despair, strengthened our sense of self and our solidarity.

Hooks thus describes the duality of those who operate in both the margins and the center as well as the double vision that is produced from it. Marginality, as hooks later describes, is a "site of radical possibility, a space of resistance" that "offers to one the possibility of radical perspective from which to see and create, to imagine alternatives, new worlds" (2004: 156–57).

Terence was no stranger to this radical, creative, rich space of resistance. As an outsider within, the popular playwright derives epistemic advantage from his experiences of marginality and subsequent inclusion among the Roman elite; he boldly produces a dramatic program of incisive social commentary for public consumption that critiques the elite citizen audiences for

whom it was ostensibly created and by whom it was funded.[193] Through his enslaved characters, who unselfishly advocate for the vulnerable offstage *virgo*, and through his own adaptation of the genre, Terence constructs authority out of marginality and demonstrates the power of the voices of the oppressed.

Responses to Rape: Speech as a Tool for Active Intervention

In the first part of this chapter, I have argued why enslaved characters in Terence are the best situated to critique the systematic violence and oppression experienced by the *virgo*. In the second part of this chapter, I discuss the ways in which enslaved characters respond when they have learned that the *virgo* has been or is being harmed by the *adulescens*. I demonstrate that, in addition to responding with anger directed at the rapist (*Adelphoe*; *Eunuchus*) and empathy for the *virgo* (*Adelphoe*; *Andria*; *Eunuchus*), enslaved characters—especially women—use their speech as a tool for active intervention to (1) make the suffering of the offstage *virgo* visible, (2) advocate for her interests in her absence, and (3) deliver insightful critiques of the *adulescens* and hold him accountable for his actions, thereby protecting the citizen girl's future. My analysis focuses on the enslaved characters of *Andria*, *Phormio*, *Adelphoe*, and *Eunuchus*.

Advocacy

In Chapter 1, I demonstrate that, in Terence's comedies, the *adulescens* uses the adjective *miser* more than any other character, typically to express self-directed pity. My calculations also

[193] Richlin has persuasively demonstrated that the audiences at state-sponsored and non-state-sponsored performances of Plautus' and Terence's plays were mixed—composed of men and women who were free, enslaved, and freed, poor and wealthy, citizen and non-citizen (2005: 21–30; 2017: 1–2). Still, the state-sponsored performances at the *ludi* were funded by the elite, so Terence's choice to critique systems of elite violence and oppression on the public stage represents a bold and creative use of his position as outsider within.

show that the *ancilla* uses the adjective and other *formulae desperantis* in contexts where her distress is felt on behalf of the *virgo*. In this section, I contextualize the speech of one of these *ancillae*, Mysis in *Andria*, and demonstrate that she strategically deploys empathetic language (esp. *misera*) to describe the *virgo* in conversations with the *adulescens* in order provide him with a model of loyalty and empathy and influence his decision-making.

The plot of Terence's *Andria* circulates around the *virgo* Glycerium and the *adulescens* Pamphilus, whose child she is nine-months pregnant with at the start of the play. After the death of her adoptive sister (a *meretrix* named Chrysis), Glycerium is socially dependent on Pamphilus, who has promised that he will marry her and raise the child they are expecting together. This plan is threatened, however, when Pamphilus' father, Simo, reveals to his son that he instead has arranged for him to marry a citizen girl named Philumena, the daughter of a *senex* named Chremes. Torn between his erotic desire for Glycerium and his filial piety for his father, Pamphilus' loyalty wavers, in spite of the enthusiastic promises he made to Chrysis while she was on her deathbed to care for Glycerium.[194]

Pamphilus describes the conflicting emotions that urge him to reject or accept the marriage arranged by his father (260–64):

> **PAM.** tot me impediunt curae, quae meum animum divorsae trahunt:
> amor, misericordia huius, nuptiarum sollicitatio,

[194] Chrysis entrusts Glycerium into Pamphilus' care, bidding him to adopt several protective roles over her: 'By your right hand and your *genius*, by your faith and by her destitution, I formally entreat you, do not separate her from you and do not abandon her. If I have valued you like my own brother, if she has always made you alone out to be the greatest, if she has been compliant under all circumstances, I give you to her as a husband, a friend, a guardian, and a father; I entrust our possessions to you and I commit them to your faith' …I agreed and I will protect her now that she's been received into my care" (*quod ego per hanc te dexteram et genium tuom, | per tuam fidem perque huius solitudinem | te obtestor ne abs te | hanc segreges neu deseras. | si te in germani fratris dilexi loco | sive haec te solum semper fecit maxumi | seu tibi morigera fuit in rebus omnibus, | te isti virum do, amicum, tutorem, patrem; | bona nostra haec tibi permitto et tuae mando fide……accepi, acceptam servabo*, 289–96; 298).

tum patris pudor qui me tam leni passus est animo usque adhuc
quae meo quomque animo lubitumst facere. eine ego ut advorser? ei mihi!
incertumst quid agam.

PAM. So many concerns entangle me, which drag my heart in different directions: love, pity for her, anxiety about marriage, on the other hand respect for my father, who up to this point has allowed me to do whatever my heart desired with such a lenient spirit. Do I oppose him now? Oh no. I don't know what to do.

Pamphilus thus frames his love and pity (*misericordia*) for Glycerium as existing in direct conflict with his sense of respect (*pudor*) for his father, and, left to deliberate on his own, begins to lean towards his father's case.

Detecting Pamphilus' uncertainty, Mysis makes the strategic decision to intervene on Glycerium's behalf and call his loyalty into question (264–66):

MYS. misera timeo "incertum" hoc quorsus accidat.
sed nunc peropust aut hunc cum ipsa aut de illa aliquid me advorsum hunc loqui.
dum in dubiost animus, paullo momento huc vel illuc impellitur.

MYS. Poor me, I'm afraid about how that "I don't know" might turn out. But now it is really important that he either speak with her or that I say something to him about her. While the heart is in doubt, it can be influenced in one direction or another by just a small push.

Mysis thus acknowledges the power of even a small intervention and demonstrates that she, even in her restricted social position, can use her speech to influence the errant behavior of the *adulescens*. She goes on to describe Glycerium's present state to Pamphilus with the following sympathetic image (268–70):

> **MYS.** laborat e dolore atque ex hoc misera sollicitast, diem
> quia olim in hunc sunt constitutae nuptiae. tum autem hoc timet,
> ne deseras se.

> **MYS.** She is suffering in pain and the poor girl is anxious because your marriage was arranged for today. What's more, she is afraid that you will abandon her.

Mysis' description emphasizes Glycerium's pain, suffering, and fear, leaving no room for doubt that Pamphilus is the source of all of it.

Mysis repeats this language later in a monologue delivered alone on the stage after she has become entirely convinced that Pamphilus will not marry Glycerium. She exclaims: "Truly, what hardship the poor girl suffers because of him!" (*verum ex eo nunc misera quem capit laborem*, 719). The noun *labor* and its verbal cognate *laboro* (*laborat* 268; *laborem* 719) can have the general meaning "work" or "toil" whether mental or physical (*OLD labor s.v.* 1a; *laboro s.v.* 1), but they can refer also to the physical pains of childbirth (*OLD labor s.v.* 6b). As Mysis shows, the *virgo* in this moment experiences both psychological distress (i.e., longing for Pamphilus; fear that he will abandon her) and physical pain (she will give birth to her son before

the play's end). Mysis' language captures the nuance of this dual experience of feminine pain and tries to articulate it to Pamphilus as well as to the audience.

Before she gives birth, Glycerium sends Mysis in her place to request that Pamphilus come to the house to speak with her himself. As a messenger for Glycerium, Mysis reports the request to Pamphilus in *oratio obliqua*: "My mistress ordered me to request that you come see her now, if you love her. She says that she desires to see you" (*orare iussit, si se ames, era iam ut ad sese venias. videre ait te cupere*, 686–87). The request is strategically framed, whether by Glycerium as the original speaker or by Mysis as the one reporting the request indirectly. The conditional statement (*si se ames*) puts Pamphilus into the situation of either confirming or denying his love for Glycerium according to whether or not he accommodates her request. In this way, Mysis—or perhaps Glycerium—subtly exerts pressure on Pamphilus to alter his behavior. Shortly after this, during the same confrontation, Mysis again describes Glycerium as *misera*, attributing her unhappiness to the fear that Pamphilus no longer intends to marry her: "By Pollux, it is for this reason that the poor girl is in distress" (*atque edepol ea res est, proptereaque nunc misera in maerorest*, 693). As a proxy for Glycerium, Mysis thus reports both the speech that the *virgo* herself cannot deliver on the stage and her feelings of fear and betrayal that she is not present to embody.

Mysis' strategic deployment of sympathetic language to influence Pamphilus is successful.[195] Following the *ancilla*'s appeal, Pamphilus becomes more resolute about his devotion to Glycerium. He now confirms his loyalty with a series of rhetorical questions aimed to assuage Mysis' distrust (270–80):

[195] The *senex* Simo suggests that women purposefully stir pity in young men with tricks and fabricated tears (*harum scelera et lacrumae confictae dolis redducunt animum aegrotum ad misericordiam*, 558–59).

PAM. hem! egone istuc conari queam?
egon propter me illam decipi miseram sinam,
quae mihi suom animum atque omnem vitam credidit,
quam ego animo egregie caram pro uxore habuerim?
bene et pudice eius doctum atque eductum sinam
coactum egestate ingenium immutarier?
non faciam…
adeon me ignavom putas,
adeon porro ingratum aut inhumanum aut ferum,
ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor
commoveat neque commoneat ut servem fidem?

PAM. Oh! Could I attempt that? Will I allow that poor girl to be cheated because of me, she who entrusted her heart and her entire life to me, whom I myself with an honorable heart have treated dearly in the manner of a wife? Will I allow her nature, which has been taught and brought up well and virtuously, to be mutated under the duress of poverty? I will not do it. Do you think I am so cowardly, or besides so ungrateful or inhuman or cruel, that neither our history nor love nor shame would move me or impress upon me to keep my promise?

Pamphilus' spirited response mirrors Mysis' sympathetic image of Glycerium (*illam miseram*), but it is primarily a defense of his own character. Pamphilus' abundant use of first-person verbs and pronouns centers himself, revealing that—although Glycerium is ostensibly the object of his

concern—his own reputation remains his real priority. Furthermore, Pamphilus' desire to be viewed positively is framed specifically in response to Mysis' judgment (*putas*, 277). When confronted by an enslaved woman who feels pity and empathy for the *virgo*, the *adulescens* is compelled to mimic her behavior—try as he might, however, he still cannot shed his characteristic egotism. Mysis, on the other hand, has nothing to prove. In response to Pamphilus' indignation, she simply and unequivocally tells him, "I know this one thing, that she deserves to be remembered by you" (*unum hoc scio, hanc meritam esse ut memor esses sui*, 281).

Still, there is evidence that Mysis has, at least for the moment, shaped Pamphilus' perception of Glycerium to her benefit. Pamphilus now describes Glycerium as *misera* (271), which directly echoes Mysis (*misera sollicitast*, 268). Additionally, Pamphilus reevaluates his concept of *pudor*, which in his earlier monologue he had described as the respect that he owes to his father (*patris pudor*, 262). After being confronted by Mysis, Pamphilus reframes *pudor* as something owed instead to Glycerium (279). Pamphilus' response also demonstrates that he is, in fact, aware of the negative consequences that Glycerium will face if he abandons her: the permanent alteration of her *ingenium*. Mysis alerts Pamphilus to the girl's fear, and Pamphilus acknowledges his responsibility in determining Glycerium's future stability and status, thus demonstrating his practical knowledge of the social pressures put upon both him and Glycerium. In direct response to Mysis' challenge and critique, Pamphilus proves his capacity for pity—when pushed—or otherwise the ability to *perform* pity by articulating his emotions in accordance with what those around him expect and have modeled for him.[196]

Mysis uses her speech to intervene on Glycerium's behalf and specifically to correct Pamphilus' errant behavior, giving a voice to the fears and anxieties that Glycerium cannot

[196] For further discussion of Mysis' effect on Pamphilus' speech as well as Pamphilus' characteristic self-pity, see Chapter 1.

herself express on stage. She fulfills a dual role as an advocate for Glycerium: she acts as a mouthpiece for her and voices her own concern and empathy for her.[197] When Mysis comes to fully doubt Pamphilus' loyalty to Glycerium, she questions whether the emotional hardship that he brings to her is even worth it (716–20):

> **MYS.** nilne esse proprium quoiquam! di vostram fidem!
> summum bonum esse erae putabam hunc Pamphilum,
> amicum, amatorem, virum in quovis loco
> paratum. verum ex eo nunc misera quem capit
> laborem! facile his plus malist quam illic boni.

> **MYS.** Nothing lasts for anyone! May the gods help us! I used to think that this Pamphilus was the best thing for my mistress, a friend, lover, and husband prepared for any circumstance. But now what pain the poor girl experiences because of him! It's easy to see that he carries with him more bad than good.

Mysis shows concern not only for Glycerium's future marriage but also for her present circumstance, suggesting that the emotional turmoil Pamphilus is putting her through may not be worth it even in the long run. Such is a possibility that mothers and fathers never consider, since marriage is the highest priority for them.[198]

[197] Care must be taken, of course, not to uncritically attribute to enslaved characters positive emotions for their enslavers. In the previous line, *era* communicates a hierarchical distinction between Mysis and Glycerium: Glycerium is a free, non-citizen pseudo-*meretrix*, Mysis an enslaved *ancilla*.
[198] For an in-depth discussion of the comic mother's prioritization of her daughter's marriage to a citizen man, see Chapter 2.

Intervention

In *Phormio*, the *ancilla* Sophrona intervenes on behalf of the *virgo* Phanium in her parents' absence. Temporarily fulfilling the role of surrogate parent, she arranges a marriage for Phanium (to a neighboring *adulescens*), because she realizes that the *virgo*'s lack of social and financial resources leaves her with no better options. Throughout the play, great emphasis is placed on Sophrona's active intervention in the absence of a paternal figure to the *virgo*.

When Sophrona learns that Phanium's new father-in-law has discovered the secret marriage, she fears for her safety: "For I am afraid that my mistress might have harm inflicted upon her unfairly because of my advising. I hear that the father of the young man responded violently to the news of what was done" (*nam vereor era ne ob meum suasum indigne iniuria afficiatur. ita patrem adulescentis facta haec tolerare audio violenter*, 730–31). Sophrona claims responsibility for bringing about the marriage (*ob meum suasum*; *facta haec*) and feels remorse at the possibility that Phanium might be harmed. Notably, the harm (*iniuria*) that Phanium is most vulnerable to at the hands of the *senex* is different from that of an enslaved person, though the possibility of physical abuse is not ruled out entirely (*violenter*).[199]

Sophrona further admits that her choice to place Phanium in the marriage was an informed decision: "Poverty drove me to do what I did, even though I knew that this marriage was not secure, I took care of her future, doing what would keep her life safe in the meantime" (*quod ut facerem egestas me impulit, quom scirem infirmas nuptias | hasce esse, ut id consulerem, interea vita ut in tuto foret*, 733–34). As a woman who has herself experienced

[199] *Iniuria* often refers to "unjust and injurious treatment" (*OLD s.v.* 2), though it can also refer to physical injury (*OLD s.v.* 6). For a discussion of *vapulo* as an indicator of physical abuse, see above. *Violenter* does carry connotations of physical injury "with (unreasonable) exercise of force, violently" or "with violent feelings or expressions of feeling" (*OLD s.v.* 1).

conditions of poverty and enslavement, Sophrona explains that her choice to place Phanium into an uncertain marriage was not a rash one, but one that arose out of a careful assessment of the situation and its even less desirable alternatives.

The significance of Sophrona's experiences and identity on her decision-making is revealed when she is finally reunited in a confrontation with Phanium's father (Chremes) after his long absence from Lemnos. She emphatically lays out the improper conditions in which he had left her and Phanium (751–53):

> **SOPH.** ego autem, quae essem anus deserta, egens, ignota,
> ut potui, nuptum virginem locavi huic adulescenti
> harum quist dominus aedium.

> **SOPH.** Moreover, I, who am an old woman, abandoned, impoverished, unrecognized, when I had the opportunity, I placed the girl in a marriage to this young man who is the master of this home.

Sophrona's conditions of being *deserta*, *egens*, and *ignota* make her both the least well-equipped to care for Phanium and the best situated to draw upon practical knowledge and determine the best course of action. Despite her significant disadvantages, Sophrona explains that she nevertheless fulfilled Chremes' neglected parental duty of arranging a marriage for Phanium (*nuptum virginem locavi*). Her decisive action stands in sharp relief against her lack of resources and highlights Chremes' carelessness as a father.

After Chremes discovers that Phanium is married to his nephew (the resolution he had hoped for all along), he praises Sophrona for her role in securing the marriage and emphasizes her independence in doing so: "That scenario which both of us were trying our best to bring about, this woman, on her own, managed to bring it about exercising her greatest level of care and without any of ours" (*quod nos ambo opere maxumo dabamus operam ut fieret, sine nostra cura, maxuma sua cura haec sola fecit*, 760–61). Chremes, too, acknowledges both the great effort and care that Sophrona demonstrated for the *virgo*. Finally, when Chremes requests that Sophrona keep Phanium's identity as his daughter concealed (764), the *ancilla* accommodates the request without question: "No one will learn from me" (*nemo ex me scibit*, 765). Sophrona recognizes the power of her knowledge, discretely exercising or withholding it according to the situation, always in order to take action and place the *virgo* into the safest situation possible.

Anger and Pragmatism

Nine months before the events of *Adelphoe*, the *virgo* Pamphila was raped and impregnated by the *adulescens* Aeschinus. Pamphila is never displaced from her birth family, her freeborn status is never questioned, and it is made perfectly clear that her pregnancy has resulted from rape—on numerous occasions, the onstage characters describe the incident as a violent sexual assault (*vitium oblatumst*, 296; *miserae indigne per vim vitium obtulerat*, 308; *virgo ex eo compressu gravida factast*, 474–75; *virginem vitiasti*, 686).[200] The audience first learns of the

[200] For an in-depth discussion of the language of sexual assault and particularly the word *vis*, *vitium*, and *vitiare*, see Packman (1993) and Chapter 2.

assault and resulting pregnancy from Pamphila's mother, Sostrata, who expresses distress at the isolation that she and her daughter suffer from (291–92).[201]

When Sostrata is generally anxious about her daughter's oncoming labor pains, the *ancilla* Canthara attempts to ease her distress with reassurances both that they can handle the childbirth and that the circumstance could have been worse (295–97):

> **CAN.** e re nata melius fieri haud potuit quam factumst, era,
> quando vitium oblatumst, quod ad illum attinet potissumum,
> talem, tali genere atque animo, natum ex tanta familia.

> **CAN.** Given the circumstance, things could not have happened better than they did, mistress; since it was a case of rape, especially because it concerns *him*, such a man, of such a nature and spirit, born from such a family.

Canthara's words of consolation begin with an explicit acknowledgement of the specific set of circumstances that Pamphila and her mother are in (*e re nata*), which are then defined by the causal clause, *quando vitium oblatumst* ("since the rape occurred…"). Canthara's view is a pragmatic, although upsetting, one. Given that Pamphila is expected to marry her rapist, the best-case scenario for her and her mother is that he comes from a wealthy and reputable family.[202]

---

[201] She cries, "Poor me! I have no one—we are alone, Geta is not here—there is no one I could send to summon the midwife or Aeschinus" (*miseram me! neminem habeo—solae sumus, Geta autem hic non adest—nec quem ad obstetricem mittam, nec qui accersat Aeschinum*, 291–92). Sostrata's use of the *formula desperantis* is motivated by her concerns regarding Pamphila's pregnancy and the absence of the child's father. Though her expressions of worry are at first focalized through herself (*me miseram*; *neminem habeo*), her discourse quickly shifts to include her daughter (*solae sumus*; *salvos nobis deos quaeso ut siet*, 298).

[202] Canthara's response to rape exemplifies the rationale described by Brown in his discussion of rapes that lead to marriage in Terence's plays: "Nonetheless we may feel that the boys get off very lightly, and we may find it hard to

The emphatic succession of *talem…tali…tanta* resists defining the *adulescens* and his family as straightforwardly "good" while still recognizing that these are the best circumstances that a *virgo* under these generic conditions could hope for. Canthara's assessment frames the *adulescens*' citizen status, noble family, and wealth not as "good" but as "good *enough*" to counterbalance the circumstances (*e re nata*) which his crime has created.

Following Canthara's pragmatic response to the situation, Geta comes onto the stage and delivers more bad news, revealing that the marriage between Pamphila and Aeschinus will not be accomplished as easily as they had previously been led (by Aeschinus) to believe. Having witnessed Aeschinus abduct a *meretrix* from the house of a neighboring *leno* (Sannio), Geta assumes that he has abandoned Pamphila and delivers an incensed denunciation of the *adulescens* (299–304):

> **AES.** nunc illud est quom, si omnia omnes sua consilia conferant
> atque huic malo salutem quaerant, auxili nil adferant,
> quod mihique eraeque filiaeque erilist. vae misero mihi!
> tot res repente circumvallant se unde emergi non potest,
> vis, egestas, iniustitia, solitudo, infamia.
> hoccin saeclum! o scelera, o genera sacrilega, o hominem impium!

accept it as a happy outcome for the girl that she ends up marrying her attacker. It is in fact probably the best outcome she can hope for, since as 'damaged goods' she would find it hard to attract any other husband (and to remain unmarried would not be regarded as satisfactory for her); but we seem to be invited to regard it more positively as a happy ending to the play when the marriage is secured (or, in *The Mother-in-Law*, restored). We know the boy is delighted, but we learn nothing about the girl's feelings" (2006: preface, xx).

> **AES.** Now it is the case that, even if everyone should put together all their skills at problem-solving and seek a resolution to this misfortune that is damaging to me, my mistress, and her daughter, still they would come up with no means of helping it. Oh poor me! So many things suddenly surround them and there is no way out of it—violence, poverty, injustice, isolation, infamy. What an age! What wickedness, what sacrilege, what an impious man!

Geta thus frames Aeschinus' (alleged) betrayal as a problem that affects the entire household with extreme consequences, describing it as a threat not only to Sostrata's reputation but also to Pamphila's life: "Your reputation and your daughter's life will be in danger" (*tua fama et gnatae vita in dubium veniet*, 340).[203] Like Canthara, Geta recognizes the social ramifications that are likely to befall Pamphila and her entire household should Aeschinus refuse to marry her.[204] He clearly and emphatically articulates the dangers looming over them: violence, poverty, injustice, isolation, and infamy (*vis, egestas, iniustitia, solitudo, infamia*), making it clear that, though Pamphila has already suffered *vis* at the hands of the *adulescens*, she still has more to lose.[205]

Geta unequivocally attributes the cause of Pamphila's suffering to Aeschinus' inappropriate and transgressive behaviors. Speaking to himself alone on the stage, he calls the *adulescens* and his actions "wicked," "sacrilegous," and "impious" (*o scelera, o genera sacrilega, o hominem impium*, 304). He continues (306–8):

---

[203] For my translation of *in dubium veniet*, see *OLD s.v. dubius* 9a: "(of situations, etc.) that gives rise to apprehension, unpromising, having an unhopeful outlook; (neut. as sb.) an unpromising or dangerous situation."
[204] In her discussion of female Latinity, James argues that, in Plautus and Terence, the troubles that affect citizen girls (i.e., rape, pregnancy) "are presented as serious problems affecting not only themselves but others as well" (2005: 12).
[205] For further discussion of the long-lasting consequences (social, financial, physical) of rape for the *virgo*, see Chapter 2.

GET. neque fides neque iusiurandum neque illum misericordia
repressit neque reflexit neque quod partus instabat prope
quoi miserae indigne per vim vitium obtulerat.

GET. Neither fidelity, nor his oath, nor pity restrained him or held him back, not even the fast-approaching labor pains of the poor girl whom he shamefully raped stopped him.

Geta thus rebukes the *adulescens* not only for sexually assaulting Pamphila but also for failing to act properly in the aftermath. Speaking from an achieved standpoint, Geta demonstrates his understanding of both contexts: he identifies the citizen values (*fides*, *iusiurandum*) and pity (*misericordia*) that *ought* to have prevented the behavior and he critiques (*miserae*, *indigne*) the behavior itself.

Geta goes on to envision—with a series of contrafactual subjunctives—a grotesque fantasy of revenge upon not only Aeschinus but his entire household, including those who are enslaved within it. He exclaims (309–19):

GET. …ah
me miserum, vix sum compos animi, ita ardeo iracundia.
nil est quod malim quam illam totam familiam dari mi obviam,
ut ego iram hanc in eos evomam omnem, dum aegritudo haec est recens.
satis mihi id habeam supplici dum illos ulciscar modo.
seni animam primum exstinguerem ipsi qui illud produxit scelus.
tum autem Syrum impulsorem, vah, quibus illum lacerarem modis!

> sublimem medium primum arriperem et capite in terra statuerem,
>
> ut cerebro dispergat viam.
>
> adulescenti ipsi eriperem oculos, post haec praecipitem darem.
>
> ceteros—ruerem agerem raperem tunderem et prosternerem.

> **GET.** Ah, poor me, I am scarcely able compose myself, I am burning with such rage. There is nothing I would rather have than for that entire household to be presented before me, so that I could spew all this rage upon them, for as long as this grief feels fresh. It would be enough punishment for me if I could just take revenge on them. First, I would snuff out the life of that old man who produced that wicked crime. Next, Syrus, that instigator, ah, how many ways I would tear him apart![206] First, I would lift him up high, seizing him around his waist, and I would stand him upside down with his head in the ground, so that I could splatter the street with his brains. I would rip out the eyes of that young man and after that I would hurl him down headlong.[207] As for the rest—I would rush upon them, chase them, assault them, crush them, and strew them over the ground.

Geta's anger is tangible, his threats explicit, violent, and graphic—more so than any other scene in Terence's corpus.[208] It is significant that the most extreme threats in Terence's plays are

[206] Cf. Terence's *Eunuchus*, where Chaerea praises the *servus* Parmeno as the source of his plot to rape the *virgo* Pamphila: "Oh my Parmeno, oh the contriver, the initiator, the accomplisher of all my delights" (*o Parmeno mi, o mearum voluptatum omnium inventor, inceptor, perfector*, 1034–35).
[207] In a strikingly similar scene in *Eunuchus*, the *ancilla* Pythias threatens to rip out the eyes of the rapist Pamphilus: "If he should be given to me now, how readily I would fly at his eyes with my nails, that poisonous man!" (*qui nunc si detur mihi, ut ego unguibus facile illi in oculos involem venefico*, 648).
[208] The severity of Geta's reaction to the continued violence and mistreatment enacted on the *virgo* indicates what the playwright cares about. In her highly influential study of rape in Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*, James argues that "Terence uses these two rape plots to explore unsavory aspects of the processes by which *adulescentes* become Roman men and of Roman masculinity itself, and to embed into his plays powerful, unanswered criticism of these

spoken not by one of the many enslavers in the corpus but by an enslaved man, who wants to take revenge on an entire family for an act of sexual violence against a *virgo* committed by one of its members. As an enslaved man, Geta is no stranger to methods of physical and psychological abuse; his string of threats might be imagined, therefore, to have come from personal experience or from witnessing similar treatment of his *conservi*. Geta is able to deliver threats with such detail because he is informed by his experiences and those around him. Rather than having Geta reveal the conditions of his own oppression, Terence stages (imagined) violence from the position of the oppressed. His choice to voice fantasies of abuse that punch up (and to omit those that punch down) can perhaps be explained by Anderson, who concludes that Terence could not create humor from enslavement (2001: 19–20). The choice also suggests, however, that Terence saved the most visceral rage for the social problem around which he circulated all his plots: the constant endangerment of the *virgo*.

Although Geta's rage directly follows upon his apparent discovery that Aeschinus has betrayed Pamphila, this is not its only cause. Rather, the specific forms of physical abuse that he envisages upon Aeschinus and Syrus are indicative of the true source of his anger: the rape that occurred nine months prior. Geta's word choice—three forms of *rapio* (*arriperem*, *eriperem*, *raperem*, "to carry off (and violate), ravish" *OLD* 4a)—emphatically alludes to the language of sexual violence, imagining a punishment for the perpetrators that is equal to the crime. An additional source of Geta's anger is that the Aeschinus' apparent abandonment of Pamphila

phenomena" (1998: 32). Comparing the scenes of sexual violence in Plautus and Terence, Pierce observes that the rapes in Terence "take on a more sinister and sleazy aspect" (2002: 176). She concludes, however, that "there are a few illustrations of the distress [of the rape victims] at the time of the rape, which are usually given by female characters but after that, the state of their mind and their emotions are not portrayed" (178–9). In his study of the rape-to-marriage plot, Leisner-Jensen argues that rape in New Comedy is simply a "typical convention" used to connect an *adulescens* and *virgo* and, puzzlingly, concludes that "neither society nor Menander and his colleagues can be accused of having had a cynical view of the sufferings of the young girls" (2002: 196). For a survey of the scholarship on rape and sexual violence in New Comedy, see Introduction.

renders Canthara's earlier optimistic, solutions-oriented approach obsolete. If Aeschinus will not marry Pamphila, it makes no difference for her or her household whether the rapist is of high or low status.

Geta shrewdly identifies more than one individual as complicit in the rape. In addition to the rapist himself, he assigns culpability also to Aeschinus' father, who raised him this way (*seni animam primum exstinguerem ipsi qui illud produxit scelus*), and with the *servus* Syrus, whom he calls the "instigator" (*impulsorem*).[209] The threats made against Syrus are the most plentiful and vivid (*lacerarem*; *arriperem et capite in terra statuerem, ut cerebro dispergat viam*)—even in this hypothetical fantasy, the citizen body is more protected than the enslaved one. Finally, Geta's imagined punishment for Aeschinus—extrusion of the eyes (*eriperem oculos*)—alludes to the *adulescens*' characteristic obsession with vision and robs him of the very source of his desire.[210] Geta thus offers an assessment of guilt that is expansive and uncompromising—his fantasies of revenge against citizen enslavers challenge the systems of power and domination that endorse violence against young citizen women and all those who are complicit in them.

Seeking Accountability

The *Eunuchus* features two young brothers who wish to have sex with a pair of adoptive sisters, the *meretrix* Thais and the *virgo* Pamphila.[211] After catching a glimpse of the young Pamphila, the *adulescens* Chaerea becomes infatuated with her and dons the disguise of a eunuch in order to gain access to her private room and sexually assault her. On stage, the *ancilla* Pythias describes Pamphila's condition after the attack and interrogates the men responsible: Chaerea

[209] The designation of Syrus as *instigator* implies that he fulfills the role of the stock *servus callidus*, aiding in the romantic pursuits of his enslaver.
[210] For a discussion of the *adulescens*' relationship to vision and power, see Chapter 1.
[211] The *adulescentes* do not learn that the girls are adoptive sisters until the play is nearly over.

and the *servus* Parmeno who aided him. Once Pamphila is able to reclaim her citizen status after being reunited with her biological brother (Chremes), it is agreed that she will marry Chaerea, thus ending the play.[212]

Although rape features prominently across Terence's corpus, the *Eunuchus* is the only play in the extant corpus of Roman Comedy with a rape that takes place during the action of the play. Additionally, this play demonstrates how two enslaved characters, Pythias and Parmeno, can occupy two very different roles in the rape plot, despite their similar experiences of marginalization: while Parmeno plays an active role in bringing about the assault, Pythias, by contrast, responds with anger (directed at the rapist) and empathy (directed at the *virgo*) and seeks to hold the perpetrators accountable for their actions. In doing so, Pythias delivers insightful critique of the violence committed against young citizen women and the social practices that endorse it.

The significance of Pythias' character has been recognized by scholars. Martin argues "that the role of the ancilla Pythias in the *Eunuchus* is both substantial and important [and] that the liveliness of her character is significantly enhanced by a marked individuality in her speech" (1995: 150). Rosavich states that Pythias is the only character in *Eunuchus* who can fully sympathize with Pamphila—because the women are *conservae*, "sisters in slavery" as he translates—and that "[Terence] has created [Pythias] to make a point, that from the victim's perspective rape is a terrible thing" (1998: 48–49). According to Rosivach, however, the play's sympathy is short-lived (49):

[212] Perhaps in part due to Chaerea's involvement in the resolution of this play, scholars of the early twentieth century have lauded Chaerea as the hero of the story. This apologist vein of scholarship is best represented by Kraemer (1928) and Rand (1932). For my review of the scholarship on Chaerea, see Chapter 1.

> The point, however, should not be exaggerated. The play's sympathy (or even concern) for Pamphila does not extend beyond the two scenes with Pythias, the first (643–67) when she confronts Chaerea's brother with what his "eunuch" has done, and the second (850–909) when she plays counterpoint to the reconciliation of Chaerea and Thais. Nor should we forget that Pythias is merely a slave, female and probably old, hardly a figure of authority. Terence has had his audience hear what she has to say, but he has also made it easy for the audience to dismiss it, just as Thais does (861).

James demonstrates that Pythias functions as an "internal female critic whose judgment of the rape is severe" (1998: 41). She concludes (45):

> Terence uses [women] to voice criticism of the male sexual values that characterize Roman masculinity, and the fact that he stages no refutation of their criticism (in the form of even so little as a self-reproving speech by either *adulescens*) suggests that he is presenting his own critique, in the female voices, of adult Roman masculine sexuality and its method of acquiring wives.

James sets a significant precedent for taking Pythias seriously for her harsh critique of both Chaerea and Parmeno.

After Pythias discovers that Pamphila has been raped, she must decide what she will do with that information: disclose it or keep it hidden. Her conversation with a fellow enslaved woman named Dorias lays out the options available to her and the benefits of the latter (721–23):

> **PYTH.** ita, utrum praedicemne an taceam? **DOR.** tu pol, si sapis,
> quod scis nescis neque de eunucho neque de vitio virginis.
> hac re et te omni turba evolves et illi gratum feceris.
>
> **PYTH.** So, should I say something or should I stay silent? **DOR.** By Pollux, if you are sensible, then whatever you know about the eunuch and about the rape of the *virgo* you don't know it. By doing this you'll disentangle yourself from this whole mess and do the girl a favor.

Dorias urges Pythias to act as though she knows nothing about the assault or its perpetrator, indicating that non-action is the choice that will most benefit both herself and Pamphila.[213] By indicating that Pythias could have opted to overlook the assault (and by labeling this as the easier option), the exchange marks the Pythias' choice to acknowledge the rape as all the more important. It is not just that Pythias's standpoint positions her to be able to *recognize* violence, she is equipped also to *confront* it. She does so, declining to be a bystander to violence and instead unwaveringly speaking out as a witness of it.

Although the rape of *Eunuchus* takes place off stage and the audience never sees the *virgo* for themselves after the assault, the violent manner of the attack and Pamphila's condition in its aftermath are scarcely left to the imagination. After learning of the assault, Pythias describes the state in which she found the girl, making her pain visible on the stage: "After he played his games with the *virgo*, he ripped the poor girl's clothing from top to bottom and then

[213] If it is widely known that Pamphila was raped, her marriageability will be compromised, regardless of whether her citizenship is recognized.

he tore her hair" (*postquam ludificatust virginem vestem omnem miserae discidit, tum ipsam capillo conscidit*, 645–46).[214]

Similar to Geta of *Adelphoe*, Pythias reacts to learning of the injustice that the *virgo* has suffered with insults and threats to repay violence with violence. Immediately, she directs her anger at the eunuch, whom she believes to be the attacker; acting openly hostile toward him, she exclaims (643–44, 647–48):

> **PYTH.** ubi ego illum scelerosum misera atque impium inveniam? aut ubi quaeram? hocin tam audax facinus facere esse ausum!
> …
> qui nunc si detur mihi,
> ut ego unguibus facile illi in oculos involem venefico!
>
> **PYTH.** Poor me, where can I find that immoral, most wicked man? Where should I search? What a shameless crime he dared to commit! […] If he should be given to me now, how readily I would fly at his eyes with my nails, that poisonous man!

Pythias' threat to fly at the assailant's eyes with her nails is remarkably similar to that of Geta when he expresses a desire to tear out the eyes of the rapist in *Adelphoe* (*eriperem oculos*, *Ad.* 318).[215] Pythias' threat, like Geta's, seeks to take away the source of the perpetrator's desire and power, enacting violence as a punishment for violence. Her outright indignation on behalf of

[214] After seeing Pamphila for herself, Thais provides a similar description: "The girl weeps in silence still wearing her torn dress" (*virgo conscissa veste lacrumans obticet*, 820).
[215] Breitenfeld (2021) argues that Pythias' desire to rob the rapist of his sight is related to a consistent, underlying discourse throughout the play that connects vision with power and domination.

Pamphila, who cannot express her own pain and anger, reinforces Pythias' role as her mouthpiece and advocate.[216]

Even in her extreme emotional state, Pythias exhibits social competence and awareness of her civil status when she moderates her rage in response to the premature arrival of Chaerea's older brother, Phaedria. Pythias briefly redirects her anger at him, blaming him for gifting her household with the violent eunuch in the first place.[217] Her confrontation of Phaedria is remarkably restrained considering her rage mere moments before: "Won't you and those nice gifts of yours go where you deserve? What a mess that eunuch you gave to us created!" (*in' hinc quo dignu's cum donis tuis tam lepidis? eunuchum quem dedisti nobis quas turbas dedit*, 651–52). As her social position—that of an enslaved woman addressing a citizen man—demands, Pythias holds back from openly insulting Phaedria, opting instead for a rhetorical question dripping with irony (*cum donis tuis tam lepidis*) to express her displeasure with him. Still, despite her vulnerable position, Pythias is not willing to let Phaedria's role in the crime—indirect as it is—go unacknowledged.

After the interrogation of the real eunuch Dorus reveals that Chaerea was the rapist in disguise, Pythias keenly navigates the social boundaries that, under normal circumstances, would prevent her from confronting Chaerea with outright hostility. Because Chaerea is still disguised as the eunuch (and still unaware that his true identity has been compromised) when Pythias meets with him, he is temporarily forced to simulate the vulnerable position of an enslaved

[216] All of Pythias' speeches and actions following the rape are evidence against Barsby's claim that the rape was not intended to be troublesome to Terence's contemporary audience: "The whole idea of rape offends our modern sensibilities, but there is no sign in this scene that Terence means the spectators to react with revulsion" (1999: 185). Pythias' highly emotional response and repeated descriptions of Pamphila's appearance after the assault ensure that the physical violence of the rape is all but impossible to ignore.

[217] Cf. Geta's anger and threats directed at the father who raised the rapist in *Adelphoe*: "I would snuff out the life of that old man who produced that wicked crime" (*seni animam primum exstinguerem ipsi qui illud produxit scelus,* 314)

person. Taking advantage of Chaerea's temporary loss of status, Pythias levels insults directly at Chaerea, openly scorning him and threatening a physical attack (855–63):

CHAE. hanc metui ne me criminaretur tibi.
THAIS quid feceras? **CHAE.** paullum quiddam. **PYTH.** Eho, 'paullum,' impudens?
an paullum hoc esse tibi videtur, virginem
vitiare civem? **CHAE.** conservam esse credidi.
PYTH. 'conservam!' vix me contineo quin involem in
capillum, monstrum! etiam ultro derisum advenit.
THAIS abin hinc, insana? **PYTH.** quid ita? vero debeam,
credo, isti quicquam furcifero si id fecerim,
praesertim quom se servom fateatur tuom.

CHAE. I was afraid that she would accuse me of a crime in front of you. **THAIS** What had you done? **CHAE.** Only a little thing. **PYTH.** Ha! "Only a little thing," you shameless man? Does it seem to be "only a little thing" to you to rape an unmarried citizen girl? **CHAE.** I thought she was a fellow slave. **PYTH.** A fellow slave! I can hardly hold back from flying at his hair, the monster! What's more, he's come to make a game of it. **THAIS** Leave it, you madwoman! **PYTH.** Why should I? It's not as though I'll face any punishment if I do harm to that villain, I trust, especially since he is professing to be your slave.

Pythias calls Chaerea "shameless" (*impudens*), "monster" (*monstrum*), and "criminal" (*furcifer*).[218] She undermines and ridicules him by mimicking his words with incredulity (*paullum*; *conservam*) and threatens violence without actually committing it (859–60).[219] When Thais warns her not to overstep, Pythias reveals that her verbal attacks are deliberate and informed, promising that she will treat Chaerea like a fellow enslaved person for as long as he pretends to be one (862–63).

Having confronted Chaerea to the extent that her social position will allow, Pythias devotes the remainder of her efforts to demand accountability from Parmeno, whom she identifies as both complicit and an active participant in the events leading up to the rape.[220] With confidence, Pythias declares that she knows that Chaerea's deceit originated with Parmeno: "I know that this is Parmeno's trick, as sure as I live… I will figure out how to pay him back fairly" (*Parmenonis tam scio esse hanc techinam quam me vivere…inveniam pol hodie parem ubi referam gratiam*, 718–19). For Pythias, the plan is as important as the deed itself, the accomplice as guilty as the perpetrator. Chaerea, too, makes it clear that Parmeno played a crucial role. After he has raped Pamphila, Chaerea sings Parmeno's praises: "Oh my Parmeno, oh the contriver, the initiator, the accomplisher of all my delights, do you know what a state of joy I am in?" (*o Parmeno mi, o mearum voluptatum omnium | inventor, inceptor, perfector, scis me in quibus sim gaudiis?* 1034–35). The repetition of the three vocatives *inventor, inceptor,* and *perfector* are

[218] According to Martin *furcifer* is a term of abuse that is "always, in both Plautus and Terence, put in the mouths of male characters" except in this one instance (1995: 147). This rare use of the insult spoken by a woman, therefore, supports Martin's claim that Pythias is exceptional and makes the insult extremely emphatic.
[219] Martin states that "ridicule [is] the only weapon left to [Pythias]" (1995: 147). In Pythias' threat of physical violence, which she will not carry out, her reference to "flying at the hair" of Chaerea represents a reversal; as Martin notes, "at 646 Pythias describes how Chaerea had torn the hair of the girl he had raped; now *she* expresses the wish to seize *his* hair" (147).
[220] Interpretations of Parmeno as a "bungling slave" (most notably Barsby 1990: 4–5) minimize Pythias' discerning appraisals of Parmeno's contribution to the success of the rape plot, and, in this way, diminish the agency of both enslaved characters.

emphatic, each highlighting Parmeno's role in the conception and the accomplishment of the deed.[221] As Chaerea goes on, he, like Parmeno, separates plan from action. He asks: "Whom should I celebrate first, or whom should I praise the most? The one who gave me the plan so that I might carry it out, or myself who dared to set it in motion?" (*quid commemorem primum aut laudem maxume? illumne qui mihi dedit consilium ut facerem, an me qui id ausu' sim incipere*? 1044–48).

On multiple occasions, Pythias acknowledges the generic relationship between the *servus callidus* and *adulescens*. Recognizing the direct influence that Parmeno has on Chaerea, Pythias describes him as an *auctor* during her confrontation of him after the rape: "Was that shameful act not enough for you, the one which the young man committed because you contrived it?" (*an paenitebat flagiti, te auctore quod fecisset adulescens, ni miserum insuper eitam patri indicares*, 1013–14). The ablative absolute (*te auctore*) before the relative clause (*quod fecisset adulescens*) emphasizes the individual agency of both Parmeno and Chaerea, while also demonstrating Pythias' high level of metageneric competence that allows her to recognize the comic plot and the mechanisms of power at play in the relationship.

When Pythias realizes that no one else intends to hold Parmeno or Chaerea accountable for the rape, she decides to intervene by creating her own punishment for the men. Her plan involves first misleading Parmeno into believing that others have also identified him as the crime's source. She warns him falsely, "Watch what you're doing, Parmeno, or you might do him no good and undo yourself. Seeing that they think the whole matter originated from you" (*vide, Parmeno, quid agas, ne neque illi prosis et tu pereas; nam hoc putant quidquid factumst ex te esse ortum*, 964–66). Pythias' lie lays the groundwork for her punishment, and—along with

[221] Cf. Geta assigning blame to Syrus for the rape of the *virgo* of *Adelphoe* (*Syrum impulsorem*, *Ad.* 315), as discussed above.

her other declarations of Parmeno's agency—again emphasizes that the deed (*factumst*) originated with him (*ex te esse ortum*).

Unlike her confrontation with Chaerea, Pythias has no reservations about punishing Parmeno. She asks herself, "How can I pay back that criminal who snuck that man into our lives?" (*quid, quid venire in mentem nunc possit mihi, quidnam qui referam sacrilego illi gratiam qui hunc supposuit nobis?* 910–12). Her sense of justice accords with what she perceives to be equal recompense for one's actions. Pythias swears (941–44):

> **PYTH.** ego pol te pro istis dictis et factis, scelus,
> ulciscar, ut ne inpune in nos inluseris.
> pro deum fidem, facinu' foedum! o infelicem adulescentulum!
> o scelestum Parmenonem, qui istum huc adduxit!

> **PYTH.** By Pollux, I will punish you myself, you villain, for these words and actions, so that you won't have made a game of us without punishment. By god, what a vile crime! Oh what an unfortunate young man! Oh that villainous Parmeno, who led him here!

Because she is still restricted from physically harming Parmeno due to her gender and status, Pythias decides instead to psychologically torment him, instilling him with fear of punishment by his enslaver: "I trust that I have figured out my own way to torture this man. Then, I will come out and scare the hell out of this criminal" (*spero me habere qui hunc meo excruciem modo. ibo intro de cognitione ut certum sciam; post exibo atque hunc perterrebo sacrilegum*, 920–22).

Taking up the role of *poeta*, Pythias creates her own fictional subplot within the play, one that features Chaerea, still in his eunuch disguise, having been found guilty of rape and about to be castrated as punishment. She reports this imagined narrative to Parmeno when the two are alone (949–58):

> **PYTH.** perdidisti istum quem adduxti pro eunucho adulescentulum,
> dum studes dare verba nobis. **PAR.** quid ita? aut quid factumst? cedo.
> **PYTH.** dicam. virginem istam, Thaidi hodie quae dono datast,
> scis eam hinc civem esse? et fratrem eius esse apprime nobilem?
> **PAR.** nescio. **PYTH.** atqui sic inventast. eam istic vitiavit miser.
> ille ubi id rescivit factum frater violentissimus—
> **PAR.** quidnam fecit? **PYTH.** —colligavit primum eum miseris modis—
> **PAR.** colligavit? **PYTH.** —atque equidem orante ut ne id faceret Thaide.
> **PAR.** quid ais? **PYTH.** nunc minatur porro sese id quod moechis solet,
> quod ego numquam vidi fieri neque velim.

> **PYTH.** You destroyed that young, little man whom you led here in the eunuch's place, when you endeavored to deceive us with your words. **PAR.** In what way? What happened? Go on. **PYTH.** I will tell you. That girl, the one who was given as a gift to Thais today, do you know that she is a citizen and that her brother is of very noble birth? **PAR.** I don't know. **PYTH.** She has been discovered to be so. That wretched man raped her. When her brother, a very violent man, learned that this happened— **PAR.** What did he do? **PYTH.** —first he bound him by wretched methods— **PAR.** Bound him? **PYTH.**

> —while Thais was truly begging him not to do it. **PAR.** What are you saying? **PYTH.** Now, moreover, he is threatening to do what typically happens to adulterers, a thing which I myself have never seen and would not want to.

Pythias' fabricated plot incorporates metageneric language as well as a combination of truth and fiction that both makes the narrative believable to Parmeno and puts her generic competency on display.[222] The elements of Pythias's narrative that are true follow Terence's typical comic plot: Pamphila is designated as a *virgo*, a hyperfortuitous *anagnorisis* with a long-lost relative confirms her citizenship, and the *virgo* is raped by a wretched (*miser*) young man.[223] Pythias' description of Chaerea as *miser* is ironic and strategic.[224] Outside of her ruse, Pythias exhibits no sympathy for Chaerea. Rather, by describing Chaerea as *miser* and by implementing the phrase *miseris modis*, Pythias feigns sympathy for the *adulescens* and appeals to Parmeno's perspective. Parmeno is able to believe the falsehoods within Pythias' narrative—even though they are unheard of in the genre—because they are nested in truth and because they express sympathy for the character with whom Parmeno's sympathies are most likely to lie.

Parmeno takes the bait. In an effort to save Chaerea from castration, Parmeno reveals everything that has happened to Chaerea's father (979–96), thus exposing himself to the threat of physical abuse as punishment for his scheming. Pythias' *fictional* punishment of Chaerea thus leads to *real* harm for Parmeno—though it does not ultimately take place during this play.[225] Without her intervention, Parmeno and Chaerea would have faced no consequences for the rape,

[222] Germany remarks on the power of Pythias' words to bring about punishment for Parmeno: "She is giving him a taste of his own medicine, and like some of her namesake's most infamous oracles, what Pythias says may in one sense be untrue, but it is the kind of pretense that has the power to create reality" (2016: 14).
[223] For a discussion of the typical comic rape plot, see Chapter 2.
[224] For the *adulescens* being consistently characterized—often by himself—as *miser*, see Chapter 1.
[225] On this point, see Leigh 2004 above.

since arrangements for the marriage of Pamphila and Chaerea were easily agreed upon without his father's involvement (879; 884–93). Rather than allowing the generically-expected marriage arrangement to proceed unchallenged, Pythias intervenes and redirects the plot toward her own *telos*—one that punishes perpetrators of sexual violence—if only for a short time.

Finally, one might wonder what circumstances cause Parmeno's and Pythias'—or, even, Parmeno's and Geta's—responses to violence committed against the *virgo* to be so different, where, despite their similar experiences of marginality, one exercises protection over her while the other actively harms her. As an enslaved woman, Pythias occupies a social position closest to Pamphila.[226] Even though the two women only meet at the beginning of the play, their similar social situations and experiences create an immediate emotional connection between them.[227] Pamphila and Parmeno, on the other hand, are separated not only by their gender but also by the households to which they belong. While Pamphila is quickly assimilated into Thais' household, Parmeno's loyalty lies firmly with the *adulescens*, as is demanded by his condition of enslavement. As Chaerea pressures Parmeno to aid him in his pursuit of the *virgo*, he reminds Parmeno of the promises he is accustomed to making in exchange for small favors (307–10):

> **CHAE.** nunc, Parmeno, ostendes te qui vir sies.
> scis te mihi saepe pollicitum esse 'Chaerea, aliquid inveni
> modo quod ames; in ea re utilitatem ego faciam ut cognoscas meam,'
> quom in cellulam ad te patris penum omnem congerebam clanculum.

[226] Pamphila is at this point still an enslaved (pseudo-)*meretrix*.
[227] She does reveal later that she has grown fond of Pamphila (*nam illi faveo virgini*, 916), which she clearly demonstrates throughout the play.

> **CHAE.** Now, Parmeno, you will show what kind of man you are. You know that you often used to promise me, 'Chaerea, just find something you love, then I'll make sure that you recognize my usefulness in that situation,' when I was secretly heaping up my father's entire storeroom for you in your tiny quarters.

Chaerea thus appeals to his long relationship with Parmeno and reminds the *servus* that he has a role to fulfill in this play's plot (and this role has no room for empathy for the *virgo*). Parmeno, having already turned promises of future action into currency in the past, must oblige.

After Pythias has revealed her trick to Parmeno and had a good laugh at his expense (1007–8), she exits the stage and is notably absent for the remainder of the play (approximately seventy lines that feature the actual resolution of the dual love plots, including the promise of marriage between Pamphila and her rapist). Her absence during this ending speaks to her function as a character: after holding the perpetrators of violence accountable by temporarily imposing her own, alternate ending on the comedy, she is not there to endorse the "happy" ending that is demanded by the genre. Pythias delivers the final line before her exit to Parmeno: "This is the reward for that service of yours. I'm out of here" (*hic pro illo munere tibi honos est habitus: abeo*, 1023). In Pythias' version, Parmeno is "rewarded" not with the victory palm that he dreamed of (930) but with physical punishment, and Chaerea is permanently castrated, unable to rape again.

In sum, Terence presents the audience of *Eunuchus* with a nuanced framework of guilt and accountability. As an enslaved woman who occupies a similar social position to the displaced *virgo* (before she is recognized as a citizen), Pythias is uniquely situated to empathize with and advocate for Pamphila in her absence. Her marginalized position is also the very quality

that enables Pythias to temporarily take control of the narrative in order to enact a psychological punishment on Parmeno and a revenge fantasy on Chaerea. Pythias' acts of advocacy and intervention stand in stark relief with Parmeno's complicity in the premeditated, violent assault of the *virgo*. Through the character of Pythias, Terence demonstrates his knowledge of oppression, critiques it, and offers active intervention through speech as a solution to it.

In this chapter, I have argued that enslaved characters are the best positioned to advocate for the *virgo* in her absence, due to their similarities of experience and their unique ability to empathize with her. Unlike mothers, who are preoccupied with securing a stable future for the *virgo*, enslaved characters are primarily concerned with the *virgo*'s present circumstances. When they learn that she has been harmed by the *adulescens*, they respond with anger and empathy, using their speech to make the experiences of the offstage *virgo* visible on stage, to advocate for her best interests when she herself is not present to do so, and to critique the transgressive behavior of the *adulescens*.

In the first part of this chapter, I have argued that feminist standpoint theory can be productively applied to the study of Roman Comedy, and that it is an especially fruitful approach to the study of enslaved characters. Feminist standpoint theory enriches this study by illuminating the ways in which individuals from marginalized groups construct knowledge and derive critical insights about the systems and practices that oppress them. This theoretical approach also accounts for the variations of marginalized experiences—while one individual may deliver perceptive critique of their oppressors (e.g., Pythias, Geta), another may be complicit in the oppression (e.g., Parmeno, Syrus). Finally, feminist standpoint theory offers a

productive framework for understanding the connection between Terence's biography and how his poetic program was received in antiquity and continues to be read today.

Conclusion

I have argued in this dissertation that, in the absence of an actor portraying the *virgo* on stage, Terence's audience must construct their own image of this young woman based on what they learn about her from the plays' onstage characters. In Chapter 1, I demonstrated that the playwright characterizes the *adulescens amans* as so self-interested and superficial that any information he provides about the *virgo* is of questionable reliability. In Chapter 2, I described the "regenerative plot," in which mothers work to duplicate for their daughters their own experiences in securing a respectable marriage, and outlined its significant influence on the comic mothers' pragmatic responses to sexual assault. I showed that mothers and daughters occupy different stages of the comic woman's life course, which follows a consistent series of experiences characterized by vulnerability and risk. Owing to these shared experiences, mothers are motivated, even as they empathize with their daughters' pain, to exert control over their futures by pushing them toward marriage as a socially-endorsed remedy to sexual assault. This solution of citizen marriage is further complicated by the playwright's presentation of antagonistic and abusive marriages between the *senex* and *matrona*, which discloses the citizen woman's continued vulnerability even in a secure marriage. In Chapter 3, I apply the framework of feminist standpoint theory to suggest that, in the play world of Terentopia, enslaved characters, especially women, are better positioned to develop nuanced understandings about the systems that oppress them than their enslavers. Furthermore, out of this socially-situated knowledge, enslaved characters deliver insightful critiques of the violence and harm that their enslavers inflict upon the *virgo* offstage. The result is a pointed critique of acts of violence against women and of the social systems that generate these conditions of vulnerability. Finally, I considered the report of Terence's former enslavement in the biographical tradition preserved in

Suetonius. This biographical detail, if true, and if we expand our application of feminist standpoint theory to the world beyond the stage, would have imbued Terence the playwright with an intimate knowledge of Rome's oppressive hierarchies; the epistemic advantage evidently belonging to enslaved characters within the world of Terentopia might then be interpreted as a fictive correlation to the author's own standpoint of the "outsider within." Whether Terence was really a freedman operating within elite social circles, or this detail was a fiction constructed posthumously, Terence's plays feature characters with marginalized identities empowered to voice critiques of gendered violence and the systems that perpetuate it.

The remainder of this Conclusion presents a case study designed to complicate the prevailing scholarly opinion about the only *virgo* who appears onstage in a speaking role in all of Terence's comedies: Antiphila of *Heautontimorumenos*. Taking into consideration the sum of evidence about the *virgo* that has been accumulated in the body of this dissertation, I demonstrate that Antiphila's onstage reunion with the *adulescens* is governed by the same or similar social demands that endanger and exploit the *virgines* of Terence's other plays. This case study illustrates the limitations of uncritical acceptance of the *adulescens'* perspective and showcases the interpretive promise of listening to the play's women and resisting the impulse to filter their words through the dominant ideological perspective.

Disperii, perii, misera*: A Case Study from *Heautontimorumenos

Like Glycerium of *Andria* and Pamphila of *Eunuchus*, the *virgo* Antiphila was born into a citizen family before entering into the care of an adoptive mother named Philtera.[228] Although

[228] For a discussion of the relationship between displaced citizen girls and their adoptive mothers, including Antiphila and Philtera, see Chapter 2.

separation from her birth parents prevents Antiphila from a formal claim of citizenship, she is nevertheless raised in accordance with the virtues expected of a citizen girl: "[She] has been raised well and chastely, untrained in the arts of a *meretrix*" (*bene et pudice eductam, ignaram artis meretriciae*, 226).[229] An *adulescens* called Clinia becomes enamored of Antiphila and pursues a sexual relationship with her, but complications arise when Clinia's father (the eponymous "self-tormentor") learns of it. Pressured by his father's disapproval, Clinia leaves his home and Antiphila to avoid further conflict, joining an army in Asia as a mercenary soldier (117). Philtera dies during this interval, prompting Antiphila to mourn her adoptive mother's death and to confide in the *meretrix* Bacchis that Philtera was not, in fact, her birth mother. Later, when Clinia returns home and observes Antiphila in Bacchis' company, he fears that she has become a professional *meretrix*, having sex with other men for profit.[230] Accounts of Antiphila's singular devotion to Clinia delivered by Bacchis and an enslaved man named Syrus, however, quickly prove these suspicions to be untrue. With his fears assuaged, Clinia approaches Antiphila, and the two share a brief exchange before exiting. Antiphila does not return to the stage for the remainder of the play.[231]

In Antiphila's singular onstage appearance, she engages first in a conversation with Bacchis, and then with Clinia. The onstage reunion between the *virgo* and *adulescens*—the only

[229] In Terence, a *virgo* who has had premarital sex can still be considered chaste (*pudica*) as long as she did not consent to the act. In this way, rape is explicitly presented as a solution to premarital sex in *Adelphoe*, *Eunuchus*, and *Hecyra*.

[230] As Rosivach explains, Clinia's fearful assumption "reminds us of the likely fate of most of the women in these liaisons [i.e., extramarital] when their lovers eventually leave them" (1998: 62). Clinia's anger at the possibility that Antiphila has begun to support herself through sex labor (250; 256–63) equally reminds the audience that the *adulescens* is concerned only with maintaining his own access to the *virgo*, not with her safety and wellbeing. Forehand suggests that Clinia's unfounded suspicions paint him unfavorably after the audience learns that Antiphila has not had sex with any other men, leaving spectators "with the impression of a mistress [Antiphila] so devoted that she is undeserving of Clinia's doubts" (1985: 62).

[231] In a series of convoluted schemes that follow, Antiphila is brought into the home of another *adulescens* (Clitipho) where she is eventually recognized by her birth parents by means of a ring that she was entrusted with when she was surrendered. With her citizen status restored, Antiphila is promised to Clinia in marriage, bringing the play to a close. For an in-depth discussion of Antiphila's reunification with her birth parents, see Chapter 2.

scene of its kind to appear in Terence's corpus—has received little scholarly attention.[232] The scholars who do comment on the scene tend to assign positive, romantic emotions to both Antiphila and Clinia. Brothers contrasts the "romantic appeal" of the reunion of "genuine young lovers" (1980: 110) with the tedium of Bacchis' relationship with Clitipho, and Rosivach upholds the former relationship as an example of "profound mutual love" (1998: 130). More specifically, Bovie describes Antiphila as "overwhelmingly happy to learn that Clinia had come back" (1992: 75). These positive interpretations are predicated upon an assumption that Antiphila's love for Clinia is as mutual as the *adulescens* claims it to be.

Crucially, such readings require that Antiphila's own words in this scene are either overlooked entirely or abstracted into exaggeration. Scholars who have treated Antiphila's exclamation (*disperii, perii misera*, 404) as idiomatic and hyperbolic—in parallel with the generic and amatory overuse of terms like *miser* and *perii* by the *adulescens*[233]—run the risk of misrepresenting or even erasing her apparent distress at coming face-to-face with Clinia. If we resist treating Antiphila's speech as though it belongs to the register of a lovestruck *adulescens*, I argue, then the possibility emerges that Antiphila's interaction with Clinia is dictated by fear and self-preservation; if we take seriously the vulnerability she expresses to her female companion before Clinia arrives onstage, then we may read her carefully chosen words during her exchange with the *adulescens* as adaptive behavior designed to mask distress. The reunion between Antiphila and Clinia, from this angle, is not a romantic vignette of young love, but an onstage representation of a young woman navigating a precarious and imbalanced social dynamic in

[232] Brothers argues that the appearances of Bacchis and Antiphila and, therefore, the reunion between the latter and Clinia were Terentian innovations, marking a departure from Menander's original play of the same name (1980: 117–19). He suggests that Terence "was attracted by the idea of portraying the reunion of Clinia and Antiphila on stage" (117) and "really wanted to write [her] in" (118); this apparent desire of Terence's to showcase such a reunion raises questions about why it is the only one he ever wrote.

[233] I systematically analyze the frequency of these terms in the speech of Terence's *adulescentes* and discuss the terms' broader contexts in Chapter 1.

order to find the security that only permanent commitment from a citizen man—and specifically a citizen man who has been sexually pursuing her—could provide.

At the beginning of the play, Antiphila experiences a high degree of isolation and, as a result, uncertainty about her future. After the death of the Corinthian woman who acted as her mother figure since she was entrusted to her as infant (271), Antiphila lacks a parental figure to support her. Yet, in the absence of financial security, Antiphila has her freeborn status to rely on—whether or not she herself is aware of it. It is never explicitly stated whether Antiphila knows that she was born into a citizen family before her reunification with Sostrata. It is clear, however, that Antiphila is certain from the play's beginning that Philtera was not her birth mother. While apprising Clinia of the events that took place during his time abroad, Syrus tells the young man that he overheard Antiphila disclose to Bacchis that the Corinthian woman said to be her mother was not (*quaest dicta mater esse ei antehac, non fuit*, 270). Additionally, Antiphila keeps the ring that she was surrendered with on her person, maintaining it carefully, and even showing it to Sostrata (655). The value of this ring lies not in its financial worth, but in its potential—which is eventually realized—to serve as the token by which Antiphila may be recognized by her birth family. Whether or not Antiphila herself knows that she was born into a citizen family, the audience members with competence in the conventions of Roman Comedy (i.e., generic competence) would have been aware of this as soon as Clitipho described her as "[a girl] who has been raised well and chastely, untrained in the arts of a *meretrix*" (*bene et pudice eductam, ignaram artis meretriciae*, 226).[234] The details that are revealed about Antiphila's mother thereafter, along with Syrus' description of her modestly weaving (see below), would

[234] The phrase "raised well and chastely" (*bene et pudice eductam*) immediately establishes Antiphila in the category of *virgo*. In *Andria*, Pamphilus describes the *virgo* Glycerium's *ingenium* as having been "taught and raised well and chastely" (*bene et pudice eius doctum atque eductum*, *An*. 274), and Pamphila of *Eunuchus* is similarly said to be "raised in a way that is worthy of [her status]" (*educta ita uti teque illaque dignumst*, *Eun.* 748).

have only made them surer of this fact. The audience members (and characters) equipped with the degree of generic competence that would enable them to identify Antiphila as a Terentopian *virgo* from the play's beginning are also better equipped to recognize the metageneric allusions in her interaction with Bacchis and the subtext nested in her response to hearing that Clinia has returned.

In a lengthy monologue, Bacchis contrasts the unfavorable circumstances of her own social position as a free *meretrix* with the opportunities afforded to Antiphila (381–95):

BAC. edepol te, mea Antiphila, laudo et fortunatam iudico,
id quom studuisti isti formae ut mores consimiles forent;
minimeque, ita me di ament, miror si te sibi quisque expetit.
nam mihi quale ingenium haberes fuit indicio oratio;
et quom egomet nunc mecum in animo vitam tuam considero
omniumque adeo vostrarum volgus quae ab se segregant,
et vos esse istius modi et nos non esse haud mirabilest.
nam expedit bonas esse vobis; nos, quibuscumst res, non sinunt.
quippe forma impulsi nostra nos amatores colunt:
haec ubi imminutast est, illi suom animum alio conferunt.
nisi si prospectum interea aliquid est, desertae vivimus.
vobis cum uno semel ubi aetatem agere decretumst viro,
quoius mos maxume consimilis vostrum, hi se ad vos applicant.
hoc beneficio utrique ab utrisque vero devincimini,
ut numquam ulla amori vostro incidere possit calamitas.

> **BAC.** By Pollux, my Antiphila, I praise you and I judge you fortunate, since you have studiously taken care that your conduct matches your beauty. May the gods love me, it surprises me not at all if everyone desires you for himself. For my part, your speech has served as proof of what sort of character you have. Now, when I think about your life and indeed the lives of all girls of your type who separate themselves from the public, it is not at all surprising that you all are of that sort and we are not. It is advantageous for you all to be good, but, for our part, those with whom we do business do not allow us to be good. Indeed, lovers cultivate us because they are driven by our beauty. When our beauty has diminished, they set their heart on someone else. If, in the meantime, there hasn't been some planning for the future, then we live forsaken, on our own. For you, once it has been decided that you will spend your life with one husband, whose conduct most matches yours, they attach themselves to you. By this deed, you truly are bound one to the other, so that never could any disaster befall your love.

Through the emphatic repetition of the personal pronouns *nos* (we/us) and *vos* (you all), Bacchis draws a clear distinction between the two women based on their future prospects, in as much as they are tied to their ability to enter into a long-term contract with a citizen man. There is, however, another interpretation of Bacchis' dichotomy (*nos* v. *vos*) available to the spectator with generic competence. When viewed from this perspective, Bacchis separates the two women not according to a difference in age or number of sexual partners, but according to their character type.

Bacchis succinctly outlines the specific set of expectations and outcomes available to each woman within the world of Terentopia. She begins her speech with a standard comic motif, describing Antiphila's physical beauty (*formae*) and speech (*oratio*) as indicative of her innate nobility (*ingenium*). The force of Bacchis' contrast lies in the powerful self-awareness of her social limitations—and what she must do to combat them—as they are dictated by her civic status. As a free, non-citizen *meretrix*, Bacchis' ability to procure clients and financially support herself is contingent upon her physical appearance and, especially, her youth. Bacchis tells Antiphila that women in her position must profit and save as much as they can in the limited time frame that youth affords them, so they will not be destitute when they inevitably lose the support of their clients.[235]

Bacchis also explains that, in contrast to professional *meretrices*, women like Antiphila obtain security through permanent relationships (i.e., marriages to citizen men) and by doing so avoid disaster (*calamitas*). Her speech thus identifies a categorical distinction between *meretrices* and the girls who can marry, clearly defining the social expectations and risks that accompany both situations. This speech thus functions as an immediate reminder—for both the audience and Antiphila—of precisely what is at stake in her relationship with Clinia. At this point, audience members with generic competence would recognize that Antiphila's ability to avoid social ruin crucially depends on whether Clinia, who has already engaged her in a sexual relationship "in the place of a wife" (*pro uxore haberet*, 98), will marry her.

Antiphila's brief response to Bacchis reveals that she, too, recognizes the unique circumstances of her social position and the extent to which her future is tied to Clinia's. She

[235] This blunt observation prompts Forehand to describe Bacchis as a "hardheaded business woman, who knows she must make her fortune before her attractiveness fades" in comparison to the "devoted, chaste, and self-denying" Antiphila (1985: 63–4).

tells Bacchis, "I don't know any other girls. What I do know is that I have always carefully made sure to adjust what is beneficial for me according to what is beneficial for him" (*nescio alias; mequidem semper scio fecisse sedulo ut ex illius commodo meum compararem commodum*, 396–97). Antiphila's claim that she does not know any others (*alias*) responds to the distinction between classes of women made by Bacchis; owing to her experience of natal alienation, Antiphila has been isolated not only from her family but from the other citizen girls with whom Bacchis associates her. In metageneric terms, *nescio alias* may be interpreted as an index of the uniqueness of Antiphila's character in Terentopia: as the only *virgo* to be both seen and heard throughout Terence's entire corpus, she is the singular representative of a stock character who is in all other instances invisible.[236]

Antiphila's response also reveals her clear-eyed understanding of her dependency on Clinia, a reality that she has been carefully negotiating for the duration of their relationship. By telling Bacchis that she has always taken deliberate (*sedulo*) care to ensure that she derives benefit from the same circumstances as the man to whom she is irreversibly bound, Antiphila constructs an image of herself not as a girl helplessly in love but as a conscious agent of her own future. Antiphila, then, is both aware of the precarious social circumstances that she must navigate and resourceful enough to do so.

During the entire exchange between Bacchis and Antiphila, Clinia and Syrus are present elsewhere on the stage, unseen by the women. After Antiphila has spoken, Clinia cries out with an expression of desire for her—though she still remains unaware of his presence (397–401):

[236] This interpretation is complicated slightly by the fact that *Heautontimorumenos* is one of Terence's earlier plays (either the second or third). It is, however, a convention of Roman Comedy in general (not just in Terence's plays) to restrict the *virgo* from the stage. Antiphila's line, then, may be interpreted as a comment on the character's absence in the genre broadly.

CLIN. ah!
ergo, mea Antiphila, tu nunc sola reducem me in patriam facis.
nam dum abs te absum, omnes mihi labores fuere quos cepi leves
praeterquam tui carendum quod erat. **SYR.** credo. **CLIN.** Syre, vix suffero.
hocin me miserum non licere meo modo ingenium frui!

CLIN. Ah! My Antiphila, you alone made me return home. For, as long as I was away from you, all the hardships which I undertook were light, save that it meant I had to put up with being separated from you. **SYR.** I believe it. **CLIN.** Syrus, I am scarcely holding up. To think that it is not permitted for me, poor me, to take pleasure in her nature in my way!

Clinia's speech displays the typical characteristics of the self-concerned, superficially motivated *adulescens*.[237] He focuses on his own hardships (*labores*), uses a self-pitying expression (*me miserum*), and expresses his desire with an expression of enjoyment (*fruor*) that values Antiphila for his idea of her natural disposition (*ingenium*), which he seems to have constructed from witnessing her articulation of how carefully she works to meet his needs and expectations. Clinia's aside, then, functionally presents an abbreviated characterization of the stock *adulescens*, immediately following Bacchis' programmatic speech that (even unwittingly) expresses the important distinctions between the *meretrix* and *virgo* stock types. The placement of these metageneric characterizations of stock types immediately preceding Terence's only onstage reunion between a *virgo* and *adulescens* should not be overlooked.

[237] These characteristics and their consistent association with the *adulescens* are discussed in Chapter 1.

The reunion itself is remarkably short. While Clinia makes his complaints to Syrus, Bacchis finally notices the two men standing nearby and realizes that Clinia is staring at them.[238] When Antiphila, too, sees the men, she shares a brief but intense exchange with Bacchis before Clinia's approach interrupts them. Clinia and Antiphila next exchange their own greeting before promptly leaving the stage together, bringing the scene to a close (403–8):

> **BAC.** quisnam hic adulescens est qui intuitur nos? **ANT.** ah, retine me, obsecro.
> **BAC.** amabo quid tibist? **ANT.** disperii, perii misera! **BAC.** quid stupes,
> Antiphila? **ANT.** videon Cliniam an non? **BAC.** quem vides?
> **CLIN.** salve, anime mi. **ANT.** o mi Clinia, salve. **CLIN.** ut vales?
> **ANT.** salvom venisse gaudeo. **CLIN.** teneone te,
> Antiphila, maxume animo exoptatam meo?

> **BAC.** Who is this young man watching us? **ANT.** Ah, hold me, I'm begging! **BAC.** Please, what's the matter with you? **ANT.** I'm destroyed, entirely destroyed, poor me! **BAC.** What has stupefied you, Antiphila? **ANT.** Do I see Clinia or not? **BAC.** Whom do you see? **CLIN.** Hello, my heart. **ANT.** O my Clinia, hello. **CLIN.** How are you? **ANT.** I am glad that you have returned safely. **CLIN.** Am I holding you, Antiphila, the one who is most desired by my heart?

Antiphila's reaction to seeing Clinia is powerful, as evidenced by her plea that Bacchis hold her (*retine me*) and Bacchis' own observation that Antiphila has the appearance of being stunned

[238] For a discussion of the ways in which vision and power are associated with the *adulescens*, see Chapter 1.

(*quid stupes*).[239] In addition to her request for assistance—or, perhaps, comfort—from her companion, Antiphila also delivers the emphatic, emotionally charged cry: "I'm destroyed, entirely destroyed, poor me!" (*disperii, perii misera*).

As discussed above, scholars have long assigned romantic, loving, and happy emotions to this scene. Because this line—and indeed the entire exchange between Antiphila and Clinia—is so infrequently discussed by scholars, a brief survey of modern translations of the exclamation offers the most expansive evidence for scholarly attitudes toward the scene:[240]

Table 3.1. Translations of *disperii, perii misera* (*Heaut.* 404), listed chronologically

Oh heavens! Oh, I'm fainting.	Sargeaunt 1912
Ah! I faint: I die.	Perry 1929
I'm going… *faints away*	Graves 1962
Oh, my goodness! Oh, dear! Oh, my!	Copley 1967
I can't bear it, it's too much.	Radice 1976
I feel faint…I feel so weak…oh, dear!	Brothers 1988
Mi sento morire! Povera me!	Gazzola 1990
I'm dying, I'm dying!	Bovie 1992
Oh dear, I'm overcome, quite overcome.	Barsby 2001a
I've had it! I can't take it! Help me!	Brown 2006

[239] The precise meaning of "*retine*" is up to interpretation. The verb *retineo* has a wide range of meanings; when used transitively, it can mean "to hold fast" (*OLD* 1), "to hold back, stop" (*OLD* 3a), and "to keep hold of, grasp, cling to; to hold in place, prevent from slipping" (*OLD* 4). The imperative is used elsewhere in Terence only once, in a scene from *Phormio*, in which Chremes commands Demipho to restrain Phormio as the latter threatens to reveal Chremes' extramarital affair to his wife (*Ph*. 982).

[240] While this methodology is imperfect, it nevertheless reveals how ubiquitous positive interpretations of this scene are. The scarcity of discussions of the exchange between Antiphila and Clinia is itself evidence that Antiphila is an undertheorized character. Her speech, as a direct result, is taken for granted.

Oh dear, I'm faint, I feel queer!	Clayton 2006
Ich sterb, vergeh, ich Arme!	Rau 2012

The translations of this line by Sargeaunt, Graves, Copley, Brothers, Barsby, and Brown render Antiphila's exclamation loosely enough to soften or even entirely erase the sense of her words. While Bovie provides a literal translation of most of the line, he elects to omit *misera* (1992: 102); this omission seems telling in light of his choice to assign positive emotions to Antiphila in his introduction to the play: "The young woman, Antiphila, was overwhelmingly happy to learn that Clinia had come back" (75). Gazzola (1990) and Rau (2012) do not comment on this scene. The interpretations imposed upon the text by translators (especially those that weaken Antiphila's strong reaction to seeing Clinia) seem informed by an instinct to reconcile her words of distress with the assumption—shaped by focalization through the *adulescens*—that the reunion is *supposed* to be happy.

Claims that the phrase *disperii, perii misera* can communicate positive emotions have no internal support within this play or Terence's corpus as a whole. Across the playwright's six plays, nowhere do the words *miser* and *perii* communicate overwhelm caused by happiness, regardless of the character type of the speaker.[241] A line from Plautus's *Mercator* that is identical to Antiphila's cry, however, provides a direct comparison that supports the interpretation that Antiphila is expressing distress. In the *Mercator*, an enslaved woman named Syra delivers the line upon discovering a woman in her household whom she perceives to be a threat to her *domina*, Dorippa: "I'm destroyed, entirely destroyed, poor me, oh poor me!" *disperii, perii misera, vae miserae mihi!* Pl. *Merc*. 681). Dorippa responds: "Please, are you in your right mind?

[241] All occurrences of *perii* and *miser* in Terence were identified and analyzed in Chapter 1.

Why are you wailing?" (*satin tu sana es, opsecro? quid eiulas?* Pl. *Merc*. 682). Her question provides direct, internal evidence about Syra's delivery. The verb *eiulo*, "to utter cries of anguish," (*OLD* 1a) indicates clearly that the line is intended to communicate negative emotion.[242] A similar cry, also accompanied by tears, is made in Plautus' *Epidicus* by a mother (Philippa) who has been separated from her daughter. When Philippa loses hope that she will be reunited with her lost daughter, she exclaims: "I'm destroyed, poor me!" (*perii misera*, Pl. *Epid*. 601). In response, the *senex* Periphanes instructs her to stop crying and cheer up: "Don't cry, woman. Go inside, have good spirit" (*ne fle, mulier. intro abi, habe animum bonum*, Pl. *Epid*. 601). The total absence of similar lines conveying anything like positive emotion in extant Roman Comedy, alongside these illustrative examples from Plautus, offers powerful evidence that the language of the line *"disperii, perii misera*," conveys distress rather than joy.

Internal evidence within *Heautontimorumenos* also supports this interpretation. Shortly before the onstage reunion, Syrus reports to Clinia that he had previously notified Antiphila that the *adulescens* had returned from abroad. He describes her reaction to the news to Clinia (302–7):

> **CLIN.** perge, obsecro te, et cave ne falsam gratiam
> studeas inire. quid ait ubi me nominas?
> **SYR.** ubi dicimus redisse te et rogare uti
> veniret ad te, mulier telam desinit

[242] In the absence of staging notes, we rely on the text itself to reconstruct performative aspects including staging, blocking, props, and delivery. While this absence provides room for interpretation and creative choices (Marshall 2006: 186), occasional cues within the script demand specific staging conditions, like the one seen here. For a discussion of tone and, in particular, the challenge of interpreting tone as a reader of Roman Comedy (rather than a spectator viewing a play in performance), see Marshall (2006: 185–192). Marshall discusses the acts of interpretation that would have taken place at various levels, including that of the acting troupe, of the individual actor, and of the spectator.

> continuo et lacrumis opplet os totum sibi,
> facile ut scires desiderio id fieri tuo.
>
> **CLIN.** Come on, I'm begging you, and I'm warning you, don't try to get into my good graces falsely. What did she say when you said my name? **SYR.** When we said that you had returned and were requesting that she come to you, the woman stopped weaving and immediately her entire face filled with tears. You easily would have known that this was out of longing for you.

According to Syrus, Antiphila's reaction to learning of Clinia's return was immediate (*continuo*) and marked by strong emotion, since her face filled with tears (*lacrumis opplet os totum*). The mere news of Clinia's return triggered an automatic, physical response in Antiphila, just as the sight of him would later do. It is important to acknowledge that tears can be caused by a complex range of emotions, including but not limited to sadness, fear, happiness, and relief. In the absence of an explicit explanation from Antiphila about the underlying cause of her tears, the possibilities remain open. Syrus, in fact, exploits this ambiguity, offering his own interpretation of Antiphila's tears that is focalized through Clinia's perspective (*scires*) and, accordingly, assigns desire (*desiderio*) to the *virgo*. The authenticity of this interpretation, however, is undermined by the parameters of Clinia's initial request for information from Syrus, in which he warns (*cave*) him not to simply lie in order to get into his good graces. This ostensible request for authenticity both reminds Syrus of his subordinate position and suggests to the audience the likelihood that a man in Syrus' position is likely to lie in order to keep his enslaver happy. The conclusion that Antiphila's tears derive from happiness is patently presented, therefore, as an interpretative

intervention framed to satisfy the desires of the *adulescens*, and so does not offer trustworthy evidence of Antiphila's emotional state.

Thematic resonance with an icon from Roman legendary history provides further evidence of the imbalance of Antiphila's relationship with Clinia. After Clinia and Syrus have observed Antiphila alongside Bacchis and her expensive company, Clinia begins accusing Antiphila (to Syrus) of being unfaithful *(ubinamst fides*?, 256) and taking on new clients to "enrich" herself (*conlocupletasti*, 258) in his absence. In order to assure Clinia of Antiphila's loyalty to him, Syrus reports to him a scheme that he undertook to gain proof of the girl's character while Clinia was away (281–91):

SYR. hic sciri potuit aut nusquam alibi, Clinia,
quo studio vitam suam te absente exegerit,
ubi de improvisost interventum mulieri.
nam ea res dedit tum existumandi copiam
cotidianae vitae consuetudinem,
quae quoiusque ingenium ut sit declarat maxume.
texentem telam studiose ipsam offendimus,
mediocriter vestitam veste lugubri,
(eius anuis causa opinor quae erat mortua)
sine auro, tum ornatam ita uti quae ornantur sibi,
nulla arte malas expolitam muliebri;
capillus passus, prolixus, circum caput
reiectus neglegenter. pax!

> **SYR.** Clinia, there is no better way to know how someone lives their life when you're not there than to burst in unexpectedly on a woman. This occasion provided the opportunity to judge the habits of her everyday life, which are the best indication of one's character. We found the woman studiously weaving, modestly dressed in mourning clothes (I think because of that old woman who died), without gold jewelry; she was dressed in the way of one who dresses for herself, her cheeks bore no womanly makeup, her hair was loose, flowing, and thrown back behind her head carelessly. Enough said!

Two features stand out to suggest that Syrus' account gestures toward the legendary history of Lucretia: the test of Antiphila's character by means of an unannounced visit to her home and the image of Antiphila studiously weaving. Although the fullest extant account of Lucretia is transmitted by Livy, who wrote his *Ad Urbe Condita* in the late 1st century B.C.E.—more than a century after Terence's lifetime—the legend, nevertheless, would have been familiar to Terence and his contemporaries. Niebuhr (1811: 318) and Dunlop (1824: 84) have established that Livy's version of the narrative borrowed from Ennius—an author writing before Terence's time—in a portion of his work now lost to us.[243] The evident antiquity of the myth certainly makes it possible for this moment in Terence to directly allude to a pre-Livian version of Lucretia.

Goldberg notes the allusion to Lucretia, remarking that the functions of the comparison are to confirm Antiphila's good character—Lucretia was renowned for her chastity and devotion—and to guarantee early in the play that she will be recognized as a marriageable, citizen woman by its end (1986: 140–41). I add to this conclusion another crucial feature of

[243] Niebuhr advances an argument that pushes the tradition even farther back to ballads in Saturnian verse (1811: 179).

Lucretia's narrative: her experience of rape. While there is no explicit indication of rape in *Heautontimorumenos*, the introduction of Lucretia as an implicit parallel to Antiphila and, specifically, the placement of Antiphila within the specific circumstances that led to the rape of Lucretia, invite serious consideration of the possibility that Antiphila, too, has been a victim of sexual violence. When considered alongside the frequency with which *virgines* experience sexual violence at the hands of *adulescentes* in Terence's plays, the subtext introduced by the allusion to one of Rome's most famous, most violent legends presents Antiphila as vulnerable to the same brand of sexual violence that Lucretia endured.

Finally, the detectable shift in Antiphila's demeanor and tone that occurs in direct response to Clinia's presence may reveal a crucial character trait of the otherwise elusive *virgo* character. In the shared company of another woman, Bacchis and Antiphila candidly reflect on the imbalanced expectations imposed upon them by their social positions. When Antiphila sees Clinia approaching, she seeks support from Bacchis (*retine me*, 403), lets out an emotional cry (*disperii, perii misera*, 404), and displays signs of shock (*quid stupes*, 404). In short, she shows vulnerability to her companion.

Upon Clinia's approach, Antiphila transforms; her emotions become latent, her speech formulaic. She responds to Clinia with two short formal greetings before she exits the stage, never to return (406–8):

> **CLIN.** salve, anime mi. **ANT.** o mi Clinia, salve. **CLIN.** ut vales?
>
> **ANT.** salvom venisse gaudeo. **CLIN.** teneone te,
>
> Antiphila, maxume animo exoptatam meo?

> **CLIN.** Hello, my heart. **ANT.** O my Clinia, hello. **CLIN.** How are you? **ANT.** I am glad that you have returned safely. **CLIN.** Am I holding you, Antiphila, the one who is most desired by my heart?

Antiphila's address (*o mi Clinia, salve*) mimics Clinia's, without flourish.[244] Similarly, Antiphila's (non-)answer to Clinia's question (*ut vales*) deflects focus away from herself and onto Clinia. As a standard, polite greeting *salvom venisse gaudeo* is used in a variety of social situations; it is how mothers greet their sons, brothers greet brothers, and enslaved individuals greet their enslavers.[245] The greeting on its own does not communicate any particular degree of affection.[246]

Removed from its context, Antiphila's exchange with Clinia reveals little about her attitude toward his return. When read against the immediately preceding interaction with Bacchis, however, Antiphila's quick tonal shift suggests a deliberate modification to her behavior. In the company of the *adulescens* upon whom her future depends—the fact of which she has just discussed with Bacchis—Antiphila promptly masks her distress and speaks in generically appropriate terms. With all of this evidence in mind—the negative emotions

[244] Dutsch discusses the marker *mi*: "We can conclude, then, that the possessive [*mi*] (not unlike *amabo*) is a marker of closeness used by both men and women, but that male characters tend to use it less frequently and to do so mainly in those contexts where the semantics demand it. The female *personae*, by contrast, tend to use the possessive emphatically, stressing or simulating rather than merely indicating familiarity" (2008: 55). In the case of *Heaut*. 406, it is Clinia who uses the *mi* as a marker of affection, substituting the term of endearment *anime* for Antiphila's name. Antiphila mirrors Clinia's language.

[245] In Terence specifically, the exchange is used between mothers and sons (PAM. *mea mater, salve*. SOS. *gaudeo venisse salvom*, *Hec*. 353), between brothers (MIC. *salvom te advenire, Demea, gaudemus*, *Ad*. 80–1), and between enslaved characters and their enslavers (PAR. *salvom te advenire, ere, gaudeo*, *Eun*. 976; GET. *ere, salve, salvom te advenisse gaudeo*, *Ph.* 286).

[246] Nevertheless, some translators—often the same ones who soften Antiphila's exclamation—introduce enthusiasm into these lines. For example, the line is rendered by Graves as "Well, since I have got you again, my darling" (1962), by Copley as "I'm so glad you're back safe!" (1967), and by Brothers as "Overjoyed that you're back safe and sound" (1988). In accordance with their assumption that this is a happy reunion, then, translators allow for loose interpretations of Antiphila's cries of distress but overinterpret the formulaic *gaudeo* as an expression of true joy.

connoted by her initial response, her thematic affiliation with Lucretia, the formulaic mirroring behavior she engages in once Clinia is within earshot—Antiphila's reaction to seeing the *adulescens* seems not to be an exaggerated expression of mutual love, but a guarded and self-protective fear response.

It is only in the company of Bacchis, a free *meretrix* with whom Antiphila shares no family relation, that the *virgo* is freed from the social constraints that at all other times restrict her speech. In this temporary space of safe companionship, the *virgo* can relax into honesty, and we are granted a momentary glimpse of the *virgo* as a fully realized character—one who takes comfort in the company of a friend, who grieves the loss of her mother, who makes plans for her future, who feels strong emotion, and who is capable of sharply perceiving the world around her and recognizing the complications of her place within it. The moment is brief. The arrival of the *adulescens* demands the departure of the *virgo*, once again rendering her invisible and inaudible. The truth of the *virgo* in Terentopia is that she can only be fully present when the *adulescens* is not.

Although Antiphila's appearance is brief, it is crucial to our understanding of the *virgo* character; it is therefore essential that we resist focalizing her experience through the *adulescens*' misleading experience of mutual love. This instinct to privilege the dominant perspective, as I have demonstrated, has led scholars to actively ignore or reshape the force of the words spoken by the only *virgo* who appears onstage. From Antiphila's perspective, the events of the play are not truly about a boy in love—they are about a displaced daughter who does what she must to survive. When we listen to Antiphila, we come to understand that it is the acts of profound maternal and filial—not romantic—love that bring about the true happy reunion of the play.

Throughout his corpus, Terence complicates the function of marriage as an easy resolution to the comic rape plot. Antiphila—the only *virgo* to appear onstage in a speaking role in all of Terence's comedies—is not so different from her offstage, non-speaking counterparts, all of whom are consistently depicted as vulnerable to harm and abuse by the *adulescens*. Terence's speaking *virgo* models both fear and restraint in the face of the *adulescens*, voicing her distress in strategic and generically-appropriate terms. When we refocus our reading through her perspective, remembering the unique social constraints restricting her ability to speak candidly, we are better equipped to hear the messages encoded within her words.

Final Conclusions

Terence's offstage *virgo* contains layered but resolvable contradictions: she is a foundling, but a citizen; her body is violated, but untouchable; she is a stock character, but indefinable; she exists nowhere onstage, but everywhere in the spectator's mind; she is a projection of male desire, but a paradigm of female care. Far beyond being the superficial romantic interest of the plays' lovesick men, the *virgo* offers a focal point for the expression of women's empathy. She is the heart of the play, but her role in romantic plotlines is only a surface-level feature of her character. The women and enslaved characters who share aspects of their identity with the *virgo* are better positioned to recognize both the overt and sublimated ways in which she is vulnerable to male harm. Mothers seek to protect their daughters by placing them in secure marriages, even when it means perpetuating cycles of generational trauma and reproducing for their daughters the same precarious circumstances that they themselves once experienced. Enslaved characters respond to and critique the violence that the *adulescens*

commits against the *virgo*. They make her suffering visible on the stage and intervene on her behalf.

When we examine the evidence offered by onstage characters about her place within Terentopia, observing how deeply she is loved by maternal figures and how carefully women and enslaved characters advocate for her security and well-being, we are encouraged to reframe our understanding of what the "central plot" of Terentian Comedy truly is. The dislocation and reunification of a vulnerable citizen girl with her natal family is not merely a plot point that facilitates the "happy ending" of marriage; marriage is a practical tool for securing a safe future for the girl around whose body the play's plot revolves. Terentian Comedy is not about young men who fall in love; it is about the girls who must find a way to survive in Terentopia and the protective figures who help her do so. Terence's choice to center his *palliatae* around the *virgo* invites his audiences, ancient and modern, to reflect on the ways that society seeks to control women's bodies. Through his nuanced depictions of women who voice powerful critique of generically typical instantiations of male harm, the playwright, in an act of metageneric reflection, explores what is funny, and what is not, about the experience of being a woman in a Roman Comedy.

Bibliography

Adams, J.N. 1984. "Female Speech in Latin Comedy." *Antichthon* 18: 43–77.

Anderson, W.S. 1993. *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2001. "The Problem of Humor for an Ex-Slave." *Gail A. Burnett Lectures in Classics*: 8–21.

Arnott, W.G. 1975. *Menander, Plautus, Terence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barchiesi, M. 1970. "Plauto e Il 'Metateatro' Antico." *Il Verri* 31: 113–30.

Barsby, J.A. 1990. "The Characterisation of Parmeno in the Opening Scene of Terence's *Eunuch*." *Prudentia* 22: 4–12.

Barsby, J.A. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge University Press.

———. (ed.) 2001a. *The Woman of Andros. The Self-Tormentor. The Eunuch.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. (ed.) 2001b. *Phormio. The Mother-in-Law. The Brothers.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Beare, W. 1942. "The Life of Terence." *Hermathena* (59): 20–29.

Bovie, P. 1992. *Terence: The Comedies*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Bowen, M.E., Gilbert, M.H., and Nally, E.G., ed. 2024. *Believing Ancient Women: Feminist Epistemologies for Greece and Rome*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Breitenfeld, S.B. 2021. "*Ut Ego Unguibus Facile Illi in Oculos Involem Venefico!* Pythias and Sight as Power in Terence's *Eunuchus*." [Conference paper]. Society for Classical Studies 2021 Conference.

Brothers, A.J. 1980. "The Construction of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*." *The Classical Quarterly* 30 (1): 94–119.

———. 1988. *Terence:* The Self-Tormentor*, edited with Translation and Commentary*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Brown, M. 2017. *Menander Offstage*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Brown, P. 2006. *Terence: The Comedies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2019. *The Girl from Andros*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Caldwell, L. 2015. *Roman Girlhood and the Fashioning of Femininity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christenson, D.M. 2019. "Metatheatre." In Dinter, M. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 136–50.

Clayton, F.W. 2006. *The Comedies of Terence*. Exeter, UK: University of Exeter Press.

Collins, P.H. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought." *Social Problems* 33 (6): S14–32.

Copley, F.O. 1949. "Emotional Conflict and Its Significance in the Lesbia-Poems of Catullus." *AJPh* 70: 22–40.

———. 1967. *The Comedies of Terence: Translated, with an Introduction*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

De Melo, W. (ed.) 2011a. *Casina, The Casket Comedy, Curculio, Epidicus, The Two Menaechmuses*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

De Melo, W. (ed.) 2011b. *The Merchant, The Braggart Soldier, The Ghost, The Persian*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Deacy, S., and Pierce, K.F., ed. 2002. *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Paperback. Classical Press of Wales.

Dixon, S. 1988. *The Roman Mother*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

duBois, P. 2009. *Slavery: Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duckworth, G.E. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dunkin, P.S. 1946. *Post-Aristophanic Comedy: Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at Both Athens and Rome*. Vol. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. 31 vols. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.

Dunlop, J. 1824. *History of Roman Literature from Its Earliest Period to the Augustan Age, V.1*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, Paternoster-Row.

Dutsch, D.M. 2008. *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy: On Echoes and Voices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dutsch, D., James, S.L., and Konstan, D., ed. 2015. *Women in Roman Republican Drama*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Fantham, E. 1971. "*Hautontimorumenos* and *Adelphoe*: A Study of Fatherhood in Terence and Menander." *Latomus* 30 (4): 970–98.

———. 2015. "Women in Control." In Dutsch, D., James, S.L., and Konstan, D. eds. *Women in Roman Republican Drama*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 91–107.

Feltovich, A. 2015. "The Many Shapes of Sisterhood in Roman Comedy." In Dutsch, D., James, S.L., and Konstan, D. eds. *Women in Roman Republican Drama*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 128–54.

———. 2020. "Social Networking among Women in Greek and Roman Comedy." *Classical World* 113 (3): 249–78.

Fetterley, J. 1978. *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fontaine, M. 2010. *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Forehand, W.E. 1985. *Terence*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Frangoulidis, S.A. 1993. "Modes of Metatheatre: Theatricalization and Detheatricalization in Terence, *Eunuchus*." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 18: 146–51.

———. 1997. *Handlung Und Nebenhandlung: Theater, Metatheater, Und Gattungsbewußtsein in Der Römischen Komödie*. Stuttgart: M & P Verlag für Wissenschaft und Forschung.

Frye, N. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gardner, H. 2012. "Ventriloquizing Rape in Menander's *Epitrepontes*." *Helios* 39: 121–43.

Gazzola, G. 1990. *Il Punitore de Se Stesso*. Milano: Rizzoli.

Gellar-Goad, T.H.M. 2013. "Religious Ritual and Family Dynamics in Terence." In Augoustakis, A. and Traill, A. eds. *A Companion to Terence*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 156–174.

———. 2021. *Plautus: Curculio*. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Germany, R. 2016. *Mimetic Contagion: Art and Artifice in Terence's* Eunuch. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, S.M. 1986. *Understanding Terence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2001. "The Dramatic Balance of Terence's *Andria*." In *Oxford Readings in Menander, Plautus, and Terence*, Segal, E. ed. Oxford. 216–23.

———. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and Its Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2013. *Terence Hecyra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2019. *Terence: Andria*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Gratwick, A. S. 1982. "Drama." In Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, W.V. eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, Vol. 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 77–137.

Graves, R. 1962. *The Comedies of Terence*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gruber, W. 2010. *Offstage Space, Narrative, and the Theatre of the Imagination*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hallett, J.P. 1984. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Harding, S. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———., ed. 2004. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge.

Harris, W.V. 1994. "Child-Exposure in the Roman Empire." *Journal of Roman Studies* 84: 1–22.

Hartsock, N.C.M. 1983. *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. New York: Longman.

———. 2004. "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism." In Harding, S. ed. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge. 35–53.

Henry, G.K.G. 1915. "The Characters of Terence." *Studies in Philology* 12: 55–98.

Hines, C. 2023. "*Materna Tempora:* Gestational Time and the Ovidian Poetics of Delay." In Gilhuly, K. and Ulrich, J.P. eds., *Making Time for Greek and Roman Literature*. Routledge: 84–102.

hooks, b. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press.

———. 2004. "Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness." Edited by Sandra Harding. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*: 153–59.

Hunter, R.L. 1985. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

James, S.L. 1998. "From Boys to Men: Rape and Developing Masculinity in Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 25 (1): 31–47.

———. 2005. "Effeminate Elegy, Comic Women, and the Gender of Language: Recovering a Female Voice in Classical Latin." Paper contributed to American Philological Association Seminar, "The Gender of Latin," Boston, MA.

———. 2012. "Case Study IV: Domestic Female Slaves in Roman Comedy." In *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 235–37.

———. 2013. "Gender and Sexuality in Terence." In Augoustakis, A. and Traill, A. eds. *A Companion to Terence*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 175–194.

———. 2015. "*Mater, Oratio, Filia:* Listening to Mothers in Roman Comedy." In Dutsch, D. ed. *Women in Republican Roman Drama*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 108–27.

———. 2016. "Ancient Comedy, Women's Lives: Finding Social History and Seeing the Present in Classical Comedy." Text. *Franklin Humanities Institute*.

https://humanitiesfutures.org/papers/ancient-comedy-womens-lives-finding-social-history-seeing-present-classical-comedy/.

———. 2020. "Repetition, Civic Status, and Remedy: Women and Trauma in New Comedy." In Panoussi, V. and Karanika, A. eds. *Emotional Trauma in Greece and Rome*. London: Routledge. 49–70.

Karanika, A., and Panoussi, V., ed. 2020. *Emotional Trauma in Greece and Rome: Representations and Reactions*. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies. Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.

Knorr, O. 2007 "Metatheatrical Humor in the Comedies of Terence" in ed. P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers, and F. Felgentreu, *Terentius Poeta: Zetemata Monographien zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 127. Munich: Beck. 167–74.

———. 2013. "*Hecyra*." In Augoustakis, A. and Traill, A. eds. *A Companion to Terence*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 295–317.

Kraemer, C.J. 1928. "In Defense of Chaerea in the *Eunuch* of Terence." *The Classical Journal* 23 (9): 662–67.

Kurke, L. 2011. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Leigh, M. 2004. *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leisner-Jensen, M. 2002. "*Vis Comica*: Consummated Rape in Greek and Roman New Comedy." *Classica & Mediaevalia* 53: 173–96.

Maltby, R. 2012. *Terence Phormio*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Marshall, C.W. 2006. *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2013. "Sex Slaves in New Comedy." In Akrigg, B. and Tordoff, R. eds. *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greek Comic Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 173–96.

Martin, R.H. 1995. "A Not-so-Minor Character in Terence's *Eunuchus*." *Classical Philology* 90 (2): 139–51.

Mazzara, R. 2021. *Plautinopolis: Imagination and Representation in Plautus' Roman Comedy*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

———. 2022. "Metagenre and the Competent Audience of Plautus' *Captivi*." *Ramus* 51 (2) (December): 160–81.

McCarthy, K. 2000. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McClure, L. 1999. *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Moore, T.J. 1998. *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

More, T., Lupton, J.H., and Robinson., R. 1895. *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More: in Latin from the edition of March , and in English from the 1st ed. of Ralph Robynson's translation in 1551*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Narayan, U. 1989. "The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives From a Nonwestern Feminist." In Jaggar, A.M. and Bordo, S. eds. *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing*. Rutgers University Press. 256–69.

———. 2004. "The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Nonwestern Feminist." In Harding, S. ed. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge. 213–24.

Niebuhr, B.G. 1811. *Römische Geschichte*. Berlin: Realbuchhandlung.

Norwood, G. 1923. *The Art of Terence*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Packman, Z.M. 1993. "Call It Rape: A Motif in Roman Comedy and Its Suppression in English-Speaking Publications." *Helios* 20: 42–55.

———. 1999. "Feminine Role Designations in the Comedies of Plautus." *The American Journal of Philology* 120 (2): 245–58.

———. 2013. "Family and Household in the Comedies of Terence." In Augoustakis, A. and Traill, A. eds. *A Companion to Terence*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 195–210.

Patterson, C. 1985. "'Not Worth the Rearing': The Causes of Infant Exposure in Ancient Greece." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974–)* 115: 103–23.

Patterson, O. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study, with a New Preface.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Penwill, J.L. 2004. "The Unlovely Lover of Terence's *Hecyra*." *Ramus* 33: 130–49.

Perry, F. 1929. *The Comedies Of Terence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Petrone, G. 1983. *Teatro Antico e Inganno: Finzioni Plautini*. Palermo: Palumbo.

Petrone, G., and Bianco, M.M. 2012. *Immaginari comici*. Palermo: Flaccovio.

Phillips, J.E. 1978. "Roman Mothers and the Lives of Their Adult Daughters." *Helios* 6 (1): 69–80.

Pierce, K.F. 2002. "The Portrayal of Rape in New Comedy." In *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Paperback. Classical Press of Wales. 163–84.

Pomeroy, S.B. 1995. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken Books.

Prete, S. 1961. "Terence." *The Classical World* 54 (4): 112–22.

Radice, B. 1976. *Terence: The Comedies*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Rand, E. K. 1932. "The Art of Terence's *Eunuchus*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63: 54–72.

Rau, P. 2012. *Terenz Komödien*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Revermann, M. 2006. "The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athens." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126: 99–124.

Richlin, A. 2005. *Rome and the Mysterious Orient: Three Plays by Plautus*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press.

———. 2017. *Slave Theater in the Roman Republic: Plautus and Popular Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, H. 1983. "Hand, Brain, and Heart: A Feminist Epistemology for the Natural Sciences." *Signs* 9 (1): 73–90.

Rosivach, V.J. 1998. *When A Young Man Falls in Love: The Sexual Exploitation of Women in New Comedy*. London; New York: Routledge.

Saller, R. P. 1984. "'*Familia*, *Domus*,' and the Roman Conception of the Family." *Phoenix* 38 (4): 336–355.

Sargeaunt, J. (ed.) 1912. *Terence.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Scafuro, A. 1997. *The Forensic Stage: Settling Disputes in Greco-Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segal, E. 1968. *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Slater, N.W. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Smith, D.E. 1987. *The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, L.P. 1994. "Audience Response to Rape: Chaerea in Terence's *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 21: 21–38.

Sommerstein, A. 1998. "Rape and Young Manhood in Athenian Comedy." In Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Routledge. 100–114.

Stewart, R. 2012. *Plautus and Roman Slavery*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Strong, A.K. 2012. "Working Girls: Mother-Daughter Bonds Among Ancient Prostitutes." In Hackworth Petersen, L. and Salzman-Mitchell, P. eds. *Mothering and Motherhood in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 121–39.

Tolkien, J. R. R. 1989 (1947). "On Fairy-Stories." In Tolkien, J. R. R., ed. *Tree and Leaf: Including the Poem Mythopoeia*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1–82.

Traill, A. 2008. *Women and the Comic Plot in Menander*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tran, C. 2021. "A Case of Cross-dressing and Rape in Terence's *Eunuchus*." [Conference paper]. Society for Classical Studies 2021 Conference.

Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Watson, P. 1983. "*Puella* and *Virgo*." *Glotta* 61 (1): 119–43.

Weiberg, E.L. 2024. *Demanding Witness: Women and the Trauma of Homecoming in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Witzke, S.S. 2015. "Harlots, Tarts, and Hussies?: A Problem of Terminology for Sex Labor in Roman Comedy." *Helios* 42 (1): 7–27.

———. 2016. "Violence against Women in Ancient Rome: Ideology versus Reality." In Riess, W. and Fagan, G.G. eds. *The Topography of Violence in the Greco-Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 248–74.

———. 2024. "Plautus' *Truculentus* and Terence's *Hecyra*: Patriarchal Authority and Women's Credibility." In Bowen, M.E., Gilbert, M.H., and Nally, G.N. eds. *Believing Ancient Women: Feminist Epistemologies for Greece and Rome*. 121–37.

Wolf, M.J.P. 2012. *Building Imaginary Worlds: The Theory and History of Subcreation*. New York/London: Routledge.

Appendix

Table 1.1 Occurrences of self-pitying language in Hecyra *(by speaker)*

	Miser(*a*)[247]	*Perii*	*Interii*	*Occidi*	
Pamphilus	**10**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**16**
Sostrata	4	1	0	0	5
Myrrina	3	2	0	0	5
Other	3[248]	1[249]	0	0	4
Total occurrences	20	8	1	1	30

Table 1.2 Occurrences of self-pitying language in Andria *(by speaker)*

	Miser(*a*)[250]	*Perii*	*Interii*	*Occidi*	
Pamphilus	6	**4**	**1**	0	**11**
Charinus	3	0	0	0	3
Davos	0	2	0	**2**	4
Mysis	**7**	0	0	0	7
Other	1[251]	1[252]	0	0	2
Total occurrences	17	7	1	2	27

[247] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).
[248] Syra, Philotis, Sosia.
[249] Parmeno.
[250] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).
[251] Simo (*senex*).
[252] Crito (male relative of Chrysis).

Table 1.3 Occurrences of self-pitying language in Heautontimorumenos *(by speaker)*

	Miser(*a*)[253]	(*Dis*)*perii*	*Interii*	*Occidi*	
Clinia	**5**[254]	1	0	0	6
Clitipho	**3**	4	0	0	**7**
Antiphila	1	2	0	0	3
Syrus	0	**5**	**1**	0	6
Sostrata	1	1	0	0	2
Menedemus	2	0	0	**1**	3
Chremes	1	1	0	0	2
Total occurrences	13	14	1	1	29

Table 1.4 Occurrences of self-pitying language in Phormio *(by speaker)*

	Miser(*a*)[255]	(*Dis*)*perii*	*Occidi*	
Antipho	2	0	**2**	**4**
Phaedria	1	0	0	1
Phormio	0	1	0	1
Nausistrata	2	1	0	3
Sophrona	**3**	0	0	3

[253] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).
[254] One of these occurrences is reported speech (by Clitipho); when asked how Clinia is faring, Clitipho responds, "*miserum se esse* (he says that he is miserable)" (192). In this table, I count this as a self-directed use of *miser* by Clinia, since it is not Clitipho who is expressing sympathy.
[255] Only occurrences of *miser*(*a*) that are used to refer to the self are counted in this table (e.g., *me miserum*).

Geta	1	0	0	1
Total occurrences	9	2	2	13

Table 1.5. Occurrences of miser(a)

Speaker by character type	Refers to self	Refers to someone else	Total	Percentage of total usages referring to self	Total lines[256]	Frequency of usage within character's total lines
Adulescens	34	7	41	**38%**	1653[257]	2%
Servus	8	8	16	9%	1829[258]	<1%
Ancilla	17	7	24	19%	341[259]	5%
Matrona	14	1	15	16%	237	6%
Virgo	2	0	2	2%	10[260]	20%
Senex	6	3	9	7%	2610	<1%
Other[261]	9	5	14	10%	957[262]	<1%
Total occurrences	90	31	121	—	—	—

[256] Lines were counted using Timothy Moore's web tool, "The Meters of Roman Comedy."
[257] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *adulescens* and *adulescens amans*.
[258] This includes the following from Moore's categories: eunuch, *servus*, and *servus callidus*.
[259] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *ancilla*, *anus*, *nutrix*, and *obstetrix*.
[260] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *mulier* and *virgo*.
[261] This category is comprised of stock characters who do not appear across all six of Terence's plays (e.g., *meretrix*, *leno*, *parasitus*).
[262] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *leno*, *libertus*, *meretrix*, *miles*, and *parasitus*.

Table 1.6 Occurrences of miser(a) *used reflexively by play*

Speaker by character type	*Andria*	*HT*	*Eun*	*Ph*	*Hec*	*Ad*	Total
Adulescens	**9**[263]	**8**	2	**3**	**10**	2	34
Servus	0	0	3	1	1	3	8
Ancilla	7	—	**7**	**3**	0	—	17
Matrona	—	1	—	2	7[264]	4	14
Virgo	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Senex	1	3	0	0	0	2	6
Other	0	0	4	0	2	3	9
Total occurrences	17	13	16	9	20	15	90

Table 1.7 Occurrences of (dis)perii, interii, and occidi

Speaker by character type	(*Dis*)*perii*[265]	*Interii*	*Occidi*	Total	Percentage of total occurrences	Total lines[266]	Frequency in character's lines
Adulescens	**22**	**2**	**5**	**29**	**40%**	1653[267]	2%
Servus	15	1	2	18	25%	1829[268]	<1%

[263] Pamphilus six times, Charinus three times.
[264] Split among two *matronae*: Sostrata uses the adjective self-referentially four times; Myrrina three.
[265] *Disperii* occurs only 3 times, *perii* constitutes the remaining 55 occurrences.
[266] Lines were counted using Timothy Moore's web tool, "The Meters of Roman Comedy."
[267] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *adulescens* and *adulescens amans*.
[268] This includes the following from Moore's categories: eunuch, *servus*, and *servus callidus*.

Ancilla	3	0	0	3	4%	341[269]	<1%
Matrona	6	0	0	6	8%	237	3%
Virgo	2	0	0	2	3%	10[270]	20%
Senex	4	0	2	6	8%	2610	<1%
Other[271]	6	0	2	8	11%	957[272]	<1%
Total occurrences	58	3	11	72	—	—	—

Table 1.8 Translations of disperii*,* perii misera *(*Heaut*. 404)*

Oh heavens! Oh, I'm fainting.	Sargeaunt 1912
Ah! I faint: I die.	Perry 1929
I'm going… *faints away*	Graves 1962
Oh, my goodness! Oh, dear! Oh, my!	Copley 1967
I can't bear it, it's too much.	Radice 1976
I feel faint…I feel so weak…oh, dear!	Brothers 1988
Mi sento morire! Povera me!	Gazzola 1990
I'm dying, I'm dying!	Bovie 1992
Oh dear, I'm overcome, quite overcome.	Barsby 2001a
I've had it! I can't take it! Help me!	Brown 2006

[269] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *ancilla*, *anus*, *nutrix*, and *obstetrix*.
[270] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *mulier* and *virgo*.
[271] This category is comprised of stock characters who do not appear across all six of Terence's plays, (e.g., *meretrix*, *leno*, *parasitus*).
[272] This includes the following from Moore's categories: *leno*, *libertus*, *meretrix*, *miles*, and *parasitus*.

Oh dear, I'm faint, I feel queer!	Clayton 2006
Ich sterb, vergeh, ich Arme!	Rau 2012