

Title	Abstract of Vol.13, Mar.1996
Author(s)	
Citation	西洋古典論集 (1996), 13: 101-108
Issue Date	1996-03-31
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/68634
Right	
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

SUMMARIES

Plots and Play in Plautus' *Pseudolus*

Hiroyuki Takahashi

This paper reconsiders two much discussed inconsistencies in Act V of the play, i.e. no action for Callipho, who promised to act as a mediator in Act I, and Pseudolus' promise to Simo to return part of the money, which the slave is supposed to pay to Ballio. It will be suggested that these are part of a plot designed upon the audience.

I have called attention to Simo's soliloquy at the end of Act IV, saying that he is going to prepare a trap for Pseudolus in a manner different from other comedies, to bring money to him unasked(1239-45). It is because he actually does so in Act V(1313-4) that the role of the mediator becomes unnecessary, and it is certain that he is aiming to get some money back(1290-1) and Pseudolus could not make the promise before he was given the money.

Simo's soliloquy can be compared to Pseudolus' in Act I, Scs. iv and v, where he likens himself to a playwright, who finds what is nowhere in the world (395-405), and promises to produce something new in new fashion on the stage (562-70). Also, Simo's move to give money unasked seems to correspond to Pseudolus' straightforward confession to Simo of his intention and of Calidorus' love(479-503), which places Simo on firmest guard against his plot(504-6, 516). Both look desperately unusual in giving away what they have in hand, namely, they force themselves to begin from a state of blank .

Then, Simo's plot appears similar to Pseudolus' at the start, and eventually becomes successful. Does this mean a failure of the central character at the ending of the play?

In this respect, it should be noted that in Act IV Pseudolus acts highly anxious and awkward, in a sharp contrast with Simia, who, entering grandiosely and full of confidence, completes the plot successfully. It is

interesting to see that Pseudolus there seems to correspond to negatively nervous Calidorus in Act I, and Simia to positively confident Pseudolus in Acts I and II.

I have observed some pairs of images and motifs, which, combined with theatrical metaphor as pointed out by Wright and Slater, appear to control the actions of characters: confident vs. anxious; cautious vs. credulous; alive vs. dead; standing(or entering) grandiosely vs. tumbling or staggering. Anxious, credulous, almost dead, and tumbling, Calidorus is never successful in Act I. Preparing to celebrate his birthday, Ballio acts confident, cautious, and grandiose in Act I, whereas in Act IV, after the cook has made him anxious, he is unable to walk straightways in entering, wrongly trusts Simia and mistrusts Harpax, and calls his birthday his death-day as he exits. In Act III, the cook's confident verbosity stresses that his dishes are for eternal life, criticizing others' as for death, whereas Simo suspects that he cooks for the dead.

In Act V, Sc. i Pseudolus enters staggering with wine, and speaks of the banquet, which he has just come out of. The festivity described is said to be what life is for(1255), but there Pseudolus fails to enjoy himself fully because he is requested to dance, and ends up falling down, which marks the end of his play(*naenia ludo* 1278), as he daubs and takes off his mantle, a symbol of *servus*. In Sc. ii, he humiliates Simo by belching and adding an insult "*vae victis*" when he gets the money from him, but he needs Simo's hold to stand when he belches, and "*vae victis*" are the words of Brennus, one of the most abhorred of the Romans' foes. These images for Pseudolus seem to imply that he is no more *servus callidus* in Act V.

I have suggested that the ending scene is directed as follows, with Callipho placed in the audience (CALL. *lubidost ludos tuos spectare* 552): when Simo proposes to Pseudolus to invite the audience together(1331f.), Callipho stands up, pointing to himself as if to ask that he should also be called; when Pseudolus negates the proposal(1332-3), he, already heading toward the side of the stage, does not glance at Callipho, as Simo, following Pseudolus, turns a smile to Callipho with a gesture of his index finger pointed to the purse at Pseudolus's back and his thumb to himself, as if to say, "that's mine".

Now we may see the real target of Simo's plot, i.e. of this play: not Pseudolus, but, rather, the audience represented by Callipho. The unexpected ending must have surprised them, especially Callipho, who is robbed of his chance to speak, although his name means "fine voice".

Pseudolus' final words to the audience, to invite them tomorrow (*in crastinum*) if they applaud the play (1334), seem to endorse that all the actors, including the audience, have successfully finished their roles. Pseudolus had cautioned the audience against himself for today (*in hunc diem* 128), and they have played roles to be played by the play's plot: the slave acting the fool. So has Callipho, whom Pseudolus had asked to be a witness to his play just for today (*in hunc diem* 547). There will be no play (therefore, no invitation) tomorrow, when Ballio will transact with citizens (*cras agam cum civibus* 1231).

Seneca's *Phoenissae*

— The Plan of Seneca and the Nature of the Text —

Hidefumi Ohnisi

The text of *Phoenissae* consists of the following four scenes;

- A (a) 1-319 Oedipus - Antigona scene
- (b) 320-362 nuntius - Oedipus - Antigona scene
- B (a) 363-442 Iocasta - satelles - Antigona scene
- (b) 443-664 Iocasta - Polynices - Eteocles scene

These scenes were once considered as fragments or excerpts of a tragedy or two or more tragedies. But opinions about the nature of the text of *Phoenissae* seem nowadays to fall into two main groups, one which considers it as an unfinished text of a tragedy, the other as another type of text, that is, a text of a tragedy for recitation or a text of a Lesedrama. In either case, it is generally agreed that these scenes constitute as a whole a text of one work, be it a tragedy

(for staging) or a tragedy for recitation or a Lesedrama. Those scholars who consider it as a text of an unfinished tragedy naturally conjecture from the text the whole construction and plot planned by Seneca of the unfinished tragedy, and almost all of them (e.g. Th. Hirschberg, *Senecas Phoenissen*, 1989, p. 7; I. Opelt, *Zu Senecas Phoenissen*, in, *Senecas Tragoedien*, 1972, p. 284) suppose the development of events or the plot after B(supposed as act III) is the same as that of Euripides' *Phoinissai*, that is, that the battle between Eteocles' army and Polynices' begins and they fall in a duel, and then Iocasta commits suicide in the battlefield. But does the text permit such a supposition ?

At 272ff. Oedipus mentions, for the first time in the text, the crime his sons will commit in the near future, which is the main theme of *Phoenissae*. He describes it as 'maius' (i.e. greater than his) in three places(272ff., 287, cf. 306 *nocentior me*), but does not reveal concretely what it is in this presaging scene A(a). In the next scene A(b), however, in which he lays curses upon his sons, what he meant by this 'maius (crimen)' becomes clear. His main and greatest curse is uttered in these words; '*primus a thalamis meis /incipiat ignis.*' (347), *date arma matri*' (358), both of which means one and the same thing('incipiat ignis' being a metonym), that is, the death, or rather, the murder (even if indirect) of their mother Iocasta. This is both the main theme (because her death and her sons' crime are two sides of the same coin) and the climax of the text, and events after this scene progress toward the realization of this curse of Oedipus.

In the next scene B(a), in which Iocasta is requested by an attendant to 'be the barrier to stay unholy arms of her sons', her daughter Antigona also entreats her, '*aut solve bellum, mater, aut prima excipe*' (406) This '*prima excipe*' echoes that curse of Oedipus '*primus incipiat ignis*' Iocasta's reply reechoes it again; '*ibo, ibo . . . petere qui fratrem volet, / petat ante matrem . . . qui non est pius / incipiat a me*' (407-14) Determined, in this way, to sacrifice her life, or rather, premediating suicide(cf. 413-4), Iocasta hurries to the battlefield to dissuade her sons from the crime (of war and mutual killing).

The opening words of Iocasta in the last scene B(b) are an announcement of her firm resolve to sacrifice her life or to commit suicide if her sons will not

stop the war and mutual killing. She says, 'in me arma et ignes vertite . . . hunc petite ventrem . . . haec membra spargite ac divellite . . . si placuit scelus, maius paratum est' (443ff.) The curse of Oedipus was also 'maius' (272, 287, cf. 353), 'ignis' (347) and 'arma' (358). Again and again the effect of the magical charm of his curse is manifested. And the brothers reject her dissuasion. The text ends with Eteocles' merciless words 'imperia pretio quolibet constant bene.'

What can be supposed to happen then ? It is inevitable, we think, Iocasta should commit suicide before, not after, her sons begin war and mutual killing, just as Oedipus cursed 'primus incipiat' and Antigona entreated 'prima' and she herself determined firmly 'ante', 'incipiat', 'maius paratum', and despite her death, the brothers go on to war for imperium, trampling over their mother's corpse, in a sense, and crossing over a pool of their mother's blood (cf. *tuo cruori per meum fiet via*. 476). Is this — Iocasta's suicide before her sons' war and mutual killing — not both Seneca's plan and his invention ?

Seneca seems to be fond of this kind of motif of 'suicide of protest or condemnation' in persuasion - or dissuasion - scenes (cf. *Phaedra* 250ff., *Hercules Furens* 1301ff., and esp. *Oedipus* 1004ff., where Seneca, changing the famous Sophoclean plot, makes Iocasta commit suicide on the stage). We think Seneca must have carried out his plan, which can be read clearly from the text, and inserted 'Iocasta's suicide before her sons' war and mutual killing' -scene or -speech just after the end of B(b)(i.e. in the supposed third act), if he had tried to write a text of a tragedy for staging. As it is, the extant last scene B(b) lacks it. Why did Seneca not add it? Our conclusion is that the text of *Phoenissae* is not a text of a tragedy for staging, but such 'a written text for recitation or dramatized reading' as is suggested by E. Fantham (*Seneca's Troades*, 1982, p.48), in other words, a text as a prototype of Senecan tragedies, and the uniqueness and incompleteness of *Phoenissae* come from the different nature of the text.

'A capite ad calcem' in the Description of Personal Appearance

Masahiro Gonoji

The portrayal of Sophonisba in Petrarch's "Africa" (5, 18ff.) and that of Circe in Petronius's "Satyricon" (128, 3ff.) use the same device of describing a fair lady in that both describe each physical part one by one in order from head to foot. The description by Petrarch has been thought to follow the medieval style of portrayal which can be recognized both in literary works and handbooks of poetical theory, but Petronius' passage throws a doubt whether such a device goes back to the ancient rhetoric or literature. This paper attempts:

1. to summarize how the ancient rhetoric handled the description of personal appearance and how the 'a capite ad calcem (from head to foot)' rule came up.
2. to give examples from classical works that describe a person from head to foot in detail, and examine the influence of rhetoric on literary works from ancient times to the Middle Age.

The ancient rhetoric has several terms related to the description of personal appearance. 'Enargeia,' a figure of thought, is a vivid description, which "shows things as if before our eyes." There are some figures that are almost identical to Enargeia: Diatyposis, Hypotyposis, Leptrogia and Latin equivalents. Quintilian (8, 3, 64) refers to Enargeia of a person, but he seems to place an importance on describing the action or behavior rather than the appearance.

'Characterismos' is also a figure of thought, meaning just the description of a person. In earlier times this figure included description both of the appearance and of the action or behavior, but later Latin rhetoric handbooks show their interest only in the appearance.

'Ekphrasis' is not a figure but a name of the preliminary rhetorical exercise in Greek books titled "Progymnasmata." This is the exercise of describing various objects "vividly as if before the eyes." Here Enargeia is treated as an

effect of Ekphrasis (vividness), not as a figure. Persons are included among the objects. The two 4th or 5th century rhetoricians, Aphthonius and Nikolaus, give instructions to describe a person from head to foot in detail, while Theon and Hermogenes (2C.) do not state such a rule. The descriptions of persons (statues) in Libanius' "Progymnasmata" (4C.), a collection of many examples of the exercises, obediently follow the 'from head to foot' rule.

We can only guess what kinds of exercises pupils were required to do before starting declamatory training before second century. Quintilian (2, 4) and Suetonius (De Gr. 4) say that 'Ethologia,' which Seneca identifies with 'Characterismos,' was one of such exercises. According to Bonner (1977), description was an important element in Declamatio and its preliminary training was undoubtedly regarded as indispensable. Quintilian didn't include the exercise of description in his list, because he hated the excessive emphasis on description prevalent at that time.

My supposition about the process of establishing the 'from head to foot' rule is as follows. In the rhetorical education of earlier times, the description of personal appearance was only one element of describing a person totally. Students might have referred only to a few peculiar physical parts among other characteristics, where the order of the physical parts was beyond concern. Later, as the rhetorical exercise lost its practical basis and the description itself became the purpose, students were urged to describe personal appearance (often statues) in great detail. The order, 'from head to foot,' was most natural for such long descriptions. Finally in the 4th century Progymnasmatas, 'to describe a person from head to foot' was established as a rule, but it is impossible to determine when this sequence became the rule in school instruction.

I found several examples in classical works describing a person from up to down. It is hard to determine whether the descriptions before 3C. are the application of rhetorical exercises or just from intuition. Ovid's two long descriptions (Met. 8, 801ff., 12, 395ff.) suggest the possibility of rhetorical influence. The portrayals by Petronius, Martial, Achilles Tatius and Ausonius seem to follow a kind of pattern in describing a beautiful person with praise,

but the passages are not detailed enough to prove the influence of rhetorical exercise. Two portrayals (Ep.1, 2; 3, 13) by Sidonius Apollinaris (5C.) are apparently the application of Ekphrasis, describing a person 'a capite ad calcem' in full detail.

I cannot trace the 'a capite ad calcem' description from Sidonius until late 12th century, when this type of description was common both in literary works and in handbooks of poetical theory. As the two Progymnasmatas stating the rule were not available at this time, direct consultation is improbable. There are three possibilities regarding the source of medieval descriptions: 1. excessive emphasis on detailed descriptions was still alive in medieval education; 2. there were some collections showing examples of rhetorical composition, such as Libanius'; or 3. people took the earlier literary works as models applying the rhetorical rule (Sidonius was definitely an important model). The pattern 'from head to feet' was not a stated rule in medieval poetical theory, but later poets, including Petrarch, also followed this pattern.