

*Pudor, liberalitas and amicitia: Family and Community Relations in Terence's Adelphoe*

In the opening monologue of Terence's *Adelphoe*, Micio compares his own philosophy on child-rearing to that of his brother Demea, claiming that *pudor* and *liberalitas* are more effective means of restraint than *metus* (57-8) and that *imperium* is more stable if it arises through *amicitia* than through *vis* (65-7). The results of *pudor*, *liberalitas*, and *amicitia* are a son who will do the right thing *sua sponte* rather than through *metus* of another (75).

Rosivach (2001) has noted the way in which the two fathers in this play use the same terms with different senses. This insight points to the complexity of the concepts Micio adduces in that opening monologue. The events of the rest of the play, in fact, encourage the audience to explore them more fully, and to consider whether, in fact, an *imperium* based on *pudor*, *liberalitas*, and *amicitia* is stronger than one based on fear.

This paper deploys recent work on the concepts of *pudor*, *liberalitas* and *amicitia* (e.g. Kaster 2005, Manning 1985, Comerci 1994, Konstan 1995 and Burton 2011) to argue that Terence's play does, with qualifications, endorse Micio's formula. The complexity of the terms, however, makes them more challenging to use as tools for child-rearing than Micio acknowledges. While they can function in concert as mutually supporting forces, they can also be at odds with each other, as when the *pudor* Aeschinus feels at his rape and impregnation of Pamphila prevents him from telling Micio and thus solving the problem, as the candor associated with *amicitia* would require.

In addition to their sometimes problematic interactions, each of the concepts has a negative version, particularly when the relation involved becomes purely instrumental or overly economic. *Amicitia* can turn into *adsentatio* or flattery; *liberalitas* can become

*largitas* (in the sense of lavishness or even bribery); *pudor*, rather than restraining behavior to conform with community standards, can interfere with independent judgment. It is these more negative versions of the three traits that we see play out in the final scenes of the play.

Care must be taken, then, that the forces work together rather than against each other, and their negative extremes must be avoided. Yet with these qualifications I believe that the play does fundamentally present *pudor*, *liberalitas* and *amicitia* as an ideal prescription not only for fostering the father-child relationship, but for social relations in the larger community. In his opening monologue Micio assumes that the filial relationship will be a model for others more generally (55-6). It is reasonable, therefore, to consider the implications of what we learn about paternal *imperium* more generally also. The play makes clear that these forces do indeed operate positively in the wider context of societal relations, particularly relations between groups of unequal power and status.

### Bibliography

Burton, Paul, *Friendship and Empire: Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle*

*Republic* (Cambridge 2011)

Comerci, Giuseppe, "Humanitas, liberalitas, aequitas; nuova paideia e mediazione sociale

negli Adlephoe di Terenzio" *Bollettino di studi latini* 24 (1994) 3-44.

Kaster, Robert, *Emotion, Restraint and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford 2005).

Konstan, David, "Patrons and Friends" *Classical Philology* 90.4 (1995) 328-342

Manning, C. E., "'Liberalitas' -- the Decline and Rehabilitation of a Virtue" *Greece and*

*Rome* 32.1 (1985) 73-83.

Rosivach, Vincent, "Terms of Censure in the *Adelphoe*" *New England Classical Journal*

28.4 (2001) 222-229.