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Plautus' Mercator: A Commentary

Abstract

by Boris Dunsch

This thesis comprises an introduction, a lemmatic commentary, and indices. The introductory chapter, apart from a brief discussion of a more general nature, investigates the play and the relation it bears to Philemon's Emporos, its lost Greek model, especially with regard to the act-divisions of the Greek play and the pacing of the action in Plautus' adaptation. The commentary is provided to address problems posed by the Latin text, notably those of exegesis, textual criticism, metre, grammar, humour, imagery, staging, and the relationship to the Graeco-Roman comic tradition. An attempt is also made to distinguish between elements which may reflect the Greek comic tradition and those which suggest Plautine origin. In recent work about Plautus and Philemon it has been argued that the plot of the Emporos underwent far-reaching changes at the hands of Plautus, but the author of this thesis argues for the essential unity of the Mercator and for Plautus' conservative treatment of the plot of the Greek original, at the same time allowing for the fact that Plautus may have Romanised, exaggerated, and extended Philemon's play at certain points. By its structure, metrical arrangement, pacing, juxtaposition of contrasting types, parallel arrangement of core scenes, and the recurrence of key imagery, themes and motifs, the Mercator proves to be a carefully conceived, effectively balanced, and well-composed play.
I. Introduction

1. The Unity of the Mercator

Recent scholarship on the Mercator had been virtually dormant until Lefèvre (1995) published a major study dealing with Plautus and Philemon. Lefèvre has argued that the plot of the Emporos underwent far-reaching changes at the hands of Plautus, but I shall argue for the essential unity of the Mercator and for Plautus' conservative treatment of the plot of the Greek original, at the same time allowing for the fact that Plautus has Romanised, exaggerated, and extended Philemon's play in loco. By its structure, metrical arrangement, pacing, juxtaposition of contrasting types, parallel arrangement of core scenes, and the recurrence of key themes and motifs, the Mercator proves to be a carefully conceived, effectively balanced, and attentively composed play.

A notable feature of the dramaturgy of the Mercator is the parallel composition of Charinus' four appearances on stage (1-224; 335-498; 588-666; 830-956). His four monologues (1-110; 335-363; 588-597; 830-841) are followed by four encounters with other characters (Acanthio and Demipho once, Eutychus twice). Each time Charinus is presented with some bad news (mala res, cf. 615) that leads to a subsequent emotional outburst (181, 195-197, 204-206; 468-473; 607, 617f., 624, 629-632, 645-647, 658-660; 920-951). Moreover, three times the fears uttered by Charinus that something may go wrong will prove correct. All along, his fears are focused on what is to become of Pasicompsa. In lines 107-109 he fears that his father may find out about her; Acanthio tells him that he actually has (180f.). In his second monologue Charinus says that he is afraid that his father may sell the girl (353-355), as he says he will in the subsequent dialogue between them (461). Waiting for Eutychus' return from the harbour, Charinus has doubts whether the sale of the girl will turn out well for him (592-594), and indeed the result is devastating: he has lost the girl (611). In all cases the delivery of the news (or further details) is delayed by elements of farce (135-172, 601-606, 612-642, 866-894) some of which (but probably

1 For Plautus' name, life, and career see Leo (1912) 63-86, Duckworth (1952) 49-56, Beare (1964) 45-49, Gratwick (1971) and (1993) 1-7, and von Albrecht (1994) 133-135. Doxographies of Plautine scholarship since the Renaissance are provided by Ritschl Opuscula II 34-161, Fraenkel (1960) 1-6, Laidlaw (1960), and Gaiser (1972). For scholarship on the Mercator see especially Lefèvre (1995) 9-13. For the question to what extent Plautus' œuvre is related to the Greek models he adapted or in what ways he may be indebted to Italian extempore farce see e.g. Zagagi (1980), Hunter (1985), Stämk (1989), Anderson (1993). Wherever any of these general matters arise, they will be addressed in loco in the commentary. For passages of Mercator that are mentioned in this introduction, my notes ad loc. should also be consulted, as material contained there has not been repeated here; for themes and motifs see also Index I s.v.


4 Blänsdorf (1978) 199 n.83 rightly calls it a play that "im Niveau als niedrig gilt, aber dramatisch recht gut gebaut ist."

5 See Steidle (1975) 343.
not all) may be due to Plautine expansion. Another parallel that may be noted in this context is that both Charinus and Demipho, _adulescens amator_ and _senex amator_, use monologues to talk about their amatory infatuation (Charinus: 40-107, 335-363, 588-597, 830-841, 851-865; Demipho: 225-270, 544-561). Both woo for the spectators' attention, both try to establish as close a rapport with the audience as possible: they are not only rivals in love but also rivals in securing the attention and sympathies of those who are watching them.

The characters are juxtaposed in oppositional pairs. The pairings are: Demipho - Lysimachus (_senex amator_ - _amicus/senex amator_), Charinus - Demipho (_adulescens amator - senex amator_), Charinus - Eutychus (_adulescens amator - sodalis opitulator_), Dorippa - Lysimachus (_uxor dotata - senex amator_), Dorippa - Pasicompsa (_uxor dotata - meretrix_). The main opposition of the play is the rivalry between father and son who love the same girl.

The threat of losing dramatic cohesion is countered by four techniques: (a) the use of the _amicitia_ motif, allowing the mirroring of two pairs of young and old men and the rivalry of the _senes_, (b) the recurrence of key words, phrases, images, and themes, (c) the technique of piecemeal revelation of future events (e.g. by anticipatory characterization, as in the case of Charinus' description of his father in the prologue or the creation of suspense as to the fate of Pasicompsa), (d) the focusing of the intrigues on the character of Pasicompsa.

While love is the _primum movens_ of the _Mercator_, its most prevalent theme is that of friendship (_amicitia_). The friendship theme is doubled and paralleled in the pairs of Lysimachus - Demipho and Eutychus - Charinus. Moreover, Lysimachus' friendship contributes to the complication of the play (and is therefore dramatically essential to it, and not accidental) as Lysimachus attempts to protect Demipho by covering up the fact that Pasicompsa has been bought for his friend. This leads him to be suspected of introducing a _meretrix_ into his family home. The friendship theme is also the reason why Acanthio had to disappear for good after line 224, since his intervention as 'clever slave' (_servus callidus_)

---

7 On the characters' competition for rapport with the spectators see Moore (1998) 30-34, 44-46, 115-119.
8 See Averna (1990) 15-52 and Sherberg (1995) 141-143. Fuhrmann (1976) 85 and Rissom (1971) 183 are correct in stating that of the three Plautine plays involving very active rivalling _senes amatores_ (Asinaria, Casina, and Mercator) the _Mercator_ is perhaps the least immoral one, as here father and son do not know that they are rivals; only the spectators do. Moreover, Demipho is spared a humiliating confrontation with his wife (who has no part in the plot). Instead, Dorippa is introduced and the marital argument is transposed into Lysimachus' home. As a result, the _senes_ receive a relatively light punishment: Lysimachus is punished by Dorippa and will be found innocent (cf. the hints at 956, 960, 1011-1013); Demipho is punished by Eutychus and Lysimachus (cf. 974-1003), while his wife will remain ignorant (cf. 1003-1005). The nature of the father-son relationship between Demipho and Charinus is explored throughout the play (79-85, 107, 208-211, 349-355, 991-994); that between Lysimachus and Eutychus is left aside.
10 Cf. 499, 710, 797-799.
at a later point would have diminished Eutychus' importance as a 'friend in need' (sodalis opitulator) of Charinus. The relationship between the members of the younger generation is characterized by emotionality, that between the older characters by politeness and formality. Lysimachus' help is discredited by the fact that he develops an interest in the girl himself, whereas Eutychus' unselfish help is simply given because it is needed (cf. 475, 887). The fact that his efforts are not immediately crowned with success does not diminish his importance as the epitome of a caring friend. After all, it is Eutychus who finds the girl in the end and leads Charinus to her (cf. 952-956), not without having searched the whole city for her first (cf. 805). Charinus' absence from the finale has been criticized by Lefèvre (1995) 40 as slightly awkward. This apparently careless dramaturgy may be mitigated by the fact that Charinus has an enormous overall stage presence (he is on stage for the duration of more than half of the play). Moreover, after Charinus has got his amica, his function as adulescens amator has been fulfilled, while Demipho's role as senex amator still needs to be brought to completion.

Another important source of unity is the use of certain key words, phrases and images recurring from scene to scene and sustaining important themes. As is appropriate for a play called Mercator, technical language describing financial transactions and business relations abound. There are many passages in which the dominant theme is practices of trade and commerce (or a comic send-up of what purports to be mercantile practices). Since Philemon's play was called Emporos, it is likely that Philemon already exploited the theme and that not all of these allusions to the business world are Plautus' own invention. Some notable examples are: mercari (229, 232, 976), mercimonium (500), mercatus (11, 83, 358), merces (769), merc (76, 87, 93, 96), negotium, mandatum, mandare, tradere 'deliver' (278), pretium (487), res 'property', res mandata 'a commission (of an agent)' (374), rem quaerere 'make money' (551), lex 'condition, stipulation' (817, 1015, 1024), argentum, aestumare 'set a value on' (96), mutuari (52), lucrum (95, 553), parare 'purchase' (77), parere 'make money' (78), auctuarium (490), lictari (441), polliceri 'bid' (439), accudere (432), addicere 'to make over, sign over' (616), mancipium (449), abducere (616, of a purchased slave), adnumerare 'count out' (89), eximere (486), luculente vendere (423).

In the context of the playwright's use of commercial vocabulary, mention should also be made of the maritime imagery and the nautical technical language found in this play. Both

11 See Nadjo (1971) 105. Lysimachus' acts of friendship are discredited as they serve a purpose that invites disapproval: the acquisition of a courtesan (meretrix), see Zucker (1950) 169.

12 For an analysis of the wealth of commercial vocabulary used by Plautus see Skiles (1940/41); on expressions for 'rich' and 'poor' see Crampon (1985). There are also many direct and indirect references to money and business matters in Mercator. It is surprising that Andreau (1987) 333-356 and 527-606 does not mention any of them. In particular, ibid. 334 n.9 he should have taken note of the several instances of characters going ad portum, a place where financial transactions (e.g. sales, auctions) took place (e.g. Mer. 326, 328, 465).
are connected with the professional background of Demipho and his son as overseas traders. Nautical imagery is found at 195-197, 695f., 875-880, 890f.; terms connected with sea-travel are, for example, navis cercurus (87), solvere "weigh anchor" (92), portus (97, etc.), armamenta "riggings" (174, 192), lembus (193, 259), trans mare asportare "sell overseas" (333), nausea (389). The use of nautical terminology is connected with the allusions to travel. Apart from the fact that it is Charinus' business trip to Rhodes (92-106) that sets off the amorous events of the play in the first place (11-13), there are allusions to travel in connection with Charinus' desperate thoughts about exile (644-658, 855-863, 931-947).  

An area of particular interest is the handling of animal imagery. An entire menagerie is adduced, e.g. anguis (referring to Dorippa, 761), capra (Pasicompsa, 229f.), haedus (Eutychus?, 248f.), hircosus (Demipho, 575), musca (Demipho, 361), ovis (Demipho, 524-526), simia (Lysimachus, 234f., 276), vervex (Demipho, 567). The use of animal metaphors in the Mercator is concerted and effective. The animal imagery focuses on the senex amator (cf. 272f., 361, 524f., 567, 575). All but one of the images are devoted to Demipho, and the pattern begins shortly after the recitation of his dream (225-251). The pattern is relevant to the character of Demipho as the senex libidinosus and may be compared with Lysidamus in Casina, both with regard to the metaphorical structure. The images surrounding Demipho are further unified by arising from the same species. He is seen as a member of the ovine family from several perspectives: as sexually potent and powerful (272f., reflected in his dream: 229f.), as stupid and gullible (524-526), as physically and aesthetically unsuitable for love (567, 573). The imagery is an effective means of establishing Demipho's character, and it also contributes to the erotic atmosphere of several scenes, particularly the first scenes of the third act.

There are also a number of passages of apparently 'philosophical' content: 3-8 (cf. 626f.), 18f., 24-28, 145-149, 225-227, 320f., 308-312, 359, 482f., 601-608, 648-657, 830-

---

13 See Fantham (1972) 23. For Philemon's use of nautical imagery see Averna (1988) 43-49. On the use of nautical imagery in Plautus see also Winniczuk (1987), surprisingly leaving the Mercator aside.

14 An interesting parallel between the two Plautine plays based on Greek comedies by Philemon is Mer. 875 cape modo vorsoriam (and 878 recipe to ad terram) - Tri. 1026f. cape vorsoriam/recipe to ad erum. is Cadoni (1991) 295 calls the motif of travelling in Mercator "strutturalmente più importante, scenicamente più movimentato e basato su motivazioni che determinano (o possono determinare) improvvisi capovolgimenti dell'azione drammatica."

15 Cadoni (1991) 295 calls the motif of travelling in Mercator "strutturalmente più importante, scenicamente più movimentato e basato su motivazioni che determinano (o possono determinare) improvvisi capovolgimenti dell'azione drammatica."

16 Cadoni (1991) 297 points out rightly that the two trips are complementary: the trip to Rhodes (92-106) took place in reality and got Charinus the girl; the trip in the chariot (931-947) takes place in his imagination and gets him the girl again. The beginning and the ending of Mercator are strongly linked by this motif.

17 See Svendsen (1971) 94.

18 Cf. musca, Mer. 361 = culex, Cas. 239; vervex, Mer. 567 = Cas. 535; hircus, Mer. 573 = Cas. 550.

19 Cf. Mer. 524f., 567f., 575f.
None of these passages, however, contains anything specifically philosophical. It is possible to interpret all of these statements made by comic fathers, sons, lovers, slaves, wet-nurses, wives, and courtesans simply as homespun wisdom of ordinary people, containing no more (nor less) philosophy than could be picked up by the spectators.

Still, there is a pedestrian discourse on ethical problems in Mercator, as is indicated by the frequent occurrence of words for ‘good’ and ‘bad’ in their moral sense, malus being one of the key-words of the play. It does not occur more frequently anywhere else in Plautine or Terentian comedy (32 times); bonus and malus are contrasted several times in the course of the play (145-148, 393f., 510-513, 969-971).

Another noteworthy feature is the amount of text dealing with or alluding to religious matters, religious language, several prayers (to Apollo, Fortuna, the Limina, and the Lar/Lares), the occurrence of deified abstractions (including a word-play on Eutychus and Tyche), and the Juppiter-and-Juno theme alluding to the marital problems of Dorippa and Lysimachus. There are also frequent allusions to medicine. Other themes and motifs that recur are ‘beauty and vision’ (forma, formosus, video; including the topos of love at first sight), ‘love as illness and madness’ (linked to the medicus-theme, which in turn is linked to Apollo), ‘senile love’ (linked to the topos that old people regress to childhood), women and marriage (Syra’s monologue, Pasicompsa, Dorippa). As far as imagery is concerned, the overall impression is one of coherence, underlining the unity of the play.

2. The Act-Divisions
When discussing the unity of the Mercator, a problem deserving special attention is whether the distribution of the act-divisions of the Greek original can still be traced in Plautus’
adaptation. Whenever that is the case, it may indicate that the Roman playwright left the overall dramatic structure of the Greek play intact. The prologue of the Mercator states that it is a Latin version of (and in some sense the same play as) Philemon's Emporos which was probably, like the Menandrian comedies we know of, divided into five acts (μέτρι) designated by χοροῦ ("choral interlude") after each act.  

The act-divisions printed in most editions are the work of Renaissance scholars. It is reasonable to look for the points in the Latin adaption which could correspond to Philemon's act-division. Plautus' plays were adapted for continuous presentation; for this purpose the choral interludes of the Greek model were done away with. Most of Roman comedy is reluctant to divulge the locations of the act-divisions of the Greek originals, as the Roman playwright may have chosen to bridge an act-division and thus have obscured the original structure, possibly leading to the undue compression of off-stage time or the infringement of the three-actor-rule. In addition, the fact that Plautus felt free to expand or telescope scenes of the Greek play at will (as can be seen from the comparison between Bacchides 526-561 and the fragments of Menander's Dis Exapaton which can be paralleled for that passage) makes it more difficult to establish the location of the Greek act-breaks in the Latin plays with any degree of probability.

The action unfolds in a number of distinct strands and is presented to the spectator from several different viewpoints (Charinus, Demipho, Lysimachus, and Dorippa). As a consequence, there are several shifts from one phase of the action to another, each of which involves a distinct group of characters, whose conflicting aims are - unknown to them until the very end - curiously entangled. Their different spheres do not touch often: Charinus meets Demipho only once, Eutychus three times, Lysimachus and Pasicompsa never. Dorippa never meets Demipho, Charinus, nor Eutychus, she remains confined to the world of her household (Lysimachus, Syra) and she does not even address the cook when she meets him. Eutychus meets Demipho only once, at the end of the play (and once he eavesdrops on him), he meets his father Lysimachus only once too, also in the final scene. He never meets his mother, and his meeting with Pasicompsa takes place off-stage.

The general impression is that the worlds of the characters exist in separation, there being a strong preference for old meeting old, and young meeting young. Eutychus and

---

33 See Barsby (1982) 78. The act-divisions in the vulgate of the Mercator are as follows: 1-224 (act I), 225-498 (act II), 499-666 (act III), 667-829 (act IV), 830-1026 (act V).
35 See e.g. Hunter (1985) 38, Anderson (1993) 28. On the three-actor-rule (which states that no more than three speaking characters can occupy the stage at the same time) see Sandbach (1975) and, more cautiously, Blume (1998) 64-66.
37 See Handley (1968) and Bain (1979).
Charinus meet three times; each meeting is well-motivated, and the sequence is well-balanced. First, they meet after Charinus’ defeat after the auction (474): Eutychus offers his help, and the plot takes a new turn. Then they meet after Eutychus’ failure to secure possession of the girl for Charinus. When they meet for the last time, Eutychus is in a position to reunite him with Pasicompsa. This tripartite structure is probably intentional, as it puts emphasis on the friendship theme in the Mercator. The same is achieved by the meetings between Demipho and Lysimachus, but their relationship is portrayed more ambivalently. They too meet three times, but only their first two meetings are characterized by their ‘friendship’.

All of this characterizes the Mercator as a play that focuses on the confrontation of characters. In a play in which the playwright has attached such importance to the keeping-apart of the different spheres of the characters, vacant stages cannot be avoided, and there are quite a number of them (after 224, 498, 543, 587, 666, 691, 802, 829, 956). Whereas some plays have only a small number of vacant stages (two in the Mostellaria, at 857 and 1040), those plays which have a lot of them pose a difficulty if one takes ‘vacant stage’ indiscriminately as a signal of an act-division in the Greek model. In his edition, Leo, for example, ends an act at Ba. 368, and in doing so is forced to consider the action continuous at 384. The same happens e.g. at Cas. 514 and 530, Tri. 728 and 819, and at Mer. 802 and 829. It is obvious that where there are two vacant stages with equal claim to recognition as being indicative of χορός, consistency is hard to achieve.

For the purpose of locating Philemon’s act-divisions, the so-called ‘Webster-criterion’ will yield better results. It works by determining where offstage action implies a major lapse of dramatic time that would have been covered by a choral interlude in the Emporos. This was done by Legrand, who assumed χορός after lines 224, 498, 666, and 802, coinciding in the first three places with the divisions imposed by the Renaissance scholars, in the last giving preference to line 802 over line 829. Another suggestion was made by Freté: act-divisions after lines 498, 666, 802, and 956. These divisions would imply massive Plautine expansion at the beginning of the play; at the same time, they require

---

39 The structure leading to their three encounters is broadly similar. At the beginning Charinus is alone on stage and monologizes (469-473, 589-597, 830-841), a situation that emphasizes his desperate isolation. Then he is joined by Eutychus who brings about a change in Charinus’ mood each time they meet.


40 Lysimachus’ friendship to Demipho lacks the unselfish dedication and cordiality (cf. his formal politness at 283-289, his clipped and rude bluntness at 562-577, and the harsh abuse in the final scene) that is characteristic of Eutychus’ friendship with Charinus, whose capricious (cf. 643f., 867-881, 921-951) and at times ungrateful behaviour (cf. 611-614, 629-633) serves to underline the special nature of Eutychus’ amicitia.

41 See Burckhardt (1927) 20.


43 See Legrand (1910) 476.

44 See Freté (1930) 41-43.
the assumption of massive cutting towards the end, a claim which is, despite the statement at Merc. 1007f. (eadem brevior fabula/erit), hard to substantiate. However, the strongest objection must be that Act IV would be left with too little action.

The empty stages after 543 and 587 are unlikely to represent Greek act-breaks. However, there can be little doubt about a major break after 498. A strong argument is that if the action was continuous at that point, Eutychus (leaving for the harbour) would meet Lysimachus (entering from the harbour at 499). Moreover, a substantial lapse of time is required to cover for both Demipho’s trip ad portum to meet Lysimachus and arrange the purchase of Pasicompsa (468-499) and for Eutychus’ trip ad portum to buy the girl in Charinus’ name (498-600).

The other act-breaks suggested by Legrand (224, 666, 802) are less certain. An act-break after 666 would cover for the off-stage action of hiring a cook and doing some shopping at the forum. On the other hand, the stage is also empty after line 691, and it is hard to decide which of the two empty stages should be given preference as an act-break in the Emporos. The fact that lines 692-699 could be taken as an entrance monologue delivered by Lysimachus at the beginning of a new act seems to support the latter idea. Freté thinks that it is not desirable to have Dorippa go into the house and remain there for the duration of the break, but rather that she should rush out immediately afterwards, the short lapse of time being covered by Lysimachus’ monologue. However, one could argue that the very fact that the spectators know that Dorippa has gone inside and is in the house before the act-break (and is therefore bound to re-emerge like a jack-in-the-box) adds an element of comic irony to Lysimachus’ situation. He does not know that his wife is back, but

46 Freté (1930) 41 rightly: “544, Démithon suit de près Pasicompsa et Lysimaque, ayant surveillé les tractations; 588, il est naturel que Charin trouve le temps long et paraisse au seuil de la maison de son père pour guetter le retour d’Eutychus.”

47 There has never been any serious doubt about this, see e.g. Freté (1930) 41, pace Lefèvre (1995) 41 who thinks that a trip from Athens to the Piraeus is impossible even if the lapse of time is covered by a choral interlude.

48 See also Hough (1936) 248: “At Merc. 667 Dorippa enters from the farm having heard from a slave sent out at 279 that Lysimachus is not coming out. Her remarks here show that the aged servant Syra is slow (incedit), and several passages between 279 and 667 have indicated the advance of time: 556, Demipho is hungry, not having eaten since the play opened: 596, the impatient Charinus complains that Eutychus is long overdue. A problem that cannot be discussed in this context is what Demipho does at the harbour all the time between 587 and 957, being off-stage for about 370 lines. In terms of dramaturgy, it is understandable that Plautus does not bring him on earlier, as his appearance would spoil the complication through mistaken identity. On the other hand, since the complication lies at the very centre of the play, it is hard to see how Philemon could have dealt with the problem of keeping Demipho away from Dorippa, Eutychus, and Charinus in any other way than we see it done in the Mercator. It appears that Demipho, as soon as he turns into an off-stage character is simply put on the storage cupboard, to be re-introduced at the pleasure of the playwright.

49 Freté (1930) 41 dismisses the possibility in an off-hand manner: “A 691, il n’y a évidemment pas de scène vide; Dorippe ne reste dans la maison que juste le temps de voir le jeune Pasicompsa à l’intérieur; Lysimaque arrivant, 692, va essuyer sa colère; ce n’est pas le moment de couper l’action.”

50 Freté (1930) 58f.
the spectators do. His wife Dorippa inside his house is like a loaded gun ready to fire, a moment for which the audience will wait in eager anticipation. Then, when the door of Lysimachus' house opens (699), the spectators, enjoying their superior knowledge, will begin to laugh. If χορός in the Greek model is assumed after 691, the audience would also be provided with room for speculation during the break, while being entertained by the chorus, as to the further developments of the action. They will probably expect a scene of confrontation between husband and wife, and some will already be aware of the fact that ultimate doom, in the person of a hired cook (cf. 578ff.) is probably already on its way, too.

Χορός after 802 was regarded as “pause necessaire” by Legrand,51 as it would cover for Syra’s trip to Dorippa’s father and back (788-803), at the same time allowing the stagehands to remove the vasa deposited by the cook’s assistants (cf. 801). It would also prevent a premature meeting between Eutychus (coming from town, cf. 805) or Syra (coming from Dorippa’s father) with Lysimachus (who leaves ad forum at 797). This, however, would leave Syra’s monologue in an awkward place, being peculiarly exposed, with an empty stage after 829, unless one assumes that Charinus enters immediately upon Syra’s exit into the house. Syra’s monologue looks like an exit monologue concluding an act, and Charinus’ monologue like an entrance monologue opening the next one.52 One could argue against this that a series of monologues like this is not infrequently used elsewhere as an element of retardation before an important and lively part of the action, e.g. Am. 974-1008, Au. 363-389, Ba. 349-384, 500-529, 1067-1086, Cap. 461-515, Ps. 562-592, Ru. 440-484, 584-614, 892-937, Tru. 434-474, and Ht. 615-642, especially in the sequence of entrance and exit monologue (which is inverted in the Mercator).53 One might also think of an act-break after 956 as suggested by Freté (see above), as the entry of Demipho and Lysimachus in mid-conversation at 957 bears strong resemblance to a standard device of beginning a new act in Menandrian comedy.54 This would leave act V with little action, but it is possible that Plautus telescoped the dialogue between the senes (lines 957-961 in the Mercator).

As for the act-break put after line 224 by Legrand (he characterizes it as “pause admissible”),55 it is certainly right that the stage becomes vacant at that point and that from then on until 498 the action of the Latin version of the play is continuous. However,

51 Legrand is followed by Freté (1930) 42 and Webster (1970) 132 n.2.
52 The fact that Syra does not immediately follow Eutychus into the house, contravening the latter’s order (816 sequere me), is peculiar. Leo (1912) 119f. offers an explanation that does not convince.
53 See Denzler (1968) 127 n.385. On consecutive soliloquies delivered by two characters neither of whom is dramatically related to the other in New Comedy see Gomme/Sandbach on Dys. 666; Jachmann (1931) 76 n.1 mistakenly thought that such a succession was contrary to Greek dramatic conventions.
Legrand had already noted that a break at that point would be hardly desirable. Acanthio’s warning has prepared for Demipho’s imminent appearance (cf. 223f.).

Freté notes that the stage may become vacant after line 224, but he raises some objections: “Mais Acanthion, arrivé du port en toute hâte, 109, conseille à Charin d’y retourner par la ruelle, non par le chemin normal, de peur de croiser son père, déjà sur ce chemin, et que l’esclave Acanthion a gagné de vitesse. Charin et son esclave partent donc par la ruelle, 224, et le public s’attend à voir paraître le père, Démiophon, par la coulisse du port. Un entr’acte 224-225 rompait cet effet et n’est guère admissible.” On the other hand, Burckhardt strongly advocates a break after 224. She argues that there is a tendency for the stage to be vacant not long after the beginning of the play, and she compares An. 171, Ht. 170, Eu. 206, Ph. 152, Hec. 197, Ad. 154, Au. 119, Ba. 108, Cis. 202, Cas. 143, Ru. 184, Tri. 222, As. 126, Cap. 194, Cu. 215, Ep. 165, Men. 225.

Contrary to this, Lowe has suggested that the first choral interlude is after 334, after Demipho’s scene with Lysimachus. In Lowe’s opinion Plautus has “there bridged a Greek act-division by keeping Demipho on stage for his meeting with Charinus in the following scene.” The first reason adduced by Lowe is that it is unconvincing for Demipho to be idle during Charinus monologue (335-363) instead of going inside at the end of the first act, only to re-emerge from his house and meet his son at about 366. Further, there is an awkwardness in Demipho’s statement that he wants to go to the harbour (328f.) just after Lysimachus has said the same (326), Lowe regards it as implausible “that Demipho, having gone to the harbour at dawn (255), completed his business there (256) and returned home, should propose to go back to the harbour before he has even entered his house and without any real explanation. The hypothesis that Plautus inserted 328-329a in order to keep Demipho on stage and thus bridge a Greek act-division provides an explanation for this awkwardness. The pretext of negotium at the harbour could more appropriately have motivated Demipho’s emergence from his house in a new act after a lapse of time, and it is possible that Philemon so used it.” Lowe’s suggestion has much to be said for it, and his arguments are strong ones. Yet, it remains unclear why Plautus should avail himself of an obviously awkward and repetitious phrase in order to bridge the act-break rather than have Demipho deliver some short monologue, musing on the follies of love or planning his further actions. On the other hand, lines 1-224 do not contain much in terms of dramatic action, and Lowe’s assumption would account for that. However, since it remains unclear to what

---

56 Legrand was followed by Burckhardt (1927) 45f. and Webster (1970) 130.
57 Freté (1930) 41.
58 She also compares Men. Epit. 171, Ph. 266; one may now add Asp. 249, Dysc. 232, Sam. 119.
59 See Lowe (forthcoming).
60 His aside (364 quid illuc est quod solus secum fabulatur filius?) points at the artificiality of the situation, using a stereotyped phrase that can be paralleled in Menander, see Bain (1977) 158.
61 For an alternative explanation involving double entendre see 328n.
extent Plautus has actually expanded the opening scenes, I feel reluctant to adopt Lowe's attractive theory.

3. The Scenario of the Mercator
In the following, I have compiled a scenario of the Mercator to illustrate my point of view concerning the act-division of the Greek original. A final verdict on the exact structure of the Emporos seems impossible to reach despite of the comparatively straightforward structure of the Mercator.

Prologue (lines 1-110) (Spoken verse)
Delivered by the young lover CHARINUS in front of the two houses of Lysimachus and Demipho. The story of Charinus' amorous affairs comes in two instalments:

(1) The first love-affair (40-97): 'After my ephebate, I fell madly in love with a courtesan and carried Father's money off to her pimp. Father was very angry. I agreed to travel to Rhodes for business with Acanthio. There I made huge profits, enough to put some aside for myself.'

Basically this story could provide the material for the plot of another comedy, albeit with an untypical ending: the pater durus is triumphant, the adulescens amator is exiled and turns into an 'uncomic' figure, that of the successful businessman.

In the course of this long narrative the character of Demipho is established as the epitome of a pater durus. His austerity motivates Charinus' fear of Demipho seeing the girl, and this fact is, in turn, used to motivate the first deception at 107f. (the concealment of Pasicompsa aboard the ship at the harbour). It also motivates Demipho's fear that his son might find out about his love for the girl (333f.).

(2) The second love-affair (97-107): 'I met a hospitable fellow at the harbour. He entertained me at his house and sent me with a beautiful young girl who spent the night with me. I fell madly in love with her, bought her and brought her back home. I'm going to conceal her on the ship so that Father doesn't see her.'

Exposition (lines 111-224)
Enter ACANTHIO from the harbour:

(111-140) (Canticum)
AC. I have terrible news! Open up! (Banging the door of Demipho's house.)

(141-224) (Recitative)
CH. (stepping forward, anxiously) What's the matter? - AC. Disaster! Your father has seen her! CH. Oh no! AC. But don't worry, he thinks she's a present for your mother ...' (second deception, 201-212).
CH. (turning to the exit leading to the harbour) Why do I not go to the ship? Follow me.
AC. No, don’t go there, or you’ll run into the arms of your father, and he’ll cross-examine you. CH. O.K., let’s go off the other way. (Both off by the exit leading to town.)

(χοροῦ end of μέρος A in Greek original)

Complication (lines 225-666)
Enter DEMIPHO from the harbour, in an agitated state.

(225-334) (Spoken Verse)
DE. I had a strange dream: I bought a beautiful goat and entrusted her to a monkey, but the monkey told me to take her back. Then a young he-goat approached me, claiming that he had taken the she-goat. Terrible! This morning, down at the harbour, I saw my son’s ship. There I fell in love with a beautiful girl. I suppose she is the she-goat, but I have no idea about the other animals. (225-271)

(Lysimachus enters his house, followed by a slave.) LY. Tell my wife that I shan’t come to the country, I have court business here. (Slave off). DE. (approaching him) I am madly in love. LY. Be ashamed of yourself. Now I have business at the harbour. (off to the harbour, 328) DE. (aside:) Why, I’ve also got business at the harbour. (Enter CH.) There’s my son. I’ll wait for him. (Steps aside.)

(335-363) (Canticum)
Enter Charinus from town, in a desperate mood:) CH. Oh dear! I’ll lose my girl.

(364-498) (Recitative)
(Approaches Demipho) DE. Have you bought a girl? CH. Yes. DE. We need to sell her. Someone has commissioned me to buy a girl like her. CH. I was asked to do the same. DE. My client offers a pricely sum. CH. Mine offers more. DE. He’ll never get her. She’ll be sold. (468, off to harbour). CH. (is devastated) Oh dear! (EUTYCHUS is already present, standing in front of the house of LY.) CH. (continues) I’ll kill myself. (starts to go off) EU. (rushes towards Charinus) Wait! I’ll buy the girl for you. CH. A great plan! (EU. off to the harbour, CH. off into DE.’s house.) (469-498)

498 (χοροῦ: end of μέρος B in Greek original)

(499-543) (lively Recitative in place of Canticum)
Enter LYSIMACHUS with PASICOMPSA from the harbour; he is dragging her along)
PA. Why did you buy me? LY. You’ve been bought back for your former master. PA. Wonderful! (Both off into LY.’s house).

(544-587) (Spoken Verse)
(Enter DE. from the harbour.) I’ll enjoy myself as long as I can. My neighbour will put the girl up in rented accommodation for me. (544-561) (Enter LY. from his house) I’ll lead him
to you. DE. (approaches him, eagerly:) Please lead me to her. LY. You old fool! DE. (suavely) Let's hire a cook for a party. LY. Good idea. (Both off to town.) (561-587)

(588-666) (Recitative)

(Enter CH. from DE.'s house.) Oh, dear! Will Eutychus ever come back? (Sees him.) CH. What's happened? EU. Disaster! The girl's been sold to an Athenian citizen. CH. Oh dear! I'm off into exile. (Off into DE.'s house.) EU. I must search the city for the girl. (Off to town.) (667-829)

Reversal (lines 667-829)

(Enter DORIPPA from the country. SYRA following at a distance. ) I'll find out what's going on. (Turning back.) SYRA, go inside while I pray. (SY. off into LY.'s house.) Apollo, help us! SY. (bursting out of the house, in an agitated mood) Oh dear! Come and see that prostitute in our home! (Both off into the house. ) (667-691)

691 (χορος: end of μέρος Γ in Greek original)

(Enter LY. from town) Where is the cook we've hired? (692-699) (Enter DO. and SY. from the house.) LY. (approaches her) Hello, my dearest! DO. Who's that woman? LY. Woman? DO. I'll find out anyway. LY. She's been entrusted to me. DO. That's a bad excuse. DO. (desperately) I'm stuck! (700-740)

(Enter the COOK with his ASSISTANTS from the forum, carrying baskets with food and other party equipment. The stage is getting crowded;) CO. There we are! LY. Ssh, go away! CO. But you are the man who hired us. (LY. is cringing,) DO. (triumphantly, looks knowingly at SY.) There we go! LY. Off with you. (AS. drop the baskets in front of LY. CO. and AS. off to town.) DO. (angrily) SYRA, go and fetch Dad. (SY. off to town, DO. off into the house.) LY. Oh, dear. My neighbour has to take the girl back! (Off to the forum to see DE.) (744-802)

802 (χορος: end of μέρος Δ in Greek original?)

(Enter SY. from town.) The father of my mistress wasn't at home. EU. (enters from town, tired and desperate, approaches SY.) SY. Your father has brought a girlfriend into your home! EU. Is she still inside? SY. Yes. EU. Follow me. (EU. off into the house; SY. stays behind) (803-816) SY. More justice! Both husband and wife should do what they want with impunity. (Off into the house.) (819-829)

(830-1026) (Recitative)

Resolution (lines 830-1026)

(Enter CH. from DE.'s house, dressed as a soldier.) CH. Goodbye, my home! I'm off. (830-841). (Enter EU. from the house, in a cheerful mood.) EU. (approaching CH.) Don't go. I've found the girl. She's in our house. CH. (happily) Wonderful! (calls out a SLAVE and hands him his military cloak. Enter SL., then SL. off. To the slave:) Bring me a mantle. (To
EU.) Lead me to her. EU. Not yet. CH. (disappointedly) You’ve been lying. (Turns to go.) I’m off. Bring out the cloak again. (Enter SL., handing cloak to CH., then SL. off.) EU. (begs) Don’t go. CH. I’m off. (Making fantastic gestures, as if climbing a chariot and riding on it.) There, that’s Cyprus, that’s Chalcis. EU. You’re mad! CH. I’ve just heard that my girl is here in Athens. EU. Good! Now come on. CH. Lead me to her. EU. I will. (Both off into LY.’s house.) (842-956)

(Enter LY. and DE. from town.) LY. I’m worried about my wife. DE. I’ll explain it to her. (957-961). (Enter EU. from LY.’s house.) EU. (to DE.) You’ve no girl-friend any more. DE. I protest. LY./EU. Be ashamed of yourself! You took her from your own son! DE. Oh dear! Well, he shall have her. I want him not to be angry with me. EU. Don’t worry. But before we go off, I’d like to announce an edict. (In a grandiose fashion:) The old shall not love, but the young shall. Hereafter the old shall support the love-affairs of the young. (Turning to the audience:) That’s it, folks. If you like this law, and for the old men’s sake, clap your hands. (962-1026)

1026

(end of μετρος Ε in Greek original)

4. Monologues in the Mercator

At first glance, the Mercator appears to be a rather conventional play. There are no face-to-face verbal attacks, violent commotion, nor any other signs of fabula motoria. Most of the scenes contain a different kind of humour, based on verbal ingeniosity, punning, double entendres, sexual confrontations, errors, mistaken identities, cluelessness (especially on the side of the adulscens amator), melodrama, contrasted characters, and various grotesqueries.

In this context, the exceptional character of the Mercator with regard to its monologues may be noted. It is a play that has a more reflective character, a fabula stataria, than other Plautine comedies, e.g. Stichus or Menaechmi. Thirty-one percent of its text consisting of monologues, the Mercator is not only the play containing the highest number of monologues in Plautus, but also in Terence, equal in this respect only to Senecan tragedy. Actually, the average percentage for monologues in Plautine comedy is seventeen percent (as against twelve in Terence).

---

62 For the terms fabula stataria ‘a play which involves little vigorous action’ and fabula motoria ‘a play full of action’, see Brothers on Ht. 20, cf. Don. Ter. An. 24.
63 See Duckworth (1952) 103 n.4.
64 On the importance of monologues for establishing actor-audience rapport see Moore (1998) 24-49; on Charinus’ greater rapport with the audience in Mercator through his monologues (if compared with Demipho who has about 100 lines less of monologue), see Moore (1998) 33.
65 There are no equally representative figures for New Comedy, but Dyskolos has the high proportion of twenty-six percent, see Blundell (1980) 28-64, Barsby on Ba. 170-177.
Monologues may also have been a hallmark of Philemonian style, which may be suggested by the fact that Philemon’s style was described by Demetrius as ἐςανάγγλωστος (‘easy to read aloud’) in opposition to Menander’s λέξις, which is called ἅποκριτική (‘suited for delivery’, i.e. by a performing actor), perhaps pointing to different modes of reception. There is no reason to believe that the high proportion of monologue in the Mercator could not reflect an equally high proportion in the Emporos.

Menander’s Samia is a play in which the playwright has also made extensive use of monologues. As in the Mercator, the two main users of monologues are the two principal characters, Moschion and Demeas (like Charinus and Demipho). The use of monologues provides the audience with insight into the feelings and reactions of characters which would not have been revealed in the same way in dialogue. Since Demipho and Charinus, just like Moschion and Demeas, have to conceal something from each other for the duration of almost the entire play and cannot talk openly to each other, monologue is the medium of communication that is left to the playwright to achieve his main objective, i.e. to communicate well with his audience, and indeed monologues do contain numerous instances of audience-address in this play and elsewhere in ancient comedy, a technique that may ultimately derive from Old Comedy, but is used differently by the playwrights of New Comedy, i.e. not to merely joke with (or about) the spectators, but to establish some kind of rapport with them. At the same time, the Mercator is one of the plays containing very few cantica, namely two, amounting to a total of a mere 67 lines.

In addition to this, an analysis of the changes of metre in the Mercator shows that this play, with only 25 metrical changes (Verswechseln) per 1000 lines contains one of the lowest numbers of such changes in extant Roman comedy. Lower figures are only found in As. (12/1000) and Mil. (11/1000).

Iambic senarii account for about 36% of the text, trochaic septenarii for more than half of it (about 53%), the remaining 11% being taken up by two cantica and a scene in iambic septenarii (499-543). This is a very high proportion of ‘recitative’ and cantica taken together. This means that the Mercator is to be imagined as produced with a lot of

---

66 Demetrius De elocutione 193 Radermacher.
67 It is likely that Menander’s and Philemon’s dramatic techniques differed in some way, even if we cannot ascertain exactly how, see e.g. Handley CHCL 1.2 172 on Diphilus and Philemon: “It is eminently credible from the scale on which some motifs are treated in the fragments that both poets had a more relaxed, more traditional, and in a sense more comic attitude to comic writing [...]. Philemon, on the evidence of the Latin plays, excelled in comedy of situation; in the Greek that we have the pompous heavy-footedness of some of his writing, as opposed to Menander, reminds one of Plautus as opposed to Terence, and suggests a man with broader rather than subtler theatrical effect in mind.”
70 For the statistics see Braun (1970a) 70. On metrical changes in Terence see Bruder (1970). A comparable study for Plautus is still a desideratum.
musical accompaniment' of some sort or another, leaving much room on the one hand for farcical interludes (e.g. the *servus currens* routine at 111-140 or Lysimachus' advances to Pasicompsa at 499-543), on the other for personal reflection (e.g. Charinus' monologue which is actually better called a monody, at 335-363). If one further looks at the scenes where iambic senarii are used, one finds that the majority of them is used in monologic passages (1-110, 225-271, 544-561, 678-680, 692-699, 700-704, 705-707, 741-748, 789-802, 803-804, 805-807, 817-829) and a significantly smaller number of lines in dialogue (667-677, 681-691, 708-740, 749-788, 808-816), again pointing to a reflective overall mood in this play. Conversely, most of the time when characters in this play talk to each other, they actually 'sing'. The reason why longer stretches of scenes IV.1-5 have been composed in iambic senarii is probably that action and dialogue become more and more complicated and turbulent, and that verbal humour is very much part of the comic effect of these scenes. Verbal humour, however, is best picked up when the characters do not 'sing' It is hard to say whether it is also an indication for a less drastic Plautine intervention into the texture of the Greek model. It is noteworthy that the pacing of the fourth act is considerably faster than that of the other acts, which may be another indication of relative faithfulness to the movement of the Philemonian plot - which does not mean to say that any significant variations in the pacing of the action elsewhere in the play will necessarily be Plautine.

5. The Pacing of the Action
Another feature of the play that may help to determine Plautine originality is the way the playwright handles the pacing of the action. It is generally assumed that passages where 'nothing happens' are owed to Plautine expansion, increasing the impression of farcical prolixity, whereas passages where the action advances and developments are brought on their way are not unlikely to derive in some form from the Greek model. This theory was argued for by Fraenkel, and it can be found again in Lefèvre (1995), who holds the view that Greek comedy possessed *oikovôxia*, 'dramatic economy', whereas Roman comedy was prone to being rather more verbose and incoherent in structure.

While admitting that Plautus expanded on some scenes of the originals he used for adaptation (at the same time compressing or dropping others), I remain unconvinced that 'retardation' of the dramatic action is a valid criterion that would help to decide questions of Plautine originality.

72 See the summary in Fraenkel (1960) 379-384.
74 See already Tierney (1945) 52: "Fraenkel lays great stress on retardation of the action as such, and constantly uses this criterion to diagnose Plautine additions, for although he several times theoretically admits that the comic poet may wander off the high-road of plot-development, he yet in fact does not allow this viewpoint in his handling of particular Plautine passages. We do possess a good example of retardation at *Samia* 295 [641 Sandbach] where Moschion after meeting Parmenon, the man he most desires to see, yet
On the other hand, the Mercator is indeed unevenly paced. Lines 1–498 contain little action and do not greatly increase the amount of information available to the spectators. Lines 499-587 and 667-740 do, and (allowing for some substantial expansion in 842-956 and 962-1026) so do lines 499-1026 in general. While the first half of the play is acted out with four characters, an additional three (plus a number of mute extras) will be introduced in the second half, actually within less than a hundred lines (Dorippa at 667, Syra at 672, the cook and his team at 741); in most ‘scenes’ in the first half, no more than two actors (discounting the ‘extra’ at 282) are present on stage, in the second half, there are up to four on stage (in IV.4) at the same time.

6. The Casina and the Mercator

The resemblance of the plot of the Mercator to the Casina (in which father and son are rivals for the favours of the foundling Casina), Asinaria (in which the father becomes the rival of the son as the plot develops), and Bacchides (in which the fathers become the ‘rivals’ of their sons at the end of the play), has been noted by several scholars.

The Mercator presents a plot of intrigue in which the usual arch-intriguer and his dupe are replaced by two characters intriguing against each other. The experienced playgoer anticipates that Acanthio will function as servus callidus and carry out an intrigue against Demipho, but his role turns out to be of little importance, as the later trend of the plot makes his presence unnecessary, even undesirable, beyond the expository scenes.

The broad similarities between the Casina and the Mercator are noted by Forehand (1973) 251f.: “The basic conflict of father vs. son for the right to a slave girl is similar in each; both show us an old man committed to actions improper to his age and position; there are a number of interesting expressions common to both, e.g. the use of the Jupiter-Juno image for husband and wife, or the use in both of the word vervex.” Then he lists a number...
of important differences, such as "the attitudes of the old men to their actions and in the shifting of the focus in the Casina from father-son quarrel to husband-wife conflict."

Forehand (1973) 239-241 stresses the independent modelling of Lysidamus as a senex amator, especially when compared with Demipho, who tries to give some kind of (standard comic) excuse for his behaviour (cf. 316-321, 544-561), while Lysidamus is simply a nihilii cana culex, 'a worthless grayhead gnat' (Cas. 239), not the least interested in propriety (cf. Cas. 515-519).81

This impression is reinforced by the behaviour of both senes in the final scenes of both plays, see Forehand (1973) 250: "Demipho is not really a repentant sinner at the discovery of his actions. Like Lysidamus, his primary concern is to get out of trouble, but under pressure he eventually admits he is wrong even though grudgingly. In this regard he is different from Lysidamus, and certainly he is in no way as whittling or time-serving." A comparison of the last few lines of both plays is instructive. While in the Mercator, without trying to appeal for the abolition of the sexual double standard, there is a call for decency and moderation among the senes, the final comment in the Casina grants all the pleasures sought after by Lysidamus (Cas. 1016 clam uxorem ducet semper scortum quod volet) to the audience on the condition that they - applaud. Forehand (1973) 253 is right in concluding that in the Mercator "we are presented with a set of characters who eventually do what is expected of them. [...] Demipho has a proclivity toward straying from the marital straight and narrow, but on the whole he does not repel us as totally offensive. On the other hand, Lysidamus never rises above the implications of his lecherous objectives. [...] Lysidamus learns, not that he should not philander, but that he should not be caught."

More recently, O'Bryhim (1989) investigated various aspects of the originality of the Casina, comparing the characterization of the senes amatores in the Casina with that in the Mercator and the Asinaria, finding a close similarity between the former and the Casina; not all of his points (p. 86f.) will stand up to scrutiny (especially not points 8 and 10; some others are trivial as they are the natural elements of a plot involving a senex amator), but the ones that he has in common with Cody and Forehand are convincing enough; notable additions of O'Bryhim are: the senex offers to be whipped, the expression capite cano (Cas. 518 - Mer. 305), the proverbial joke about 'lovers feeding on love alone' (Cas. 795, 802 - Mer. 744), the 'bad breath' joke (Cas. 727, 731a-732b - Mer. 574f.), but all of them (or at

artificial device for determining who will have the girl (the allotment in the Casina and the auction in the Mercator)."81

---

81 Forehand (1973) 240f.: "[Demipho] is certainly not conscience-stricken, but he does acknowledge that his actions can best be defended by asking forgiveness in advance. Appeals to convention are totally lost on Lysidamus - he is only concerned with accomplishing his plans for lechery. [...] He is an exceptional senex not because of his lechery and foolishness, which he shares with other representatives of the type, but because he exhibits these traits without the characteristics which tend to soften our disapproval of the objectionable deeds of other old men."
least the last three) are likely to be common comic stock-in-trade in senex-amator-plays. None of these similarities, however, makes a case for large-scale contaminatio, as O’Bryhim (1989) 87f. claims. There is something to be said for the idea that Plautus recycled certain isolated jokes or phrases that he knew would raise a laugh as they had done so before in other play (Plautus imitator sui), and that theory would be sufficient to account for the similarities in verbal humour. As for the similarities in situation, they are probably best taken to reflect what was a comic stock situation.

7. Some Thoughts on Plautine Originality

‘Plautine’ versus ‘non-Plautine’ is a strange dichotomy, for the comedies that we have are all Plautine in the sense that they are from Plautus’ pen, whatever his model may have been.82 We have almost no remains of the plays he used as models.

The question to be asked, then, is to what purpose should one try to determine which passage is ‘Greek’ and which ‘Roman’? First, to investigate Plautine techniques of adaptation in order to appreciate Plautus’ artistic qualities. Second, to gain indirect information about New Comedy, about authors who we would otherwise only know by a few fragments. The second purpose is faute de mieux, as it would be preferable to gain such information from the Greek texts, if only we had more of them.83

The question of Plautine originality leads to the question of the ‘stage conventions’ of New Comedy and Roman comedy. More recently, the absence of any one specific Hellenic comedy as a model has been claimed for Amphitruo,84 Epidicus,85 Asinaria,86 and Menaechmi.87 This assertion rests upon assumptions about what are the Greek and what are the non-Greek features of each play. In each case the arguments are of a similar structure. After establishing a norm as characteristic of Hellenistic comedy, deviations from that norm in the Roman adaptations are explained by certain known facts relating to the tradition of the Latin texts and the methods of composition followed by the Roman playwrights. In other words, after claiming that according to Greek stage conventions a certain passage (or a whole play) could not have been composed the way it is, the passage is interpreted in terms

82 The uniformity of style points to a single person’s authorship, see Gratwick (1993) 5.
83 To follow up the question of Plautine originality as an end in itself is, to my view, a vain effort. Harsh (1937) 293 concludes his brief study of the subject with the following words which I fully endorse: “[The] method of distinguishing Roman workmanship from Greek by means of logical analysis and theoretical standards of dramatic technique must definitely and finally be abandoned.” See Eagleton (1996) 157 for a general criticism of ‘secondary revision’ of texts by literary scholars: “In its obsessive pursuit of ‘harmony’, ‘coherence’, ‘deep structure’ or ‘essential meaning’, such theory fills in the text’s gaps and smooths over its contradictions, domesticating its disparate aspects and defusing its conflicts.”
84 Lefèvre (1982) claims that Plautus used a Greek tragedy but made up the plot of Amphitruo from scratch.
85 Goldberg (1978).
of Italian orality as a specimen of extempore farce. The conclusion that is drawn is that Plautus either introduced considerable changes to the Greek play (as Lefèvre assumes for *Mercator*)\(^8\) or that Plautus even invented the entire play, as there was no Greek original in the first place.

The argument rests on two propositions: (a) that tightly circumscribed conventions were observed by the authors of New Comedy, and (b) that where one finds any of these conventions violated, the inevitable conclusion is that they are the result of Plautus’ ‘messing’ with the text.\(^8\)

An example of the kind of assumptions made about Menandrian comedy is the conclusion of a book on the role of Tyche in Menandrian comedy: “Dieses Ergebnis, wie kalkuliert und geschlossen Menander seine Handlungen konstruiert hat, ist nun auch in Hinblick auf die römische Komödie von Belang. Denn der im einzelnen geführte Nachweis einer tatsächlich bis ins Detail reichenden lückenlosen Kausalität schließt aus, sich künftig auf eines der hier analysierten Stücke als Kronzeugen zu berufen, wenn man für menandrische Provenienz einer bei Plautus oder Terenz auftretenden Unstimmigkeit argumentieren will. Im Gegenteil erweisen sich Stringenz und Stimmigkeit als kompositorische Werte an sich, und es ist kaum denkbar, daß dieses Resultat nicht auch für die verlorenen Stücke gälte.”\(^9\) Although our picture of Menander is necessarily distorted by the dearth of material we have, let us assume for the sake of argument that this view of Menandrian dramaturgy is indeed correct and that Menander strove for a thoroughgoing causal concatenation of all events on stage and avoided inconsistencies of the plot. Does this assumption help us with Philemon? Lefèvre, for example, argues that when Syra returns without Dorippa’s father at *Mer.* 803 (whom she was sent off to fetch at 788), this would constitute “ein blindes oder abgebrochenes Motiv.” In order to substantiate this claim, he invokes the conventions of New Comedy, which he extrapolates from what we have of Menandrian comedy. In Lefèvre’s view, Syra is needed to bring about the denouement, as Lefèvre postulates an *anagnorisis* (recognition scene) at the end of the *Mercator* during which Pasicompsa is recognized as Lysimachus’ long-lost daughter, restored to her citizen status, and married off to Charinus.\(^9\)

However, to characterize the Roman playwrights by putting them next to Menander is not equivalent to characterizing Menander by putting his works next to those of his contemporaries. The attribution of individual characteristics to poets like Philemon or

\(^8\) Lefèvre (1995) 13 claims “eine durchgreifende Bearbeitung” of the play by Plautus.


\(91\) See Lefèvre (1995) 18f. Lefèvre’s idea is not original. An *anagnorisis* as the finale of the *Mercator* was already proposed by Rambelli (1957) 55 and 86, a work not mentioned by Lefèvre.
Diphilus rests primarily on the interpretation of the Roman plays, and is thus always in danger of being vitiated by circularity of argument. Sometimes it requires an assumption of uniformity of structure and treatment within a playwright’s work which may be correct but still incapable of proof. With a view to the development after the publication of the *Dyskolos* and other papyri containing fragments of New Comedy plays, Dover stated that the “papyri stimulated interest in the separation of Greek from Roman elements in the Roman plays, but this work has been most fruitful when its purpose has been to construct a positive picture of the Roman element; attempts to give an equally positive picture of the Greek element tend to be vitiated by an oppressively subjective assumption that the Greeks were *dramaturgically impeccable* [my italics].”92 Indeed, *faciunt favos et vespae*. In a similar way, Prescott criticized the ideology that “in Plautus everything artistically satisfying is Greek in origin, everything defective and weak is Roman botching.” He warns against a narrow-mindedness that would ignore “the possibility that many of the defects of form in Roman comedy are Greek in origin and natural survivals of the incoherence of earlier stages of the Greek type.”93 It is our very lack of precise knowledge about the writers of Middle and New Comedy, with the partial exception of Menander, which makes it impossible to use such generalizations to support wide-ranging conclusions about Roman comedy.94

8. ‘Metatheatre’ and ‘Realism’

The term ‘metatheatre’ is defined by Slater as “theatrically self-conscious theatre, i.e., theatre that demonstrates an awareness of its own theatricality.”95 In view of this definition, it is tempting to ask whether any kind of theatre that is unconscious of its own theatricality is actually conceivable, since all theatre is by necessity performed, and performance presupposes within the mind of the performer (and, since performance is a form of

93 Prescott (1916) 145.
94 Tierney (1943) 184 criticized that method as “a straitjacketing of drama into some quite artificial scheme of imagined correctness.” Similarly Gratwick (1993) 23 n.27 notes that Stärk (1989), claiming that there was no Greek original for the *Menaechmi*, “is over-confident that none of the sixty-four exponents of New Comedy whom Alexandrian scholarship later distinguished could possibly have devised a plot (as he would have it) so repetitively mechanical and implausible.” On the variety of plots in New Comedy see Brown (1990) 241-244. See also Csapo (1986) 114: “‘Sober realism’ and ‘gratuitous scurrility’ are no touchstone of Roman creativity. Who would assert that the Greeks were incapable of either? So long as a deviation from a demonstrated norm does not dislodge any of the specific components which generate the humour of a stock situation, there is no need to explain the deviation in terms other than the (original) author’s natural desire to nurture or play upon the tradition he uses.” Pöschl (1973) suggested that German scholarship from Leo on was very much concerned with the methods of text criticism. The ‘archetype’ of Roman comedy and Roman elegy was New Comedy. If the two genres had a common ‘reading’, it has to be referred to their antecedents in New Comedy. Further, he suggests that this model served for the entire relationship between Greece and Rome, pointing out the superiority of the former, see Halporn (1993) 209 n.6: “How this chronological priority should lead to an aesthetic judgement is not clearly argued by Pöschl, and the notion that the source is superior to the later text is exactly that.” See also Slater (1985) 6f.
95 Slater (1985) 14.
communication, within the minds of the spectators) a consciousness of the fact that he is performing. Slater admits that jokes "about the play as a play go back to Aristophanes, where they tend to be isolated phenomena." He rightly observes that "Plautine drama is full of references to the play as a play and to the performers as players and playwrights." Thus the term 'metatheatre' as currently used is shorthand for 'producing references to the play and its performance within the play itself', and as such is unlikely to carry us further than to the truism that any performer and any audience watching him are conscious of the fact that he is performing and that they are watching. Its use should probably have been confined to the field of literary studies where it was coined, namely the study of Renaissance drama, where Abel (1963) called 'metaplays' such plays that deal with life as already theatricalized, which is, it would appear, a sound application of the terminology. 97

9. Conclusion
My main thesis shall be restated at this point. The Mercator preserves much of its Greek substance, allowing for the fact that Plautus may have expanded or telescoped the plot in loco and that passages of the Mercator may be hyper-Hellenic, Plautus guising as a 'Greek' author where he chooses to, leaving us little or no chance to find out whether he really is or not, posing as farceur and poeta at the same time. He leaves it to his spectators to decide whether they are watching an extempore play or not, and to build up expectations about the behaviour of the characters which may or may not be met in the course of the play. Plautine drama is the cooperative creation of playwright, actors, and spectators. When completely realized, it exists in a mutual interrelationship between these three, an intercourse from which it issues and on which it depends. 98

96 See Pfister (1997) 149.
97 Abel's definition of metatheatre is summarized by Slater (1985) 170 in the two propositions "the world's a stage" and "life is a dream". Abel developed his theory first in connection with Spanish Renaissance drama, in particular Lope de Vega. The application of these concepts to ancient theatre leaves me with strong doubts. Slater himself (p. 172) states that "Plautine metatheatre is [...] quite different from that described by Abel in the Renaissance and after. Life is not seen as equally theatricalized for all. The stage world divides into players and playwrights, poets and poetic material." This view does not sufficiently consider Plautus' main concern, that is, to entertain his audience with deceptive charades. Plautine comedy is not concerned with "a celebration of the power of imagination" (Slater p. 177), but becomes alive only as a continuous agon between the spectators' and the playwright's wits, leaving those behind who can be gulled into believing that what they see on stage is extemporized drama of the usual kind. See also the criticisms of the application of the term to Plautine theatre by Anderson (1993) 138f. and Gratwick (1993) 15.
98 Hoban (1988) 99 writes about her experience as a modern producer of the Mercator: "[...] the script was almost like a musical score. Very few people could have read it and understood its full potential, yet when it was performed, it was completely accessible to everyone."
Abbreviations and Preliminary Notes

1. The Text
The text is based on Leo's edition. Comments on editorial decisions will be made (a) where my text deviates from Leo's, (b) where editorial decisions made by other scholars and accepted by Leo or such arrived at by Leo himself merit clarification, (c) where the paradosis needs further explanation. Conversely, this means that editorial decisions reached by Leo for obvious reasons will not be commented on. I am conscious of the fact that a subjective element in deciding about this cannot be avoided. In view of the limitations imposed on a work of the present nature, I chose, where in doubt, to err on the side of brevity.

2. Metrical Abbreviations Used in the Commentary
- = longum, ~ = breve, ~ = resolution (in iambic, trochaic, bacchiac metres), x = anceps, IK = iambic shortening (iambenkürzung); ia = x — ; ia² iambic measure, ia⁴ iambic dimeter, ia⁶ iambic senarius, ia⁸ iambic octonarius; tr = — x; tr² trochaic measure, tr⁴ trochaic dimeter, tr⁷ trochaic senarius, tr⁸ trochaic octonarius; ba = x — — ; ba² bacchiac dimeter, ba⁴ bacchiac colon (= sycopated bacchiac dimeter), see Questa (1967) 218; an = —— ; an⁴ anapaestic tetrameter; ^ = catalectic, docked by one place, last or penultimate, e.g. ba⁴

3. Alphabetic Scansion
In the commentary section metrically doubtful lines have been analysed using the alphabetic notation described by Gratwick (1986), (1987) 268-283 and (1993) 40-63 and 251-256, considering the senarius and all but the first three positions of the septenarius as consisting of three measures of four positions each, labelling these positions alphabetically (A B C D). A heavy syllable is represented by an upper-case letter, a light syllable by a lower-case letter. The standard patterns (in alphabetic notation) of the iambic senarius and the trochaic septenarius are:

\[ ABCD // AbCD // \]
and \[ BCDA // AbCD // \]
The iambic septenarius can be rendered thus:

\[ ABCD ABCD // AbCD // AbCD // \]
For the rarer iambo-trochaic and lyric metres, see my notes in the commentary section.
4. Policy of Brevity

In redacting this commentary, a strict policy of brevity had to be implemented. Its principles are as follows:

1. Variant readings of the text are only discussed where they are of importance to the edition of a readable and workable text, or where their reportage is deemed to have some general didactic value.

2. Lines will be scanned in full where there is need to illustrate a general point, a specific metrical problem with some bearing on an editorial decision, or a metrically difficult line.

3. Instead of listing as many references as possible, only the most recent one or the one(s) providing the most comprehensive treatment of a certain question will be given *exempli gratia*. This policy will be handled flexibly if other works contain material of great interest or valuable cross-references.

4. The discussion of parallels is limited to a minimum, especially of post-Republican parallels or such taken from genres other than drama. Greek and Roman texts are only quoted if the wording has direct bearing on the discussion of the passage in *Mercator*. Parallels from mediaeval and modern literature have been reduced to a very small number.

5.1. References to secondary literature are given using the Harvard system. References to a work *passim* are simply set as, e.g., "Boldrini (1999)" instead of "Boldrini (1999) *passim*"; the word "see" is not used to introduce references to works of modern scholarship; however, "cf." is used to introduce parallels from ancient authors.¹

5.2. References to commentaries on the *Mercator* are given in the form ‘name of author’ (e.g. Ussing) + ‘ad loc.’ References to commentaries on other works are given as (e.g.) ‘Gratwick on Men. 180f.’

5.3. ‘Leo’ without further specification means ‘Leo (1895) in his apparatus criticus ad loc.’; ‘Enk’ without further specification means ‘Enk (1932) ad loc.’ References to emendations and conjectures suggested by scholars are made by name of the scholar only if they can be traced through the critical apparatuses of Goetz/Schoell, Leo, Lindsay, Enk, and Ernout; if not, they are given in full (see 5.1).

6. The bibliography is not intended to be exhaustive. See Hughes (1975) and Bubel (1992) for extensive bibliographies. Some recent monographs also contain good bibliographies, e.g. Moore (1998).

7. Words that are sufficiently explained in *LSJ, OLD* or *OCD* are not usually discussed in the commentary.

¹ In his recent works on Plautine comedy, Zwierlein suggests the excision of a considerable number of lines. However, where he does not provide reasons for these deletions, his suggestions have been glossed over in silence to save space.
8. Some of the longer scenes are prefaced with an 'Introduction' concerned with form and function of the scene, followed by a lemmatic commentary. At the end of several scenes there is a 'Discussion' dealing with questions of Plautine originality and the significance of the scene in the wider context of the play. For some smaller scenes I have dispensed with a concluding section.

9. The *argumenta* prefixed to the *Mercator* will not be commented as they have no bearing on my thesis.

10. There is no appendix on the quality of the textual transmission, as this commentary does not claim to produce a text that is independent of Leo, except for a few new suggestions *ad loc*.

5. Abbreviations
The plays of Plautus and Terence are abbreviated as follows (for brevity, the plays are referred to by title only in the commentary section):

**Plautus:**
- Am. = *Amphitruo*
- As. = *Asinaria*
- Au. = *Aulularia*
- Ba. = *Bacchides*
- Cap. = *Captivi*
- Cas. = *Casina*
- Cis. = *Cistellaria*
- Cu. = *Curculio*
- Ep. = *Epidicus*
- Men. = *Menaechmi*
- Mer. = *Mercator*
- Mil. = *Miles gloriosus*
- Mo. = *Mostellaria*
- Per. = *Persa*
- Poen. = *Poenulus*
- Ps. = *Pseudolus*
- Ru. = *Rudens*
- Stich. = *Stichus*
- Tru. = *Truculentus*
- Tri. = *Trinummus*
- Vid. = *Vidularia*

**Terence:**
- An. = *Andria*
- Ht. = *Heauton timorumenos*
- Eu. = *Eunuchus*
- Ph. = *Phormio*
- Hec. = *Hecyra*
- Ad. = *Adelphoe*

The names and works of other authors are usually abbreviated as in *OLD* and *LSJ*. Obscure or potentially ambiguous names are given in full.
Abbreviations are standard and mostly obvious; only the following call for comment: ‘233’ means line 233 of *Mercator*, ‘233n.’ (without another number preceding it) means the lemma on line 233 of *Mercator* in this commentary, ‘in app.’ means in the *apparatus criticus* (or *apparatus critici*).

For the abbreviation of the titles of series and periodicals, I have mainly followed the practice of the *Index des périodiques dépouillés* in *L’Année Philologique*. Unusual titles have been written out in full.

The fragments of Greek comedy are cited according to the numbering of Kassel/Austin, Menander according to Körte/Thierfelder. The fragments of Roman drama are cited according to Ribbeck (even where reference is made to Jocelyn’s commentary).
I. Introduction

1. The Stage

The Mercator is set in Athens, but the audience are not told so until later in the play (cf. 836f., 944f., see also 635n.). In the fabula palliata the scene, which remains unchanged throughout the play, usually represents a street in residential Athens (or some other city of the Hellenistic world), while the back wall of the stage has three doors, two of which represent the houses of Lysimachus and Demipho. There was also an altar (of Apollo Agyieus) on the stage (see 676n.). For detailed discussions of stage and setting of Roman comedy, see Duckworth (1952) 79-85, Bieber (1961) passim, Beare (1964) 159-161, 176f., Blume (1991) 122-124, and Beacham (1991) 56-85 (Beacham’s method of using the evidence of later wall-paintings for the reconstruction of what the wooden stages of earlier times may have looked like should be greeted with prima facie scepticism, as one may have to allow for an element of idealization in such paintings that would render them invalid as conclusive evidence of the kind that would be needed in this case).

2. The Prologue

The main function of the comic prologue is exposition, a function for which it was expressly not employed by Terence (cf. the prologues of Andria and Phormio and Hec. 58). He seems to prefer the plot to unfold itself within the play proper (cf. Cic. De orat. 2.80), while using his prologues for invective against literary opponents. Plautus seems to have dispensed with the expository prologue as well at least on one occasion, cf. Tri. 16f.

Prologues are commonly delivered either by a divinity (e.g. Pan in Dyscolus), or by characters from the play (as here), or by a fixed prologus who has neither any part in the play nor pretends to be a deity or a human character (as in some, probably post-Plautine, prologues of the Plautine corpus, and in all comedies of Terence). For details, see Leo (1912) 188-247, Duckworth (1952) 211-218, Hunter (1985) 24-35. Trinummus, Rudens, Cistellaria, Aulularia and Amphitruo have a divine prologue. In Captivi, Asinaria, Menaechmi, Poenulus, Pseudolus, Truculentus and Vidularia, the prologue is delivered by a member of the troupe, probably usually a younger one (cf. Ht. 1-3) who was dressed for that part (cf. Hec. 9). Here and in the Miles gloriosus (deferred prologue, Mil. 79-153) the prologue is spoken by one of the characters of the play.

Of the two people familiar with the situation and thus in theory available as potential prologi (apart from an omniscient prologue deity), Charinus and his trusted slave Acanthio, only the former is actually available, as Acanthio will be needed later on
as a messenger (*servus currens*, cf. 117) to let Charinus know that his father Demipho has seen his *amica* Pasicompsa (cf. 180f.) and to reveal the situation as it affects Demipho (cf. 182, 203), since Demipho himself can, of course, not be used to reveal directly to his son what he actually wishes to conceal from him (cf. 333f.), see Fields (1938) 102f.

It is noteworthy that Charinus is both a *prologus* and a character taking part in the action of the play he announces. In the course of his prologue, he ‘changes’, almost imperceptibly, from being a *prologus* to a character involved in the action himself. Thus the transition from exposition to action is quite smooth. Like e.g. Mercurius, the prologue-speaker of *Amphitruo* who has already assumed the likeness of the slave Sosia before he enters the stage, and unlike the *prologus* of *Hecyra* pro. II, Charinus is from the very beginning dressed as *adulescens*, he wears the costume of the part he is to play and his mask. On costumes and masks in Roman comedy see e.g. Duckworth (1952) 88-94, Beare (1964) 184-195, 303-309, Sandbach (1977) 111f.

The double function of Charinus as *prologus* and as *adulescens amator* provides the playwright with the advantage of presenting the main facts of the exposition and at the same time throwing into relief the characters who are going to be most important, the merchants, father and son. This is important because the *Mercator* is a play that is mainly concerned with character. Wilner (1938) 22 rightly points out that in some plays, as here, the character of one or more characters is described “as a short-cut method of explaining the opening situation” (cf. lines 42, 103-105); Wilner compares *Am.* 104-139, *Cap.* 27-34, *Mil.* 138-153, *Poen.* 98-101, *Ru.* 47-56. At the same time, some characterizations contain traits that are emphasized and will be keynotes of the play (here, lines 42, 46-78, 103); she compares *Au.* 21f., 37-39, *Mil.* 88-92, *Ru.* 33-38, *Tru.* 12-16. The prologue falls roughly into three main parts, (1) 1-10, (2) 11-38, and (3) 39-110. The division appears to be intentional, as several signals in the text show (strong contrast between lines 10, where Plautus ‘signs’ his play, and 11, where a formal narrative of previous events starts; in 39 *illuc revorti certumst, conata eloquar*, Charinus calls himself ‘back’ from the digression about the *vitia amoris*). Part (3) can be subdivided into (3a) 39-60 (Father’s continued reproaches and threats), (3b) 61-78 (Father’s own hard upbringing), (3c) 79-91 (Charinus’ change of mind and willingness to better himself; preparations for business expedition to Rhodes), (3d) 92-105 (disaster strikes again: Charinus’ new love-affair in Rhodes), (3e) 106-110 (Charinus’ fear that Father finds out).

This prologue-monologue is longer than a number of others in Plautus, but the playwright has carefully taken measures to prevent it from being tedious. Instead of just stating the bare facts, Charinus provides the audience with a lengthy list of *vitia amoris* (18-36) and a short narration telling them about his previous expensive love-affair (40-45) and his father’s reaction (46-60), which in turn provides Charinus with an opportunity for telling the audience about his father’s character and for reporting some
of his father’s stories about his own youth (61-78), enriched by a lively prosopopoeia (70-72). This leads to the narration of Charinus’ own two-year business trip to Rhodes (12, 85-106), inspired by his father’s exhortations (11, 79-84), where he meets the stunningly beautiful slave-girl Pasicompsa, falls instantly in love with her (13, 100-103), and buys her to bring her back to ‘Athens’ (104-106). The events narrated in the prologue are tightly and conclusively concatenated, see Leo in app.: Prologi compositio una et perfecta est. Apart from the interesting presentation of the subject-matter itself, Plautus employs a number of rhetorical devices (like contrived alliteration, hyperbaton, irony, prosopopoeia, variations in the pacing of the narrative), see Goldberg (1986) 183.

3. ‘Markers of Greekness’

Williams (1968) 290 states that in many cases Plautus has simply taken over a Greek detail from his model, and has made no attempt to explain it to his Roman audience. He takes the mention of the *peplus* at 65-67 as an example. Williams’ and many other scholars’ unspoken premiss is that at least large parts of Plautus’ audiences needed special coaching in the art of understanding Greek culture. This is not the only way to look at allusions to ‘Greek’ things. It is equally possible that they were inserted into a Plautine passage as ‘markers of Greekness’, an ability that Williams (1968) 290f. finds no problem in crediting Terence with. On Plautus’ policy of making his plays ‘more Greek than the Greeks’ see also e.g. Leo (1913) 142, Fraenkel (1960) 123, Handley (1975) 117-132, Huxley (1978) 155 n.9. This prologue, for example, contains a great number of allusions and terms that sound Greek and remind the audience of the supposedly ‘Greek’ setting of the play (cf. 3 comoediis, 9 Emporos, 11 and 93 Rhodum, 40 and 61 ex ephebis, 67 peplum, 75 metretas, 87 cercurnum, 89 talentum, 91 paedagogus, 100 hilare). For a list of all Greek loan-words in the *Mercator* see index 3 s.v. ‘loan-words, Greek’.

Such ‘markers of Greekness’ could at first sight be attributed to the original, assuming that Plautus is here simply Philemon’s translator. However, this does not say anything about the purpose Plautus may have had in mind. Such markers of Greekness may in a number of cases actually be taken as indicative of Plautus’ consciously adding some more Greek ‘flavour’ to a passage, an artistic strategy that is called ‘hyper-Hellenization’ by Moore (1998) 61. It will not be possible to establish for every marker of Greekness whether it is a sign of intended hyper-Hellenization or not, but one should be careful to assume that Plautus is incapable of sounding Greek when he wants to, of spinning out a shorter passage of the original, contriving at the same time to sound Greek, and of conjuring up the atmosphere of a *civitas Graeca* when he chooses to do so. Prime examples are the *parasitus currens* monologue in *Curculio* (280-298) which contains a high proportion of markers of Greekness but is probably Plautine and the
inimitable line *Mil. 213 euge euscheme hercle asstit dulice et comoedice* which was probably not in the Greek play.

II. Commentary

1 CH. duas res simul nunc agere decretumst mihi:
When a young lover like Charinus enters the stage in Plautus, he delivers an entry (or entry/exit) monologue, see Denzler (1968) 47, cf. the openings of *Per.*, *Tru.*, *Men. Geo.*, *Mis.*. *duas*: monosyllabic by synizesis (coalescence of two consecutive vowels); also frequently (but not invariably) with the oblique forms of *is*, the genitive singular of demonstratives (*illius, eius, huius*), possessive adjectives (*meos, suas*), forms of *deus* and *dea*, fifth declension nouns (*rei*), the perfect of *esse* (*fuisse*), and with a few indeclinable words (*dehinc, praecit*). At line-end, such forms may secure *cD*. On paper, words of iambic shape may either be scanned as disyllables with two shorts (*meäs*) or as monosyllables with synizesis (*meäs*). As Latin has no glottal stops, the latter is regularly to be preferred, *pace* Lindsay (1922) 162, see Gratwick (1993) 50, 276, Soubiran (1988) 179-184, Questa (1967) 79-85. In the following, this phenomenon shall only be noted where it poses a problem for the scansion of a line. *simul*: *dd* by *IK* (iambic shortening), a common phenomenon by which an iambic word (or an iambic sequence heading a word-group with phrase accent following immediately upon the iambic sequence) can have its second syllable shortened (*— > —* or *— —... > — —...*). *IK* can occur in various contexts which will be discussed ad loc. when it occurs. For general discussions see Gratwick (1993) 50, 255f., Soubiran (1988) 242-252, Drexler (1969), Questa (1967) 31-70. *decretumst* *mihi*: 'I am resolved to do', impersonal expression, somewhat more authoritative than *decrevi*; frequent in Plautus, see Lindsay (1907) 52f., see also 776n., for an extreme example cf. *Ps.* 457 *salve. quid agitur? :: statur hic ad hunc modum. decretumst* = *decretum est*; prodelision (aphaeresis) of *es* and *est* is regular in Plautus and Terence, e.g. 14 *operaest = operaes est*, 451 *communest = communis est*, 463 *meliust = melius est*, 725 *innoxius = innoxius es*, 976 *mercatus = mercatus es*. On prodelision see Questa (1967) 23-25, Gratwick on *Men. 36*. Prodelision will not be noted each time it occurs.

2 et argumentum et meos amores eloquar.
Cf. *Mil. 85 et argumentum et nomen vobis eloquar*, *Ar. V. 54 φέρε νῦν κατείπω τοῖς θεοταίς τὸν λόγον*, *Pax 50. argumentum*: 'plot' (*λόγος*); does not refer to 'what happens on stage' (= *comoedia*). Rather, it means 'the background of the play', i.e. what preceded (at least partly) the dramatic action. *Narrare argumentum* is the task of the
prologus (An. 6, Ad. 22); aperire argumentum and in agendo ostendere are alternative methods of making the plot known (Ad. 23f.). Argumentum is used to refer to the substance of a play and not directly to its structure, cf. e.g. Men. 11-16, Don. Ter. An. prol. 9.2. For details see Dunsch (1999) 110-118. meos amores: ‘the details of my lovelife’; amores may be personal (‘girl-friend’) or, as here, impersonal (‘love affairs’, the actions and circumstances to which the love has led), see Fordyce on Catul. 10.1. The plural of an abstract noun may be felt to add concreteness (e.g. Verg. A. 4.292). In Plautus, the latter is more frequent than the former, see Cazzaniga (1961) 118f., Woytek on Per. arg. 1. Terence has amores only once (An. 913, impersonal).

3-7 Charinus alludes to the ἀμφιθανία-monologues delivered by unhappy young lovers who call upon Night, Day, Sun and Moon to witness their pitiable plight, a stock situation in New Comedy, see Holzberg (1974) 12. In the opening scene of Curculio, Plautus introduces a young lover not unlike Charinus, only that he makes a second character comment on the whole situation at the same time, mocking the convention (Cu. 1-6).

For the use of such addresses of the forces of nature (γῇ τε κοινωνεῖ λαλεῖν) in Greek drama, conventional in tragedy, parodied in comedy, see Griffith on A. Pr. 88-92, Dover on Ar. Ra. 1329-1363. In tragedy, the purpose is often to bring a frightening secret out into the sunlight; sometimes the convention may simply have been a useful device for motivating a soliloquy; cf. Philemon fr. 82.1-2 K-A ός ἰμερος μ’ ὑπηλαθε γῇ τε κοινωνεῖ λαλεῖ μολόντι τοῦσον ός ἐσκεύαισα (parody of E. Med. 57f., cf. also Enn. Trag. 216f.), Theognet. fr. 1.9 K-A. Later (225-251) it is Demipho who mirrors his son’s behaviour by doing what Charinus says he wants to avoid: Demipho delivers a monologue to the Day/Sun, talking about his miserias.

3 non ego item facio ut alios in comoediis

In Roman comedy mention is made quite frequently of the comic genre and its conventions, cf. e.g. Am. 987, As. 174f., Ba. 649, Cap. 778, Cas. 860f., Mil. 213, Mo. 1149-1151, Per. 465, Ps. 1081f., 1240, Ru. 1249-1251, Tru. 931; Hec. 866; cf. in particular Am. 41f., where in a similar way the superiority of the Plautine play is vindicated (ut alios in tragoeidis vidi). For a similarly unfavourable comparison of ‘other comedies’ and the author’s own play cf. e.g. Ar. Ve. 54-66. Such remarks can also be found in Greek comedy, cf. Alexis fr. 103.13 K-A, fr. 121.2, Theophilus fr. 12 K-A. In Menander remarks about tragedy are more frequent than such about comedy, see Rechenberg (1965), Handley (1975) 121, cf. Epit. 325f., Sam. 589f.
4 <vi> vidi amoris facere, qui aut Nocti aut Dii

The invocation of elemental forces, parodied in Roman comedy (e.g. Ad. 790 o caelum, o terra, o maria Neptuni!) was already parodied by Menander, albeit in a subtler way, by aposiopesis and (critical) self-address of the character, as if reacting to his own acting, cf. Sam. 325f. ὁ πόλισμα Κεκροπίας χθόνος, ὑ ἀναδὶ αἰθήρ, ὡς τι, Δημέα, βοῶς: Nocti: The precondition for addressing the night is the sleeplessness (insomnia) of the comic lover, see 25n. This is also linked with the παρακάλασθορον, where lovers sometimes hold a vigil in front of their beloved’s house and wish that the sun would delay its rising, see further 408n. In Attic tragedy Night is frequently addressed; comedy parodies the device, which is also found in Roman drama, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 96. Nox is addressed in tragic style at Am. 546-550, cf. Cu. 1-6, Men. fr. 152 K-Th. Die = diei, dative singular of the fifth declension, well attested for Early Latin, see Meiser (1998) 148, cf. Am. 276, 546, Cap. 464; so is Dii of the secondary transmission (Serv. A. 1.636). Dies as a goddess is unusual, as she had no cult in Rome, unless the word is a translation of Ἡμέρα (cf. Cic. Nat. deor. 3.44), cf. Ba. 255 Volcanus, Luna, Sol, Dies, di quattuor, see Riess (1941) 152. At Cap. 464 huic Die ecfodiam oculos, ‘Day’ is manifestly invested with a body, cf. also Cas. 510 nostro omne it Dies. In general, celestial deities seem to lie as yet out of the mainstream of religious thought; cf. the mention of Luna (Ba. 255), Sol (Am. 422, Ba. 255, Mer. 873 Sol abit), Nocturnus (Am. 272), Nox (Am. 277, 546), Arcturus (Ru. 1-82), and Dies (Am. 546, Ba. 255), see Hanson (1959) 70.

5 aut Soli aut Lunae miserias narrant suas.


6-7 Przychocki (1925) 262, Coleman-Norton (1936) 323 and Handley (1975) 122 point out that the sentiment that the gods are not interested in human affairs (deos esse sed non curare) is advanced elsewhere, cf. Ba. 638a, Mer. 626f., Ru. 650; Enn. Trag. 269-271; Acc. Trag. 142f.; Ad. 693, Ht. 1038, Hec. 772. As a consequence, the gods are also sometimes described as impotent (Cis. 51, Ep. 610f., Mil. 528-531; Ad. 761f.) and unworthy of reverence (Am. 1051f., Cas. 332, Cu. 260-267, Poe. 1191), cf. also Theognetus fr. 1.9f. Κ-Α γῆ τε κούρανωι λαλῶν / οἷς οὖθεν ἐστίν ἐπιμελὲς τῶν σῶν λόγων, Turpilius’ Leucadia (quoted in Cic. Tusc. 4.72).
6 quos pol ego credo humanas querimonias
credo / humanas: DA / BCD with metrical hiatus (non-elision of a final vowel) at A/B. Metrical hiatus is legitimate at A/B or D/A junctures, but not at C/D, see Gratwick (1993) 54, 253. In the following, metrical hiatus will be discussed only where it poses a metrical difficulty or may be invoked to facilitate the scansion of a line. humanas querimonias: BCD / aaBcD, an instance of an unexplained type of exception to Meyer's law (which states that if unaccented word-end falls in D, it should be approached ..BcD/ not ...BCD/). When the last measure is occupied by a single quadrisyllabic word, Meyer's law may be infringed, resulting in a well-defined 'dragged' cadence, probably meant to come across as slow and weighty, see Gratwick on Men. 102, cf. 48, 328, 796.

8 vobis narrabo potius meas nunc misericias.
Captatio benevolentiae addressed to the audience: they can feel flattered to be regarded as more important (vobis ... potius) than the gods, a feeling that secures close rapport between Charinus as prologus and the spectators, see Rambelli (1957) 60f. Close rapport with the audience is further sought and achieved by several appeals in the second person plural, cf. 14f., 17, 37, 103; see Knapp (1918) 47 for examples of the same technique and Moore (1998) 8-49 for the general strategy of securing rapport between spectators and actors. Cf. also 267 and 313.

9-10 Osann and Ritschl thought that passages announcing the title of a play (cf. As. 9-12, Cas. 30-4, Men. 3, Mil. 86f., Ps. 1f., Tri. 8-20, Tru. 1-3, Vid. 6f.) should be bracketed. However, the promuntiatio tituli appears to have been conventional, as is shown e contrario by Ht. 7-9, where the expectation is defeated; see Abel (1955) 10f., Handley (1975) 119: "From the point of view of the audience, there can hardly have been much doubt from the start that they were to see a Latin version of a Greek play, and possibly [...] the naming of Greek author and title is, as much as anything, a reminder that the goods are genuine." Wright (1974) 93f. points out that, if one compares this promuntiatio tituli with those in Tri. 18-21, As. 10-12, Vid. 6-7, it seems as if Plautus insisted in those cases to give a title different from that of the Greek original, whereas in the case of the Mercator he simply translated the title instead of, for example, calling the Latin play Rhodita 'The Lady from Rhodes', which is actually a title of one of Philemon's plays; cf. Cas. 31-34, where the prologus translates Kleroumenoe as Sortientes, similarly Mil. 86f.

With the abrupt transition to the didascalic note Charinus has definitely stepped across the line keeping the two identities of prologus and 'character in this play' apart; he is now an actor announcing the bare facts of the of the play in which he is going to perform: from lines 1-8, Charinus is both prologus and adulescens amator, in 9-10 he is only prologus, and from line 11 on he is adulescens amator. At As. 9-12, Cas. 29-34,
and Poen. 50-55, where similar 'vortere-acknowledgements' are made, the speaker introduces them with a formula like "But now I shall tell you the title of the play." At Trin. 18-21, such an introduction is unnecessary, as the announcement of the original and translated title is made at the end of the prologue so that no confusion can arise among the audience. Insofar, the present passage is exceptional. It resembles more closely the Terentian way of giving the title of the Greek original somewhere in the middle of the prologue, a practice observed in all prologues but that of Hecyra. As far as the very damaged text of Vidularia allows us to see, Plautus may have done something similar there (Vid. 66, where he seems to be referred to, in Terentian fashion, as poeta noster). Yet, in Terence the naming of the title(s) is always linked to the remainder of the prologue (which seems also to be the case in Vid.) and forms an important part of the playwright's apologetic strategy. In the present case, however, the Greek and Roman title are named without sufficient motivation.

9 Graece haec vocatur ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ Philemonis
The title of the play is associated with mercatus in line 11. It seems probable from this that Plautus himself called his play Mercator. Alternatively, the prologue-speaker may just be translating the Greek word for the audience, but this is improbable in the case of a word as common as Ἐμπορός. The playwright states through the prologue-speaker that the Mercator is a Latin version of, and in some sense the same play as, Philemon's Emporos. Plautus tells us that he has adapted plays by at least four playwrights, namely Philemon (Thesauros, Emporos), Diphilus (Kleroumenoi, Synapotheskontes, and the original of the Rudens, cf. Ru. 32), Menander (Adelphoi α, Kolax), and Demophilos (Onagos), see Goldberg (1986) 35. Graece: corresponding to Latine (10). For this contrasting combination cf. Cas. 31, Poen. 53, Trin. 18-21, Ph. 25f.; similarly Graece - barbare (As. 12). haec: sc. fabula, 'this play'. Philemonis: On Philemon see OCD3 1159 s.v.; he is mentioned along with Diphilus at Mo. 1149-1151. He is credited with the authorship of the originals of Mercator, Trimummus, and maybe Mostellaria, see Stärk (1989) 109-111.

10 eadem Latine MERCATOR Macci Titii.
Macci Titii Ritschl: mactici B: mattici CD; the corruption is explained by Lindsay (1896) 40 as a haplography due to the repetition of three similarly-written syllables (ci-ti-ti). Ritschl's conjecture, which has good claim to be correct, leads to a rare infringement of Meyer's law (ca. 2% of Plautus' ca. 8.000 senarii, see Gratwick on Men. 294), as Mercator Macci Titii scans as B C D/ A B/ c D/, resulting in a dragged cadence (see 7n.). It is hard to say what effect would have been intended by a slow and weighty movement in a line like this. Plautus' name is given as Maccus (or Maccius) Titus. This form is peculiar in two ways. First, it is an inversion of the usual sequence praenomen - nomen
gentile (Titus Maccius). Second, it is the only instance where the playwright is not merely referred to as Plautus or Maccus, see Enk ad loc. On Plautus' name as some kind of literary pseudonym see Gratwick (1973) 82. Macci: Although Maccius is a proper Roman name, the nomen gentile 'Clownson' seems in this case to be some kind of nickname or pseudonym, unless one would assume that by mere coincidence one of Rome's most prolific comic playwrights was actually a member of the Clownson clan, see Gratwick (1973) 79.

11 pater ad mercatum hinc me meus misit Rhodum:
Demipho had sent his son abroad on a trading venture, a situation familiar from other plays, see Hindsholm (1990) 53, cf. Ba. 235f., Cas. 62, Cis. 157-159, Men. 32, Mo. 440f., 638-640, 971, Per. 501-527, St. 402-417, Tri. 108-114, 1087-1090. This line marks the beginning of the 'real' prologue of the play (11-108/110), in the sense that it is the passage which introduces the main theme and its characters. hinc 'from here' (from 'Athens'), see Handley (1975) 118. Unambiguous references to 'Athens' occur as late as at 836f., 944f., but an Athenian setting is also suggested in 40 and 67. Rhodum: accusative of motion without preposition, see Lindsay (1907) 25, cf. e.g. 92, 937. Rhodes with its large transit port was one of the leading trading centres of the Hellenistic age, see Berthold (1984), Gabrielsen (1997) 71-76, and as such a likely place to go for trading purposes; cf. As. 499, Eu. 107. There was also an active market for (female) slaves in Rhodes, see Kruškol (1947), Berthold (1984) 100. The later purchase of Pasicompsa at Rhodes (100-106) does thus not seem unrealistic.

12 biennium iam factumst postquam abii domo.
biennium iam factumst: 'the space-of-two-years has passed since ... ' Contrast line 533 iam bienniumst quom mecum rem coepit; on the chronological problem posed by this, see note ad loc. The question arises why it takes Charinus two years to travel from Athens to Rhodes and back. The usual duration of 'absence' of a person going abroad in comedy (e.g. the unhappy love-stricken young man) is two years, cf. Ba. 388, Mo. 79, 440f., St. 40, 137, 214; upper limit is probably three years, after which a missing man was presumed by law to be dead, see Levy (1927) 150f.

Hindsholm (1990) 54 lists the other direct references to the destinations and/or duration of overseas business travel in Plautine comedy: Ba. 235-236 (Athens - Ephesus) - 2 years (Ba. 170-171); Ci. 156-161 (Sicyon - Lemnos); Men. 17-31 (Syracuse - Tarentum); Mo. 440 (Athens - Egypt) - three years (Mo. 440), Per. 498 (Athens - Persia) - about eight months (Per. 504); St. 152 (Athens - Asia) - three years (St. 137); Trin. 112 (Athens - Seleucia). Casson (1951) shows that with a wind from the right direction, ships could make a speed between 4 and 6 knots. A trip from Rhodes to Alexandria is reported to have taken 3½ days. Voyages made with unfavourable winds
took longer, the average speed of the ships being between 2 to 2½ knots, e.g. from Rhodes to Byzantium in 10 days. However, a voyage could be slowed down by adverse wind conditions, forcing a ship to stop at an intermediate port for days, weeks, or even months, see Casson (1951) 143 n.34. Yet again different figures will apply for travel that does not use direct routes over open water but uses a coastal route.

13 ibi amare occepi forma eximia mulierem.
amare occepi: ‘I fell in love’, the periphrastic perfect of ingressive *amasco* (Naev. Com. 137), cf. the aorist ἡράσατον; cf. 650, Am. 107, Ba. 565, Ci. 68, 94f., 260, Ru. 44, Ht. 97, Eu. 125, 568, Ph. 82, 111, Ad. 327. forma: ‘beauty’ (cf. 210, 260, 395, 405, 414, 517, 638), ablative of description, used three times in this play (210, 260), always with reference to Pasicompsa. Pasicompsa’s beauty is a leitmotif, cf. 229, 517, 755 (‘inverted beauty’: the cook’s statements let the audience compare Dorippa with Pasicompsa).

14-15 These lines seem to be in a peculiar place, partly repeating what was said in line 8 *vobis narrabo potius meas nunc miserias*. At Men. 16 and Mil. 80 similar phrases involving the word *benignitas* are used before *prologus* narrates the *argumentum*. Here, *prologus* seems to repeat himself. Maybe these two lines were used as a deliberate reminder addressed to the audience to keep quiet and be attentive during the performance, and particularly during Charinus’ long monologue.

14 sed ea ut sim implicitus dicam, si operaest auribus
A *captatio benevolentiae*, as it was traditional in prologues (e.g. Mil. 80 *si ad auscultandum vostra erit benignitas*); similar phrases are used in Greek comedy, cf. Men. Dysc. 46 υψεσθ’ ἐὰν βούλῃτε - βούλῃτε δέ. *implicitus*: taken from medical contexts, ‘infected’ (OLD s.v. 8a); cf. Verg. A. 1.660; also in Greek literature, see Barrett on E. Hipp. 467. *si operaest auribus*: ‘if your ears have leisure’, cf. Ba. 991, Ps. 560; *operae* is dative of purpose (cf. *mihi curae est*), see Leo (1912) 341 n.2.

15 atque advortendum ad animum adest benignitas.
Cf. Mil. 80 *si ad auscultandum vostra erit benignitas*. *advortendum ad animum*: *anim(um)-advertere* ‘pay attention to’ occurs still unelided in Plautus, though infrequently, see *LHS* I 224; cf. 302, 968.

16 et hoc parum hercle more amatorum institi:
amatorum*: a reference to the comic character *adulescens amator* (cf. 32f., 381).
17 trem eampse ecfatus sum orsusque inde exilico;
The text is corrupt beyond remedy; nam in line 18 suggests that whatever was in this line
is linked to the enumeration of the vitia amoris. A possible line of speculation is that the
line contains a reference to what Charinus has said so far (acting as a praeco
‘announcer’), and that he is going to be an index ‘informer’ now (reading something like
ea praecoonatus vobis sum index ilico). This way he would be referring to the dual nature
of his role in the prologue (see 9-10n., cf. 1 duas res).

18-36 For a similar but shorter list of vitia amoris cf. Eu. 59-61. Garcia Jurado/López
Gregoris (1994) 240-242 suggest reading this passage as an extended programmatic
illustration of the principle ‘love is insanity’. Indeed, this play will see the development,
among other things, of a prime example of insanus amor (cf. 265). Forer (1979) 1-4
regards this passage as an example of genuine self-criticism uttered by Charinus. This
interpretation does not consider the topical character of the catalogue of vita amoris.
The same applies, to a lesser degree, to Demipho’s statement in lines 262-266, which are
discussed by Forer ibid. 123-125, see also Rissom (1971) 125.

19 cura, aegritudo nimiaque elegantia,
A loose triad in which the first two elements belong more closely together; a closer triad
is found at 870 cura, miseria, aegritudo. cura: ‘pain’ of passion, a commonplace in the
sermo amatorius, see Prescott (1909) 13, Austin on Verg. A. 4.1.; cf. 162, 247, 347,
870, and e.g. Ep. 135, Ps. 21. aegritudo: occurs always in connection with Charinus,
and probably always (see 140n.) with reference to his love-sickness (cf. animus aegrotus,
An. 193 animum ... aegrotum adulescentuli); the expression is linked to the medicus-
motif (139f., 472, 489, 951). For an analysis of the use of the word in Cicero’s
philosophical writings, see Preston (1916) 5-7; for the topos of love as an illness, see
Lieberg (1962) 134 n.62. elegantia: ‘extravagance’, cf. the description of Amor given at
Tri. 239 blandiloquentulus, harpago, mendax, cuppes, avarus, elegans, despoliator.

20-30 Leo brackets this passage; Lindström (1907) 25-27 lists arguments for its
spuriousness, none of which are convincing. The offence taken against lines 20-30 is a
kind of rearguard action resulting from a controversial scholarly debate of the second
half of the nineteenth century, after Ritschl had declared the whole prologue and various
scholars had declared different parts of it post-Plautine and suggested numerous
transpositions, see Hornstein (1914) 112-114 for a doxography.

More recently, Blânsdorf (1967) 19 n.1, following Thierfelder (1929) 62-64, has
also doubted the authenticity of the passage, but see Hornstein (1914) 113 who points
out that the fortuita farrago of the vitia listed by Charinus befits the confused and
emotional state of an adulescens amator. Moreover, haec cuncta vitia (18) would be a
strange expression if only four vitia were to follow (19 cura aegritudo nimiam elegantiæ; 31 multiloquium), see Prescott (1909) 12. Leo’s criticism involves certain unproved presuppositions, e.g. that Plautus may not repeat and amplify his own words and that a fortuita farrago (if properly defined) is not characteristic of his style; see also Calderan on Vid. fr. 2.

The passage is clearer and more coherent and its difficulties are far less serious than many scholars have believed. The fact that the measures taken to remedy what seemed so incongruous with the concept of what this prologue had to be like, ranging from wholesale deletion to the assumption of contaminatio, retractatio, interpolatio, or more recently, Plautine ‘orality’, see Lefèvre (1995) 21f., shows how inadequate a tool the ‘critical analysis’ of such versus Plautinissimi may be.

20 haec non modo illum qui amat sed quemque attigit

Lines 20-23 contain a parenthetical digression expanding on the disastrous effects of elegantia. Slightly awkward as the parenthesis may be, it is worth noting that the transition from the triad to the digression is somewhat like the sequence of thought in a lyrical passage in the Trinummus (223-275). In the Trinummus the lover’s extravagance has been described at length (242-254). His extravagance makes him an inops amator (255); the conclusion is that although it is dulce to lead this life of expensive dissipation, Love amara dat tamen, satis quod aegre sit (cf. aegritudo). Then the far-reaching effects of elegantia and aegritudo are suggested in 261-64: the lover fugit forum, fugit at suos cognatos, fugat ipsus ab suo contutu / neque eum sibi amicum volunt dici, see Prescott (1909) 13. qui amat: ‘lover’ (cf. e.g. 744, Hec. 343); scans bbC by ‘prosodic’ hiatus, the semi-elision of a vowel as the first element of a resolution (bb, dd); see Soubiran (1966) 329-386, Gratwick (1993) 254. ‘Prosodic’ hiatuses can occur in different metrical settings and shall be discussed ad loc. where they pose a problem. The term ‘prosodic hiatus’ describes the phenomenon that may occur when the latter part of the ‘length’ of the prior element (word) is lost due to an extremely intimate relationship of two neighbouring words, and is therefore, basically, a sandhi-phenomenon, called ‘semi-elision’ by Gratwick (1993) 50. In the iambic senarius, the preferred location of this phenomenon is the opening of the latter half-line, cf. Men. 690, 827, and perhaps 517 (with Gratwick ad loc.). This phenomenon is by no means common in Plautus, but it is not uncommon enough to justify violent changes to the vulgate. The terminology in this case is particularly unhappy, since the term ‘hiatus’ implies a ‘gaping’, a ‘chasm’ between words, whereas in the case of the so-called ‘prosodic hiatus’ the exact opposite is the case, i.e. the two words belong closely together, indeed, phonetically united. The terminology was developed by Klotz (1890) 103 and accepted by most scholars, including Pelz (1930) and Drexler (1967) 46f.; it may be kept faute de mieux. For ‘prosodic’ hiatuses with parts of amare see Questa (1967) 93f.; the shortening may be

21 magno atque solido multat infortunio,
The diction is taken, probably with parodic intent, from formulaic language, more often connected with mactare (Am. 1034, Au. 535, Ba. 364, 886, Cu. 537, Poen. 517 Tri. 993; Ph. 1028; Nov. Com. 33), see LHS II 120; mutare is properly used of imposing fines (Ps. 1228, Tri. 708), but can also be used of causing damage to someone (Am. 852, Cas. 722). solido: cf. 378 solida fides; 'definitive', 'substantial', cf. Ba. 188 Cu. 405 solidam gratiam, Ep. 392, Per. 425; maybe derived from IE. *solo-s 'whole', 'firm' (cf. ὅλος, salvus, soleo), see Walde/Hofmann s.v. salvus. Plautus' linguistic inventiveness is a characteristic of his style. He recognizes the morphological patterns of words, either for the purposes of coining neologisms or for the purpose of using common words in a novel way that is truer to the underlying etymology of a such a standard word like solidus that is commonly applied to the description of the quality of metals, 'solid' (especially gold, see OLD s.v. 1). Terence's use of solidus seems to be influenced by Plautus, cf. Eu. 871 solidum ... beneficium (a 'real', 'substantial' kindness), An. 647 solidum gaudium. The juxtaposition is an oxymoron and παρά προςδοκιαν (magno [positive] atque solido [positive] infortunio [negative]), as the adjective is found more often in positive contexts (e.g. Cu. 405, An. 647, Eu. 871). Similarly nec ... sine grandi malo in the following line. infortunio: cf. 165 maximum infortuniumst.

22 nec pol profecto quisquam sine grandi malo
profecto: *pro facto ('as a fact'), see Fraenkel (1928) 222, 'surely', expresses the speaker's confidence in the truth of his statement. For profecto used in general statements cf. also e.g. Am. 649, Cap. 119f. omnes profecto liberi lubentius / sumus quam servimus. sine grandi malo: cf. 146 sine malo omni. grandi: colloquial adjective, often used in financial contexts, e.g. 96f. peculium ... grande, Cap. 258, Per. 494 (pergrande lucrum). In Plautus it generally has its primary meaning of 'ripe', 'full-grown', 'mature', which is originally a peasant word, see Walde/Hofmann s.v., OLD s.v. 2a, Väänänen (1981) 78f.

23 praequam res patitur studuit elegantiae.
praequam res patitur: 'to a greater extent (prae) than (quam) his means allow' (lit. 'when compared with his means', prae 'compared with'). praequam: in (unfavourable) comparison with', rare in Plautus, only Am. 634, Au. 503, Mo. 982, 1146; not in Terence. Leo in app. crit. criticizes the use of praequam = praeterquam as un-Plautine, see also Lindsay (1907) 105. The word is unproblematic, see the translation given above.
24-31 After the digression about the consequences of *elegantia*, Charinus resumes the *vitia* catalogue. On the topical character of the tribulations of the lover see Preston (1916) 11, Lier (1914) 17f., Kenney on Apul. *Met.* 6.9.2; cf. Lucr. 4.1141-1144. An order in this apparent farrago of *vitia* is seen by Kistrup (1963) 3f.: Charinus begins with an enumeration of the symptoms of suffering of soul and body, *cura, aegritudo, insomnia, aerumna, error, terror, fuga*, then he mentions the lover’s attitudes that are preconditions of these sufferings, *dispendium* and *elegantia, ineptia* and *petulantia*, then he touches on the consequences of a dissipated life-style, which may be internal or external, *cupiditas - contumelia*. Finally, he mentions *multiloquium* and *parumloquium*.

24 *sed amori accedunt etiam haec quae dixi minus:*

*haec: sc. vitia, cf. 18. quae dixi minus: ‘which I didn’t mention’, ‘which I haven’t mentioned yet’; Eu. 737. Read perhaps quo dixi minus ‘as I omitted to say’, cf. Am. 479, Cap. 430, St. 162, see Lindsay (1907) 111.*


25 *insomnia, aerumna, error, terror et fuga,*

The accumulation of suffixes like -or is typical of epic and tragic style, cf. *Ru.* 215 *algor, error, pavor me omnia tenent* with Acc. Trag. 349 *persuasit maeror, arxtudo, error, dolor* and Pac. Trag. 274f. *corpusque meum tali / maerore, errore, macore senet.* These accumulations are carried through to line 31. Charinus is particularly given to the use of such stylistic devices in his paratragic monologues, cf. 830-841. *insomnia: cf. 370 poste hac nocte non satis quievi ex mea sententia,* sleeplessness is one of the commonest privations of the lover, see Preston (1916) 11. *Insomnia* is mentioned, perhaps as a *vittium amoris*, at Caec. *Com.* 168 *consequitur comes insomnia, ea porro insaniam affert;* cf. *Men. Mis.* A1-14, Phas. 34, fr. 152 K-Th; *Eu.* 219, Cu. 1-6. *aerumna: for the lover’s aerumnæ cf. Cu. 142 edepol qui amat, si eget, adficitur misera aerumna, Per. 2,* see Prescott (1909) 14, Kistrup (1963) 109, cf. also *Ep.* 179. The word was old-fashioned in Cicero’s time and obsolete in post-classical Latin, except for the Labours of Hercules (*Fin.* 2.118; Petr. 48.7). *error, terror:* paronomasia like *amens-amans* (82), *arare-amare* (356), *mares-amores* (Ps. 64); the words do not only fall together
acoustically, but also as being similar *perturbationes*, see Prescott (1916) 10, Wright (1974) 69f. On the theme cf. *Am.* 633-636, *Tru.* 699-705. *error*: cf. 347, Trabea *Com.* 6 *ego volupitatem animi nimiam summum esse errorem arbitror*. The word is also a term of literary criticism referring to the *comicus error*, the mistake or delusion upon which the complication arises, due to a fact or circumstance concealed during the action (cf. Apul. *Flor.* 16, Don. *Ter. Ad.* praef. II.1). *fuga*: a natural consequence of *terror*, flight on the part of the lover is a common motif in comedy, cf. *As.* 591, *Ht.* 118, *Eu.* 216, see Preston (1916) 10. The association of *terror* and *fuga* cannot be better illustrated than by Charinus’ own experience as set forth in the action of this play (588-660, esp. 643-660, and 830-841, 864-873, 920-946, 981); *error, terror et fuga* represent an unbroken sequence.

26 ineptia stultitiaque adeo et temeritas,

Another triad, shown by Prescott (1909) 16f. to continue the theme of line 25 (link: *error - temeritas*). The first two words are near-synonyms, like in the preceding triad, while the third describes a more intense manifestation of the same qualities. *ineptia*: would only scan as $aBc\, dd\, aBC\, ddA\, Bc\, d+$, but this is barely acceptable, as a *locus Jacobsohnianus* (i.e. $d+$ allowed instead of $D$) is normally not available at place 4 of the senarius or place 7 of the septenarius, see Gratwick (1993) 57, Questa (1967) 151-156. It is possible that a final short vowel ‘made position’ before $sc-$, $sp-$, $st-$ in Latin, see Lindsay (1922) 257, Soubiran (1995) 1. Still, the absence of parallels in Plautus is notable (*Ps.* 1003 is uncertain), and several scholars have suggested remedies, e.g. *ineptiae* (Camerarius), *inepties* (Lachmann), *ineptia atque stultitia* (Ritschl). Perhaps one should read *ineptiast* (as suggested by Lindsay in app.)? *stultitiaque*: cf. 381 *quippe haud etiam quicquam inepte feci amantes ut solent*. The word recurs at 849 in another list of *vitia*; it occurs in erotic contexts, and may denote merely the fact of being in love (e.g. *Cis.* 61, 62, 64, 76), but is also used euphemistically for the seduction of a girl or an intrigue with a courtesan (*Au.* 752, *Tru.* 820, *Mo.* 1157, perhaps Titin. *Com.* 95), see Paschall (1939) 21.

29 inertia, aviditas, desidia, iniuria,

$aBc\, dd\, aB C\, dd\, A B c\, d+$; lacking caesura. *inertia*: is Leo’s conjecture for the MSS *inerit etiam*, preserving the list of nouns from interruption. The text of the MSS would result in a suspicious run of seven shorts, see Questa (1967) 137, Lindsay (1922) 95. *aviditas*: is, perhaps wrongly, taken to be equivalent to *φιλαργυρία* by Preston (1916) 12, who observes that the son is later reproached by his father for his squandering (52f.), but the argument remains unconvincing: It is one thing to be in need of money, and another to be rapacious. Rather it is a repetition and intensification of *cupiditas* (28), see Prescott (1909) 19. *desidia*: cf. 62 *amori neque desidiae*; see Preston (1916) 12
“vicious or wasteful idleness”, Prescott (1909) 19: “inactivity that seems in the sermo amatorius to be almost synonymous with love” (with references to Greek tragedy and Roman elegy). iniuria: Prescott (1909) 19 notes the unusual juxtaposition of desidia and iniuria, establishing a paradoxical connection between inactivity and active wrongdoing. It seems, rather, that the grouping is chiastic (inertia - desidia; aviditas - iniuria), expressing a cause-and-effect relation.

30 inopia, contumelia et dispendium. The first and the third element of the triad belong together as reversed cause and effect (dispendium results in inopia); the second element comes between them as the causing agent, the contumelia of the girl or meretrix (cf. Eu. 48). inopia: ‘lack of funds’, cf. 162, 848; typical of the comic lover, see Preston (1916) 14, cf. e.g. Caec. Com. 199 in amore suave est summo summaque inopia, Ps. 300 ita miser et amore pereo et inopia argentaria. The use of the term in Plautus is discussed by Crampon (1985) 76-84. It occurs three times in catalogues of personal calamities in the Mercator, here, 162 vim, metum, cruciatum, curam, iurgium atque inopiam, 848 iram, inimicitiam, maerorem, lacrumas, exsilium, inopiam. The word recurs in Eutychus’ argument as to why Charinus should not go abroad and ‘run away’ from his problems (650 si ibi amare forte occupias atque item eius [i.e. amoris or amicae] sit inopia). dispendium: ‘expense’, repeated, this time from Demipho’s mouth (in reported speech) in line 53 (amorem multos inlexe in dispendium).

31-36 Digression about the comic lover’s rhetorical ineptitude. Charinus is making the point that the lover is either too eloquent and says too much (multiloquium), but at the wrong time (adverso tempore), or he is lacking brilliance and says too little (pauciloquium) when it would be of advantage (quaes in rem sint) to do so, just like Charinus himself, see Leo in app.

31 multiloquium, parumloquium: hoc ideo fit, quia A bb c D / aa bb C dd A B c d+ will only scan if parum- is allowed to be set aa and not a B; the absence of a caesura is notable; hoc ideo fit quia may be corrupt. The text of Ru. 24 id eo fit quia ‘that’s because’ (cf. Am. 756, Cu. 61), scanning dd A B c D/ in line-end, could point to: -loqu(ium) [hoc] id eo fit, quia (suggested by Marx), scanning c dd A B c D/. After the solemn exposition of the vitia, it is time for the speaker’s humour to assert itself by introducing as a maximum vitium in this line multiloquium; this is elaborated in mock-serious fashion, the conclusion being nunc vos mihi irasci ob multiloquium non decet (37). For the sentiment cf. Philemon fr. 99 K-A, see Trains (1962). multiloquium, parumloquium: an example of Plautus’ linguistic inventiveness (see 21n.); multiloquium is a neologism on the pattern of μακρο-λαγια, pauci-loquium is
coined by analogy, cf. Mil. 296 stultiloquium, Per. 49 amoris vitio, non meo, nunc tibi morologus fio, 514 stultiloque, Ps. 1264 (morologus), Tri. 222 stultiloquentiam, also Cic. Top. 35 ἐτυμολογία id est verbum de verbo veriloquium, see Băltăceanu (1966)

113. multiloquium: cf. Don. Ter. Eu. 207 amatorium multiloquium et vaniloquium continet ista actio; nam et repetit quod iam dictum est, et id facit (necessario) magis et odiose nimis. Beare (1928) 106-111 regarded the accumulation of nouns denoting abstract concepts in this prologue (esp. lines 25-31) as a sign of the early composition of the Mercator. Beare argues that the playwright has to use a multitude of abstract nouns due to his yet imperfect ability to phrase things concisely. This is rightly criticized by Molsberger (1989) 53f. and Thierfelder (1929), who argue that the long enumeration is a direct consequence of the young man’s habitual multiloquium, and therefore serves as a means of indirect characterization; a similar sign of the young man’s multiloquium is that Charinus utters a philosophical gnome (145f.), but Acanthio cuts him short (147). There is barely a scene in which Charinus does not prove to be verbally incontinent. As Molsberger (1989) 54 has observed, this verbal incontinence rubs off on the other characters, and a number of them show signs of loquacitas in the course of the play (cf. e.g. I.1, I.2, II.1, II.3, V.1, V.2). The multiloquium is indeed, as Molsberger (1989) 54 observes, a leitmotif in this play. Such groups of adjectives and verbs as well as of nouns (cf. 4, 19-30, 162, 310, 630, 640, 646, 674, 833, 846-849, 852-854, 859-861, 870) may also be indicative of the Greek author’s tendency to form extensive groups of words of the same category, see Prescott (1909) 11.

33 tam amator profert saepe adverso tempore; 
tam = tamen, in initial position, see Lindsay (1907) 117, OLD s.v. tam 7, cf. e.g. Men. 387, St. 44, Ba. 1194. adverso tempore: ablative of time with a modifying adjective (or pronoun); only three times in Plautus (also Am. 567, Ru. 4); also in Terence (e.g. Ad. 21, Hec. 531).

38 eodem quo amorem Venus mihi hoc legavit die. 
eodem quo ... die = eodem die, quo, see Enk ad loc.; emphatic hyperbaton. m(ihi) hoc: filling one metrical place by synizesis and total elision. hoc: sc. multiloquium. legavit: ἀνὸ κονοῦ with amorem and hoc.

40-106 What follows is a well-composed passage of lively comic narrative, cf. the monologue of Philolaches at Mo. 118-156, where he reports how he has fared previous to the action of the play. Charinus’ story consists of three parts of roughly similar length: (a) Charinus first love-affair (39-60), organically leading to the second part, (b) the narrative of Demipho’s own youth (61-78), resulting in the third part, (c) Charinus’ business venture to Rhodes (79-106).
The narrative of his first love-affair and his father’s story about Grandfather could both be the plots of *comoediae palliatae* in their own right, and this is probably intentional, reminding the spectators of some play or another. The narratives are enlivened by various elements of style, notably alliteration and assonance, prosopopoeia, and climax.

40 principio <ut ex> ephebis aetate exii

ex ephebis exii: ‘I completed the ephebate’, cf. *An.* 51 *excessit ex ephebis*; *Xen. Cyr.* 1.2.12 ἐξήλθον ἐξ ἐφήβων. Dietze (1901) 56 and Gobara (1986) 93 compare Philemon fr. 34 K-A ἐγὼ γὰρ ὡς τὴν χλαμύδας κατεθύμην ποτὲ / καὶ τὸν πέτασον. In Athens young men were called ἐφήβοι from 18 to 20 years of age (cf. *An.* 51). During their ephebate (military training) they served as περίπολοι ‘watchmen’ in the Athenian militia (at *Eu.* 290 Terence, instead of using the loan-word *ephebus* translates *custos publice est*), see *OCD* s. v. *epheboi*. The end of the ephebate signals the start of a new phase in the life for an young man, perhaps somewhat like the significance attached to the ‘21st birthday’ today, see Schmitter (1971) 102, Rissom (1971) 40f.; Rosivach (1998) 154 observes that the *adulescens* (or νεανίσκος) usually begins his career as *amator* when he is past his ephebate.

41 atque animus studio amotus puerilist meus

Parody of high style, cf. 388 nescioqui animus mihi dolet, 530 animus redit, 589 si domi sum, foris est animus, sin foris sum, animus domist, 890 animus fluctuat. Charinus refers to his *animus* unusually often. *studio ... puerili*: The motif of love as a ‘thing that puere do’ recurs frequently, cf. esp. 292, 296, 303f., 540f., 976. Here, the audience will perhaps think Charinus means ‘I said farewell to the pastimes of my childhood (i.e. to puerile exploits)’, but the next line contains a surprise, as the spectators are told that Charinus turned to the *studium puerile κατ’ ἐξοχήν* - loving a *meretricum*!

42 amare valide coepi hic meretricem: ilico

Charinus’ statement is paradoxical: ‘When I turned 21, I stopped with all that childish nonsense, ... and fell madly in love.’ His father will be similarly inconsistent and paradoxical later on, first praising country-life, then telling his son that he sold the farm immediately after Grandfather’s death to set up a maritime trade, which is the very opposite of farming (cf. 69-77). An apple does not fall far from the tree. *amare ... coepi*: ‘I fell in love’, see 12n. *valide*: unsyncopated form of *valde*; near-synonyms, see Meiser (1998) 67 (*valide* ‘strongly’, *valde* ‘very’), cf. 48, 103. *meretricem*: a *hetaira* ‘courtesan’, just like Pasicompsa. On courtesans in Philemonian comedy see Henry (1988) 43f., who does not discuss the *Emporos*. On the courtesan as a stock character in comedy see e.g. Leo (1912) 149-151, Hauschild (1933), Duckworth (1952) 258-261,

43 *res exulatum ad illam iam abibat patris.*

This shows that Charinus has access to his father’s funds, as otherwise he could not afford the *meretrix; res ... patris* shows that the money is not taken from his *peculium*, see Rissom (1971) 44, Rosivach (1998) 85f. Young lovers are lavish with money, see Davidson (1997) 194-200; cf. e.g. Tru. 944-963 and esp. Tru. 231 *neque umquam erit probus quisquam amator nisi qui rei inimicust suae.* The fantastic prices charged by grand *hetairai* are discussed Gomme/Sandbach on *Men. Epit.* 136. **exulatum:** accusative of the abstract verbal noun ending in *-tus*, indicating motion towards or purpose, so-called first ‘supine’, see Woodcock (1959) 112. **iam:** The MSS have *iam*; Wilhelm’s conjecture *clam*, adopted by Leo and others, is rightly criticized by Thomsen (1930) 187f. who objects that *res patris clam abibat* would mean ‘my father’s property went quietly into exile’ (Nixon), which squares badly with what is said in 46 and 48, where it is clear that Father has found out about the affair and the financial losses. Thomsen suggests to keep *iam* and to translate ‘my father’s money was about to go into exile’, taking *iam* as ‘from then on’ (*OLD* s.v. 1b, cf. *Eu.* 433) and *abibat* as an ‘inceptive’ imperfect, see Woodcock (1959) 156, which yields good sense, cf. 981. **res exulatum ... abibat:** joking periphrasis involving personification, see Langen (1882) 674f. and Schmidt (1959) 401-405, cf. 593 *salus*, and of a real person at 644 and 884, cf. also 933, 980. Of the seven instances of *exsilium* in Plautus, six are in the *Mercator*, one in the *Persa* (562 *te in exsilium hinc ire oportet*); one doubtful instance in Terence (*Ph.* 243). The repeated and evenly spread use of the word suggests that *exilium* is a *leitmotif*. This is also supported by the fact that the supine *exulatum* combined with a verb of motion, mostly *abire*, is used nine times in Plautus, see Lodge s.v. *exsulo*; four of the instances are in the *Mercator* (43, 593, 644, 884). The phrase *exulatum abire* can itself be a metaphor for disappearing or perishing of things, see *OLD* s.v. *ex(s)ol- 1c.*

44 *leno importunus, dominus eius mulieris*

**leno:** another stock character of ancient comedy, probably the one with the worst reputation, see Stolz (1920), Duckworth (1952) 262-264; on the pimp (*πορνοβοσκός*) in *Philemon*, see Gobara (1986) 146-151; cf. the negative characterisations of *lenones* at
Cu. 499-504, Per. 406-416, 683-690, Ps. 359-375, Ru. 346, 651-653. The pimp is the owner of slave-girls whom he hires out for sexual favours or sells off to whoever can pay the right price, see Moore (1998) 34f. Where he occurs in Roman comedy, he is the villain of the piece, greedy, heartless, and unscrupulous, cf. Ad. 188 leno sum, pernicies communis, fateor, adulescentium; he is a blocking character to be defeated so that the adulescens can get access to his girl. A prime example of how a leno treats a young lover is the dialogue between the pimp Ballio and the adulescens amator Calidorus (and his slave) at Ps. 243-380. importunus: ‘unapproachable’, ‘inaccessible’.

46-78 Demipho finds out about his son’s affair and reproaches him ceaselessly and vigorously (46-60). Then Charinus narrates how Demipho told him about his own youth (61-78), a speech within which Charinus quotes Demipho who is in turn quoting the ipsissima verba of Grandfather (71f.). This piece of lengthy narrative is well-structured, elaborate, and coherent. On the motif of filium accusare, see Rissom (1971) 124-129, cf. e.g. Cis. 225-229, An. 880f., Ht. 99-108, Ph. 231-233. At Ht. 99-108 Menedemus gives a vivid account of how he told his son off for having an amica, and how he told him about the hardships of his own youth as a contrast; the phrase vi et via pervolgata patrum (101 ‘with hackneyed harshness, as fathers do’) emphasizes the topical character of such paternal accusations and preaching, cf. also Plin. Ep. 9.12, Quint. Inst. 11.3.91 (a young man recounts in indirect speech the reproaches of his father on account of an affair with a hetaira).

This passage is an early example of extended indirect speech, of which there are but a few instances in Plautus (Am. 205-215, and shorter, with immediate connection to the play, Poen. 175-178, Cu. 346-349, 667-669). Demipho’s advice could have sounded like Turp. Com. 160-163 quaeso omite ac desere hanc / meretricem, qua te semel ut nacta est, semper studuit perdere / detergere despoliere oppleraque adeo fama ac flagitia; cf. also Com. fab.inc. fr. 54f. (apparition of the father’s ghost) ‘Cur te dedecoras, famam cur maculas tuam? / cur rem dilapidas, quam miser extruxit labor?’ Plautus’ audience was probably well acquainted with such stock scenes, and a few lines were sufficient to suggest the whole situation. Cicero conjured up such a scenario in the courtroom (Cic. Cael. 37), where he quotes the words of a pater durus from a play by Caecilius (Com. 230-242), where a father rebukes his son violently for indulging in ista vicinitas meretricia. For Greek comedy cf. Theophilus fr. 11 K-A.

46 obiurigare pater haec noxets et dies,
oburiugare: Ritschl’s necessary emendation of the MSS obiurgare to make the line scan.
In Plautus, both obiurigo (Am. 706, Ba. 1020, Trin 68, 70) and the syncopated obiurgo (Cu. 171, Mer. 321f., Tri. 96, 680) are found, Terence has only obiurgo, see Lindsay (1922) 208f.; iurigare is used by Acanthio in 119. The unsyncopated form iurigare is
truer to the etymology of this verb (*iure agere), see Walde/Hofmann s.v. iurgo, thus meaning ‘press one’s claims to what is right’, cf. lit-igare from *lite(m) agere. The infinitive obiurigare and six others in lines 47-51 (expromere, conloqui, abnuere, negitare, conclamitare, praedicere) are ‘historic’, indicating either vividness of the narrative or describing habitual action, usually bunched in groups of two or three, see Lindsay (1907) 75, Allardice (1929) 83f., Woodcock (1959) 15. It is rare in Plautine narrative, cf. e.g. Am. 230 (reportage of battle), Mer. 240, 242, 251 and Ru. 606 (dream narratives), Tri. 836f. (storm at sea), see Denzler (1968) 88 n.266; it becomes more frequent in Terence, see Maurach (1995) 62, cf. e.g. Eu. 402, 410-412. The historic infinitives used here may either be signs of excited narrative, indicating Charinus’ emotional involvement, or expressions of repeated action, underlining that Demipho went on and on reproaching his son. In any case, they serve to heighten the paratragic pathos of this passage.

48 lacerari valide suam rem, illius augerier.
Cf. Tri. 108-109f. hic eius rem confregit filius / videtque ipse ad paupertatem protractum esse se, 114 rem suam omnem et illum corruptum filium. Abel (1955) 77 points out that of the available motivations for acting as a blocking character against his son’s amorous affairs, Demipho has been allotted the least noble: the concern for his own property. Indeed, Demipho does not thwart his son’s plans in order to prevent damage from him (as does e.g. Ctesipho, Ad. 407) or to preserve his own good name and that of his family (as does Menedemus, Ht. 107). Contrast the arguments used at Ba. 379-381 by the tutor Lydus: neque mei neque te tui intus puditumst factis quae facis / quibus tuom patrem meque una, amicos, adfinis tuos / tua infamia fecisti gerulifigulos flagiti. valide: The postposition of valide allows the infinitives to stand in balanced opposition (chiastic arrangement: lacerari - suam, illius - augerier), corresponding to their contrasting meanings, at the beginning and the end of the line. lacerari: ‘be torn to pieces’, used in its literal sense Ba. 780; Ad. 315, Hec. 65; elsewhere in Plautus it is used metaphorically (‘waste, ruin’), cf. St. 453, As. 291, with personal objects Ba. 1094, Cu. 508; Cap. 671f. (delacerare); often in poetry and tragedy, cf. Enn. Trag. 58, Pacuv. Trag. 328, Cato Or. fr. 142 Cugusi, see Glick (1941) 110f., Petrone (1983) 62 n.39. suam rem, illius augerier: B C D / A B c d+/; breaking Meyer’s law, see 6n. The slow and weighty tone adds emphasis to Demipho’s exhortation. illius: CD by synizesis, see 1n. augerier = augeri; cf. e.g. 786 obductarier. The infinitive in -ier is frequent in Plautus, especially at line-end (which seems generally to be a place where rare or archaic word-forms tend to appear) or before mid-line break to secure B c D, see Conrad (1927) 31 and 36. Passive infinitives in -ier occur in Plautus some 168 times at line-end, see Noetzel (1908) 16 and 18 n.7, Conrad (1927) 31, Hodgman (1907) 105, and 6 times at diaeresis in iambic verse. The figures for Terence are: 37 at line-end, 4 inside the verse.
Noetzel notes 22 examples at line-end in the fragments of Roman drama, with a solitary example (Acc. Tog. 28) inside the verse; see also Duckworth on Ep. 40.

49 summo haec clamore; interdum mussans conloqui:

*summo haec clamore:* sc. *facere* (or *dicere*), a brachyology giving an impression of urgency. Charinus’ emotional state influences the way he talks. *mussans:* ‘mutter’, ‘grumble (in a low voice)’, cf. Don. Ter. *Ad.* 207 *mussare:* *hominum occulte quid et pressa voce loquentium*; also used at *Au.* 131, *mussitare* occurs much more frequently, see Lodge s.v. *mussito* and *musso*; Terence has *mussitare* (*Ad.* 207).

50 abnuere, negitare adeo me natum suom.

The most serious punishment threatened against a son in comedy is repudiation and expulsion, cf. *Ph.* 425, *Ht.* 928f. This is very harsh by any standards, and it contributes to the dislike spectators may begin to develop for Demipho as a blocking character, see Abel (1955) 78. Demipho’s threats may call to mind the institution of ὀποκήροντις (*abdicatio*) by which a father could disown his children, see Gomme/Sandbach on Men. *Sam.* 509, Saller (1994) 118f. The *abdicatio* was public (cf. 51; Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 2.26); it was practised in Athens as well as in Rome.

52 omnes tenerent mutuanti credere.

In Terence, a father is furious that his son, in his absence, allowed a court to sentence him to marry a poor girl though he could have got out of it by providing her with a dowry and marrying her off to somebody else. The young man had not enough cash for the transaction but he could have raised it, the father exclaims, from the usurers. This argument is countered by a slave who is the son’s confidante: *hui dixti pulchre! siquidem quisquam crederet / te vivo* (*Ph.* 302f.). An adult Greek could conduct any financial transactions he liked (buying, selling, borrowing, or lending), even if his (grand-)father was still around. His Roman contemporary was unable to that unless he succeeded in persuading his father to support him or in finding somebody willing give a loan to him in the hope that he would outlive his father and eventually, a *paterfamilias* himself, settle his debts, see Daube (1969) 76, Saller (1994) 203. Thus, Demipho’s proclamation is unnecessary under the conditions of Greek law, where young men after their ephebate were economically independent and the father was not liable for damages resulting from financial transactions entered into by his son, see Legrand (1910) 278, Fredershausen (1912) 242. However, the passage does not make sense in terms of Roman law either, as there was a *annorum lex quinavicensaria*, aimed to prevent fraud against minors by invalidating any contracts entered into by men under 25 years of age, see Duckworth (1951) 41 n.10, Kaser (1986) 75f., Saller (1994) 188 (*lex Laetoria*, about 200 BC), cf. *Ps.* 286, 301-305, 504, *Ru.* 1380-1382. Still, young men in comedy did manage to
borrow money (e.g. Philolaches in the Mostellaria), and it is probable that the reference here is not to Roman legal restrictions arising from Demipho’s public announcement but to the reluctance of Greek (or Roman) moneylenders to advance loans to sons whose fathers were likely to repudiate the debt or about to disinherit their son, cf. the quotation from Phormio (see above). tenerent: ‘hold up (actions)’, ‘refrain from’ (see OLD s.v. 19), usually se tenere, see Lindsay (1907) 73. mutuanti B: mutu tanti CD. Pylades’s mutuitanti, printed by Leo, derived from a middle conative mutuitari ‘try to get a loan for oneself’ would fit the present context better than mutuanti from mutuare/-ri ‘get a loan’. This does not outweigh the fact that Pylades has claimed the existence of an otherwise unattested hapax. Since both forms are metrically exceptionable, I have decided to retain B’s. On the legal definition of mutuum see Kaser (1986) 186f. Mutuum sumere ‘take out a loan’ is a standard practice of impecunious lovers to raise money for their affair, cf. As. 245-248, Cu. 63-69, Per. 43f., 255f., Ps. 80, 286 si amabas, invenires mutuom. The mutuum is similar to the Greek ἔρπως ‘collective loan’, by which a man in need of money for some purpose could collect contributions from friends, and repay them by instalments, see Rauh (1993) 279-281, Millett (1991) 153-159. credere: ‘give a loan’, cf. Ps. 506.

53 Amorem multos inlexe in dispendium:
Amorem: should be capitalized because Love is personified here, cf. e.g. 590, Cis. 215 ita me Amor lassum animi ludificat. inlexe = inlexisse, cf. obduxe (arg. I 7). The omission of -is(s)- is to avoid excessive sibilation. Such omissions occur in verb-forms when s (or x) precedes. It happens most frequently in the perfect indicative active (second person singular and plural), e.g. promisti, scripstis, in the infinitive perfect active, as here and e.g. scripse, dixe, and in the pluperfect subjunctive active, e.g. duxem.

54 intemperantem, non modestum, iniurium
This line echoes two of the vitia amoris, cf. 27 immodestia, 29 iniuria.

55 trahere, exhaurire me quod quirem ab se domo;
trahere: ‘rob’ cf. Tri. 289f. cetera: rape, trahe, fuge, late; Sall. Cat. 11.4 rapere omnes, trahere, Jug. 41.5 sibi quisque ducere, trahere, rapere. exhaurire: ‘drain dry’ (Nixon), ‘use up entirely (ex-)’, see OLD s.v. 4a. For eating and drinking metaphors used in financial contexts see also 239n. on ambedisse. For a list of things that a dissolute young man may spend his money on cf. Tri. 406-412. quirem: subjunctive of queo ‘be able’, conjugated like a compound of -ire, see LHS I 521f. ab se domo = a domo sua, cf. Au. 341 domo abs te, Cis. 658 hinc ab nobis domo.
 ipsus: cf. 481, 598, 759; a frequent by-form of ipse (89, 466, 991) in Early Latin. The original form seems to have been *is-pse (cf. eampse etc.) which came to be declined ipse, ipsum, etc. on the pattern of iste and ille, see Meiser (1998) 163. Then it formed a nominative ipsus on the analogy of adjectives like magnus. The form is also found in Terence, who employs it more restrictively, see McGlynn s.v. ipse I.2 (with another noun or pronoun being emphasised), II.1 (on its own, indicating contrast), II.2 (on its own, indicating emphasis), III (with prepositions and particles), and IV (for erus).

58 amoris vi diffunditari ac didier.

The subject of these infinitives is ea (56). The second word expresses the substance of the first, a feature known from tragic and comic drama, especially prologues, cf. e.g. Am. 11 concessum et datum, 23 vereri et metuere, 118 veterem atque antiquam, Au. 4 possideo et colo, Cap. 47 compararunt et confinxerunt, Men. 52 imperato et dicit0, Enn. Trag. 5 pugnant proeliant, 78 purus pututs, 118 differt dissupat, 148 expedito atque eloquar, 207 verecunde et modice, 233 viduae et vastae, 311 squalem et sordidam, 337 profiteri et proloqui, see Fraenkel (1960) 344f., Haffter (1934) 53-55. Also found in Greek tragedy, e.g. A. Ch. 5 κλάειν οκοσσαν. diffunditari: 'be squandered', frequentative form of diffundo, apparently a hapax; for the image (lit. 'spread a liquid') cf. perhaps effundere (Ad. 991), profundere (Ad. 133), see Fantham (1972) 51. didier: 'be distributed' (OLD s.v. dido1 I); on the form see 48n.

59 convicium tot me annos iam se pascere;

This accusation is commonly made by parents of all times: 'All those years of love and concern, and this is the thanks I get?' A parent telling his son in our society, 'I've fed you long enough', implies normally, '... so now see that you stand on your own two feet.' In Rome, the young man remained in his father's household, and the father implied, '... so now work harder and contribute to our household', see Rissom (1971) 45. convicium: sc. mihi facit, followed by accusative and infinitive. The word is taken from the Itali, and has been in the text since the editio princeps. B gives coniurium, CD have conuirium, a miswriting of coniurium by metathesis of two letters. Prescott (1912) 82 notes that the other contexts in which convicium, 'a stand-up quarrel', is found in Plautus connote noise and abuse (Mer. 235; Ba. 874, Mo. 617; Ad. 180). He is right to maintain that the word cannot mean
‘disgrace’ here, as is assumed by the early editors (and by Enk ad loc.), as it is not a synonym of *opprobrium*. After suggesting the adoption of *B*’s *coniurium* as a predicative adjective (which would be a hapax in Latin), Prescott (1912) 251 finally, at the instigation of Lindsay, suggested taking *commulcium* into the text, a word taken from Lambinus’ note ad loc. (*vetus unus codex in quo scriptum reperi commilcutum; alter in quo litteris obscuris* *commulcium*). Lindsay (1898) 16 n.1 had uttered doubts about the authenticity of the reported reading, which he thought to be a mere misreading by Lambinus of the word *convicium* written *litteris obscuris*. It is, however, unlikely that someone should misread a word in a way that results in *commulcium*, a very rare word indeed, rather than in *convicium*. Lindsay refers to Cic. *ad Att.* 1.14.5 *Cato advolat*, *commulcium Pisoni consuli mirificum facit, si id est commulcium, vox plena gravitatis, plena auctoritatis, plena denique salutis*. It is tempting to follow Lindsay’s suggestion, but one must ask the question what the word *commulcium* would mean in the present passage. ‘A black eye’, and hence, ‘disgrace’, as is suggested by Prescott, seems unlikely. At Apul. *Met.* 8.28.2 the verb *commulcare* means ‘beat violently’. In Cicero’s text it is used metaphorically, meaning ‘dressing down’, see Shackleton Bailey ad loc. The air assumed by Cato in that text, combining the *auctoritas* and *gravitas* of the speaker with his concern for *salus*, fits the present context very well. Considering that *convicium* is only found in *F*, and that *P* had *coniurium*, it would be hard to explain how Lambinus (or the scribe of the MS he was using) could independently divine *commulcium* without the support of an independent witness to *ω*. It is also unlikely that any scribe or scholar could have taken the word from Cicero’s text, (a) because the vulgate of that text had *convicium* in many cases, and (b) because it is unlikely that someone should substitute or gloss a word that gives good sense, *convicium*, with one that is barely known at all. Taking all this together, and assuming that Lambinus’ reportage is correct, the reading *commulcium* may be taken into the text.

### 60 quod nisi puderet, ne luberet vivere.

*ne luberet vivere*: Enk ad loc. takes this to be a euphemistic circumlocution for encouraging suicide, meaning *potius te ipse interime*. However, this phrase sounds harsher than it is meant; Demipho’s argument is strictly hypothetical (with reference to an unfulfilled obligation or unexecuted command when the time for the action is already past), as is made clear by the use of the imperfect subjunctive in both cases, see Gratwick on *Men.* 611 and 239. There are only very few examples of *ne* + imperfect/pluperfect subjunctive in Plautus, *Men.* 611, *Ps.* 437, and here, see Lodge s.v. *ne* II.A.2.g, and none in Terence. See also 401-402n.

### 61-72 Demipho points at the exemplary moral quality of his own youth, contrasting it with the dissipate behaviour of his offspring; on this *ego-iam-a-principio* motif see
Rissom (1971) 129-142, cf. e.g. *Ht.* 110-112. Rissom (1971) 131 points out the similarity between the motif in comedy and actual speeches like Cato fr. 93 Cugusi *ego iam a principio in parsimonia atque in duritia atque industria omne adulescentiam meam abstimui agro colendo, saxis Sabinis silicibus repastinandis atque conserdendis.* We could hear such words just as well from a comic *senex durus.* Rissom ibid. assumes that the present passage can be taken as an indication that Plautus takes Roman values seriously: "Nirgends wird ein überlieferter sittlicher Grundsatz auf seine Berechtigung hin geprüft, sondern er wird als ehrwürdiges Gut geachtet und in konservativem Geist weitervermittelt. Eine kritische Durchleuchtung findet in der römischen Komödie erst bei Terenz statt."

The ironic twist Rissom overlooks is that the same Demipho who states these principles of staunch morality cannot wait to sell the farm off after his father's death (73f.). Passages like the present one are all *but* an indication of Plautine conservatism. It is true, however, that Terence exposes the fragility of such 'morality' more directly, cf. e.g. *Ad.* 103-107. Demipho's narrative about his youth actually gives the impression of being the plot of another comedy, just not the one staged this time. In this respect, it is similar to the story of how Demaenetus' father dressed up as a *naucerus* to assist in the abduction of a girl from a brothel (*As.* 68-72: a dressing-up intrigue involving a lover posing as *naucerus* actually happens in the *Miles gloriosus*, cf. 1176-1195, and scenes IV.7 and 8), just that Demaenetus' father was the epitome of a *senex lepidus*, whereas Demipho's father was a *pater durissimus*.

61 *sexe extemplo ex ephebis postquam excesserit,*
This parallels (and contrasts) clearly the situations of Father and Son (cf. 40): Demipho says, in effect, "When I was your age, just after finishing High School, I was not idling around like you". Father obviously wants to make the point that *his* behaviour at the same age was so much better.

62 *non, ut ego, amori neque desidiae in otio*
*otio*: a minor motif in the *Mercator*, cf. 62 and 552 (in connection with love/foolishness), 286, 374. Comic fathers (and other characters advocating a sober and serious life) regard *σχολή/otium* as the source of all possible evils, and they tell the young not to waste their lives away but to strive for gain and glory, cf. e.g. *Ht.* 109, *Men. Dysc.* 293-295, *Phasm.* 27-43, see Schmitter (1971) 87. That Love finds work for idle minds was a commonplace in Greek ethics. Theophrastus defines love as *πάθος ψυχῆς σχολαζούσης* (Stob. *Flor.* 64.66), cf. E. fr. 322 N. 2 ἐρως γὰρ ἀγγέλαν κατα τοιούτοις ἔφυ. Comedy took up the sentiment for good effect, largely because of the engraved Roman distrust of *otium otiosum*, wholly unproductive leisure, cf. *Mo.* 133-141, *Tri.* 649-654; *Ht.* 109-112; cf. also Ennius *Trag.* 187). Later, the elegists valued *otium* for the very reasons that
senes duri in comedy condemned it, as cibus amoris, e.g. Tib. 2.6.5f., Ov. Am. 1.9.41-46, Catul. 51.13-16; see further André (1962) 6f.

63 operam dedisse neque potestatem sibi
neque potestatem sibi/fuisse: This seemingly innocuous remark is revealing. If Demipho was as virtuous as he says he is, why should a sentence like “... and of course, I did not have the chance to fritter away my time on love and sex like you” slip out? It appears that Father is more like Son than he would admit, see 42n. As in 817-829, the pathos of the ideals that are upheld is comically undercut by the exposure of the inadequacy and farcical ineptitude of the characters who utter them.

64 fuisse; adeo arte cohibitum esse <se> a patre.
The very choice of Demipho’s words (if we take the indirect speech as a verbatim reportage of what he actually said) is interesting, as it implies that Demipho himself was by no means happy with the situation he was in as a young man (adeo arte implies a ‘too much’, cohibitum esse an act that involved some kind of external force, as if Demipho had to be physically restrained so as not to visit the entertainments district). adeo arte cohibitum: cf. As. 78f. quamquam illum mater arte contenteque habet, / patres ut consueverunt, Cis. 225-228. a patre: also at line-end at 68, literally ‘framing’ the trip to the city to see the peplos: Grandfather’s powerful position is emphasized.

65 multo opere immundo rustico se exercitum,
Life on the farm is hard (cf. Vid. 31). At the same time, it is idealized as a source of pride, status, family solidarity and income, see Casson (1976) 34, Finley (1973) 116-122. exercitum: For the status of exercere as a catchword in contemporary discourse on the good life cf. Cato’s moralising statement in his carmen de moribus (quoted by Gell. 11.2.6): vita humana prope uti ferrum est. si exerceas, conteritur; si non exerceas, taman robigo interficit. item homines exercendo videmus conteri; si nihil exerceas, inertia atque torpedo plus detrimenti facit quam exercitio. The country (rus) is in many ways opposed to the city (urbs) in Plautine comedy as well as in Greek and Roman culture, see 714n. In the world of comedy, both places carry different associations. The country is essentially a non-comic (and ‘anti-erotic’) space, the realm of dirt, hard work, and humourless toil, see Ribbeck (1888) 31f., in a word: a place where young lovers can be brought to sober up, cf. e.g. Cis. 225-228, Ad. 95, Cic. Off. 3.112 criminabatur etiam [M. Pompinius L. Manlium] quod Titum filium, ... ab hominibus relegasset et ruri habitare iussisset; cf. also the remark at Plut. Mor. 57D put into the mouth of a flatterer who wants to ingratiate himself with ‘lascivious women’ and who calls faithful wives who love their husbands ἄνωφροδίτους καὶ ἀγροίκους. Life in the country was often regarded as a kind of exile from civilisation; Plato Phdr. 230d describes how Socrates is
not interested in the country because it has nothing to teach him. In comedy, the typical countryman could be presented as an anti-social groucher, as in Menander's *Dyskolos*. For further discussion, see Ribbeck (1888) 10-15, 22-27, and Ramage (1973). opere immundo rustico: If these are the words Demiphor spoke to his son (reported speech), the fact that he characterizes the work on his father's farm as *immundus* 'squalid' speaks volumes. It reveals Demiphor's genuine dislike of farmwork and further subverts his moralizing about what Charinus should be doing with his time. This goes well with the fact that Demiphor, upon the death of his father, has nothing better to do than to sell the farm and set up a - by the standards of Greek and Roman societies, less honourable - business, namely that of a merchant (74-77).

66 neque nisi quinto anno quoque solitum visere
quinto anno quoque: ablative of time, 'every fourth year', counting inclusively, cf. *Tri.* 524 quinto quoque sulco. Lefèvre (1995) 41 thinks that this could be an indication that the *Emporos*, unlike *Mercator* (cf. 945), was not set in Athens, but in some other Attic port. However, since Demiphor states that he sold the farm after his father's death (74), nothing prevents us from assuming that he moved to Athens to set up his maritime business there (75-77). solitum: sc. se esse; solitum is Ritschl's conjecture for the MSS *positum*, not taken into the text by Leo ("fort. ab eo situm" in app.), but accepted by Lindsay and Ernout. The influence of (con)suevi, jointly with the tense-indifferent nature of the participle, seems to be responsible for the frequent use of *solitus sum* for *soleo*, cf. *Ru.* 1074f., *Tri.* 651, 829, see Skutsch on *Enn. Ann.* 96. The recurrence of the word in line 68 is not a reason against but for printing it here also (cf. *a patre* 64 and 68).

67 urbem atque extemplo inde, ut spectavisset peplum,
On the Panathenian Festival which was celebrated in the month *Hekatombaion* (about midsummer with the new moon before the summer solstice, approximately July, Parke p. 29) in honour of the city's patron goddess Athena see Pfühl (1900) 3-34, Deubner (1932) 22-35, Parke (1977) 33-50. The Panathenaic procession ended with a presentation of a new *peplos* to the goddess. Since the establishment of the Greater Panathenaea, the *peplos* was apparently woven only every four years, see Deubner (1932) 30. The Panathenaia, like other Greek festivals, furnished participants, who came from all over the country, with ample opportunity for 'dinner parties' and other fringe activities, see Davidson (1997) 96. See also Parke (1977) 39: "It was a conventional motive in the New Comedy to describe a maiden leading a sheltered life in the country as only coming to town to see the *peplos*." Although this is perhaps an exaggeration, it is possible that the motif was used more often than we can see now, cf. Plut. *Virt. mul.* 249d οι δὲ μνηστήρες ἐθέαντο παῖδοςας καὶ χορευόσας, Flickinger (1936) 122f., Gow on Theocr. 2.66, Headlam on Herodas 1.56, Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.*
2.12.19. peplum: The great πέπλος had bright colours that produced a striking visual effect, see Parke (1977) 39.

68 rus rusum confestim exigi solitum a patre
rusum = rursum; in the combination -rs- the -r- tends to be dropped with lengthening of the preceding vowel (cf. prorsus/prosus), see Meiser (1998) 116. confestim: (*com festi 'with hurry') 'without delay', cf. Tri. 798, see Walde/Hofmann s.v., Bergsland (1940) 63; on the formation of adverbs in -im and -tim in Republican Latin (cf. 205 guttatim) see Bergsland (1940) passim.

70-72 This passage is remarkable, as it is Charinus impersonating his father impersonating Grandfather (prosopopoeia in direct speech), a case of double charade: an impersonation of mos maiorum itself; cf. the way in which Davus imitates direct speech in An. 221-223 (cf. Don. Ter. An. 221 a διηγηματικῶς μημητικῶν transit).

70 laboravisse, quom haec pater sibi diceret:
a B C D a / bb c D aa B c D; prosodic hiatus quom haec (bb), see Questa (1967) 91; IK of sibi (aa). laboravisse: is potentially ambiguous; either Demipho says that 'he was by far the best farm labourer of the members of the household' or he says 'I was the first to suffer from strain'.

71 'tibi aras, tibi occas, tibi seris, tibi item metis,
Γνωμολογεῖν, talking in commonplaces, a general feature of ancient comedy, seems to have been used fairly often by Philemon, cf. the testimony by Apul. Flor. 16, see the studies of Conca (1973) and Hommel (1984). Here, the gnomic statement of lines 71f. is enlivened by prosopopoeia, mimicking the lingo of the professional businessman. The statement is proverbial, cf. Mo. 799, Ep. 265; Cap. 661, Cic. De orat. 2.261; see Otto (1890) 221. The praise of agriculture and rural life is common in both Greek and Roman literature; Philemon fr. 105 K-A provides an example of laus agri. For an overview see Kier (1933), André (1962) 28-33. aras: see 356n. on a possible obscenity. occas: 'break up the clods with a harrow (occa)' before sowing, see Walde/Hofmann s.v. occa, cf. Cap. 663.

72 tibi denique iste pariet laetitiam labos.'
labōs = labōr, s-stem of the third declension, cf. honos/honor, arbōs/arbōr, see Kieckers (1931) II 35-38; the form ending in -s is more usual in Plautus, cf. Cap. 196, Tri. 271, Tru. 521, but labor at Cu. 219, Ru. 202. See also 860n. (on calor). For the use of an abstract noun as subject, the alliteration, and the gnomic sententiousness of the line see Haffter (1934) 93; Thierfelder (1939) 163 and Molsberger (1989) 174f. note that the use
of *parere* with abstract objects (here: *laetitiam*) is a sign of paratragic diction, cf. e.g. *Cis.* 161 *pedibus perfugium peperit*.

73-74 It is truly remarkable that Demipho seems to have sold the farm straight after his father’s death. For the observant spectator, this will already have thrown doubts on the true nature of Demipho’s morality. It is even funnier that Charinus reports his father’s words without noticing his father’s dislike. Demipho’s behaviour is paralleled by that of Cato the Elder, who claimed that agriculture is more entertaining than profitable and used to loan money on ships, making him the first Roman *mercator* we know of, see Hindsholm (1990) 60f., Kienast (1954) 7f. Delcourt (1964) 168 gets the tone of this passage: "Le séjour à la campagne représentait pour un fils de famille une sanction analogue à ce qu’était pour un esclave le laboureur du moulin. Libéré [my italics] par la mort du vieux, Démiphon a dit aux champs un adieu éternel, a risqué sa chance sur un navire marchand et s’est enrichi."

73 postquam recesset vita patrio corpore
‘After Life had left the paternal body’, an elevated way of saying that Grandfather had died. *patrio*: The distinction sometimes made between *patrius* ‘of a father’s nature, dignity, or duty’, and *paternus* ‘of a father’s property, possessions, external relations’, is not strictly observed by Plautus or Terence, see Martin on *Ad.* 74, cf. *Lucr.* 4.1206 *corpore de patrio et materno sanguine crescent*.

75 *navem, metretas quae trecentas tolleret,*
*navem*: *I*-stems originally had the accusative ending in *-im*, still to be seen in the adverbial accusatives *partim* and *statim*, and e.g. in *puppim, turrim, vim*, see Kieckers (1931) II 34f., 46. *Navis* is properly a root-noun from *näus* (ναῦς), but from the identity of its accusative *navem* (from *näym*, cf. νησί) with *hostem* etc. after the confusion of *i*- and consonant stems, it passed over to the *I*-declension and formed a nominative *navis*. Hence the accusative *navim* is formed on the pattern of the old *i*-stems, see Meiser (1998) 138. There is confusion in the MSS; in the case of the *Mercator*, *B* has regularly *navem*, whereas *CD* have *navim* (75, 87, 92, 187, 218, 259, 461; unanimously *navem* only at 257, 194 *navi* being corrupt for other reasons), see Lodge s.v. I for a reportage of the variant readings. The MSS of Terence have only *navem* (three times), see McGlynn s.v. *metretas*: The *metreta* (μετρητής, from μέτρον ‘measure’) is either used as a measure of liquid capacity (normally = 1½ *amphorae*, i.e. approx. 9 gallons or 45 litres) or as a word for a container, ‘tun, cask (for wine)’, see White (1975) 166f.; *Juv. Sat.* 3.247 seems to suggest some kind of container that is large but can still be handled by one man. Jacobs (1937) 44 n.3, Hill (1958) 256 and Wallinga (1964) 20 see an allusion to the *lex Claudia* of 218 BC which barred senators from
large-scale overseas trade by fixing the maximum capacity of ships that could be owned by senators or their sons at 300 *amphorae* (roughly equivalent to *metretae*; Liv. 21.63.3); see Händl-Sagawe (1995) 396f. for the socio-economic implications of the *lex Claudia* (leading to the development of the *equites* into a trading class). Wallinga (1964) 20 n.3 supposes that the allusion supports a dating into the year 218 itself, since after that year "the allusion would have lost all its force through the horrors of the war [...]. It is of course possible that the whole question became topical again, when after 201 (or perhaps even 189) senators were able (if ever they were) to return to 'normal, prewar' business. In that case, however, current chronological theories about Plautus' plays would be very much upset." Plautine comedy should not be pressed too hard to detect allusions to real-life institutions for the purposes of dating. In this case, however, an allusion seems possible, but the main purpose may be a joke involving the tonnage of Demipho's ship. Whether it could carry 7.8 metric tons, as Wallinga (1964) 21 calculates, or about 8.5 metric tons, as Hill (1958) suggested, it is clear that such a vessel is rather small. Hultsch (1882) 584f. states that the Attic *μετρητής* equals about 55.3 pints (31.4 litres); that would result in 16.590 pints (9.423 litres) for Demipho's ship, a figure that is in the region of Walling's and Hill's. The figure of 11.817 hectolitres given by Ussing and adopted by Enk, is erroneous, see Hill (1958) 254f., Hindsholm (1990) 53f. Casson (1971) 183 notes that by the third century BC vessels under 80 tons were of negligible size and such of 130 tons were average. Casson gives these figures for the port of Thasos, but even if we allow slightly smaller tonnages for Roman ports, Demipho's ship would still be a very small vessel indeed: the playwright has produced a paradoxical joke, as it is unlikely that Demipho made his fortune (*77 bona*) as an overseas merchant using a cockle-shell. If the mention of the 300 *metretae* is an allusion to the *lex Claudia*, all we get is a *terminus post quem*, 218 BC, and Plautus is believed to have taken up work around 220/210 BC anyway.

76 parasse atque ea se mercis vectatum undique,

*parasse* = *paravisse*; between similar vowels -v- disappeared with subsequent contraction of the vowels (*consueram > consueram, audivisti > audisti*). These shortened forms of the stem were then extended by analogy to forms where the loss of -v- was phonetically unjustified, e.g. *amavisse > amasse*, see Palmer (1954) 274, Meiser (1998) 63.

77 adeo dum, quae tum haberet, peperisset bona;

'up to the time when (until) he had acquired the fortunes which he owned then', see LHS II 615. *peperisset*: note the (ironical?) echo of Grandfather's words at *72 (pariet)*: Demipho has made his fortune, but not in the way Grandfather had advised.
79-86 Schmitter (1971) 84 sees in this passage an example of *pietas* shown by Charinus towards his father. This is doubtful. Charinus is, more or less, saying the following: "When I saw that my father did not like what I was doing, I [despairingly] - *amens amansque* 'mad lover that I was' - took a grip of myself, and I said I would go on a business trip, [pause] *si velit* 'if he wished', and I would give up my love affair. He thanked me and praised my good sense, [in a displeased voice] *sed* - 'but ... he was not slow in following up my promises.' Charinus was all but willing to go on that trip, and he says so later (357f.); his father had to twist his arm into obedience (cf. 50-52). Rissom (1971) 143 suggests that Charinus' sudden obedience and Demipho's sudden leniency are indications that the whole quarrel between father and son does not have any further consequences, a dramaturgical 'storm in a teacup'. Clinia in Ter. *Ht.* 113-116 also 'gave up' his first *amica* at the insistence of his father, then he went to Asia as a mercenary.

79-80 *ego me ubi invisum meo patri esse intellego*
ninvisum: 'repellent', 'disliked'; used only here in Plautus, but cf. e.g. *Ad.* 989, 597; the word denotes uncongeniality and is probably no stronger than *odio esse* 'be a nuisance' (cf. 81), see Glick (1941) 59 n.2 and 761n. on *odisse*. *intellego*: historic present.

81 *atque odio me esse cui placere aequom fuit,*
odio: 'importunity', e.g. *As.* 443, 912, *Mil.* 743, *Ru.* 944, *Tri.* 632; for *odio esse* cf. e.g. *Cap.* 1035, *Cu.* 501, *Ep.* 2, *Tru.* 121, *Poen.* 922; see 761n. on *odisse*. *aequom fuit*: 'it was right' (*OLD* s.v. *aequus* 6a), has a formulaic ring about it; it is employed like *aequom fuerat/erat* without perceptible difference in meaning, see Ernout on *Ba.* 1017, used at line-end e.g. *Cap.* 995, *Mil.* 725.

82 *amens amansque ut animum offirmo meum,*
*A B c D a / bb c D A B c D;* metrical hiatus after *-que*. *amens amansque*: proverbial, see Otto (1890) 18, Sutphen (1902) 6f., Paschall (1939) 84, cf. e.g. *An.* 218, *Liv.* 3.44.4. On the concept that 'love is insanity' cf. e.g. Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.13, Cic. *Tusc.* 4.67-76; the theme *amor = insania* occurs often in this play, cf. 261f., 443, 446. This is one of the many instances where Plautus puts a long with a short vowel, cf. e.g. *Am.* 1 (cf. 1006), 318 (cf. 342), 498, *As.* 142, 568, *Ba.* 362 (cf. 687), 490 *malis malim modis, Ep.* 595, *Mer.* 643 *ne ille oblongis malis mihi dedit magnum malum, Mil.* 316, *Ru.* 1225. On this type of rhetorical assonance see Austin on Verg. *A.* 4.238, Brinkhoff (1935) 139-142.

This is the inversion of the common motif that Father goes abroad on business and leaves at home his young son with the consequence that the latter sows a few wild oats, cf. e.g. Men. Sam. 96-112, D.E. (Pl. Ba.), Ter. Ph. 66-68, Pl. Mo. 440, 971, St. 366-368, Tri. 771. mercatum: cf. mercatus meretricius in Poen. 339; Ad. 231 mercatus in Cyprus (‘market, fair’), the pimp Sannio’s destination, probably the equivalent of πανήγυρις there (and here?), because it is in Cyprus, probably a festival in honour of Aphrodite, cf. Ph. 837-838 ego me ire senibus Sunium / dicam ad mercatum, ancillulam emptum dudum quam dixit Geta.

For a similar statement of filial piety, cf. Hec. 448f. nam me parenti potius quam amori obsequi / oportet, which may yet be ironical, see Konstan (1983) 136f. missum facere: ‘put aside’, ‘forget about’, cf. 657, 1000, Am. 1145, Mo. 1177, Tri. 1168; An. 630, 833, Eu. 90, 864, Ph. 946, Hec. 408, 780, Ad. 906, 991, see Schmitfranz (1910) 34.

‘But he didn’t forget to follow up what I had promised’, cf. Am. 586, St. 141, see OLD s.v. persequor 9.

aedificat: ‘he had a ship built’; historic present; for trading purposes ships were usually chartered (cf. 76 parasse) and not built, cf. Ru. 57; Ad. 225. navem cercurum: For a description of the cercurus (κέρκυρος) see Casson (1971) 157f., 163-166, Saint-Denis (1935) 67. On the evidence of St. 367f. one might be lead to believe that the cercurus was at least regarded as a medium-to-large-sized vessel; Livy 23.34.4 stresses its celeritas. merces: accusative plural; Leo prints mercis, following the MSS (Nonius has merces), but at 93 and 96 he prints merces, again following the MSS. Both endings (-is and -es) are possible, see Meiser (1998) 138, see 75n. on navem. For the sake of consistency, I have printed merces throughout.

talentum argenti ipsus sua adnumerat manu,
1375, 1380 Tru. 952. A *stater* weighing 8 grammes, this would amount to 2.4 kilogrammes in gold (and more in silver). It would be ludicrous to try and count such a sum coin by coin into someone’s hand. A grotesque exaggeration, just as the ship at line 75 is grotesquely small. On *talentum* see also 703n. This action characterizes Demipho as the epitome of a *mercator*, a man who hates parting with his money, counting out every single coin as slowly and carefully as possible, cf. *As.* 499 *mercator dives ... mihi talentum ... adnumeravit.* *adnumerat*: historic present, ‘counted out’, used frequently by the classical jurists, see Daube (1969) 33 with n.5.

90 *mihi paedagogus fuerat, quasi uti mihi foret*
Charinus is almost too old to have this kind of chaperone be sent with him as a guardian, especially since he is meant to be a businessman abroad. Does his father not trust him? *paedagogus*: On the *paedagogus* see Boulogne (1951) 14-35, 47-59, Schmitter (1971) 121-126, Spranger (1984) 82f., Schulze (1998) 13-19. Despite of its title (‘Die komische Figur des Pädagogen bei Plautus’), the article by Schottlaender (1973) focuses exclusively on Lydus in the Ba. Though there are slaves in a number of comedies who watch over their young masters’ morals during Father’s absence (cf. e.g. *Ba.* 109-169, 405-499, *Men.* 258-264, 338-347, *Mo.* 20-33, *Tru.* 250-314, *Ph.* 71-79), there was apparently no recognised character-type (comic ‘mask’) for the *paedagogus*. By contrast, the ‘doctor’ and the ‘cook’ were minor characters with a well-defined profile. For a παιδαγογοῖ helping Young Master in Greek comedy cf. Baton fr. 5 K-A. The παιδαγογοί were carefully distinguished from the δίδασκαλοι, and the main part of their business was the supervision of the morals, taking their young masters to school (Plat. *Lysis* 208c), etc. (rather like ‘childminders’). The office was given to the most trustworthy slaves. There are two types of *paedagogi* in comedy, the ones who support the amorous affairs of their *alumni* (e.g. *Ps.* 394-408; *Ad.* 961-966) or at least ignore them (*Ph.* 78f.), and on the other hand those who try to avert ‘evil things’ from their *alumni* (*Ba.* 145f., *Cu.* 175-177) and are therefore not liked by them (*Ba.* 136, 155, 449f.; *Cu.* 194f.). As the audience are to learn soon, Acanthio is a fine specimen of the former group. Here Plautus is careful to explain the office of this *paedagogus* even to those in the audience who might not be familiar with the Greek term. Still, the majority of the Greek terms and phrases found in Plautus is probably not taken from his models, but from contemporary speech at Rome, see Shipp (1953) 105-112. Terence prefers to translate the term (= *magister*), except in *Ph.* 144 where the exact term is required. Plautus uses both, apparently indiscriminately, see Shipp on *An.* 54.

91 *custos. his sic confectis navem solvimus.*
*custos*: a synonym of *paedagogus*, cf. also *comes, monitor, pedisequus, rector, magister*, see Boulogne (1951) 15f., 35. *navem solvimus*: ‘set sail’ (lit. ‘loosen a vessel
from its moorings’), see de Saint-Denis (1935a) 104, cf. Am. 412, Ba. 288, Mil. 1188, 1300, St. 417.

92-96 For Rhodes as a major trading centre in Hellenistic times see 11n. The situation described here (Rhodian merchants importing goods from abroad) mirrors an economic reality of the island in Hellenistic times, as the “Rhodians had an ever-increasing need for imported goods, especially grain and timber for shipbuilding”, see Berthold (1984) 47. Since Charinus made an unforeseen profit on his wares (beyond his father’s estimate, cf. 95f.), it is possible that the commodity he is envisaged to have carried was grain (yet *quas merces* in line 93 is vague), which can undergo rapid fluctuations of price due to unforeseen changes in availability; on the Hellenistic grain trade see Casson (1954). Yet Rhodes was more than just a place where grain merchants made profitable business, see Berthold (1984) 52: “Given Rhodes’ position and financial resources, it naturally dealt in more than just grain, and every kind of commodity could be seen on its wharves, including slaves and luxury goods from the East.” On the slave-trade in Rhodes see Kruškol (1947).

A romantic anecdote shows how important Rhodes had become even as a clearinghouse of the slave-trade, see Berthold (1984) 100, quoting Athen. 13.578a: “When Mysta, mistress of Seleucus, was captured and sold into slavery at Ankyra in 236, she soon appeared on the blocks at Rhodes, where she was recognized and promptly returned to the king. So vital was the Rhodian market that a slave taken three hundred miles away in the interior of Asia was disposed of on the island.”

93 *omnis ut volui vendidi ex sententia*

*ut volui ... ex sententia*: a slightly pleonastic blending of two constructions, cf. Mil. 1221 *meo arbitratu ut volui*, Ru. 587 *praeter animi quam lubuit*, 963, Tri. 827 *meo modo ut volui*, cf. also Am. 221, As. 152, Per. 359, Tri. 295, 827. *ex sententia*: sc. *mea* ‘to my liking’, ‘in line with my taste’, cf. 370; often used of perishables in prime condition, ‘just right’, ‘perfect’, see Gratwick on Men. 273; *ex sententia* occurs thirteen times in Plautus, at line-end in eleven of these, as well as in Turpilius Com. 137 R., see Wright (1974) 158; it is a good formula to conclude an iambic senarius or trochaic septenarius (*DABcD*). It is used less frequently by Terence, usually without a possessive pronoun (but cf. e.g. *Ht*. 683 *ex sententia tua*), see McGlynn s.v. *sententia*. The phrase is cognate with *ex mei animi sententia*, a set phrase from legal terminology used in the judge’s oath, cf. Cic. *Ac.* 2.146, Ulp. *Dig.* 40.12.27.1, see also 377n. (on *advorsum mei animi sentantiam*).
95 lucrūm ingens facio praeterquam mihi meus pater
a B C dd A / B C D / A bb c d+, breaking Meyer’s law (see 6n.). lucrūm ... facio: cf. Cap. 327, Cas. 395, Per. 494, 503, Tru. 426. The financial theme is transformed at 553
id iam lucrūmst quod vivis to show the change of mind in the Mercator (senior). The line
is a reprisal of the theme of money-making, cf. 77. praeterquam: ‘above and beyond’,
see OLD s.v. 1. meus bb, see Gratwick on Men. 44.

96 dedit aestumatas merces: ita peculium
aestumatas merces: Again, Demipho is shown to be a carefully calculating businessman,
see 89n. peculium: ‘special fund’. The concept of money put aside by those who are,
basically, economically dependent on their master, i.e. slaves and sons, is, at least in the
case of slaves, not unknown in Greek comedy, cf. Men. Heros 7, but the peculium is
fundamentally a Roman institution, see Fredershausen (1912) 242-244, Kaser (1938)
85f., Crook (1967) 110, Daube (1969) 75-91. The ultimate control over the money was
always with the paterfamilias, see Crook (1967) 56, Saller (1994) 217f. See also 525n.

97-98 Exactly who the hospes was whom Charinus met at the harbour is a puzzle, see
98n. Most scholars assume that he is a family friend (ζευς), and that is the way hospes is
usually used in Plautus. On the other hand, hospes and related words are used in later
Latin in the sense of ‘innkeeper’, see Kleberg (1957) 11-14, and inns were often
associated with prostitution; for prostitution of females working in inns, see Kleberg
(1957) 89-91; see further McGinn (1998) 137 and 297 on laws dealing with prostitutes
working under the pretext that they are part of the service staff of an inn, an involvement
that receives increasing recognition in Late Antiquity. This is also true for some Greek
‘inns’, see Casson (1976) 35: “Euctemon in Isaeus 6 [owned] a synoikia in the
Ceramicus (6.20) which he turned into a brothel, a synoikia in the Piraeus (6.19), and a
bath (6.33) in the Piraeus [...] The synoikia in the Piraeus, being next to the wine
market, may have had a bar, along with rooms for guests, for the two usually went
together.”

Rosivach (1998) 86 thinks rightly that this is a possible interpretation: “Charinus’
language (especially ‘he recognized me’ [me ... adgnovit, 98] and ‘as we went to recline
at night’ [discubitum noctu ut imus, 100] appears to weigh against such an interpretation
here, but the ‘host’ does provide Charinus with an unusual form of hospitality, one more
likely to be found in an inn than in a private home.” Rosivach continues: “The woman,
Pasicompsa, is also no ordinary household servant. Not only do her looks set her apart -
Charinus’ father assumes that people ‘will accuse me and my wife of pimping’ (uxori
meae mihiqve obiectent lenocinium facere, 410-11) if they keep her in their house - but
also, like a true party-companion, she knows nothing about grinding grain, chopping
wood or any of the other regular chores expected of a female domestic slave. It is
probably relevant here that in the scene heading for Act 3, scene 1, the only scene in which Pasicompsa appears on stage, those manuscripts which supply characters types in their scene headings identify her not as an *ancilla* [...] but as a *meretrix.*"

Rosivach's last statement is untenable. The scene headings, however old the tradition they derive from may prove to be, are the product of people who know the whole play before they compose the headings. Thus, all that the scene headings can prove is that to some people between the time of Varro and Late Antiquity the role of Pasicompsa seemed to be that of a *meretrix*. For the purpose of interpreting the lines as we have them, it might prove more fruitful to look at how a Roman audience might have understood the story Charinus tells them. Therefore, in addition to Rosivach's arguments, one may note that *hospes* is used of disreputable characters at *Ru.* 49, 72, 451, 491, esp. 49f. *ei* [sc. *lenoni*] *erat hospes par sui, Siculus senex / scelestus, Agrigentinus, urbis prodictor, 72f. *munc ambo, leno atque hospes, in saxo simul/sedent ejecti, 451 meum erum lenonem Siciliensemque hospitem;* at *Poen.* 685 the *leno* Lycus refers to himself as a *hospes* in greeting a potential client who is also a stranger in town.

Potential 'clients' were often intercepted at the harbour just after disembarkation, cf. the situation described at *Men.* 338-343 *morem hunc meretrices habent:/ad portum mitunt servolos, ancillulas./si quae peregrina navis in portum advenit,/rogitant cuiatis sit, quid ei nomen siet,/postilla extemplo se applicant, adglutinant./si pellexerunt, perditum amittunt domum,* see further Schuhmann (1975) 256f. It is not without reason that *portus* can be used metaphorically of a brothel (*As.* 158). Rosivach (1998) 86 concludes: "On the whole then it would seem that Pasicompsa is a slave-*meretrix* whom Charinus has purchased from her owner, in this case an inn-keeper rather than a *leno*. However he came by her, he took her along with him as he continued his merchant travels, and now, after two years together (cf. 12-13, 533), he has returned with her to Athens." Apart from the fact that Rosivach does not take into account Charinus' statement at 106 that he came straight home after he had bought the girl, his conclusion is correct.

97 *conficio grande. sed dum in portu illi ambulo,*

98 *hospes me quidam adgnovit, ad cenam vocat.*
*hospes ... quidam* The use of the indefinite pronoun precludes a straightforward translation of *hospes* as 'guest-friend' (i.e., someone who had established a long-standing
xenia, e.g. as a business partner), for such a person could hardly be referred to as quidam. Moreover, this is also implausible because Charinus would not just have aimlessly strolled and promenaded about in the harbour area if he had had someone to go to, e.g. some old business connection of his father’s. Rather, he would have gone to the house of his hospes. adgnovit: not so much ‘recognized me’ as ‘spotted me’, cf. Ep. 597, Men. 1124; so the line may be translated ‘a hospes’ spotted me’ rather than ‘my/an old hospes recognized me’. ad cenam vocat: voco often = invito, cf. e.g. An. 453.

99 venio, decumbo acceptus hilare atque ampliter. 
acceptus: ‘entertained (as a guest)’, cf. Ps. 1254, Eu. 1082. hilare: ‘cheerfully’, from ιλαρός, see OLD s.v. 1a.

100 discubitum noctu ut imus, ecce ad me advenit 
discubitum ... imus: supine with ire, see 353n., cf. 84 missum facere, 358; accubitum ire: Ba. 755, 1203, Men. 225, 368, Ps. 891; cubitum ire: Cas. 977, Ps. 846. noctu: old adverbial ablative/locative of a hypothetical feminine substantive noctus, a variant of nox, see OLD s.v., Walde/Hofmann s.v. nox sub fin., cf. e.g. Ba. 317, Ad. 532.

101 mulier, qua mulier alia nullast pulchrior; Just as his father Demipho later on, Charinus falls in love with the girl Pasicompsa ‘at first sight’ (see 262n.). Instead of the second mulier, Scaliger suggested mulier<e>, but it would appear that there is no case for it, see LHS H 564, Kienitz (1879) 533, cf e.g. Cas. 862 senem quo senex nequior nullus vivit; Cic. Sen. 84 Cato meus, quo nemo vir melior natus est, Lael. 5 tum est Cato locutus, quo erat nemo fere senior temporibus illis, nemo prudentior. The independent qua is ablative of comparison.

102 ea nocte mecum illa hospitis iussu fuit. 
mecum ... fuit: ‘to be with someone’ can be used euphemistically of sexual intercourse, see Adams (1982) 177, 226, cf. συγγενέσθαι, συνείναι, see Henderson (1975) 8, 159, cf. e.g. Am. 817f. hospitis iussu: implies that the woman is of unfree status, see 104n.

103 vosmet videte quam mihi valide placuerit: 
Cf. 267 vosmet videte ceterum quanti siem; cf. perhaps Men. Dysc. 194 ἄνδρες, τέρας (Barigazzi’s conjecture, adopted in OCT). It is only now that Charinus reverts, for the last few lines of his monologue, to his role as adulescens amator, from which he had departed after he has told the audience how his father had given him a dressing-down (79). vosmet videte: aside with direct address of the audience, cf. 267, 313-315, 851. Pociña Pérez (1975) 250 lists examples from Plautine comedy and points out that there are fewer in Terence (An. 828-832, Eu. 297-301, Hec. 865-868). valide: see 48n.

104 postridie hospitem adeo, oro ut vendat mihi vendat: also implies that the woman with whom Charinus spent the night is a slave; this should not come as a surprise, as a freeborn woman would quite certainly refrain from ‘being with someone’ on the orders of anyone.


106 quid verbis opus est? emi atque advexi heri. Cf. *Poen.* 112f. *quid verbis opus est? is heri huc in portum navi venit vesperi*. With view to the chronological difficulties arising from lines 533-535 Leo in *app.* assumed a lacuna and suggested to supply something like *emi <atque habui mulierem mecum usqueaque ut volueram> atque advexi heri*, or perhaps as little as *emi <habui> atque*. It is problematic to remedy the difficulties by admitting changes to the paradosis. Moreover, the very point of saying *quid verbis opus est?* is to prepare the audience for a harsh transition from ‘Rhodes’ to ‘Athens’. *quid verbis opus est?* ‘need I say more?’, ‘to cut a long story short’; cf. e.g. *As.* 468 *quid opus verbit, Ba.* 486, *Cu.* 79, *Ru.* 135, 590, Antiphanes fr. 35.5 *K-Α τι μακρὰ δὲι λέγειν*; and *Men.* *Sam.* 76f. *τι δὲι λέγειν*; *Hornstein* (1914) 114 notes the irony of this remark, since we do not expect brevity of a character who has demonstrated so profusely his tendency towards *multiloquium* (31) earlier in the prologue. The phrase *opus est* is used frequently to indicate that a speaker is not going to linger over further details, and it is employed in a similar way by both Plautus and Terence, see the instances in *Lodge* s.v. *opus (usus)*, McGlynn s.v. *opus (usus)*; on *quid verbis opus est* see esp. Stockert on *Au.* 468, Frost on *Am.* 615. It is used with the ablative of a noun or pronoun, as in the set phrase *quid verbis opus est?* (here and 21 other times in Plutus), and also at 396 *nihil opus nobis ancilla*, 411 *quid est opus?*, 420 *nihil istoc opus*. In the *Mercator*, it is also used with the ablative of a participle, in conjunction with a neuter pronoun (565 *quod opus facto, facito ut cogites*, 566 *opus hoc facto existumo*) or without it (333 *praecauto opus*, 466 *cauto opus*). It can also govern infinitives (917 *non opus est ... munc intro te ire*) and subjunctives (1004 *nihil opus resciscat*). *emi atque advexi heri*: ‘bought her and came here yesterday’, so-
called διὰ μέσου construction, whereby the two verbs are treated as one idea, cf. e.g. Au. 97, Ad. 917, see LHS II 783f. Note especially the use of atque 'and then', indicating a close internal (and temporal) connection between the two actions (cf. 259, 582, 661, 783, 927), see Ramsay on Mo. 488, Austin on Verg. A. 4.261. In this line the impression of rapid succession is reinforced by synaloepha. The play may be set in spring, at the beginning of the sailing season, for which see Casson (1971) 270-273. The sailing season lasted from March 10th to November 11th. Balsdon (1969) 226f.: “Given good winds a ship in normal conditions might make a hundred and twenty sea-miles in a day and, if conditions were good, travel by sea was generally far faster than by land. You might reach Ostia from Cadiz in seven days, from Marseille in three. Two days was a record voyage from North Africa to Ostia.” There may also be an allusion to the foreign travel of female ‘escorts’ hired out by pornoboskoi, on which see Davidson (1997) 92: “Apollodorus says she [Neaera] entered the trade as a young girl, bought as a slave by a woman based in Corinth called Nicarete who pretended to be her mother. She and her ‘sisters’ were hired as escorts by wealthy and distinguished men, poets, foreign aristocrats and masters of the art of Greek prose composition such as Lysias. They were taken to festivals and were seen at dinners and drinking-parties all over Greece [...]. They were often controlled by a man, a pornoboskos, whose name means literally ‘whore-pasturer’, driving his herds of women around Greece following the seasons and the festivals.” heri: ‘yesterday’, but heri, hodie, and cras do not always refer to ‘real’ but to dramatic time in Plautus, see 438n., 542n.

107 eam me advexisse nolo resciscat pater.

If it is Charinus’ plan to tell everyone that Pasicompsa is a gift for Mother, the question arises why he still conceals her from Demipho and leaves her aboard the ship at the harbour, since Father (and everyone else) is supposed to know about her anyway. Indeed, the very fact that Charinus leaves Pasicompsa behind instead of simply taking her home and presenting her to Mother (as a fait accompli) has made things worse, as it provides Demipho with a prime opportunity to intercept the girl and set up an intrigue. The explanation is that there is no (logical) reason. The playwright simply had it that way, for the sake of good comedy and dramatic (and not logical) motivation. resciscat: ‘find out’; cf. 466, 1004. ‘Finding out’ (resciscere) is a minor motif in Mercator (cf. 343, 380, 466, 720, 820, 1004; phrased without rescisco: 207-221, 333f., 477, 586f., 633-638, 687, 814). Both Demipho and Dorippa are ‘flies’ (cf. 361), obnoxious people who will find out everything. This is not so much owed to their individual characters but their comic ‘job’ as pater durus and uxor dotata respectively. Charinus’ remark raises the expectation that Father is bound to find out about it later in the play. No other Plautine comedy has so many occurrences of rescisco (a third of all occurrences in Plautus), see Lodge s.v. A remark in Hec. 866-868 refers to the typical comic technique of revelation:

108 modo eam reliqui ad portum in navi et servolum.

The announcement of entrances, whether by name or some other indication, was conventional, see Duckworth (1952) 114-116, Csapo (1986) 79ff., and cf. e.g. *E.* Hipp. 51ff., *Men.* Dysc. 47ff., 230, 773, *Sam.* 280ff.; in this play 271, 329-330, 561, 699, 961. The identity of the character is normally made known upon his first entry, or shortly before. *sed quid currentem servom a portu conspicor,*

The verb *resciscere* expresses a more vivid and physical experience on the part of the subject (Woodcock 75), quite in keeping with the preparation of a *servus-currens* routine. The verb is used particularly of the ‘catching sight’ of somebody, cf. 194.
110 quem navi abire vetui? timeo quid siet.  
Cf. Am. 988 ille (sc. a servus currens) naves salvam nuntiat aut irati adventum senis.  
This remark made by Mercury shows that the announcement of a running slave aroused  
certain expectations in the audience, especially that of a slave coming from the harbour, a  
portu. The motif of navis salva is indeed taken up by Charinus in lines 173f. (see n.), the  
motif of irati adventus senis is at least hinted at in lines 180-188, but it is in the following  
converted into the description of a senex amator. navi: for abire + ablative of separation  
cf. e. g. 654 hac urbe abis, Am. 208, Mo. 597. timeo quid siet.: Averna (1990) 60 n.15  
lists parallels for this type of utterance (indirect question dependent on a verb of fearing  
or wondering), cf. in particular Cas. 637 timeo hoc negoti quid siet; Ter. Ht. 620 timeo  
quid sit. siet: The forms siem, sies, siet, sient are relatively common in Plautus (c. 170  
occurrences) and Terence (71 occurrences); 136 of the Plautine examples occur at line-  
end of iambic senarii as c D, as is the case here. The figures are given by Noetzel (1908)  
26-30. This and other iambic by-forms (duim, fuam, infinitives in -ier), see Haffter  
(1934) 115, conveniently secure the cadence cD/ at line-end, relatively more often in the  
longer iambo-trochaic metres than in senarii, see Gratwick on Men. 267.

III. Discussion

Beare (1928) 214 thought that the “absence of Roman colouring in the Mercator is  
particularly noteworthy in the opening scene. Here if anywhere we might expect to find  
that appeal to the audience which is so manifest in the other opening scenes - whether  
they are ‘prologues’ proper or not. As a matter of fact, Charinus’ monologue, besides  
being verbose and dull, contains nothing which might not be ascribed to Philemon. [...] It  
is difficult to believe that such an opening scene could grip the attention of the Roman  
audience. (Contrast the brief, humorous, and direct prologue of the Asinaria.)”  
Conversely, it has also been argued that very long monologues like this one cannot in this  
form have been part of the Greek original, see e.g. Denzler (1968) 103 (pointing out that  
Terence’s monologues are much shorter) and Fraenkel (1960) 135-196 (monologues and  
monodies contain the largest and most independent sections of Plautine invention). In  
Plautus, there are ten monologues with about 50 up to 150 lines (Am. 1-152, 153-262,  
Au. 475-535, Ba. 925-977, Mil. 79-153, Mo. 84-156, St. 155-195, Tri. 223-275, Tru.  
22-92).

Charinus’ monologue has been criticised for its length, but the monologue of  
Moschion which opens Menander’s Samia (1-68) proves that the conventions of New  
Comedy actually permitted longer narrative of this kind. It is the very point of this young  
lover’s speech that it is too long (cf. 31-33).
There is no need to doubt that the straightforward narrative in 40-106 reproduces the substance of a corresponding monologue at the beginning of Philemon's play. Besides informing the audience of the antecedents of the plot, it sheds light on the characters of Charinus, in whom filial obedience struggles against susceptibility to women, and also of his father Demipho, who is dedicated to the acquisition of money and constantly nags his son to follow his example. The extradramatic character of lines 1-39 (except for 11-13) does also not constitute a *prima facie* reason for believing that an equivalent text could not also have been in the *Emporos*. Rightly Cèbe (1966) 108f., along with Lejay (1925) 79f. and Taladoire (1956) 121, regards the first two scenes of the *Mercator*, comprising almost a quarter of the play (1-224), as a good example of faithfulness to the Greek original, especially with regard to the treatment of (Cèbe 109) "les bavardages et les 'longueries d'apprêt' de la tragédie."
1. Introduction

1. Acanthio’s Function

Acanthio, whose entrance was announced by Charinus at 109f., hurries onto the stage, expounding the difficulties caused by physical obstacles in the exaggerated manner of a *servus currens*, conveying an impression of complete external chaos (115-119). This is paralleled by an internal chaos: pounding heart, ruptured lungs, revolting spleen (114, 123-125). The inner organs refuse their service and rob him of his vital breath, yet he is able to monologize in iambic octonarii all the way; he is not serious about his ‘job’, and no member of the audience would expect him to be.

Charinus, silent for the first part of the scene (except for asides at 120f., 123, 126 to communicate his suspense to the audience), only begins to join in when Acanthio calls out his name at the door (132). Their encounter is delayed to heighten suspense about the nature of Acanthio’s message. The combination of soliloquy with comments on the soliloquizing character by others on stage is common in comedy (e.g. *Tri*. 843-869; *Ad*. 299-320) and also used by Seneca (*Ag*. 421-428).

When called by Charinus and asked what the matter actually is, Acanthio at first seems to ignore his master (133), then language and mood change (underlined by a passage of metrical transition, 135-136), and Acanthio becomes more reserved and demure (137f.). Now, in contrast to his previous eagerness, he is slow and unwilling to talk. One might expect an immediate explanation for his haste, but none is given. As a consequence, tension is building up, both for Charinus and for the audience, who are just as much in suspense as Charinus is about Acanthio’s news. The technique of extended delay is maintained to the very end of the scene. The pattern of question-evasion is repeated several times before the tension is released, and Charinus is made to run the entire gamut of emotional states, from simple curiosity to deep despair, coupled with different modes of enquiry, from asking a simple question to angry demands, to humble entreaties and back to angry demands. A ludic element pervades this contest of wits between master and servant, every question being met by an unexpected witty reply. Yet, whenever Charinus seems to have lost interest in the game, Acanthio renews his interest by dropping just as much of a hint as to rekindle his master’s curiosity (e.g. 161), and the game starts again. Each time this happens, it is the slave who is in control of the dialogue, not his master. For every foolish remark and sign of irrational pathos in his master Acanthio has a sobering comment, not sparing his social superior the unflattering epithet *stultissime* (211; cf. 207). Moreover, it is Acanthio who has initiated an intrigue to conceal his master’s affair with the girl (212).
Plautus employs the technique of delayed information frequently. At As. 325 the slave Libanus bids Leonida to tell his news, but the other rejoins: placide ergo unum quicquid rogita, ut adquiescam. non vides me ex cursura anhelitum etiam ducere? Other examples are Cas. 768-828 (a reference to servi comici at 778-780), Cu. 277-327, Ep. 1-80, 194-205, Mer. 888-900, Mo. 348-362, Ps. 241-380 (the leno Ballio is in a hurry but lingers), An. 228-300, Ph. 179-198, Ad. 320-329.

It is commonly believed that Acanthio functions as a protatic character (πρόσωπον προτατικόν), i.e. he is brought on at the onset of the play to establish the setting and prompt the disclosure of information, but who thereafter disappears never to be seen again, see e.g. Riemer (1996) 108f. Such protatic characters appear in Menander, see e.g. Blume (1998) 81 with n.21 (on the origin of the term); cf. Men. Dysc. (Chaireas), Pl. Mo. (Grumio), Ep. (Thesprio), Ter. An. (Sosia), Ph. (Davus), Hec. (Syra, Philotis). On the use of slaves as πρόσωπα προτατικά in Plautine comedy, see Wilner (1931), Duckworth (1952) 106f., Spranger (1984) 16f. Strictly speaking, Acanthio is not a ‘protatic character’. As such, he would not belong to the plot at all and have no connection with it, but would be brought on from outside to serve as an alienus and ignarus (cf. Don. Ter. Ph. 35, 58) of the events he is about to hear. Actually, Acanthio is Charinus’ confidante and knows more about the recent developments than his master; he is the inventor of the intrigue (348), see also Prescott (1920) 247 (“more as messenger than as protatic rôle”).

2. The servus currens in Roman Comedy
Apart from the present passage, Duckworth (1936) 95 lists the following: As. 267-297, Cap. 768/778, 789-836, Cu. 280-305, Ep. (arguably) 1-25, Mo. 348-364 (parasitus currens), St. 275-325, Tri. 1008-1073; Ad. 299-320, An. 338-344, Eu. 643-650, Ph. 179-195, 841+. Add Am. 984-1008, perhaps Ru. 615-626 (the routine is slightly different: no specific person is looked for), Caec. Com. 132f. The beginnings of such servus currens routines are much easier to determine than their ends, which are in no case indicated by Duckworth. I have followed the principle that once the character is called upon by the others present on stage (e.g. by heus, his name, and an imperative bidding him to stop), the servus currens routine as such is over, as the slave will now, however reluctantly, proceed to impart his news. In cases where the slave does not at once recognize the person he is looking for, the short banter that ensues (e.g. Ph. 848-851) also belongs to the servus currens routine. The routine is definitely over when the slave begins to tell his news.

Duckworth excludes Ep. 192-206 and Per. 272-279, the latter – convincingly – because no message is delivered, no one is looked for by the running slave, and the routine ends in burlesque abuse, and the former – less convincingly, see Csapo (1986) 74f. – because Epidicus simply poses as a servus currens as part of the deception of the
senex. However, it should make no difference whether the running slave performs his routine in a play or in a play-within-a-play.


The question of Greek prototypes for the *servus currens* routine is discussed by Guardi (1974) who argues for a continuous development of the routine, taking its origin from the parody of the tragic messenger (e.g. *A. Per.* 247f., *S. Ant.* 223f., *O.C.* 29-31, *E. Med.* 1118-1120) in Old Comedy (e.g. *Ar. Ach.* 175-179, 1069f., *Av.* 1121-1123, 1168-1171, *Th.* 571-573) and being developed in New Comedy, see also Csapo (1986) 134-151; for the motif of exhaustion cf. also *Ar. V.* 374-376 *πονῆσε δακέσσι τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς δρόμον δρομεῖν.* At *V.* 1292 the slave Xanthias appears, running and shouting, but although certainly popular at the time of Aristophanes, the entrance of an excited running slave was probably not yet conventional, see further MacDowell on *Ar. V.* 1292. Guardi (1974) 8-10 also discusses several New Comedy passages, but the evidence is inconclusive, see Csapo (1986) 153 n.21. Surveying the examples from Menander, Guardi mentions in particular frs. 690, 286 K-Th, *Dysc.* 81-144, *Asp.* 399-419. On the last passage see also Anderson (1970); Csapo (1986) 73 regards it as an *ἐξέγγελαι* routine, but judges it sufficiently comparable to a *servus currens* routine.

The question of the extent of Plautine originality in the treatment of the *servus currens* routine is taken up by Csapo (1986) 69-165, (1987) and (1989). He argues convincingly for a Greek background not only of the running slave routine as a whole, but also for some of its elements that have commonly been regarded as more specifically Roman, especially the threat-monologue of the *servus currens*, see Hunter (1985) 81 for the current consensus.
Yet, I hesitate to assign certain portions of the present scene to Plautine and others to Philemonian ingenuity, as is done most recently by Blänsdorf (1995) 11f., who distinguishes between parts of the scene which he regards as Plautine 'clownery' and others 'necessary' for the purpose of exposition. Langen (1886) 158f. had argued similarly on the grounds of psychological 'inverisimilitude' and 'undue length' of the scene, which are unhelpful guides in dealing with comic stock scenes, see Duckworth (1936) 97: "As padding for comic effect this delay in imparting the news cannot be justified, and it is, moreover, psychologically improbable, but as a means of arousing the suspense of the spectators it succeeds in its purpose admirably. Acanthio's haste, Charinus' eagerness to hear why the slave has come, Acanthio's slowness in coming to the point - all maintain the uncertainty of the spectators who know only that Charinus has left the girl at the harbor as he did not wish his father to find out about her (106f.)." 

3. The servus currens routine in performance
The general effect would be more amusing if the slave was actually running on the spot to create the impression of haste, see Blancké (1918) 47; alternatively, and equally funny, he may be made to move onto the stage in slow motion, as was suggested by Weismann (1911) 20. Csapo (1986) 107f. points out that Acanthio must interrupt his running for a considerable portion of his monologue anyway, probably stopping when he becomes emotionally involved with some matter of secondary importance, as the obstruction by other people (116-119). Then, as if coming to realize his delay, the slave spurs himself on again (121f.) and moves on. Using the evidence afforded us by artistic depictions of comic scenes and combining it with the evidence of the texts themselves, Csapo (1986) 128-134 argues that the servus currens will at least not have run fast, and that his movements can probably be described as a "slow but agitated, awkward but highly stylized dance intended to give only the impression of speed." This seems plausible, especially if one considers the fact that it is difficult to speak (never mind sing) intelligibly while running. For example, at Cu. 280-305 one can suppose a pretence of running, with numerous halts interposed.

II. Commentary

111-140 The canticum
After a long monologue in iambic senarii (1-110), Plautus has decided to have a livelier pace; after the canticum (111-140) the remainder of the scene is in trochaic septenarii (141-224), after which another monologue brings the pace back to iambic senarii. Most servus currens entrances are in trochaic septenarii, but there are parallels to the use of other metres (as here, mainly iambic octonarii) elsewhere (e.g. Ad. 310ff., 324). Questa
(1995) 238f. regards only 129-140 as canticum proper. Braun (1970) 120 is correct in taking the whole passage (111-140) as canticum.

Lines 125, 130 and 131 contain four resolutions, 112, 113, and 124 three. In 113 two resolutions are followed by a short C-position, resulting in a run of five light syllables, and there is a run of six light syllables in line 131. hiatus occurs at 116 (legitimate before diaeresis). The bunching of resolutions helps to underline Acanthio’s exhaustion and Charinus’ tension, see Grimal (1975) 149. The central diaeresis of the iambic octonarius is obscured in 111, 118, 120, 124. This may reflect some change in theme or choreography at these points: At 120, Charinus speaks for the first time in this scene (as in 111, Acanthio speaks his first line), in 118, the iambic octonarii are resumed after the trochaic septenarius (117), and in 124 it seems that Acanthio has changed the theme of his servus currens monologue from ‘fighting in the street’ to ‘my bodily ailments’, and this change is perhaps (and certainly could be effectively produced as being) accompanied by a different choreography.

Monosyllabic words line-end (me) occur at 132, 134, quadrisyllabic words line-end are bunched at 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, and occur isolated at 133, 140.

111 AC. ex summis opibus viribusque usque experire, nitere
A B C d d A B c D A B c D a B c d+ (ia\(^8\)) with hiatus after nitere, which is also brevis in longo. The hiatuses here and at the end of the following line mark emphatic halts in Acanthio’s speech - he is gasping for breath. The medial diaeresis is obscured; the effect is that there is no stop in the line - the runner cannot stop. The motif of the running slave urging himself on to run faster is common, cf. e.g. Cap. 790, Ep. 194-196, St. 280-285, Tril. 1008-1015, see Leo (1908) 102f. ex summis opibus viribusque: ‘with all your might and strength’; a military metaphor, cf. Enn Trag. 89; Mil. 620, Mo. 348, St. 45.

112 erus ut minor opera tua servetur: agedum Acanthio
aa B c D / aa B c D / A B c d d a B c D (ia\(^8\)); hiatus after Acanthio. The breaks after the first and the second iambic metron result in the rhythmical equivalent of a ‘rhyme’ (aa B c D / aa B c D): the line is broken up into independent cola; cf. 114. This kind of movement goes well with the heavy panting of the servus currens. Acanthio inflates the importance of his role by stressing that it is through his efforts that Young Master will be saved, cf. St. 282. erus ... minor: ‘young master’ (τρόφιμος), cf. As. 328f; Men. Epit. fr. 1.1 Sandbach, Sam. 646; the proper word used by slaves to refer to their master’s son (= erilis filius, Tru. 307; Eu. 289), see Shipp (1977) 9. servetur: used of rescuing lovers from their distress, cf. Cu. 628, Men. 1065, Poen. 917, see Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Dsyc. 378 ἀπέκωσας. agedum: ‘get on with it [age-] now [dum]!’ used with an imperative or jussive subjunctive; enclitic dum ‘now’ is added to imperatives, adverbs and exclamatives for intensification, and agedum (ἀπε δῆ) is its commonest use, e.g. Am.
49

782, 1081, As. 746, Au. 646, Ba. 832. Acanthio: self-address, a convenient convention by which a character’s name can be made known; used by Plautus and Terence, see 112n., Gratwick on Men. 554, see Leo (1908) 103f., Key (1923) 31, Blundell (1980) 65-71; most commonly in monologue openings; occasionally used by Menander (Dysc. 214, Sam. 134f., 325f., 349f., 653f.).

113 abige abs te lassitudinem, cave pigritiae praevorteris.

\[aa\, B\, C\, D\, a\, B\, c\, D\, /\, aa\, bb\, c\, D\, A\, B\, c\, d^+\ (ia^g),\] where cave could as well be scanned \(A\) instead of \(aa\) (cf. Cic. Div. 2.84). For the sentiment cf. e.g. As. 249, 254, Ep. 162, Tri. 1008, 1010, 1012, 1015; An. 206, Ad. 631. Acanthio’s exhaustion is in keeping with the fact that he is, as it would appear, already of a fair age (cf. 91); but then, running slaves complain about their exhaustion anyway. praevorteris: perfect subjunctive (or form of the ‘s-aorist’ - optative) with cave in parataxis (without \(ne\)) with regard to the present, cf. 484; also with \(fac\), \(velim\), see Lindsay (1907) 132, Gratwick on Men. 994; particularly common in the self-exhortations of slaves, cf. As. 256, St. 284, Acc. Trag. 456, but also other characters, cf. Ba. 402. At 374, 376 and 463 praevorti means ‘turn one’s first attention to’. Here it seems to mean ‘be overcome’, or should it be taken as ‘do not turn yourself/your first attention to your indolence’?

114 simul enicat suspiritus, vix suffero hercle anhelitum

\[aa\, B\, c\, D\, /\, A\, B\, c\, D\, /\, A\, B\, c\, D\, A\, B\, c\, D\ (ia^g).\] A wordy statement of the topos of the runner’s incapacity (cf. 123-125, cf. 127, 138, 151, 157). enicat: cf. 157, 312, 557, 612, 893, 916; a good example of the colloquial exaggeration connected with this verb, which is always used with reference to a personal object, cf. e.g. Cu. 236. Terence uses the word similarly, cf. An. 660, Ph. 384, 856, Eu. 554. suffero: ‘endure’, cf. 861; Am. 1002, As. 557, Cis. 202, Cu. 376; Ht. 400, 453, An. 888.

115-119 Acanthio’s Threat-Monologue

For the threat motif Csapo (1987) 400 compares Cap. 810-822, Cu. 280-298, St. 284-287, passages which Fraenkel (1960) 215f. and 380 regarded as significantly Plautine. This view was challenged by Anderson (1970) 229-236 (cf. Men. Asp. 399-410), and, more effectively, by Goldberg (1986) 16-18 (on Ad. 311-319 as a reversal of the typical threat-monologue) and Csapo (1986) 83-97 and (1987). I think that there is no \textit{prima facie} reason to conclude from the absence of violent threat-monologues in the fragments of New Comedy that they were not used. Lefèvre (1995) 23, who does not mention any of the more recent works, takes Fraenkel’s line.
115 simul autem plenis semitis qui adaurusm eunt, aspellito,
aa B C D A B c D / A B c D A B c D (ia8). semitis: ‘sidewalk’, as sometimes in Plautus, cf. Cu. 287 quin cadat, quin capite sistat in via de semita, Tri. 481, see André (1950) 121. Roman streets did not have what we call ‘pavements’. The difference between semita and via is well illustrated by Cu. 280-287, Cas. 675, Tri. 481, Ru. 212. aspellito: compound verb (abs + pello) used almost exclusively by the archaic poets, cf. Am. 1000, Cap. 519, Tri. 672, Tru. 597; Ht. 261; Titin. Com. 47; Cic. Tusc. 2.25.

116 detrude, deturba in viam. haec disciplina hic pessumast:
A B c D A B c D / A B c D A B c D (ia8); metrical hiatus after second D. It is conventional for the running slave to complain about people who are in his way; it is noteworthy that Acanthio does not use imperatives, but complains indirectly about the other pedestrians. disciplina: ‘custom’, ‘(pedestrian) conduct’; at 133 it has a different meaning (‘discipline’ of the household slaves), see Thamm on Cis. 16-18.

117 currenti, properanti hau quisquam dignum habet decedere.
B C D aa B C D A / B c D A B c d+ (tr7). Several scholars, notably Goetz and Schoell, have inserted additions to this line to render it an ia8, as they regarded the isolated occurrence of a single tr7 peculiar, whereas Leo and Lindsay keep the paradosis. Brakman (1923) 132f. suggests quisquam <tibi> dignum.

Line 117 should be scanned as a tr7, as measuring it as an iambic octonarius would involve the assumption of a hiatus at B/C or C/D (either properanti | hau or dignum | habet). Line 118 is an ia8, since for morphological reasons it is impossible to measure simitu as an anapaest (always bacchiac). It remains slightly peculiar that the run of iambic octonarii from 111-128 should be interrupted at 117, as there is no thematic change the switch in metre would help to support. However, none of the alterations suggested to change the line, for which see Enk and Questa in app. and Braun (1970) 120, seems convincing.

The hypothesis that this is an iambic line is attractive, as the trochaic septenarius that would emerge from the paradosis is very heavy, and a molossus at the beginning (B C D) would be awkward. It is likely that the line is iambic, but it is hard to see how it could be emended to scan as an iambic octonarius. Leo in app. suggested currenti haud quisquam dignum habet et properanti decedere. Another possible change would be currenti properanti<que> hau quisquam dignum habet decedere.

This line is particularly funny because it turns the world of Roman values on its head. As can be seen from Ph. 30-33 ne ille [Luscius Lanuvinus] pro se dictum existumet, qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via/decesse populum: quor insano serviat?, Terence considers it indecorous for free-born men to make way for a slave. Yet, this is
precisely what Acanthio expects people to do: make way for him, the Grand Slave, cf. Am 986f.

118 ita tres simitu res agendae sunt, quando unam occperis:
\( A B C D A B C D A B C D A B c d^+ \) (ia\(^8\)). simitu: adverb of unclear etymology, perhaps from the same root as ὀμοῖος; in meaning and use identical with simul, cf. 847, Am. 631, Men. 745, Mo. 792, Ps. 1012, St. 249, 394, 743, Tri. 223, not in Terence.

119 et currendum et pugnandum et autem iurigandum est in via.
\( A B C D A B c D A / B c D A B c D \) (ia\(^8\)). autem: sometimes joined immediately to et or sed, usually with an intervening word, see Lindsay (1907) 95, cf. Ba. 495, Mil. 1149, Poen. 841, 927, Ps. 635, Ru. 472, Tru. 838; in some instances the colouring of et autem is adversative, sometimes merely enumerative; triple use of the same connective is rare, see Ernout on Ba. 958. iurigandum: see 46n.

120 CH. quid illuc est quod ille tam expedite exquirit cursuram sibi?
\( A B C D A B c D A / A B c D A B c D \) (ia\(^8\)); IK of illuc and ille. Barbieri (1966) 253 lists lines 120f. as an aside, but it is possible that Charinus is talking to himself and at least not intentionally to the audience. Csapo (1986) 111 points to the fact that the eavesdropper is a common ingredient of the servus currens routine and that his existence can be secured for New Comedy, cf. Men. Asp. 403. quid illuc est, quod...?: elaborate periphrasis for ‘why?’, cf. 364, 379, Ep. 609, Men. 958, see Lindsay (1907) 79f.

121 curaest negoti quid sit aut quid nuntiet. AC. nugas ago.
\( A B c D A B c D / A B c D / A B c D \) (ia\(^8\)). nugas: ‘nonsense’, cf. 942. Acanthio states what he does - as an actor in a comedy, and one playing a slave at that, his task is nugas agere.

122 quam restito, tam maxume res in periclo vortitur
\( A B c D / A B c D / A B c D A B c d^+ \) (ia\(^8\)). quam restito, tam maxume: superlative for comparative, cf. e.g. Cato De agr.cult. 64.2; Au. 236, Cap. 352, Mil. 781, Tru. 171, Ht. 997, Ad. 503 (quam ... facillume ... tam maxume); Sall. Iug. 31.14 (quam quisque pessume fecit, tam maxime tutus est), see Ax (1930) 38. periclo = periculo; -clum was originally monosyllabic, but became disyllabic through the insertion of a ‘parasitic’ vowel (anaptyxis), see Meiser (1998) 89.

123 CH. mali nescioquid nuntiat. AC. genua hunc cursorem deserunt
\( a B C D A B c D / a B c D A B c D \) (ia\(^8\)). mali nescioquid nuntiat: aside. nescioquid: scans either C dd A or C D A (with synizesis). hunc cursorem almost = me currentem,
on the analogy of *hic homo = ego* (e.g. *Ba* 640f., *Tri.* 1115f.; *Ht.* 356f.), similarly δὲ ὁ ἀνήρ = ἐγὼ; cf. 996 *hunc senem = me*; see Loitold (1956) 121-123.

124 perii, seditionem facit lien, occupat praecordia,
aa B C dd A B c D A / B c D A B c d+ (ia⁸); monosyllabic (and emphatic) *lien* by synizesis (cf. *Cu.* 244; *quiesco at Mer.* 488). *perii*: cf. 125 (emphatic epipher), 163, 206, 510, 705, 709, 748, 792, 986; 135 *periimus*, 266 *periisse*, 610 *periimus*, 681 *disperii*; frequently little more than an imprecation, see Gulick (1941) 18f.; occasionally used in its literal sense ('disappear from, 'go away from') by Plautus (e.g. *Cap.* 537, *Ru.* 1111).

*seditionem facit lien, occupat praecordia*: personification of spleen and inner organs: the underlying idea is that the spleen can be greatly enlarged by disease. The military imagery of 111, 116 (? *disciplina*), 123 *deserunt*, is continued; cf. *Au.* 627, *Ps.* 1045. For the violent imagery of the heart (or diaphragm) palpitating with fear or excitement, cf. A. *Prom.* 881 *κραδία δὲ φόβῳ φέρειν λακτίζει*, *Hom.* *Il.* 10.941 *κραδίῃ δὲ μοι ἔξω / στήθους ἐξῆκεν*. *praecordia*: ('parts of the body immediately below the heart') inner organs, vitals (*OLD* s. v. la), in Plautus only here, not in Terence.

125 perii, animam nequeo vortere, nimi nihilis tibicen siem.
aa bb C dd A B c d+ / aa bb C D A B c D (ia⁸). Acanthio's breathlessness causes further delay, a common motif in drama, see Csapo (1986) 122f. It will be further delayed by the quibble between the slave and Young Master (139-160). *nihilis*: 'worthless, useless, spent'; common in Plautus, opposite of *frugi*. *tibicen*: There is a flute-player present at the performance (and actually playing during this scene) so this remark is perhaps, like the other references to flute-players in Plautus (*Cas.* 798, *Ps.* 573, *St.* 723, 757f.) made with a gesture towards him. It is also an indirect testimony for the difficult and exhausting handling of the *tibiae*, overlooked by Wille (1967). *siem*: morphologically an optative (cf. *eiην*); for the alteration of the vowels (from *ἐσιην*, cf. *esiem*) see Sedgwick on *Am.* 10, Meiser (1998) 201. The *-ie-* is contracted to *-i-* in *sim*, and in the other subjunctives in -im, e.g. *velim*, *duim*. The condition implicit in this comparison (*si nunc tibicen sim*) explains the use of the optative, see *LHS* II 333.

126 CH. at tu edepol sume laciniam atque absterge sudorem tibi.
*A bb C D a bb c D / A B c D A B c D (ia⁸)*. Barbieri (1966) 254 observes that most of Charinus' asides (120f., 123, 128f.) are well-suited to the context, except for this one. Charinus has so far used the third person to refer to Acanthio (109, 120f., 123), and it is surprising that he should now refer to him in the second person (without addressing him); Leo in app. calls the line *versus insulsus* and brackets it. A possible solution would be to attribute the line to Acanthio, who has already addressed himself at 112f. and 118. Alternatively, one should take this line as a scurrilous aside, see Csapo (1986) 112, who
lists a number of parallels from Greek comedy for such interjections uttered by eavesdroppers (e.g. Ar. Thes. 44-51, Men. Peric. 371).

127 AC. numquam edepol omnes balineae mihi hanc lassitudinem eximent.
A bb c D a B b c D / A B c d / a B c D (ia^8); total elision of mi(hi). balineae: cf. As. 357, Per. 90, Ru. 527; assimilated form of Greek βαλλαντίνω; for the idea that baths are good for relaxation cf. Ba. 105-108. mihi hanc: usually hanc mihi (except for St. 438).

128 domin an foris dicam esse erum Charinum? CH. ego animi pendeo.
aa B c D A B c D / A B c d / A B c d (ia^8); IK of domi. dicam: cf. 269f., 516; dicam with infinitive used as a periphrasis for the simple verb, see Haffter (1934) 109f., Stockert on Au. 804, Lindsay on Cap. 533, Gratwick on Men. 887, LHS II 797. Charinum: The character who spoke the prologue and has been on stage for almost 130 lines is named now, a rare practice, see Key (1923) 64: "The characters that are named more than one hundred lines after entry in Roman Comedy are relatively few. There are only 21 out of the 242 characters named in Plautus and Terence, against 20 out of the 86 characters of Aristophanes who are given names." ego animi pendeo: 'I am on tenterhooks' (OLD s.v. pendeo 12), cf. 166, Ht. 727. Charinus realizes that Acanthio has bad news for him. In this and similar expressions, animi is either locative ('I'm hanging in my mind') or genitive of reference ('I am hanging as far as my mind is concerned'), see Barsby on Eu. 274.

129 quid illuc sit negoti lubet scire, tme ex hoc metu ut sim certus†
bb C D a B C d d A _ _ _ A B c D † (?tr^7); IK of illuc and lubet; probably a trochaic septenarius. The scansions as ia^8\ suggested by Braun (1970) 120 n.2 and as tr^8\ by Sudhaus (1909) 77 are less convincing. The phrase lubet scire results in a violent IK in D (rather than in B or at line-opening, where it is much more frequent). Instead of certus 'confident', one would rather expect a word expressing an antithesis to metu 'fear', like Leo's ex hoc metu ut eximar. The latter half of the line is corrupt beyond remedy, so one should obelize the line with Questa (1995) 238. ex hoc metu: the force of ex is unclear, perhaps separative 'having left my fear behind'. ut sim certus: A B / C D/ impure cadence; the text is probably corrupt; a remedy would be to read ut certus sim with hiatus after metu and short -tu(s), see Lindsay in app.

130 AC. at etiam asto? at etiam cesso foribus facere hisce assulas?
bb c D a bb C D A / bb C d d A B c D (tr^9); cf. tr^9 in a door-knocking routine at Ba. 1117-1120. The great fun of this door-knocking routine is its utter uselessness. Charinus' presence on stage, for all the spectators to see, lets Acanthio's wild banging on the door appear all the more futile, and all the funnier, cf. Cap. 830-835. at etiam asto? at etiam
ceso ...?: emphatic repetition (cf. 702f.); such remarks (cf. e.g. Au. 397, Ep. 342) can be taken as statements of fact or as rhetorical questions lacking a particle, see Lindsay on Cap. 827, Duckworth on Ep. 342. Lindsay in his OCT and Enk print the second half line as a statement. Because of the parallelism at etiam ...? at etiam ...?, I follow Leo and Ernout in taking it as a question, see Shipp on An. 845. Such self-exhortatory questions addressed by the servus currens to himself are generally a sign for the end of the running slave monologue, see Martin on Ad. 320 and Csapo (1986) 98-102, strongly arguing for the existence of Greek parallels. For similar phrasing (not in a servus currens context) cf. Men. Sam. 260-262. foribus facere hisce assulas: 'kick this door to splinters'; exaggerated forcefulness is a common feature of the door-knocking routine, e.g. Am. 1119-1026, Cap. 832 assulatim foribus exitium adfero, Mo. 445, 456, 899, 939. foribus = valvis, the two leaves of the door, see Lindsay on Cap. 832; presumably the front door facing the audience. assulas: 'splinters, flakes'; only here in Plautus; a rare word of uncertain etymology, perhaps connected with asser 'wooden beam', see Walde/Hofmann s.v.

The Door-Knocking Routine
The servus currens routine is followed by a door-knocking routine allowing for much linguistic and visual clowning. Such routines are stock-in-trade of the comic tradition, see Brown (1995), Petersmann (1971), Frost (1988) 9. The door-knocking routine (κόπτειν τὴν θοραξ; pultare fores) and any kind of buffoonery at the door are old comic motifs, so is ecfringere fores, 'breaking down the door' because of one's impatience with the door-keeper, see Csapo (1986) 372-377 who demonstrates that such motifs can also be found in the Greek tradition.

The door-knocking routine is mainly a comic phenomenon, with the exception of A. Ch. 653-656, see Taplin (1977) 340f. In the Ch. the door remains closed, but in comedy the knocking is usually answered and the door opened, cf. Ar. Ach. 395f., Nub. 132f., Av. 56-60, Ran. 35-37, Ec. 974-976, Men. Dyse. 459-465, Ep. 1075-1077, Asp. 499; at Ar. V. 152 the situation is comically reversed, and since Philocleon is not allowed to leave the house, he starts a violent door-knocking scene from the inside. For the combination of calling and knocking, see Mooney (1914) 19. Not unlike Aristophanes in his use of terms for knocking and other comic escapades at the stage-door (ἀπέτειν, κόπτειν, κρούειν, λακτιζεῖν, πατάσσειν, θρυγγοῦν), Plautus has replaced the rather uniform terminology used in New Comedy (κόπτειν, παιητέος; cf. Men. Ep. 1075, 1077, Asp. 499; exceptional: Men. Dyse. 922 τὴν θοραξ κατάζεις) with a variety of terms designating 'knocking': arietare, frangere (confringere, effingere), ferire, pultere, verberare, and also threats like foribus assulas facere, pultando foribus assulatim exitium afferre, fores et postis securibus comminuere, see Petersmann (1971) 91 n.3.
It is possible that the change in vocabulary also reflects a changed approach at staging such routines, which were probably staged more wildly than in New Comedy. Plautus often emphasises the violence with which the door has been assaulted, keeping alive a motif that can be traced back to Aristophanes, see Brown (1995) 83, Wright (1974) 64f., cf. Am. 1021-1027, As. 384, Ba. 579-586, Cap. 832, Mo. 453, 456, 939, Ru. 414, St. 326-327, Tru. 256. In Terence, there is only one full door-knocking routine, Ad. 632-635 (where Terence's dislike for this routine is felt); in the other plays, knocking is merely reported (Ht. 275), the intention of knocking is mentioned (Ht. 410), or a character is called out rather than summoned by knocking (Ph. 987).

131-134 'Recognition scene', cf. Tru. 257; Men. Dysc. 551-553. The encounter between Charinus and Acanthio falls short of the typical split-second recognition. First, Acanthio does not seem to notice his master at all, then he simply starts talking to him (without greeting him). There is no clear recognition or retarded cognition, as one might expect, cf. e.g. Cu. 303-305, As. 267, Cap. 830. The transition from not hearing to recognising is harsh. However, it does not seem to be usual for a citizen to enter into a greeting routine with slaves, see Arnott (1965a) 262.

Moreover, there are parallels in Greek comedy for such in medias res dialogue-openings between two characters who have both been present on stage for a while (but of whom at least one has been ignorant of the other's presence), cf. Men. Epit. 464f. (where a guitar-girl does not say 'hello' to a citizen but simply starts to talk about the problem they are faced with). In Plautus, the inflation of the simple process of two characters meeting and recognising each other can be comically inflated, e.g. Au. 811-817, Ba. 534-536, Cu. 229-234, Per. 13-17b, Ru. 229-237, 332-336. The formula "Is it ...? Yes it is." is frequent in New Comedy, Plautus and Terence, see Bain (1977) 135-144.

131 aperite aliquis! ubi Charinus erus? domin est an foris?

bb C dd a bb c D a bb c D A B c D (tr7); IK of ubi. aperite aliquis: 'open the door, somebody'; constructio ad sensum: plural of the imperative verb used with aliquis (and other indefinite pronouns), especially in commands, cf. 910f., Ep. 212, 399, Men. 674, Ps. 1284, St. 67; Ad. 634; Accius Trag. fr. 425, see Ax (1930) 31, Lindsay (1907) 5, LHS II 439; also in Greek comedy, cf. Men. Epit. 254, Sam. 86. In Greek and Senecan tragedy imperatives (and their equivalents) accompanying aliquis (τις) take the singular, e.g. Sen. Med. 996 huc rapiat ignes aliquis, see M. Billerbeck 'Deux observations sur l'art dramatique de Sèneque' Pallas 49 (1998) 104f. ubi Charinus erus?: Lindsay writes Charimust, Ritschl erus est, Leo est erus, but Goetz and Ernout are right to keep the paradosis, as one may assume a case of verbal ellipsis, cf. e.g. Cas. 542, Cu. 437, Men. 280, Eu. 780. erus: final -s after short vowels is 'dropped' in Plautus, but the
suppression is not total. In iambic-trochaic verse, suppression can only be traced in the last foot, and non-suppression can only be traced in some isolated cases in anapaestic lines, as Ps. 931 occidis me, St. 22 melius facturum, Tri. 829 pauperibus te. Plautus does not seem to be really happy with final -s as making either a good long syllable or a short one. In Terence, this kind of sensitivity has disappeared. Terence drops final -s more readily to get a final cretic at line-end, nor does he mind any combinations at line-beginning. This may indicate that for Terence the dropping of final -s was already an archaism, and that he thinks of final -s as (usually) making position. In the case of disyllabics like nimis, satis, quibus it is tidier to regard them as objects of IK. With other words, the phenomenon is severely restricted to some phrases (e.g. the fixed syntagma perdis me, 324) and some expressions at line-end (final cretic: nullus sum, salvos sum).

132 num quisquam adire ad ostium dignum arbitratur? CH. ecce me, 
A B c D a B c D / A B c D a B c D (ia\(^6\)). num quisquam: unique in Plautus, not found in Terence; num originally 'now', the same form occurs in nunc (*num-ce); cf. e.g. Men. 890. For its use in agitated questions when the answer 'yes' is expected, see 173n. dignum arbitratur: has the sound of a heavy Ciceronian clausula.

133 Acanthio, quem quaeris. AC. nusquamst disciplina ignavior.
a B c D A B C D A B c D A B c D (ia\(^6\)). Acanthio fails to see Charinus. Closely connected with the servus currens routine is the comic convention whereby a character pretends not to hear or ignores another character calling him although they stand close by, cf. Caecil. Com. 196, Mo. 885-887, Ps. 243-251, Tri. 1059-1070, Tru. 116-122, Ad. 299-321, Ph. 179-196, Men. Dysc. 552, see Wright (1974) 114. disciplina: unlike 116, 'discipline' (domestica disciplina, of the household slaves), cf. Ad. 767 exemplum disciplinae. At 116 the word refers to the disciplina publica, see further Mauch (1939) 48-51 (domestica disciplina), 66-72 (disciplina publica). For a similar complaint about lack of discipline in a door-knocking scene cf. Men. Dysc. 459-465. ignavior: 'more lax'; signifies carelessness and want of activity and initiative, cf. 662.

134 CH. quae te malae res agitant? AC. multae, ere, te atque me.
A B c D A / bb C D aa B c D (ia\(^6\)). The sudden and unexplained entering into a conversation of two characters who have previously not seen (or pretended not to see) each other, may be paralleled in Men. Asp. 419f. This is a single iambic senarius found in a canticum system. Similar instances of metrically isolated lines are e.g. Ru. 254, 906, St. 288b, 300, Tru. 251, 722. In Greek tragedy a corresponding metrical phenomenon is found at the onset of choral odes: S. Ph. 135, E. Supp. 373, 618, Andr. 479. It appears that the recitative is interrupted for a moment by a line of 'prose'. The characters may
have stopped, turning towards each other, and talking ‘straight’. *quaee te malaee res agitant?*: ‘What awful things are harrying you?’, cf. *Mo.* 518.

135 CH. *qui est negoti?* AC. *periimus.*

*a B c D A / bb c d+ (ia4)*. Cf. 609f. *EU. primum omnium: / periimus.* *Ar. Av.* 1171 Πτ. τί το πράγμα τοντί; Αγ.8 δεινότατα πεπόνθαμεν.

135a CH. *principium <id> inimicis dato.*


136 AC. *at tibi sortito id optigit.*

*A bb C D a B c D (ia4). sortito: with tibi; sortiri ‘to have lots drawn’, cf. Cas. 298, 342, 395, 413; Enn. Trag. 137; ablative absolute of an impersonal past participle, like Am. 658 optato, Pers. 607 auspicato, Poen. 788 consulto, An. 533, 807.*

137 CH. *loquere id negoti quidquid est.* AC. *placide, volo adquiescere.*

*aa B c D A B c D / aa B c D a B c d+ (ia8).* Acanthio’s reply asking for time to catch his breath echoes metrically his master’s order to tell him what is going on (cf. the rhythmical ‘rhyme’ at 112, a similar play with metre is found at 282 where Lysimachus dispatches his slave to the country). The suggestion made by Questa (1995) 239 to change the colometry of lines 137-140 from ia8 to ia4 is attractive (esp. for this line with its strong medial break), but could on the same grounds be extended to lines 112-116 and 122f. Likewise, it is difficult (and perhaps impossible) to decide whether lines 135 and 135a should really be one line or not. Questa is correct in observing that in lines 137-140 Plautus has put great emphasis on the divisability of the iambic octonarius, a feature inherent in the structure of this metre with its tendency to have a medial break after the second iambic measure. Lines 137 and 138 contain rhythmical rhyming (the metre of the first half of the line is echoed by that of the second), which at the same time emphasizes the connection between the two half-lines and keeps them apart as separate aural entities. The phrasing of the second halves of lines 139 and 140 is strictly parallel: future imperative (*vorato - bibito*), apodosis with a verb in the perfect subjunctive (*salvom feceris - aegritudo absesserit*); this also emphasizes the divisibility of the lines. *placide:* ‘gently’ (cf. 159, 169). The word is used again, but this time by Charinus (change of roles indicated).
According to Wallochny (1992) 61f. and 67f., these lines are a good example of Plautine *verbivelitatio* (for the term see *As.* 307) and *par pari respondere* (for the term see 629). Such *verbivelitationes* are often, as in this case, unmotivated and gratuitous (Wallochny lists *As.* 296-307, *Cu.* 391-403, *Ep.* 1-40, *Mo.* 885-898, *Per.* 200-215, *Poen.* 621-643), and can even, when initiated by *servi currentes*, delay the delivery of important messages (Wallochny compares *Per.* 272-300 and *Ru.* 627-640). Lefèvre (1995) 23f. agrees with Wallochny and states that the “discontinuity” of the Plautine dialogue between Acanthio and Charinus is owed to the tradition of Italiote autoschediastic entertainment. Such views go back to Ritschl (1854) ix who had already faulted lines 139-160 as *vix satis dignum poeta* for their psychological improbability and for the long standstill of the action caused by the *verbivelitationes*, followed by Langen (1887) 158f. and Fraenkel (1960) 215.

In response to this, I would like to quote Csapo (1986) 126f., with whom I fully agree: “The distinction we are asked to make [by Fraenkel] is a subtle one: between the *raffinato ritardando* of Philemon and the *non raffinato ritardando* of Plautus. A weakness of Fraenkel’s method is that it treats the act of theatre production as too individualistic. In the case of the ancient theatre, as in the case of all cultural production, a writer’s individual style is defined as much by his divergence from his literary tradition as by his adherence to it. [...] Though ‘inverisimilitude’ has become a catchword of Plautine style, in the particular instance of the altercation after the recognition of the running-slave scene, inverisimilitude in the use of this motif is indistinguishable from the inverisimilitude which runs throughout the stock scene, and cannot therefore be viewed as a stylistic feature. [...] If Plautus added to the scene, it is not the criterion of inverisimilitude which will enable us to distinguish his contribution, nor any qualitative difference in the nature of the additions, nor any quantitative criterion based on an instinct that this has gone on too long. Philemon, once resolved to exploit the running-slave humour, would probably not have seen the virtues of restraint. Even refined Greek New Comedy might put some priority on laughter.” See, to the same effect, already Tierney (1945) 52f.

Further, it could be argued that the fantastically bizarre nature of this gory ‘recipe’ betrays the Plautine origin of this passage. Nevertheless, hot pitch did belong to the stock-in-trade of the Greek medical profession. Moreover, there seem to have been parodies of medical procedures in Greek comedy, cf. e.g. Antiphanes fr. 47 K-A.

138 tua causa rupi ramites, iam dudum sputo sanguinem.

A B C D A B c D / A B C D A B c D (ia$⁸); metrical ‘rhyme’ (enhanced by s-alliteration); *tua* monosyllabic by synizesis. **rupi ramites:** cf. 151 *me rupi*; *Cap.* 14 *ego me tua caussa, ne erres, non rupturus sum*, *Poen.* 540; ‘crack one’s lungs’.

**ramites:** ‘the lungs’, cf. *Poen.* 540, see *OLD* s.v. *ramex* 1. **sputo sanguinem:** cf. *Enn.* *Trag.* 106 *maria salso*
spumant sanguinem, cf. Verg. A. 6.87, 9.456. The expression occurs also in Paulus Aeginet 3.175 Heiberg, where it is stated that the spitting of blood occurs secundum rupturam.

139-144 This is a short stichomythia (rapid repartee), cf. e.g. Cis. 240-250, Men. 203-207. For a less animated stichomythia cf. Vid. 31-40. What the exact nature of the joke is and how it works has not yet been sufficiently explained. Why does Acanthio take so badly to Charinus' advice? And why does Charinus rebuke his slave with the words 'I have never known a more irascible man than you' (141)? Finally, what reason could Acanthio have to reply 'I have never known a more abusive man than you' (142)? The explanation given by Enk ad loc. is that the joke lies in the imperative vorato; resin would have to be drunk not eaten. The use of vorato would then be contrasted by that of bibito in Acanthio's reply. Such a joke would not have much force; Acanthio is not a philologist, nor are the spectators. Nor does this solution provide an explanation for the exchange of the following two lines (141f.).

An alternative explanation would be that Acanthio somehow misunderstands Charinus' advice. It appears that Charinus meant well (cf. 143 sin saluti quod tibi esse censeo) and that Acanthio took whatever Charinus advised him to do as involving some kind of 'torture' (cf. 144 apage istiusmodi salutem <cum> cruciatu quae adventi). Charinus may have been referring to some kind of Egyptian cough-mixture. Unfortunately for the well-meaning adviser, talk about resina and mel and the adjective Aegypticus will have evoked associations of the Egyptian art of mummification, for which honey and resin were used, just as readily as such of cough-mixtures, both in Acanthio and in the Roman audience. According to Rost (1836) 256-258, Acanthio took the advice to mean 'get yourself mummified'. The dialogue would thus run as follows: Ac. (panting heavily) 'Hang on, I need a rest. I have burst my lungs for your sake; I have been spitting blood this long time.' - Ch. (patronizingly) 'Take Egyptian resin with honey, and you'll be fine.' - Ac. (angrily) 'Yes, by God, and you just drink some hot pitch, that will take away your suffering.' - Ch. (astonished) 'I have never known anyone more easily irascible than you.' - Ac. (still angry) 'And I have never known anyone more abusive than you.' If one replaces 'take Egyptian resin with honey' with 'go get yourself mummified', the dialogue makes sense from Acanthio's point of view.

139 CH. resinam ex melle Aegypticam vorato, salvom feceris.
A B C D A B c D / a B C D A B c d+ (ia³). Adams (1995) 638 identifies this use of ex as one typical of medical texts, for which a distinctive use of voro with the imperatival suffix -to and a commentary of the type salvom feceris are also typical. On the attributive ('adnominal') use of prepositional phrases with ex as being frequent in medical writers see also LHS II 265. Langslow (1999) 214 n.86, points out rightly that Adams (1995)
60 "prefers this 'medical' phraseology to be characteristic of written treatises rather than of the speech of practising medici (or ueterinarii). This implies that these Plautine parodies of doctors (like other humour in Plautus) suppose a literate audience. It is relevant to the last point that Varro and his interlocutors in the Res rusticae expect both magistri pecoris and humble pastores to be literate and to carry with them written records (commentarii) of the symptoms and treatment of animals' diseases." Another allusion to medicine can be found at 489 (see note ad loc.); on Greek medicine in Rome, see Scarborough (1969). resinam ex melle: The nature of this 'cough-mixture' has posed a problem to the readers of this play. There are Greek medical papyri that contain references to resin combined with honey in recipes, for which see Marganne (1981) 16-17 (against fever; the papyrus is in a very bad state, but the adjective 'Egyptian' seems to be mentioned), 262-265 (the anti-inflammatory properties of resin). Ussing ad loc., followed by Enk, Ernout and Bertini, suggested that the passage be referred to the description of the use of resin against pectoris vitae in Plin. Nat. hist. 24.34 and that the recipe is one against throat-ache. The first Greek doctor to arrive in Rome, Archagathus (see 472n.), used resinam terebinthina in one of his recipes (reported by Cels. Med. 5.19.27), see Marasco (1995) 42. Both honey and resin occur together in Pap. med. Berol. 9777.17f. (dated to the first century BC), together with wine (?) from Egypt (line 22), see Kalbfleisch/Schöne (1905) 33f. Aegyptiam: for the important role of Egyptian medicine in Hellenistic times, especially Egyptian pharmacology, see Nutton (1995) 33-38. vorato = vora (future imperative). feceris: future perfect, cf. the very similar (quasi-medical) predictions at 372, 389 verum actutum apscesserit (sc. nausea), and the 'despatch formula' 497 ego fecero (in a promise). The future perfect differs often little from the simple future. In origin it is an aorist subjunctive (-ero from *-eso), which has come to have a future meaning. It differed from the simple future only in the kind of action, not in the time of action. Thus fecero means 'I shall do (it) at once' (a momentary act), whereas faciam means 'I shall begin doing (it)' or 'I shall repeatedly do (it)' (an imperfect or repeated act). From its use in subordinate clauses (e.g. Men. 54 nisi qui argentum dederit, nugas egerit) it came to express a future act as prior to another future act, i.e. it acquired the sense of a 'future perfect' in non-dependent sentences also (e.g. Cic. Att. 9.15 cum tu haec leges, ego illum fortasse convenero). The use of the future perfect with the force of a simple future seems to have remained in the colloquial language. Cf. the words of the standard-bearer of Caesar's 10th legion meum officium praestitero 'I shall certainly do my duty' (B.G. 4.25.3). By using this old form for a momentary act (i.e. an act not regarded as in progress), the speaker expresses his sureness that nothing can stand in his way to prevent the fulfilment of his duty. Cf. the colloquial exaggeration 'I shall be back' for 'I'll come back', see 497n.
140 AC. at edepol tu calidam picem bibito, aegritudo apscesserit.

*Parataxis of imperatival main clause and subordinate clause, containing a future perfect indicating that the envisaged action would be brought about quickly and expressing certainty about its success, see 448n. A sudden repartee using *pix* instead of the previously mentioned substance is also found at Cap. 596f. (also as a reaction to a ‘medical’ statement) *atra bilis agitat hominem.* :: at pol te, si hic sapiat senex, / pix atra agitet apud carmificem tuoque capiti inluceat. bibito: future imperative. apscesserit: cf. 372, 389, seems to be used habitually of illnesses that find relief.*

141-224 At 141 the metre changes from iambics (137-140) to trochaic septenarii (141-224). This change is also marked by a transition from the *servus currens* scene and the announcement of some great danger to a scene of line-for-line exchange between Acanthio and his master, leading up to the reportage of what the slave has seen.

141-142 For similar epiphora cf. Cis. 735-740, Men. 895-897, Per. 365-368. Here the epiphora is split between the interlocutors (echo-effect), cf. Mo. 517.

141 CH. hominem ego iracundiores quam te novi neminem.

_hominem ... neminem_: The strongly emphasised position at line-end (with hyperbaton) adds an incongruous, formulaic gravity to the lines, cf. Per. 209 *puerum peiorem ... neminem*. On _homo nemo_ see Barsby on Eu. 549 (also an etymological play: _nemo_ < *ne-homo*).

144-148 Acanthio’s refusal (‘Just keep your concern - I can do without a cure that comes with pain.’) elicits a philosophically coloured question from Charinus (‘Is there any good that does not come with some bad attached to it?’), which is in turn answered in a sober manner by the slave who displays little interest in philosophy (‘That’s too deep for me. I have no use for help that hurts.’).

The question “Is there anything in life that can be enjoyed without an admixture of woe?” is reminiscent of the motif of the two _πηθον_ of Zeus at Hom. Il. 24.527-533, one containing only bad things and one containing good things, being distributed by Zeus. The important point is that good and evil can only be received in mixed form, whereas evil can be received by itself in an unmixed and pure form. The motif could be Greek as well as Roman. The philosophical parallels listed by Enk ad loc. do not express the same idea. The passage from Plato (Phaedo 60b) actually deals with the reciprocality, not the mixture, of good and evil.
144 AC. apage istiusmodi salutem, <cum> cruciatu quae advenit.

bb CD a B c D A / B cc D A B c D; isti(u)s disyllabic (CD), slurred genitive singular, cf. 48 illi(u)s, secured by Tru. 930 hominem isti modi (dd A B c D) at line-end, see Lindsay (1922) 64-70, Questa (1967) 108, Drexler (1967) 65. apage: transliteration of the colloquialism änaye (Ar. Eq. 1151, Men. Pk. 396), denoting dislike; it takes the accusative (e.g. Tri. 537); frequent in Plautus, only twice in Terence (Eu. 756, 904), also e.g. Afran. Com. 383, see Reimers (1957) 44. istiusmodi: ‘of that kind’; six times in Plautus (also Ep. 119, Mo. 746, Ru. 321, Tri. 552, Tru. 930), once in Terence (Ht. 387).

145-148 The contrast bonum/malum is somewhat colourless, though common in such contexts, cf. Am. 636 quin incommodi plus malique iculo adsit, boni si optigit quid; An. 720; Enn. Trag. 335 J. nimium boni est cui nihil est mali. The remark made by Charinus may be understood to refer to the situation of the audience and the actors on stage: the spectators’ enjoyment (bonum) is increased in direct proportion to the anxiety (malum) experienced by the young lover; their pleasure comes at the expense of Charinus himself. Moreover, in a way, these lines refer to the main theme of the Mercator: the play explores the question whether there is any ‘good thing’ (quid boni) that one can enjoy without ‘any bad thing’ (sine malo omni) and without any ‘trouble’ (labor); it is not important in this context whether this question is of a philosophical nature or if the playwright had philosophical ambitions. It remains true that this question is of universal interest and that it can be explored by the spectators with or without any previous philosophical knowledge, simply referring to one’s own experience.

The exploration works on several levels: (1) love, (1a) of Charinus (adulescens amator) and Pasicompsa, (1b) of Demipho (senex amator), (1c) of Lysimachus (second senex amator), (2) marriage, (3) friendship. Accessory motifs are (4) old age versus the joys of youth, (5) adultery and marital double standards.

(1) The joys of love are balanced against the worries and anxieties, the losses incurred are balanced against the gains. Charinus makes it explicit that he could do without such troublesome love (356 hocine est amare? arare mavelim quam sic amare), and he uses at the beginning of his monologue explicitly comparative statements in the bonum-malum mould (339f.): ita mihi mala res aliqua obicitur, bonum quae meum comprimit consilium. Even Pasicompsa is not free from these anxieties (536-537, 539-540). (2) The enjoyment of one’s wife’s dos is pinned against the bad quality of life (555f.) and the desire to break free from one’s routine. (3) The value of friendship is contrasted against the dependence on friends, anxieties related to the friend’s services, and the persistent fear of infidelity.

The final answer given in the Mercator is of course not a serious one. Finally, Eutychus publicizes a mock-decree about the behaviour of senes and adulescentes in love matters. Not surprisingly, he states that the young have more rights than the old.
The message is, it seems, that in a world where every good has attached to it its share of malum, it is only by reversing the present order of things in the holiday season of a dramatic festival that we can enjoy a bonum sine malo omni. In the Mercator, there are several other passages in which philosophy and 'talking big' are thematised (511-513, 339-340); cf. also e.g. Am. 635-636 ita dis est placitum, voluptatem ut maeror comes consequatur: / quin incommoditi plus malique ilico adsit, boni si optigit quid, Cu. 189-190, Ru. 185-188, see Stawekca (1967/68) 213. The way in which a philosophical problem is touched on in this passage is also found in New Comedy (which was known for its sententiousness). Similar considerations can be found e.g. in Philemon fr. 145 K-A (τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος ἡ σίγη ἀνθρώπου, γίνεται εὐφρανομέθη ἑλάττων ἢ λυπούμεθα.)

145 CH. dic mihi, an boni quid usquamst quod quisquam uti possiet
For the sentiment cf. Am. 636 quin incommoditi plus malique ilico adsit, boni si optigit quid. uti: + accusative (instead of ablative), used sometimes by Plautus, but by Terence only at Ad. 815, see Lindsay (1907) 29. possiet = possit, securing Bc D, see 125n.

146 sine malo omni, aut ne laborem capias quom illo uti voles?
sine malo omni: cf. Au. 215, Tri. 338, 621; sine omni for sine ulla, peculiar to Plautus and Terence (e.g. An. 391). aut ne: Sedgwick on Am. 127 suggests ut ne (on which see 441n.), already proposed by Guyet and perhaps worth a second thought. Stockert (1983) 221f. lists this line (reading aut ne) with Au. 358 and As. 319 as examples of 'stipulative' ut (‘ohne daß du ...’). illo: sc. uno.

147-148 Attitudes towards Philosophy in Roman Comedy
Intellectuals (who were seen as Greeks) are targets of abuse in Roman comedy. Those who deliver set speeches containing general reflections are called docti or sapientes by Plautus, and their activity is labelled as philosophari, see Leo (1912) 129-131. Philosophers or philosophizing are mentioned several times, always in derogatory fashion, perhaps reflecting the strains and tensions brought about by the absorption of Greek culture, see André (1977) 13f. Philosophizing is equated with idle prattling, see Coleman-Norton (1936) 337, Gruen (1990) 155f., cf. e.g. Cap. 274f., 284, Ps. 464f. conficiet iam te hic verbis ut tu censeas / non Pseudolum, sed Socratem tecum loqui, 687, 974, Ru. 964, 986, 1003 salve, Thales, 1235-1253, Tri. 485-487, An. 55-59, Eu. 263f., for tragedy cf. Enn. Trag. 340 philosophari mihi necesse, paucis, nam omnino haud placet, Pacuvius Trag. 348 odi ego homines ignava opera et philosopha sententia.

Fraenkel (1960) 370 is confident that passages exposing philosophy to ridicule are likely to be Plautine expansions. However, it is often impossible to say whether some of these passages reflect Greek or Roman attitudes, as philosophers have certainly been the butts of comedy earlier than Plautus. New Comedy does not have much time for...
philosophy and philosophers, and in any case when characters are referred to as ‘philosophizing’, what they have actually uttered tend to be the commonest of commonplace, see Kroll (1924) 85 and Dover (1974) 22, cf. e.g. the treatment of Socrates and Solon in Greek comedy. Even the expressions used by Plautus may ultimately derive from similar Greek contexts, cf. e.g. Ar. Av. 1009 οὐκ θρόσως θολής, Men. Mis. A17 and Sam. 724 φιλοσοφὸν. For a similar tone used towards philosophers cf. e.g. Philemon fr. 88 K-A φιλοσοφίαν καυήν γάρ οὐτὸς φιλοσοφεῖ, mocking Zeno, fr. 74 K-A, mocking the quest for ‘the ultimate Good’.

147 AC. nescio ego istaec: philosophari numquam didici neque scio.

philosophari numquam didici: ‘I am no egghead’, for the phrasing cf. Tru. 180f. amantes si qui non damunt - non didici fabulari. :: ⌂amantis si cui quod dabo non est ⌂non didici fabulari. Philosophari is in Plautus almost a synonym of nugari, see Cébe (1966) 115, André (1977) 14, cf. Cap. 284, Ps. 687, 974, Cu. 288-295. It is possible that this sentiment is derived from Philemon, see Webster (1970) 110, Gobara (1986) 80f.

148 ego bonum, malum quo accedit, mihi dari hau desidero.

quo: ‘to which’ (OLD s.v. 3d), adverb with accedit, cf. 674 eodem accedit servitus.

149 CH. cedo tuam mihi dexteram, agedum Acanthio. AC. em, dabitur, tene.

The clasping of the right hand (δεξιόσθως) was not only an expression of affection, greeting (Am. 716, Cu. 305-307, Poen. 1258-1260, Ps. 1065f.), or farewell; it was also a pledge of good faith, see Sittl (1890) 27-32, Duckworth on Ep. 559, Dover on Ar. Nub. 81 (την χείρα δες την δεξιάν). It had a much deeper significance than our shaking of hands. The hand was actually pressed with passionate intensity, cf. Verg. A. 8.558 dextram complexus, Xen. Cyr. 3.2.14 πολλὰ δεξιοσθέμενοι. Charinus asks for a covenant that will secure obedience: the handshake is used to corroborate reconciliation (cf. e.g. 965, E. Med. 899, 902, Sen. Thy. 558f.). At the same time, it is used to secure the promise of a covenant (Handversprechen), see Sittl (1890) 135, cf. e.g. Liv. 23.9 dextrae dextras iungentes fidei obstrinximus, Cic. Phil. 11.5 dextrae quae fidei testes esse solembant, Don. Ter. An. 289 dextram: fidei foederis membrum, S. Ph. 813, 942, Oed.Col. 1632 (δος μοι χερὸς σής πίστιν ἄρχεται). Yet, young people were not supposed to bare their hands in the street, but to keep them wrapped in their garment, cf. Dion 36.7 πάνω κοσμίως προσήλθεν ὑπὸ τὸ ἴματον τὴν χείρα ὑποστείλας, Val. Max. 6.9.ext.1 paulo post bracchium intra pallium reducit, Cic. Cael. 11, see Sittl (1890) 7f.

Does Charinus behave against what was regarded as the social norm? cedo: ‘gimme’, imperative singular, cf. 654 (‘tell me’), 675 (‘give me’); the plural ceste at 965 ceste dextras munciam; of unclear etymology, perhaps *ce + do (‘give there’), see Walde/Hofmann s.v. dexteram: unsyncopated form (22 examples in Plautus against
three syncopated forms); syncopated forms appear internally in Terence (Ht. 493, 732, Ad. 583); unsyncopated forms are found in final position for metrical convenience (An. 289, 734, 751, Eu. 775), see Barsby on Eu. 775. em: cf. 313, demonstrative ‘there!’; ‘voilá’; monosyllabic variant of the imperative eme by apocope, see Lindsay (1907) 137, pace Luck (1964) 47f., like vel (see 309n.), dic, duc, fac, fer, always preceding the utterance it accompanies. Sometimes, as here, it can be staged with a gesture, cf. the Bembine scholiast on Ph. 52 ‘em’ hoc cum gestu offerentis dicitur, see Ernout on Ba. 274. In the MSS, em poses manifold palaeographical problems; it is not infrequently confused with hem, see 620n., 677n., 911n.

150 CH. vin tu te mihi obsequentem esse an nevis? AC. opera licet
vin = vis-ne. opsequentem esse: cf. 158 sicine mihi opsequens es?; periphrastic for obsequor; on the combination of a present participle and esse see Marouzeau (1910) 38.
By contrast, at 410 ut nunc sunt maledicentes homines, sunt means ‘exist’. nevis = non vis; eleven times in Plautus, and nevolt five times. In both cases ne is used as the old direct negative in a compound, as it is in ne-scio, ne-uter, ne-quaquam. opera licet/experiri: sc. mihi, ‘that depends on the service I get in return’.

151 experiri, qui me rupi causa currendo tua,
me rupi causa ... tua: cf. 138; inversion of the usual order (tua causa) to secure cD, cf. Ba. 89, Cu. 150.

153 ut quae scirem scire actutum tibi liceret. CH. liberum
This kind of impudent blackmailing (‘I’ll tell you what I know, but I want some remuneration first’) would not be tolerated from a slave in reality, but cf. perhaps the messenger at S. Oed.R. 1005f. scirem; subjunctive by attraction (to liceret), see Lindsay (1907) 68, cf. Ba. 550, Poen. 681. The repeated use of the same verb in one sentence is quite frequent in Plautus, cf. e.g. Cap. 40, Mo. 1156, Poen. 555 (ut sciam vos scire rem), 556, Ps. 72, St. 419, Tri. 115, 607.

153 CH. caput tibi faciam <cis> paucos mensis. AC. palpo percutis.
Charinus promises Acanthio to make him a liberum caput, ‘free man’, i.e. to manumit Acanthio. This was not within the power of the filiusfamilias, unless authorized by the paterfamilias, see Daube (1969) 83 and 85. On manumission see Watson (1971) 47-51; for manumission in Plautine comedy cf. Ep. 497, 509, Men. 1145ff., Mo. 167, 204, 971ff., Poen. 164, Ps. 419ff., 494ff. caput = homo; metonymy (pars pro toto), cf. e.g. Ad. 261, also Greek, e.g. S. An. 1 ὁ κοινὸν σύντομον ἑκατόν τις ἡμέρας κάρα. <cis> paucos mensis: cf. Mo. 18 cis hercle paucas tempestates, Tru. 348 cis dies paucos; cis ‘on this side of’ (in classical Latin), restricted to temporal use in Plautus (not used by Terence),
occasionally after Plautus, e.g. Sall. *Hist.* 1.70 *cis paucos dies*. *palpo percutis*: ‘you are patting me’ (in fact, ‘butter me up just to strike me down’); *palpus* (or *palpum*) probably ‘(soft flesh on the) inside of the hand’, cf. *Am.* 526 *timidam palpo percutit*, *Ps.* 945; always used in contexts of flattery; the nominative is not found.

154-155 CH. egon ausim tibi usquam quicquam facinus falsum proloqui?
*ausim = audeam*; subjunctive used in ‘unwilling’ questions, see Woodcock (1959) 131-133 on repudiating deliberatives.

156 quin iam prius quam sum elocutus, scis si mentiri volo. AC. ah!
*mentiri volo*: ‘I am going to tell a lie’ (rather than ‘I want to tell a lie’); with verbs of speaking *volo* + infinitive may sometimes not as much denote volition as futurity. -ri *volo* AC. ah!: (B c D); monosyllabic interjection at line-end with synaloepha of the preceding word across change of speaker, cf. *As.* 37, 537, *Au.* 811, *Ba.* 686, *Ep.* 270, *Men.* 174, *Mo.* 1000, *Per.* 405, *Ru.* 153, *St.* 258; 75 times in Terence, see Drexler (1935) 227, Gratwick on *Men.* 174f.: “Pl. and Ter. generally avoid ending lines running out ... *B c D* with an accented monosyllable unless it ‘sits’ as here over an elided syllable which would by itself complete the line.” ah!: cf. 323; an interjection having various shades of meaning, commonly used for reproof, in the MSS often confused with *aha* or misspelt *ach*. It should be spoken sharply; cf. *Ar.* *Plu.* 127 ὅ, μὴ λέγε, ὅ πόνηρε, ταῦτα.’

157 lassitudinem hercle verba tua mihi addunt, enicas.
*enicas*: ‘you’re killing me’, cf. *Per.* 48, 484, *Ru.* 944, *Tru.* 119; for ἀπολλόναι used similarly cf. e.g. *Ar.* *Ach.* 470, *Ram.* 1245, *Nub.* 892, *Men.* *Disc.* 412, *Sam.* 528, *Sic.* 158. *Enicare* is very common in comedy, used both literally (see 114n.) and metaphorically (as here). The verb is used eight times in *Mercator*, five times metaphorically (*enicas*, 157, 493, 612 [a play on the literal and the metaphorical meaning, similar 312 *enicas*], 893, 916, used exclusively by Charinus as a mannerism; 557 *enicabit* is used to describe the nagging of Demipho’s wife); this figure is higher than in any other play. The verb is used twenty times altogether in Plautus, see Lodge s.v. I. It is used five times in Terence, four of which (*enicas* three times, *enicet* once) are metaphorical uses, see McGlynn s.v. I and II.

*sicine*: *s(e)ice-ne*, where *si* is supposed to be the locative of the pronominal stem so- (Greek ὅ), and -ce is the demonstrative enclitic; the final -e is weakened to -i, cf. *hocine*, see Collart on *Cu.* 589. *quid vis faciam*?: ‘what would you like me to do?’, voluntative question with *vis* + paratactic deliberative subjunctive, cf. e.g. *Au.* 634, *Ba.* 692, *Ep.* 19 *quid vis tibi dicam*?, 584, *St.* 752; *Hec.* 862, *Ht.* 818, *Eu.* 1054, see Morris (1897) 145
and 290, Schmitfranz (1910) 51f., cf. e.g. Dem. 22.69 τι βούλεσθε εἴπω; id quod volo:
Is the tone as lewd as in 504f.?

159 AC. quid <id> est igitur quod vis? CH. dicam. AC. dice. CH. at enim placide
volo.
dice: pre-vocalic and pausal form of dic, cf. 605. placide: It seems that the two actors
have raised their voices in this line (rapid dialogue; dice = 'say it!') and that Charinus
calls on them both to lower their voices, humorously echoing Acanthio (cf. 137).

160 AC. dormientis spectatores metuis ne ex somno excitem?
Disruption of the theatrical illusion, cf. Pomponius' Agamemno suppositus: neguis
miretur, cum tam clare tonuerit, ut si quis dormitaret [among the spectators]
expergisceret, other disruptions e.g. 1007f., Am. 65f., Au. 718f., Cas. 1006, Cin. 678-
681 (most impressive example), Cu. 646-647, Ep. 733, Poen. 1224 sitiunt, qui sedent,
and similar remarks to be indications of the fact that seats had been provided for Plautus'
audiences. Obviously, it would be difficult for the spectators to sleep while standing up;
see also the discussions in Beare (1964) 241-247 and Duckworth (1952) 80f.

161 CH. vae tibi! AC. tibi equidem a portu adportavisti mall.
vae tibi!: 'woe on you!'; imprecations are often the reaction to a nasty joke or
nonsensical remarks, see Reimers (1957) 46; on vae see Reimers (1957) 44-46, for vae
tibi cf. Cas. 115, 634, Ep. 28, 333, Mil. 1078, Ps. 631. a portu adporto hoc: 'I bring
portents from the port', cf. Cap. 869 porto a portu, St. 295 a portu adporto, 338
propere a portu tui honoris causa. :: ecquid adportas boni?, see Brinkhoff (1935) 150,
Correa (1969) 60f. For other punning cf. 643 oblongis malis ... magnum malum. This is
an example of an etymologizing pun in Plautus; cf. also e.g. Am. 442 inspexi, Cin. 202,
Tru. 112, Ter. Ph. 138. Puns were popular with Ennius and other early poets, see
Lennartz (1994) 186f. hoc: that is, vae 'woe'; Acanthio is ironical. quid fers, dic mihi:
interruption of the messenger who is just about to deliver the news, a distant relative of
the stichomythic interruption of the messenger in Greek tragedy, where the recipient
himself delays the delivery of the message, see Csapo (1986) 141. On stichomythia in

163 CH. peril! tu quidem thensaum huc mihi adportavisti mali.
This remark shows that the enumeration in the previous line is seen as a stylistic device
and used consciously by the playwright, see Molsberger (1989) 54. thensaum ...
mali: 'a hoard of evil' ('evils galore'), emphatic hyperbaton; for the use of thensaum cf.
68

641, Ps. 83; Apul. Met. 5.14.3 thensaum ... abeditae fraudis; E. Ion 923f. ἡσσωρὸς ... κακῶν; As. 276f., Poen. 625, Ps. 84; cf. also Am. fr. XVI Lindsay thensaum stupri.

164 nullus sum. AC. immo es - CH. scio iam, ‘miserum’ dices tu. AC. dixi ego tacens.

nullus sum: ‘I am undone’, cf. 217, 468, 978 (the largest number of occurrences in Plautus, see Lodge s.v. nullus II.B); stronger than perii, cf. e.g. Cas. 305, 621, see Maurach (1995) 82, Don. Ter. Hec. 653 hoc ulterius est quam ‘perii’, quia cum aliquis perii, reliquum vel cadaver est. The phrase is taken literally by Acanthio, cf. As. 922, see Brinkhoff (1935) 73; similarly, perii at Poen. 1360.

166 CH. opsecro, dissolve iam me; nimi’ diu animi pendeo.

opsecro: ‘please’, used paratactically with questions (= ἵκετεκό; following - e.g. 203, 682, 683 - or preceding - e.g. 173), orders (following - e.g. 605 - or, as here, preceding) entreaties, and in exclamations (e.g. 789), sometimes in conjunction with other verbs (e.g. 170 obsecro hercle oroque), see Lodge s.v. II.B. dissolve: ‘set me free’, i.e. ‘relieve my mind’ (OLD s.v. 3b) with an unimitable play on the literal meaning of pendeo ‘I hang’. nimi diu: ‘for too long’, cf. Ep. 322, Mo. 292, Per. 822, Ps. 687; nimi (lit. ‘too [much]’), cf. 166, 597, can also mean ‘exceedingly’, ‘very’, cf. 501; originally a comparative like satis, see Meiser (1998) 154f. (nimi ‘too much’ < *ne-mejs ‘not too little’), cf. mag-is (-is as a zero grade form of -ius). animi: see 128n. pendeo: (a) lit. ‘I am hanged’ (with dissolve ‘cut me off’), (b) ‘I am stuck (= hanging in my mind)’, cf. Ps. 630; for the pun cf. Poen. 148 ubi dissolutus tu sies, ego pendeam, see Lefèvre (1994) 138.

167 AC. placide, multa exquirere etiam prius volo quam vapulem.

prius ... quam in tmesis also at 456 (twice), 559, 863, 1010, the largest number (six) of all Plautine plays (four times in Bacchides, three in Epidicus and Miles gloriosus, otherwise once or twice, 31 times altogether; 10 times in Terence). vapulem: 397n.

168 CH. hercle vero vapulabis nisi iam loquere aut hinc abis.

‘By Hercules, you’ll indeed get a thrashing if you don’t talk now or go away.’ loquere = loqueris; -re is the usual 2nd person singular middle/passive ending in Plautus, see Sedgwick on Am. 344, loqueris is also used occasionally, e.g. Men. 298. In Mercator cf. 184 mugare, 581, 981, 983 loquere.

169 AC. hoc sis vide, ut palpatur. nullust, quando occipit, blandior.

Heavily ironical aside: ‘Look at that, if you please, how he caresses people! No one is more charming, once he gets going.’ palpatur: an echo of 153 palpo percutis.
170 CH. opsecro hercle oorque ut istuc quid sit actutum indices,

171 quandoquidem mihi supplicandum servolo video meo.
*quandoquidem*: ‘since’, causal, see Lindsay (1907) 106, *LHS* II 609. The word scans *B* cc *D*, as usually in Plautus, cf. 180, 933, see Enk ad loc. *supplicandum servolo ... meo*:
The diminutive underlines the paradoxical reversal of the master-slave relation. The
homoeoteleuton in -o may emphasize Charinus’ indignation at this role-reversal.

172 AC. tandem indignus videor? CH. immo dignus. AC. equidem credidi.
mirrors contemporary popular belief in Greece about the inferior nature of those born
unfree, see Dover (1974) 92f., 114f.

173-174 The words *navis* and *armamenta* are ambiguous, like ναῦς and ὀπλα, for which
see Sommerstein on *Ar*. *V*. 27. They can refer to a ship and its riggings, but also to the
female and male private parts (see also 192n.). This interpretation is doubted for *Men*. 401f. and *Ru*. 354 by Adams (1982) 89, but endorsed by Grassmann (1966) 28; see also
Marsilio (1998). In the light of this passage and the passages mentioned by Adams
(1982) 167 on the symbolism of rowing, seafaring, and boats it seems safe to assume that
a *double entendre* was intended here and in the other passages; cf. also *Poen*. 210-232,
where ships and women are directly compared. The description of *hetairai* in terms of
sea-faring is commonplace, see Page on Rufin. *Epigr*. 17 intr. who mentions e.g. Alcaeus
Mityl. fr. 306 (14), Meleager 5.204 = *HE* lx, Antiphilus 9.415 = *PG* xliii, Philip 9.416 =
*PG* lii, and cf. the names of the two harlots in Rufinus’ poem, Λέμβιον and Κερκούριον,
who take their names from two types of boats (κέρκωρος and λέμβος) which also
feature in the *Mercator*, see 86n. and 193n.

173 CH. opsecro, num navis periiit? AC. salvast navis, ne time.
Cf. Men. fr. 286.6 K-Th ἂν ναῦν σεσώθῃ μοι λέγεις; :: ἐγωγε μὴν. *num*: usually
used in questions when the answer ‘no’ is expected; here, it indicates excitement and
agitation, see *LHS* II 463, see 132n.

174 CH. quid alia armamenta? AC. salva et sana sunt. CH. quin tu expedis
*quid*: ‘what about ...?’; on elliptical *quid*-questions in Plautus see Stockert (1978) 83-
87, cf. 180f., 391, 458, 542, 685, 749, 888, 916, 948. *salva et sana sunt*: hendiadys
(rare in Plautus, see 274n., cf. 997). The metaphorical use of the terms ‘safe and healthy’ - originally only appropriate in application to organisms - also supports the interpretation of armamenta as ‘private parts’. For the formulaic character of the phrase, cf. 679 salutem et sanitatem, 889 sanam et salvam, Am. 730, Ep. 563, Ps. 1068, Tru. 259f., see Haffter (1934) 74 n.6, Paschall (1939) 70 n.6.

175 quid siet quod me per urbem currens quaerebas modo?

per urbem: Acanthio entered a portu (110) but ran after Charinus per urbem. This seems to indicate that for this play the exits to city and harbour are at the same end of the stage. If Acanthio leaves the harbour in order to find his master, he must go per urbem, at least through part of it.

The use of huc and illuc in lines 874-880 defies this inference. There are two houses on stage - Lysimachus’ and Demipho’s. The first is located by the information given in 466 and 474. At 466 Demipho goes ad portum, forbidding Charinus to follow him. Charinus determines to seek a doctor who can sell him poison and is about to go ad forum, when at line 474 he is called back by Eutychus, who enters from his father’s house. This house, then, is near the exit ad forum. From the other house Charinus enters at line 830 and is about to start off peregre, when at 864 his voice is heard by Eutychus, who had entered from the house of Lysimachus at 842. The house appears to be close to the exit peregre. When Eutychus calls after Charinus, the latter must be on the other side of the stage. Charinus’ position is close by the exit peregre, so that in Eutychus’ pleading to turn from his proposed journey, huc probably means ‘home’, illuc means peregre ‘abroad’. All disadvantages Eutychus puts illuc, all advantages huc.

If one could determine the viewpoint from which at 879 ad sinisteram is peregre, one could locate the exit peregre. Unfortunately, the text gives no further clue. But the cumulative evidence of 474 and 879, outweighing that offered by line 175, proves that the two exits do not coincide, Müller (1900) 10, Rambo (1915) 42, 219n.

For the Menandrian convention see Blume (1998) 52f. (exit to country to the left, exit to harbour and city to the right). The evidence usually adduced to identify ‘left’ and ‘right’ as ‘town’ and ‘harbour’ in Roman comedy is very confused; see Beare (1964) 248-255. The question of the relative roles of the side-entrances is more important than the absolute sitings on the left or right of ‘town’ etc. Consequently, it seems better to limit oneself to an empirical approach, since clarity about the orientation of the entrances is only needed within the system of spatial organization of each single play.

176 AC. tuquidem ex ore orationem mi eripis. CH. taceo. AC. tace.
ex ore orationem: cf. Enn. Trag. 265 quam tibi ex ore orationem duriter dictis dedit!, Cic. Phil. 5.20; perhaps an etymologizing pun like 161 a portu adporto.
177 credo, si boni quid ad te nuntiem, instes acriter,
credо: used paratactically at the beginning of a line and in mid-line, see Woytek on Per.
ad te = tibi, colloquial (re)nuntio, cf. 667 ad me venit nuntius. instes: ‘be insistent’
(OLD s.v. 7a), cf. 725.

178 nunc, quom malum audiendum st, flagitas me ut eloquar.
This may also be a reminiscence of the philosophical thoughts uttered by Charinus some
moments before, at 145-146. flagitas: The verb ftagitare is infrequent in Plautus (six
times) and does not at all occur in Terence. It is here used to introduce a final ut-clause,
see KS II.2 219; cf. Cic. Phil. 5.30 semper flagitavi, ut convocaremus.

180 AC. eloquar, quandoquidem me oras. tuos pater - CH. quid meus pater?
quandoquidem: see 171n. quid meus pater?: ‘what about my father?’, cf. 174, 181,
542, 479, 888, and many instances in other plays (e.g. Au. 213, Cap. 1015, Cas. 660, Vid.
51-52). The choice of case in the quid-question is determined by that used in the
preceding statement to which the question refers, see the following line: tuam amicam.::
quid eam? This brachylogic expression is used by Plautus and Terence (e.g. Ph. 755,
1002, Ad. 325), mainly in questions that interrupt another’s narrative, see 174n.,
Melander (1910) 120f., Stockert on Au. 213. On non-interrupting quid-questions see
749n.

181 AC. tuam amicam - CH. quid eam? AC. vidit. CH. vidit? vae misero mihi!
Other examples of four-part lines in rapid repartee are 159, 324, 730, 749, 883f., 888f.;
also e.g. Mo. 638, 641, 1000, An. 384, 449, 462, 765, see Hough (1969). The technique
was already employed in Greek drama, cf. e.g. Men. Dysc. 85, Epit. 249, 391, Sam. 409,
and one example from tragedy, S. Ph. 753. Tarrant (1978) 255 n.169 points out that
Seneca (Med. 170f., Thy. 257) seems to have adopted this technique, perhaps from
comedy, using it more specifically to mirror the emotional excitement of the protagonist,
which Tarrant thinks is not done in comedy. The present passage and lines 730 and
especially 749 do, however, appear to be written to establish that the characters are
highly excited; I find it difficult to distinguish between ‘real’ emotional excitement of
tragic characters and ‘comic’ excitement on the Plautine stage. quid eam?: ‘what about
her?’, see 180n.; this type is slightly different in that it occurs as an interruption,
introducing a word or phrase repeated in surprise of the other speaker (also at 888), see
Duckworth on Ep. 489. vae misero mihi: cf. 681, 708; also, e.g., Am. 1057, Cap. 945,
Ep. 50. Cf. 616 vae mihi; Am. 1080, As. 410, 924. Kershaw (1995) 249f. notes that the
expressions ei/heu/vae misero mihi occur in the masculine form 20 times in Plautus,
marking a change of speaker on 12 occasions (Am. 726, Au. 200, Cap. 945, Cas. 661,
Ep. 50, Mer. 217, 759, Mil. 180, 1433, Mo. 265, 549, Tru. 794), beginning a new sentence eight times, always at the end of the line (Cas. 574, 848, Mer. 181, 661, 792, Poen. 1379, Tri. 907, Tru. 342). The feminine form is found four times, once marking a change of speaker (Mer. 770), three times a new sentence (Am. 1057, Mer. 681, 701), always at line-end. To these add Mer. 708 vae miserae mi, placed mid-line and marking a new speaker, like Ht. 250 vae misero mi, also at mid-line. Acanthio’s ironical promise (see 161n.) has been kept: he has brought Charinus vae ‘woe’.

182 CH. qui potuit videre? AC. oculis. CH. quo pacto? AC. hiantibus.
A iocus ex ambiguo, see Brinkhoff (1935) 75 and cf. Am. 215, Cu. 705, Mil. 826f., Ps. 342, Tru. 709. In the first question, qui is intended as a modal interrogative adverb, but Acanthio ‘misunderstands’ it as an ablative of means (ablativus instrumenti), cf. Schmidt (1959) 214f. The second phrase quo pacto is used to specify the modal sense of the first question, but Acanthio takes it as a request for specification of the way in which the eyes perceived Pasicompsa. The question “how?” is asked frequently in the Mercator (487f., 612), and modal adverbs abound (e.g. 258 nescioqui). oculis ... hiantibus Plautus fr. I 67 (ex Non. 147) amant ancillum meam Phidullium oculitus describes a similar kind of action.

183 CH. in hinc dierectus? nugare in re capitali mea.
in = is-ne. dierectus: cf. 756 abin dierectus?; ‘go and be hanged!’; cf. Ba. 579, Cap. 636, Cas. 103, Cu. 244, Men. 442, Mo. 8, 834, Poen. 167, 347, Ru. 1170, Tri. 457 abin hinc dierecte?, either dierectus (nine times) or adverbial dierecte (four times), mostly with verbs of motion, not in Terence, see Reimers (1957) 27; of unclear etymology, already debated in antiquity, see Maltby s.v. Ramsay on Mo. 8 suggested *di(s)-erectus ‘raised on high-apart’ in application to the crucified. If this is correct, di- would have to be regarded as an alternative form of dis-, but the quantity of df- would pose a difficulty. In view of this, the suggestion of Gratwick on Men. 442 (*divo-erectus) has some appeal; see also Marx on Ru. 1170, Reimers (1957) 24. Lindsay on Cap. 636 thinks of a portmanteau-word from directum and erectum, which is accepted by Enk ad loc. The occurrence of the phrase at Cu. 244 lien dierectust ‘my spleen is burst’ seems to support a derivation suggested by Sonnenschein on Ru. 1170, from Greek διαφρήγμα (cf. διαφρογείτης as an abuse), but Cu. 237 cruciatu iecur points rather to the crucifixion-metaphor and διαφρής is not attested in Greek. In any case, the allusion is probably to crucifixion, a practice of execution which had come to Rome via Carthage in the time of the Punic Wars, see OCD3 s.v. ‘crucifixion’, cf. Liv. 22.13.33, 30.43, 33.36; it must have been established quickly. The number of ‘cross’ words and imprecations (e.g. abi in malam crucem, the pun on the name of Chrysalus - Crucisalus at Ba. 362) in Plautus is

184 AC. qui, malum, ego nugor si tibi quod me rogas respondeo?
This is a feeling (‘I am just the carrier of bad news, I do not deserve to be punished’) already uttered by messengers in Greek tragedy (e.g. S. Oed.R.; E. Bacch.). malum: interjection (cf. Don. Ter. Eu. 780, Don. Ter. Ad. 544), colloquially used to emphasize an interrogative in exasperated questions, as a personal address ‘you foul wretch’, ‘peste!’, mostly used by slaves and senes, see Reimers (1957) 47f., Martha (1879) 19-25, (1882) 208-211, most recently Müller (1997) 150-152. It occurs 29 times in Plautus (seven times in Terence) and is restricted to male characters, see Gilleland (1979) 186 with n.9. Grammatically, it has been explained as either an accusative of exclamation (‘the evil of it!’) or, less convincingly, as a parenthetic imprecation (e.g. = malum sit tibi), see Barsby on Eu. 780.

185 CH. hoc quod te rogo responde. AC. quin tu si quid vis roga.
This line is misplaced at 182 in the MSS. Line 181 vidit? wants immediate continuation by qui potuit videre? (183); if kept at 182, the present line would impede the natural flow of the dialogue. The line is bracketed by Leo (following Ussing) as a doublet of 214. However, repetition is not necessarily a reason for deletion of a line. I prefer to follow Acidalius who transposed the line to 185. Here it suits its context: it serves as a pompous introduction to Charinus’ pathetically banal question in the following line, certen vidit?, and lets it appear even more ridiculous. rogo: is Bentley’s metrically necessary emendation of the MSS interrogo. quin ... roga: imperative after quin, conversational, marking impatience or annoyance, e.g. Cu. 84 quin tu taces?, Men. 416, 815.

186 CH. certen vidit? AC. tam hercle certe quam ego te aut tu me vides.

187 CH. ubi eam vidit? AC. intus intra navem, ut prope astitit;
intus: cf. 816, 917, 924, 1008; very often (and in the Mercator always) ‘inside (a building, room, etc.’), see Lodge s.v. A; occasionally ‘from the house’, see Frost on Am. 770. intra: ‘in the interior of (a room)’ + accusative, pre- and post-classical, see LHS II 234.
188 et cum ea confabulast. CH. perdidisti me, pater.

perdidisti me, pater: In tragic fashion, Charinus addresses his absent father (apostrophe); perdidisti is used hyperbolically, cf. 324, 343 (again said by Charinus about his father), 625, see Gulick (1941) 25. The motif of the father-son-conflict is given strong expression here.

189 eho tu, eho tu, quin cavisti ne eam videret, verbero?

eho tu, eho tu: gemination indicating that emotions run high; other instances of gemination in the Mercator are 474, 558, 683, 721f., 765, 800, 928. eho: ‘hey’, often preceding a demand or request (Cap. 623, Ep. 567, Men. 432, Mo. 843, St. 150, Tru. 477; Ad. 970), but also used to express exasperation (Ba. 803), wonder/amazement (Poen. 263; Ph. 748), and derision (Ps. 314, Tri. 942; An. 710). verbero: ‘whipping post’ (derived from verberare), equivalent of μαστιγία (e.g. Men. Dysc. 473, Epit. 1113, Col. 125, Pk. 324, Sam. 324) used as a milder expletive of people who show a lack of initiative, see Reimers (1957) 219, and cf. sceleste (190). It occurs always in the singular, 22 times in Plautus (all of which but three are vocatives, two nominatives, one accusative), only twice in Terence (both vocatives). The loan-word mastigia is also used in Plautus (13 times) and Terence (once).

190 quin, sceleste, apstrudebas, ne eam conspiceret pater?

quin = qui-ne ‘why not?’, emphatically repeated (see previous line); cf. 725, Cap. 592, Men. 638, Tri. 118, 291, 802. sceleste: used as an expletive of people who show a lack of initiative, see Reimers (1957) 219, cf. Mil. 825. The word is used again at 203, where it refers to Demipho’s morally inappropriate fondling the slave-girl. apstrudebas: ‘why did you not try to hide her?’, conative imperfect.

191 AC. quia negotiosi eramus nos nostris negotiis:

negotiosi... negotiis: etymologic figure, cf. 843 spem speratam, 844 laetus laetitia; cf. e.g. Au. 215; Cap. 774, Cas. 217, Cu. 533, Ep. 120, Mil. 959, Poen. 134, Ps. 882. eramus: Acanthio talks about himself and the sailors on board of Charinus’ ship.

192 armamentis complicandis, componendis studuimus.

complecanidis, componendis: alliteration with asyndeton; frequent in Plautus, see Petersmann on St. 202; Cis. 206-210 is perhaps the most striking example. studuimus: usually governs an infinitive (or accusative and infinitive) in Plautus; also found with the dative (of purpose) of a gerund, like here (cf. St. 678), see Woodcock (1959) 47f., or the dative of a substantive (e.g. Mo. 29), and only very rarely with an accusative (Mil. 1437).
193 dum haec aguntur, lembo advehitur tuos pater pauxillulo, lembo: ‘bark’, ‘small boat’, cf. 259, qualified as *pauxillulus* to explain why Demipho’s approach escaped Acanthio’s notice. The *lembus* was used to carry people to a ship at anchor (as a ‘skiff’, or small harbour craft is nowadays), see Saint-Denis (1935) 67, Casson (1971) 162 n.28. The same word is used of a fast (and small) pirate vessel at *Ba.* 281, 286, 279, 305; at *Men.* 442 *lembus* = lover, see Murgatroyd (1995) 18 and 173-174n.

194 neque quisquam hominem conspicatust, donec in navem subit. hominem: ‘the fellow’, not a respectful way of referring to Demipho. in navem subit: ‘come aboard’, ‘embark’ (*sub-ire* suggesting that the action was hard to notice).

195-197 A very short form of the ‘inverse epibaterion’, for which see Cairns (1972) 60-63. The use of maritime imagery is apt for someone who has just completed a sea voyage. It is carefully prepared by the use of naval expressions in the preceding lines (161, 173f., 192-194). Other notable instances of maritime imagery in the *Mercator* are 695-697, 875-880. On the use of maritime imagery in Philemon’s *Ephebe* see Webster (1970) 143f. Charinus has passed through all the storms at sea only to be ‘brought to the rocks’ when he thought that he had found safe harbor. The metaphor is mock-heroic. Charinus is elevating his love-affair to the most serious level and in doing so reveals a tendency, which will be seen later, toward tragically viewing his plight, see Forehand (1968) 155f.

The dangers and folly of seafaring are topical in Greek and Latin literature from Homer onwards, cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 214 K-A. The use of a word for ‘ship’ signifying ‘life’ is a common metonymy in Greek poetry. There is similar maritime imagery (in the context of husbands’ complaints about their marriages) at *Men.* fr. 59.5-9 K-Th and fr. 335, 6f. K-Th; at fr. 656 K-Th a lover considers how he should best express the effect of his amatory passion and uses metaphors of storm and waves, see further Flury (1968) 87. The Sea of Love over which one voyages with ease or difficulty is a Hellenistic commonplace, though much older in origin (Semonides compared women to the sea, cf. fr. 7.27-42). New Comedy and epigram play with the *topos*, see Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.5.16, Zagagi (1980) 81f., Lier (1914) 34f. Lier explains this use by the fact that Aphrodite (with her attributes ποντία, ἐνηλικία and γαληνωά) was as much a goddess of love as of the sea and seafaring, and was invoked not only by lovers but also by sailors; see also Campbell on Apoll. Rhod. 3.276 on the image of a turbulent, choppy sea being associated with Eros. The passage *Men.* *Sam.* 206-210, though badly fragmented, appears to be a close parallel: a sudden change of fortune is compared to the situation of sailors who after fair sailing in good conditions
encounter a fierce storm. The image is common in Greek (e.g. E. Heracl. 427ff.) and Roman (Hor. Carm. 1.14.1ff.; Ov. Am. 2.9.31-32) literature, see Janka on Ov. Ars 2.9f.

195 CH. nequiquam, mare, subterfugi a tuis tempestatibus:
mare: mock-tragic apostrophe, cf. perhaps Tri. 1070 mare, terra, caelum, di vostram fidel! subterfugi: ‘slip away’, transitive here and at Cap. 970, intransitive at Ba. 773. The choice of this word to express ‘I escaped the dangers of the sea’ is peculiar; Cic. Off. 3.97 it is used to express shirking from military duties (militiam supertugere).

196 equidem me iam censebam esse in terra atque in tuto loco,
Cf. Ba. 342f. censebam me ecfugisse a vita marituma,/ne navigarem tandem hoc aetatis senex. in terra: ‘within sight of a harbour’, a stage of the voyage where safe arrival could normally be expected; the image of the safe haven is common in ancient literature, see Powell on Cic. Sen. 72, cf. e.g. An. 480 in portu navigo ‘I am out of deep water’.

197 verum video med ad saga ferri saevis fluctibus.
In the finale of his allegory, Charinus identifies himself completely with his ship. For the nautical imagery (ship driven onto the rocks) see Otto (1890) 314, Fantham (1972) 23; for the use of such metaphors in Terence, see Barsby (1989); cf. Aesch. Ag. 1005-1007 καὶ πότιος εὐθυπορῶν/*Ιονδρὸς ἔπαισεν ἕρμα; Men. fr. 616 ὃ τε πλοῖτος ἐξέβαλε τὸν κεκτημένον. ad saga: cf. Mo. 677 ad unum saxum me fluctus ferunt, Ru. 367 ad saxa navem ferrier~; Ph. 689 huic mandes qui te ad scopulum e tranquillo auferat.

198 loquere porro quid sit actum. AC. postquam aspexit mulierem,
The contrast between the paratragic tone of the preceding lines (195-197) and this bathetic and sober question could not be greater, cf. 615 loquere porro aliam malam rem.

199-200 rogitare occepit cuia esset. CH. quid respondit? AC. ilico
cuia: colloquial possessive, cf. 529, 720 (cuia vox also 864), frequent in Plautus, rarer elsewhere, see Lindsay (1907) 41, LHS I 481.

201 occurriri atque interpello: matri te ancillam tuae
matri te ancillam tuae: redundant possessive pronoun; cf. 261 filius quam advexit meus matri ancillam suae, where is is notable that Demipho does not say uxori ... meae but matri ... suae, as if he was talking about an alien person.
202 emisse illam. CH. visun est tibi credere id? AC. etiam rogas?

visun = visus-ne. id? :: etiam rogas? dd a B/ c D/; an exception to Luchs' law, see 394n. This is an unusual case, since it is hard to see how id could have cliticized with the following etiam (dd split over change of speaker); Plautus seems to be taking a definite license here, the text may be corrupt. One could assign id to Acanthio (id etiam rogas?), for which cf. perhaps Am. 1025, Ba. 258 (no exact parallels), taking credere with a dative. Alternatively, one could read at etiam rogas? (cf. Am. 1025; An. 762). etiam rogas? ‘do you really need to ask?’, cf. e.g. Am. 571, 1025, 1029, Au. 424, 437, 632f., Ba. 331, Cas. 997; An. 762; contrast the use of phrases like men rogas?, see 633n. Both here, at 633, and 904, rogas is used in a question that is actually an emphatic confirmative reply, cf. 763 etiam negas?, 981, 983, see Theslaff (1960) 46.

203 sed scelestus subigitare occipit. CH. illamne, obsecro?

It was socially unacceptable for elderly men to do this; cf. Men. Mis. 216-22. scelestus: commonest term of abuse in comedy, see 190n.; here it denotes morally inappropriate behaviour, cf. Per. 751 scelestus feles virginaria, Cap. 579 ut scelestus ... iste <te> ludos facit!, Ru. 1291 istic scelestus liber est, St. 571 etiam nunc scelestus sese ducit pro adulescentulo. subigitare: ‘to paw’, see Preston (1916) 28f., Adams (1983) 323f., Woytek on Per. 194, probably an action similar to the ones described at Ba. 482 quom manum sub vestimenta ad corpus tetulit Bacchidi and Ht. 562-564. It seems that Charinus, purely for the sake of a joke, is made to assume for a moment, that Acanthio could have been the object of Demipho’s affections. Prehn (1916) 71f. lists a number of passages in Plautus and Terence (only two, Ad. 532, Eu. 479) that suggest homosexual contacts and exploit them humorously. Homosexual contacts between master and slave are alluded to in particular at Cas. 453-460, Mo. 890-896, Ru. 1072-1074. obsecro: see 166n.

204 AC. mirum quin me subigitaret. CH. edepol cor miserum meum, mirum quin: ironical, see LHS II 677, Stockert on Au. 85; contrast mirum ni and mirum est/mira sunt (‘it is a wonder if/that’, i.e. ‘strange that ... not’), cf. e.g. 240, Mo. 493.

205 quod guttatum contabescit quasi in aquam indideris salem

For phrasing and pathos cf. Ep. 554f. guttula / pectus ardens mihi aspersisti, Ps. 21 quae me miseria et cura contabefacit, St. 648 quasi nix tabescit dies; Ad. 602f. quae dolore ac miseria / tabescit; Liv. Andr. Aiax 16f. praestatur laus virtuti, sed multo octus/verno gelu tabescit. The heart is said to ‘waste away gradually’, a rare verb. On the more frequent tabesco, tabes and their cognates in love contexts see Lyne on Ciris 248f., Norden on Verg. A. 6.442 (quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit), who assumes that their use is modelled on τηγεσθαι, which occurs already in Pindar and again in
Hellenistic poetry; see also Prescott (1916) 49. I do not agree with Forehand (1968) 156 that "the image of salt in water vaguely recalls the nautical metaphor just mentioned." The idea of dissolving some substance in a liquid reminds rather of metaphors like the one used at Aesch. Ag. 1121-1123: ἐπὶ δὲ καρδίαν ἔδραμε κροκοβρωθῆς / σταγών, ἄτε καὶ δορὶ πτόσιμος / ἵππων δόντως αὐγαίς. guttatim: 'drop by drop', an adequate description of how Acanthio reveals only one 'catastrophe' at a time, first mentioning that Demipho caught sight of Pasicoamps (180-183), how he then talked to her (187f.), and finally how he touched her in some way (204). If we believe Don. Ter. Eu. 638 that the five stages of love (quinque lineae amoris) are visus, allocutio, tactus, osculum sive suavium, coitus, then Charinus' worries are understandable: his father is already at stage three, and that after only one encounter! On the use and formation of adverbs in -tim, -atim and -im, Cupaiuolo (1967) 52, Bergsland (1940). This adverb occurs elsewhere in Republican drama only once, Enn. Trag. 172 vide hunc meae in quem lacrumae guttatim cadunt, and then apparently not again until Apuleius (Met. 3.3., 11.9). Similar adverb formations in -tim are frequent in Plautus and other playwrights, e.g. Cap. 832 assutatim, Tru. 613 offatim; Afran. Com. 242 fluctuatim. contabescit: for the image Fantham (1972) 60 compares Ps. 21 and Ad. 602f. (see above). Cf. perhaps also Eubulus fr. 102.7 K-A ἀρωτὶ κατατέτηκὼς?

207 stultitia istaec est. CH. quid faciam? credo, non credet pater, stultitia istaec est: It is unclear what Acanthio means and to what stultitia refers (at 211 Acanthio calls Charinus stultissime); Bach SiSt 2.274 assumed lacuna after 206. Maybe Nixon's translation, endorsed by Enk ad loc., conveys the sentiment: 'Acan. (scornful) There! That's the truest thing you've said! (pauses, then cheerfully) That's all foolishness.'

208-209 Schmitter (1971) 79 sees this passage as an example of the deep-rooted pietas whose violation is sensed as serious misconduct; he compares Ad. 629f., Eu. 386f., Ht. 259, but he overlooks that fact that Charinus is not saying, "It is a crime to lie to one's parents, and I'm sure they wouldn't believe me anyway," but rather "I think my father won't believe me if I tell him ...; and, after all (!), it's a crime to lie to one's parents." As at 817-829, Plautus shuns pathos and inverts what sounds like a 'moral' statement into its very opposite.

Such 'delayed' self-corrections (which sound half-hearted) were perceived as comic; this is shown by that fact that they recur in several plays, e.g. Ps. 290f. egon patri surrupere possim quirquam, tam cauto sensi? / atque adeo, si facere possem, pietas prohibit. In passages like Men. fr. 598 K-Th or Ter. Ph. 153-155 (and the ones mentioned above), the sentiment may be 'genuine'.
210 neque ille credet neque credibile est forma eximia mulierem
Cf. 349f. dum rursum hau placet nec pater potis videtur / induci ut putet matri ancillam emptam esse illam. forma eximia: ablative of quality, cf. 13, 260, 405f., 414; Pacuvius Trag. 230; Cic. Tusc. 5.61. Pasicompsa’s beauty is a recurring theme, cf. 516f.

211 eam me emisse ancillam matri. AC. non taces, stultissime?
stultissime: vocative of the superlative of stultus, only here in Plautus (nominative: Ba. 1098; ablative: Am. 907), once in Ter. (Ad. 218); the positive is frequent, see Reimers (1957) 210.

213 ne patrem prehendat ut sit gesta res suspicio.
patrem prehendat ... suspicio: ‘a suspicion seizes Father’, an unusual and pompous way of saying ‘Father suspects’ (suspicetur pater; cf. 215).

216 quin quidque ut dicebam, mihi credebat. CH. verum, ut tibi quidem
quin = immo, immo etiam, adding a further point to corroborate and strengthen (or correct) one’s previous statement, see Lindsay (1907) 110, cf. e.g. Am. 636, Au. 300, 302, Ep. 308, Men. 687, Tri. 932; An. 704, Ht. 581. credebat: ‘he kept believing me’, cf. 217. tibi quidem: (bb cD) cf. 502, mihi quidem at 393.

217 visus est. AC. non, sed credebat. CH. vae mihi misero, nullus sum!
non: introducing negative comments on statements (‘no, ’...’), comparatively rare in comedy, see Theslaff (1960) 56, cf. Cas. 403, Cis. 405 (doubtful, context unknown); Ht. 766, Ph. 303. credebat: appears here for the third time in six lines (212, 216, 217; credet at 210, 212; credibile at 210). nullus sum: see 164n. For the loss of -s securing BcD see 232n., cf. 978.

218 sed quid ego hic in lamentando pereo, ad navim non eo?
Mock-heroic self-apostrophe, cf. Tru. 766 sed quid ego hic clamó?; Hom. Il. 11.407 ἀλλά τή μοι τῶνα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;

219 sequere AC. si istac ibis, commodum obviam venies patri;
Charinus starts off to the right, but Acanthio stops him. commodum: (*cum-modum) ‘exactly’ (see Enk ad loc.).

220 postea aspicit te timidum esse atque examinatum: ilico
Cf. Ph. 205f. nam si senserit te timidum pater esse, arbitrabitur / commeruisse culpam, An. 403 (slave to Young Master at scene-end) curabitur. sed pater adest. cave te esse tristem sentiat. timidum esse atque examinatum: juxtaposition also at Cas. 630 nam
quid est quod haec timida atque examinata exsiluit? examinatum: used in its literal sense (‘out of breath’, Ru. 372, 409) as well as in its metaphorical sense (‘out of spirits’, ‘low-spirited’, As. 265, Au. 208, Ba. 298, Cas. 573, 630, Cis. 208, Ep. 572, Ps. 9). In Terence, only the metaphorical sense is found, see McGlynn s.v. exanimo; Greek ἀψυχός is used of a person in amorous affliction as early as Archilochos 203 T. δόστηνος ἐγκείμεταί πόθων / ἀψυχός.

224 ne te opprimeret inprudentem atque electaret. CH. optime.
Cf. An. 227 conveniam Pamphilum, ne de hac re pater inprudentem opprimat. opprimeret: ‘surprise, ‘overpower’, cf. e.g. Ba. 858, 860, 867, 917, As. 876, Men. 562. electaret: ‘worm sth. out of someone’, cf. As. 295 electabo, quidquid est. optume: ‘very opportunely’, cf. 113, 329, 912, 977, see Theslaff (1960) 46f., e.g. As. 786, Cas. 739; Ad. 402.

III. Discussion

Krysien-Józefowicz (1949) 16f. takes Plautus to task for giving Acanthio a much less prominent role in the Mercator than he would have had in the Emporos. She is dissatisfied with the fact that Acanthio vanishes for good after his one and only appearance and that Charinus goes off to the harbour, apparently without good reason. In addition, Acanthio, by lying to Demipho about the status of Pasicompasa, is viewed by Krysien-Józefowicz to be inextricably linked to Charinus in terms of the plot: “Nunc ei [Acanthionis] cavendum est, ne iuvenis mendacia eius patri patefaciat neve ipse a sene fraudis insimuletur. Interea dum Acanthio partes eiusmodi in prima fabula suscipit nullis causis adhibitis in exitu scenae I2 eas deserit. Quo facto consiliis suis tamquam fundamentum subtrahit.” This is a one-sided view. It is true that the audience is kept in suspense as to whether (and when) Acanthio may return.

Eutychus’ appearance in II.4 can be viewed as a dramaturgical ‘changing of the guard’. The remainder of the play will not be concerned with clever slaves, but, among other things, with the sodalis opitulator, who is even granted the concluding lines in V.4. An independently acting servus callidus, far from being a necessary component of the plot, would stand in the way of that development. Why, then, did the playwright bring Acanthio on the stage at all? Because, it would appear, there is no other character who could announce what has to be announced (‘Father has seen the girl”). Not unlike Syra in IV.1, Acanthio is used as a ‘living telescope’ to inform Charinus about what happens in the backstage world. Similarly, not unlike Syra, he also helps to avoid the onstage depiction of an unseeming action (in one case, a son lying to his father; in the other, a matrona meeting a meretrix), thus preserving decorum. Based on her arguments,
Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 17-20 ventures a reconstruction of Acanthio’s role in the later scenes of the Greek original, largely underrating the importance of Eutychus’ contribution to the action and the importance assigned to his role by the playwright. She adduces Philemon fr. 108 K-A in an unhelpful attempt to show that it was part of the original scene II.4, where Acanthio would meet Charinus, and both would talk about Eutychus’ help. Further, Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 38 argues that Plautus actually changed III.4 in a similar way. In Philemon’s play it would not be Eutychus but Acanthio who breaks the news about the sale of the girl to Charinus: “Eutychus ex iuvene, qui in exemplari Graeco nihil fecit nisi amicum consolatus est et ab exsilio prohibuit, apud Plautum is factus est, qui omnes res fabulae ad exitum adduceret.” She goes even further and claims that in V.4, it is not Eutychus who chides Demipho but actually Demipho’s father-in-law who would have been summoned by Syra, whose mission to fetch Dorippa’s father would have been successful in the Greek original. In addition, Krysiniel-Józefowicz argues that Pasicompsa, after staying at Lysimachus’ house for some time and after having been detected and thrown out by Dorippa, changed over to Demipho’s house, where she causes Demipho’s wife, who has a part in the Emporos, to be gravely offended and call for her father.

These hypotheses are hard to prove; they involve the assumption that Plautus has drastically changed the plot of the Greek model. Krysiniel-Józefowicz postulates that the character of Eutychus is the result of a conflation of dramaturgical leftovers. By implication, she claims that Eutychus’ role in this play as sodalis opitulator (see introductions to II.4 and III.4) is accidental and not central. As a result, Krysiniel-Józefowicz’s plot, not unlike the scenario developed by Lefèvre (1995) passim, presents the reader with a new play in search of a playwright, but that play would have little to do with the Mercator or, in fact, the Emporos.

Fraenkel (1960) 215, closely followed by Lefèvre (1995) 23, assumes expansion of this scene for the sake of buffoonery, especially of Acanthio’s entrance monologue (e.g. 114, 123-125), the retardation of the recognition (132-134), the stichomythia and altercation 135/138-150, and almost all of this scene up to line 172. This may or may not be the case, but even Fraenkel admitted that there are a number of Greek elements in this scene, e.g. the way Acanthio breaks the news gradually (guttatim, 205). Similarly, Fraenkel (1960) 225 n.1 thinks that the subtle change of tone leading to lines 195-197 is Philemonian; for the sentiment he rightly compares Tri. 1087-1090.
I. Commentary

1. The Function of the Dream Narrative

Demipho enters from the harbour, evidently troubled; his entrance has been prepared at 107, 219, 222f. Charinus has effectively characterized him as an archetypically strict father, but the expectations thereby aroused are now amusingly defeated (cf. e.g. 203 and 264). It was necessary to characterize him as a strict father in the prologue as there is no opportunity for that in the play itself: when he enters, he is already a senex amator. Conversely, the characterization is needed to help the spectators understand the motivation of Demipho’s fear that his son might find out about his interest in Pasicompsa.

The humour of Demipho’s observations relies heavily on the actor’s ability to deliver these lines with variations on a stock set of tragic and epic mannerisms and physical movements. Plautus uses the same opening lines again to introduce another dream narrative told by Daemones in *Rudens* (593-612). This fact identifies both monologues as genre pieces, in much the same way as the ponderings of Philolaches (*Mo.* 84-156) and Charinus (*Mer.* 335-359) on the ways of misspending one’s youth are generically determined. Such genre speeches distinguish the speaker from other *personae*, while at the same time creating the anticipation of a familiar type of behaviour, which can subsequently be met or frustrated to the great enjoyment of the audience, a technique that betrays dramaturgical skill.

The question arises to whom Demipho actually addresses his speech, what dramatic function the dream has and what psychological role it fulfills. The habit of reciting dreams, whether for mere interest or for purposes of averting evil omens - in the latter case they were usually recited to one friend or in soliloquy to the broad daylight - was a welcome vehicle for narrative in both tragedy and comedy, see Headlam/Knox (1922) lii-liii. The exposure of the phantasm to the light of the day was believed to have an evil-dispelling power (cf. *S. El.* 424-427, *E. Hec.* 68f., *IT* 42-60, *Ba.* 1264). In this case, the dream is narrated for the benefit of the audience (see 267n.), as they need to be given Demipho’s perspective on the things that happened on board the ship (181-203). In addition, the scene introduces Demipho, characterizes him to a certain degree and, by means of the dream, suggests the action of the play. Not unattractively, Forehand (1968) 160 calls it “an elaborate second prologue.”

Demipho’s monologue is also a topical discourse on the theme that the gods make sport of mortals in amazing ways (225); he illustrates this point, and applies the general principle to himself, by relating the amazing dream he had the night before (226-228); he is in doubt as to what the dream forebodes, but he thinks he has already discovered what part of it means (252-254); to explain this he relates his experiences of the morning, and repeats the facts already given by Acanthio. The reason for the use of Acanthio’s report in 1.2, even though the information is repeated by Demipho, is obvious: the development of the action demands that Charinus is informed of the fact that his father has seen the girl and become infatuated with her; at the same
time, Demipho wishes to conceal this from his son, and therefore cannot be used to reveal it to him directly.

It is an important feature of the architecture of the Mercator that facts which are already known to the audience are reiterated later in the play, perhaps with the addition of some previously unknown details. This brings about an interesting change of the point of view from which the action is perceived. Another dimension of reality is added to the backstage world by means of ample descriptions, and the audience enjoys more fully the privileged position of omniscient observer. Moreover, the change of perspective also adds to the characterization of the dramatic characters involved.

At the end of this monologue the spectators possess all the information needed to allow the onset of the action proper. In particular, they have been presented with two accounts of how Demipho met Pasicompsa, one by an observer (Acanthio), one by Demipho himself. These stories do not include anything that as yet might place the audience in a position of superiority over the characters on stage, which would enable them to enjoy the dramatic irony inherent in the misapprehensions the characters are seen to form. This marks a difference between this approach and that of New Comedy. The spectators are not told who is to be identified with the monkey, and only after 467 everyone will know. Although it is possible that Lysimachus outer appearance (cf. 639f.) may already suggest an ape-like person right from his first appearance immediately after this monologue (272).

2. The Style of the Dream Narrative

The style of the dream narrative has been analysed and compared to that of the other passages where dreams are narrated in Plautus (Cu. 260-262, Mil. 381-392, Ru. 593-612) by Collart (1974) 156-160; Collart should have included Mo. 497-505. Right from the beginning, Demipho's speech is notable for its archaisms, among which Collart lists damunt, adgredierier, concredere, convicium, mediocriter, ambederit, abducere, and its solemn tone. Accordingly, the mode of the piece is set as paratragic. Furthermore, Collart has noted a certain metrical regularity: spondees abound and long syllables produce a heavy lugubrious rhythm. Moreover, he notes stylistic features such as alliterations, homoeoteleuta, anaphora, and homophony: "Les tirades ressemblent plus ou moins à un carmen, à une incantation, à une formule magique." He also notes a high percentage (58 %) of repetition, of words being used twice or three times in lines 225-251; he finds similar figures for the other passages. The most frequently repeated words are those connected with the vision (video, videri, somnium, somnus, somniare), those referring to the dreamer (me, meus, mihi, ego), and those referring to things in the dream (simia, capra). Collart concludes rightly that Plautus wants to appear pronouncedly ‘tragic’ in his diction, and that his intention has been parodic: "Peut-être est-ce là justement le propre de la parodie: pour mieux se manifester, elle marche avec une certaine lourdeur."
3. Dream Narratives in Ancient Drama

Dream reports are numerous throughout Greek and Roman literature. For general overviews see Hanson (1980), Katsouris (1978), Segura Ramos (1974), for dreams in Hellenistic times, Weber (1998). In a formal and literary way the character and format of dream reports does not change much from the time of Homer to the end of the classical period, and it also maintains continuity with the older Near Eastern formats, see West (1997) 185-190. For the use of dream reports in amatory contexts in the Greek novel, see Weinstock (1932/33); on the use of symbolic dreams in ancient drama see Arnott on Alexis fr. 274 K-A. For dreams in Greek tragedy cf. A. Per. 176-199, Ch. 32-43, 523-550, S. El. 410-427, E. Cyc. 8-10, I.T. 42-64, 148-178, Hec. 1-3, 28-35, 37-42, 47-50, 68-97, 702-710, Rh. 782, for Old Comedy Ar. Eq. 1090-1095, V. 12-53, Ran. 1331-1344 (parody of Euripides), for Middle and New Comedy: Men. Dysc. 407-418, Alexis fr. 103, 272 K-A. Plautus shares a preference for allegorical dreams with other dramatists: the dreams of Demipho, Daemones (Ru. 593-612), and Cappadox (Cu. 260-263) involve allegory, and the dreams at Mil. 380-394, and Mo. 484-505, which do not, are fictitious.

II. Commentary

Marx (1899), Fraenkel (1960), and Lefèvre (1995) think that this scene (and in particular the dream narrative) is badly incoherent. This is not entirely true, see the following schematisation (and see the discussion in section III):

225-254 Demipho’s dream

225-228 Dreams come from the gods: I had a really bad one

229-251 The Dream Narrative

229-233 Demipho entrusts a beautiful goat to a simia

234-245 The simia tells Demipho to take her back

246-251 A haedus takes the goat away from him:

Demipho is at a loss

252-254 Demipho cannot interpret his dream

255-270 Demipho meets a beautiful girl

255-258 Demipho feels drawn to visit the harbour

259-261 He sees the girl on his son’s ship

262-267 He falls madly in love with her

268-270 The girl could be the goat of his dream, but who are the other animals?

271 (linking device)

225-226 There are several passages in which the gods are described as making sport of men, cf. Am. 997f., Cap. 22, Cas. 346-349, Ru. 593f. Cf. Achill. Tat. Leuc. and Cleit. 1.3.2: Φλεγ ἔτο τὸ δαμόνιον μέλλον ἀνθρώπως νύκτιορ πολλάκις λαλεῖν, cf. also E. fr. 972 πολλαίτοι μορφαίς οἱ θεοὶ σφυρισμάτων σφόλλουσιν ἡμᾶς κρείττονες περικότες.
Demipho talks about what seems to be a popularized form of ancient dream theory; he describes the quality of dreams which are sent by the gods (ἐνδοπεµπτον), see Zehnacker (1974) 779-782. Blånsdorf (1967) 142f. and Molsberger (1989) 83 point to the gnomic character of the statement. ‘Nocturnal visions’, i.e. dreams and divine visitations (δυσεζ ἐννοχον), were traditionally regarded as the main channel through which the gods communicated with ordinary (i.e. non-mantic) humans, see Griffith on A. Prom. 645-647.

At Ru. 593f. the same text is used to introduce another dream narrative (593-612): the senex Daemones tells of a dream which he had during the previous night, portending an attempted robbery. There are several other instances where Plautus is imitator sui, e.g. Cap. 664-666 and Ps. 459, As. 186 and Tru. 416, 932.

225 DE. miris modis di Judos faciunt hominibus

miris modis: cf. Cas. 625, Men. 1039, Mil. 538f. (combined with ludificari), Rd. 593 (= Mer. 225); Hec. 179; also later (Lucr. 1.123, Verg. G. 1, 477, A. 1.354, 7.89); also mirimodis, cf. Tri. 911; in the context of another spooky dream: Verg. A. 4.353f. ipsa sed in somnis inhumati venit imago / coniugis ora modis attollens pallida miris; cf. also Ar. V. 13 ὡνωρ θεωομαιτον εἶδεν ἀφίως; morphologically, miris modis is a set phrase, virtually one word (= mirimodis, Trin. 931, cf. multimodis), a unique formation in a mould that could have been more productive for adverb phrases (e.g. the formation lenta mente and the use of the morpheme -mente in the Romance languages). ludos faciunt: + dative ‘make a comic spectacle for somebody’, see Lindsay (1907) 21, Reimers (1957) 149 n.1, cf. Ru. 594 (contrast e.g. Cas. 760, Mo. 427f., Ru. 470 ‘make fun of’; Tru. 759 ‘make a scene’); at Mo. 427f. the same phrase is used by the slave who promises to give Old Master ‘games’ such as he will never have at his funeral; some time later in that play, he is going to narrate an (invented) dream to that senex. The likening of dream to drama, a common topos, gains special significance in Plautus: dreams, it is suggested, are created by men and by the Gods alike as plays within the play. For the association of ludos facere with circus cf. also Mil. 991, Cornicula fr. I Leo quid cessamus ludos facere? circus noster eccum adest. For ludos facere + accusative ‘make a fool of’ cf. Am. 571, Au. 253, Ba. 1090, 1100, Cap. 579, Ep. 706, Men. 405, Per. 803, Ps. 1167f., Ru. 470; Ph. 945. Cf. also the expressions Mo. 1040 quis me exemplis ludificatus est, Ru. 147 deludificavit me ille homo indignis modis.

226 mirisque exemplis somnia in somnis danunt.

exemplis: cf. Ba. 1092 omnibus exemplis excrucior, Cap. 691 te exemplis excruciaro pessumis, Mo. 192 di deaeque omnes me pessimis exemplis interficiant, 1116 exempla edepol faciam ego in te, Tru. 26 quot amans exemplis ludificetur; *ex-em-(p)lum (from ex-imo) means something that is picked out as a model, see Walde/Hofmann s.v., cf. e.g. Mo. 100 inde exemplum expetat; the transition of meaning appears in such phrases as As. 389 istoc exemplo ‘after that model’, i.e. ‘in that manner’. Accordingly, e.g. pessumis exemplis cruciare is ‘torture after the most painful models’, i.e. ‘in the most painful way’, effectively making exemplum a synonym of modus; see also Ernout on Ba. 505, Langen (1880) 112. in somnis: ‘in a dream’ (lit. ‘in your sleep’), the
normal expression in prose and verse, see OLD s.v. 1c, Sedgwick on Am. 621, Austin on Verg. A. 4.353 (similarly, ἐν ὑπνοῖς is regular, but ἐν ὑπνῳ rare). But here, it does mean ‘in your sleep’, and the dreams are called somnia. Cf. Mo. 490ff., 493 (apparition of a deceased in a dream), Cu. 260ff. (apparition of Asclepius), Ru. 594, 773. dant = dant, cf. Cap. 819, Mo. 129, 561, Per. 256, 852, Caecil. Com. 176. The ending -nunt is an Old Latin alternative ending to *-ont, see Meiser (1998) 216, perhaps on the analogy of situs - sinunt, datus - danunt?

227 velut ego nocte hac quae praeteriit proxuma


228 in somnis egi satis et fui homo exercitus.

in somnis: Unlike 226, the phrase seems to mean ‘in my dreams’ here, which is the more usual collocation, Stearns (1927) 27. egi satis: ‘I was badly harrowed’ (satis a euphemistic litotes for nimis), cf. Ba. 637; Ht. 225. fui homo exercitus: ‘I was an afflicted fellow’ (exercitus lit. ‘unpenned’ (ex-arceo), originally a peasant word). The Latin is very peculiar here because of the combination of fui and exercitus, which is not an example of the narrative perfect. One would expect ‘I became an afflicted fellow’, but fui seems at odds with that. The phrase is underlining the fact that the dream is haunting Demipho very much, cf. Olivieri ad loc.: “[...] ho sofferto nel sono, travagliato e agitato, io pover’ uomo.” He compares Tri. 1090 quorum causa fui hoc aetate exercitus, a good defence for inchoative fu(u)i, of which one would expect more examples. Read perhaps fio homo exercitus (‘I am turning into a permanent nervous wreck’) and scan D aA B c D instead of ddA BcD?

229 mercari visus mihi sum formosam capram

The dream is allegorical, as is noted by Demipho himself; at 268 he identifies Pasicompsa with the capra. Dreams of animals which symbolise men are a traditional motif, cf. [Ov.] Am. 3.5, see della Corte (1972) 321-324, Kenney (1969) 1-14, Arnaldi (1956). Arnaldi thinks that Demipho’s comments about his tender affection for the goat (245-247) may reflect a Hellenistic mode of expression which was later re-introduced to Roman love poetry. mercari visus ... sum: on the expression see Monaco on Cu. 260 visus sum viderier with many parallels; della Corte (1967) 108 points out that this makes Demipho the mercator, and that the title of the play is at least ambiguous, as it refers to both Charinus (who bought a girl in reality, cf. 106) and to Demipho (who bought a goat in his dreams). visus ... sum: the equivalent of ἐδόκουν ‘I imagined’ in Greek dream narratives, e.g. Ar. V. 15 (ἐδόξε μοι Ar. V. 31). formosam capram: an oxymoron; formosus to describe the physique of an animal is unusual, especially with reference to a goat: Naevius Com. 51 Warm. (Dolus) has caperrata fronte ‘wrinkled forehead’, cf. also Mo. 41 canem capra commixtam. For a similar oxymoron cf. Ov. Ars 1.296 (about Pasiphae) invida formosas
oderat illa boves, with a sexual undertone (at 1.320f. she calls the rival cows paelices), cf. also Men. Dysc. 393 τοὐτῷ τὸ προβατίν ἔστιν οὗ τὸ τυχόν καλόν 'this sheep is a real beauty'. The adjective is rare in early Roman drama, used only here in Plautus; also in Afran. Com. 156-158 (formosa virgo est ... praeterea fortis). Titin. Tog. fr. 17-19, Eu. 730 (of a man). The most interesting parallel is perhaps Afran. Tog. 378-382 si possent homines delenimentis capi, / omnes haberent nunc amatores amus. / aetas et corpus tenerum morigeratio, / haec sunt venena formosarum mulierum:/ mala aetas nulla delenimenta invent. Later it is used of female beauty by the neoters, see Fordyce on Catul. 86 who notes the sensuous quality of the adjective. The word is avoided by the epic poets, but occurs 23 times in the Metamorphoses, see Knox (1986) 53f., and is used regularly in Vergil's Eclogues, e.g. 1.5, 5.44, see Coleman on Verg. Ecl. 1.5. Size and beauty are widely attested attributes of the figures featuring in Greek and Roman dream narratives, especially divinities, see Hanson (1980) 1410. capram: It is easy for the audience to refer the capra to the girl mentioned by Charinus (101) and Acanthio (181, 210). Enk suggests Philemon as the source and cites a Greek parallel, Ael. N.A. 6.42: Κρόδος ... τῇ τῶν αἰγῶν ἰδείν ἄρατοτῆτι μέγατα. For καπροδήνα used in erotic contexts in Greek comedy cf. Phryn. fr. 34 K-A, Hermipp. fr. 9 K-A. Αἰξ is known as the nickname of a hetaira, see Gow on Machon 423, Hunter on Eubulus fr. 105.1, Davidson (1997) 205. The randiness of goats is proverbial, see Coleman on Verg. Ecl. 2.64. On the representation of goats in Roman art and literature see Toynbee (1973) 164-166 (the goats destructive habit of nibbling at everything within its reach is often represented). Goats in a dream were a bad omen, cf. Artemid. 2.12, see Headlam/Knox on Herod. Mim. 8.16.

232 posterius quam mercatus fueram visus sum
mercatus fueram: 'after I had (already) bought her'; this form of the pluperfect (fueram for eram) is relative; it is appropriate to the temporal perspective of the narrative, see Gratwick on Men. arg. 7, LHS II 321. visus sum: -s is dropped to secure B c D', cf. 245, 324; for trochaic septenarii cf. 217, 978.

233 in custodelam simiae concredere.
custodelam: 'protection', 'custody', Gruter's conjecture for the MSS custodiam, which is also demanded by metre at Mo. 406, Ru. 625, 696 (but corruptly transmitted in all instances). For concredo 'entrust' cf. Au. 615, Ba. 1064, Cas. 478f., Per. 441, Hor. Sat. 2.6.43. The alliteration and the formulaic character suggest that this phrase is an expression taken from legal (or religious) language, cf. the use of custodela at Ru. 696 (protection granted in the temple of Venus) and in the legal formula of the mancipatio familae (spoken by the executor of a testament) quoted in Kaser (1986) 310 familiam pecuniamque tuam endo mandatela tua custodelaque mea esse aio. The word is morphologically slightly unusual in being formed from a nomen agentis whereas most abstract -ela nouns are formed from a 2nd conjugation verb (e.g. tutela, which by association of meaning perhaps accounts for the morphological oddity). simiae: on the ape in ancient popular imagination see McDermott (1938), Toynbee (1973) 55-60,
Maspero (1997) 301-306; on the ape in ancient literature see especially McDermott (1935) and (1936); on the ape in ancient comedy see Lilja (1980); on the symbolic qualities of the ape in Plautus (worthlessness, trickery, deceit; παυσοφρατα) see Svendsen (1971) 84f. Criticisms of the simia are concerned with his ugliness and his moral turpitude, cf. Enn. Sat. 23 (quoted by Cic. Nat. deor. 1.97) simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis; a reference to the ape's ugliness Mil. 989 pithecium, to his roguery Mil. 285 nequam bestia. On the character of the πιθηκος in Greek literature see MacDowell on Ar. V. 1290 ("regularly used of a man engaged in trickery"), cf. Ach. 907, Eq. 887, Pax 1065; see also Taillardat (1962) 228, Lilja (1980) 31-38. On the sexual eagerness of apes see Lilja (1980) 32. The monkey was also proverbial for its ugliness, see Dover on Ran. 708.

234 ea simia adeo post haud multo ad me venit,
post haud multo: 'not much later'; the ablatives multo, paulo, quanto, tanto usually precede the word they modify; multo precedes in 66 examples (19 with separation), follows in 18; with post, it precedes in 11 examples, and follows only here, see Booth (1923) 58 n.7. ad me: 'to me' (to my house), a standard usage in comedy with verbs of motion, see 543n., cf. An. 100 ad me venit.

237 flagititum et damnum facisse haud mediocriter;
The ideas of flagitium facio 'do a shameful act' and damnum facio 'inflict a loss on oneself', see Watson (1971) 151 n. 6, are combined elsewhere, cf. 784 si quid damni facis aut flagiti, Ba. 1032 tantum damni feci et flagiti, Ps. 440f. Flagitium 'scandalous conduct', 'disgrace' stresses the moral damage, damnum the material damage the monkey has incurred; cf. An. 143 (damnum of property, malum of the person). It is interesting that it is the moral side of this argument Demipho uses in his discussion with Charinus about whether his mother is going to have Pasicompsa as a gift or not cf. 405f., 421f. facere damni mavolo /quam opprobriamentum aut flagitium muliebre eferri domo. haud mediocriter: litotes, 'quite substantially', cf. οδιδε μετριως. mediocriter: the proper scansion is a bb c d+, see Lindsay (1922) 206, but there are scholars who would scan aa B c d+ with a long -o- (surely wrongly), see Drexler (1964) 23 who compares An. 59, Ht. 183 pueritia, Ps. 51 Macedonio.

238 dicit capram, quam dederam servandam sibi,
sibi = ei; reflexive for demonstrative pronoun, an occasional grammatical laxity in Plautus, see Lindsay (1907) 47, cf. e.g. Per. 150 qui sibi parentes fuerint, Poen. 956 eum fecisse aiunt sibi quod faciendum fuit, often in the phrase suus sibi, e.g. Tri. 156 reddam suom sibi; also in other authors, e.g. Hec. 660 mater quod suasit sua, adulescens mulier fecit; Lucr. 2.190; Caes. B.G. 6.9.2; Cic. Inv. 1.55. For further examples see LHS II 175, Woytek on Per. 150.

239 suae uxoris dotem ambedisse oppido.
\(a B C D A / B C D a / B c D; suae(\text{ae}) uxor is\) fills the first iambic measure; metrical hiatus before the last cretic; unnecessarily, Leo, Enk and Ernout invoke hiatus after suae, Lindsay reads suai
ambedisse: ‘eat at’ (OLD s.v.), cf. 241; on comedere as a metaphor for extravagance in comedy and Cicero’s letters see Fantham (1972) 46f., not mentioning ambedere. Enk ad loc. thinks that Philemon had περιτρόφγειν here; see the justified criticism of Brinkhoff (1935) 52: it is unlikely that a virtuoso writer like Plautus resorts to literal translation of a single Greek term because he cannot think of anything better. Brinkhoff (1935) 53 advocates the view of Mendelsohn (1907) 117, also followed by Schmidt (1959) 184f. that the verb ambedere in connection with una is punished on as though connected with ambo ‘both’. This unconvincing idea derives ultimately from Acidalianus (1607) 324. The imagery of eating (κατεσθειν, καταφαγεῖν) is found frequently in Greek New Comedy (and elsewhere, e.g. oratory), especially in financial contexts, see Glick (1941) 35 n.1, Davidson (1997) 209f. Philemon fr. 43.3 K-A uses a very peculiar combination (τὸν πατέρα κατησθεν); cf. also Antiphanes fr. 236 K-A, Alexis fr. 128 K-A, Anaxippus fr. 1.31f. K-A meιράκοιν ερεμένην / ἔχον πατρώιαν οὐσίαν κατεσθεῖ, Men. fr. 287 K-Th ὃς δὴς ἐξήρη, εἰ τις πατρόφιν παραλαβόν γῆς καταφάγοι, Epit. 1065 καταφαγεῖν τὴν προκόπα μου; Men. fr. 325 K-Th δέκα τόλαντα καταφαγών; Hegesippus fr. 1.30 K-A οἱ καταβεβρωκόσκο ἕνεκ’ ἐμοῦ τὸς οὐσίας, see Fantham (1972) 47, cf. also e.g. Aesch. 1.96 ἐνταῦθα ἡδι ἐτρέπετο ἐπὶ τὸ καταφαγεῖν τὴν πατρώιαν οὐσίαν. καὶ οὐ μόνον κατέφαγεν αλλ’ εἰ οἶον τὲ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν καὶ κατέσθεν. The idea of a dowry being eaten (consumed) is also expressed in a graffito found on the cover of a lead coffin, where the deceased is addressed as a προικοφάγα (= προικοφάγα) ‘devourer of the dowry’, see de Waele (1936) 92. The idea is also expressed, by means of a less daring metaphor, at Titin. Com. fr. 15f. ego me mandatam meo viro male arbitror, / Qui rem disperdit et meam dotem comest. The eating metaphor occurs also in other financial contexts, e.g. Novius Atell. 1 edepol, paternam qui comest pecuniam. Either Plautus or Philemon has conflated the two ideas - of the devouring goat and of the dowry-devourer: the dowry-devouring goat. Despite the title of his essay, Chiarini (1989) does not provide the reader with an analysis of eating metaphors in Plautus and remains, apart from some remarks on selected passages, focused on comic parasites. oppido: ‘entirely’, cf. 245, 709; although this adverb resembles the ablative of oppidum, there is no recognisable connection; of unclear etymology, see Walde/Hofmann s.v., perhaps from *ob-pedom, ‘on the level’, ‘flatly’ (cf. πέδων), see Kretschmer (1913) 304, or ‘abundantly’, as if from an adjective *op(p)idus ‘abundant’ (from the root ops)? Cupaiuolo (1967) 41f. collects examples for three groups of uses of oppido, (1) on its own (e.g. Am. 299, 287, Mo. 733), (2) with the intensifier hercle (as here), (3) antithetic (cf. Cu. 135). The sense of ambedisse oppido is similar to the general sense of annihilation (helped by the verse-end) in the category of peri, exsorbeo, interi, corruptum which the other cases of oppido in the end of the verse present, see Booth (1923) 18 n.32. 240 mihi illud videri mirum ut una illae capra 240-241 sound like an ironic comment of the playwright (directed at the audience) about the unusual imagery of ‘eating up’ a dowry, which appears to have a Greek background (see 239n.) and may appear ‘outlandish’, even though it is understood well enough by the audience. This ruptures the fabric of the dream narrative; dream and reality are blurred. mihi illud: A B; total
elision of *mihi*, cf. 708. *videri*: historic infinitive equivalent to an imperfect tense; used sparingly by Plautus, slightly more often by Terence. In Plautus it is used in narratives of special situations, as in the report of a battle (*Am*. 230), the melodramatic report of Demipho’s violent criticism of his son’s profligacy (46ff.), in this dream report (here and at 242, 251) and that in *Rudens* (606), and the report of a storm at sea (*Tri*. 836ff.); for Terence see Allardice (1929) 83ff. *ut* ‘namely that’, see OLD s. v. 39, *LHS* II 645; not *mirum* (*sc.* *factum esse*) *ut*, as Enk ad loc. explains. *illaec = illa* + deictic -ce; cf. 276, 428, 607, 935, see Palmer (1954) 256.

242 *instare factum simia, atque hoc denique*

*instare factum simia*: ‘he insisted that it was the case’, cf. *An*. 147 *ille instat factum*; rare but sound construction; *instare* is historic infinitive. For the omission of *esse* cf. 389 *nausea edepol factum credo*, see Schmitfranz (1910) 41 n. 1, cf. e.g. *Eu*. 708.

243 *responderet, ni properem illam ab sese abducere,*

*n[i] = nisi* ‘unless’ (*OLD* s. v. 5). *abducere*: ‘take away (a purchased slave)’, see Skiles (1940/41) 535; cf. *Cu*. 348, Ps. 1015.

244 *ad me domum intro ad uxorem ducturum meam*

Demipho’s ‘wife’ has first been a goat (230), now she is a human being. The replacement of the person symbolized for the symbol, which happens easily in a dream narrative, is not unlike the *lapsus linguae* employed elsewhere for comic effect (cf. 758). *ad me domum intro*: typically Plautine form of verbal abundance; *ad me* or *domum (intro)* would have been sufficient; the sense of ever closer-up movement is then consummated by the ultimate threat *ad uxorem ... meam*; similarly already Brix (1857) 653. *ad ... ducturum: Adducere*, as a technical term, ‘to bring, deliver (a purchased slave)’ is the opposite of *abducere* (see 243n.), Skiles (1940/41) 535; cf. *Ep*. 608. Plautus may be playing with the technical and the non-technical meaning of both terms.

245 *atque oppido hercle bene velle illi visus sum,*

*oppido*: see 239n. *visus sum*: *B c D*, see 232n.

246 *ast non habere quoi commendarem capram;*

*ast*: ‘furthermore’, used in Early Latin to continue a conditional (‘if further’) or relative clause with a force similar to that of *autem*, cf. *Cap*. 683, *Tri*. 74, see Lindsay (1907) 94, Havet (1911) 205; sometimes, as here, used in bipartite statements, cf. Acc. *Trag*. 260 *splendet saepe, ast idem nimbis interdum nigret*. Later, it occurs in archaising formulas, e.g. *Liv*. 10.19.17 *Bellona, si hodie nobis victoriam duis, ast ego tibi templum voveo*. In the Augustan poets it became fashionable again for metrical convenience, see Austin on *Verg. A*. 4.488.
247 quo magis quid facerem cura cruciabar miser.
cura: ‘worry’ resulting from uncertainty, from not knowing all the necessary facts, cf. 345-347;
cf. e.g. Verg. A. 8.579ff., Cic. Off. 1.9, Liv. 34.12.1; Sall. Cat. 46.2, Phaedrus 3.3.12 (a close parallel: cura after a peasant has seen a portentum), see Hauser (1950) 57f.

248 interea ad me haedus visust adgredirier,
visust = visus est, prodelision. adgredirier = adgredi is also assigned to the fourth conjugation (adgrediri) elsewhere in Plautus, cf. Rud. 601 adgredirier, Tru. 251, 461. The Old Latin form of the infinitive passive ending in -ier is also found at line-end in 48 augerier, 786 obductarier, 801 auferrier, 805 pervenarier, 1018 scortarier; its derivation is unclear, see Meiser (1998) 225, Palmer (1954) 279.

249 infit mihi praedicare sese ab simia
infit: ‘he begins (properly reflexive ‘he makes himself get into it’)’, an emotional word, implying the speaker’s concern and earnest involvement, cf. As. 343 me infit percontarier, Au. 318, Ba. 265f. infit dicere / adulterinum ... esse symbolum, Ru. 51 laudare infit formam virginis, 53 infit lenoni suadere, usually combined with the infinitive of a verb meaning ‘to say’, if not, it is poetic and archaizing, see Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 385; found only in the third person singular (infitio once cited from Varro), see OLD s.v.

251 ego enim lugere atque abductam illam aegre pati.
enim: ‘whereas’, introducing a slight contrast, see OLD s.v. 6, Kroon (1995) 201.
lugere: ‘mourn’, more intense than (de)fere; used of Demipho’s feelings over the loss of his beautiful goat, the word is comically incongruous, see Roccaro (1974) 41 n.40. Lugere and pati: historic infinitives. atque abductam illam aegre pati A: atque illam abductam conqueri P. Both readings can be defended, and a decision is impossible. There are parallels for both constructions in Plautus, see Lindsay (1904) 62. The reason for this discrepancy is not obvious; perhaps it is the result of a transposition of abductam and illam, see Lindsay (1904) 60. aegre pati: ‘take badly’ (OLD s.v. patior 4d), cf. e.g. As. 832, Ba. 492, Ad. 143, Turp. Com. 183.

252 hoc quam ad rem credam pertinere somnium
Cf. Rud. 611f. nunc quam ad rem dicam hoc attinere somnium, / numquam hodie quivi ad coniecturam evadere.

253 nequeo invenire; nisi capram illam suspicor
Fraenkel (1960) 190f. was offended by the fact that at this point two apparently contradictory statements clash harshly. First, Demipho seems to say, ‘I don’t know what the dream means’, and then he says, ‘As for the goat, I think I know who she is.’ In fact, Demipho does not quite say that. Rather he says, ‘I don’t know what the dream means, except that I think the goat is ...’; there is one statement, underlined by successive enjambments. For this use of nisi ‘except that’ (with
indicative) after a negative, cf. e.g. *Cis. 676, Ru. 751, St. 357*. Neither is it plausible that Demipho should, as Fraenkel argues, feel secure and clear about the interpretation of the dream after having met the girl at the harbour. First, from a psychological point of view, the fact that Demipho believes to have met *one* of the several animals of his dream must excite him to even greater worry about the remaining menagerie, for if one element turns out to be ‘real’, it is not unlikely that the others will also have their equivalents in the real world. Second, from a compositional point of view, the audience has not yet been told that Demipho thinks that Pasicompsa is the *capra*; this has to be done in a separate, second step after the dream, and the time for that is exactly now.

**255 ad portum hinc abii mane cum luci simul;**

*ad portum*: The harbour is a continuous focus of interest for the main characters. Charinus came from it before he delivered the prologue (108). Likewise, the *servus currens* Acanthio came from the harbour (161) to tell Charinus that Demipho has seen Pasicompsa. Later in the play, characters stress the fact that they are going to retreat to the harbour to do some ‘business’ (326, 328, 461, 465, 466, 486, 616). Demipho has been to the harbour (255-258), but he does not say what Nicobulus says at *Ba. 235-238 nam meus formidat animus, nostrum tam diu / ibi desiderare neque redire filium*. From what he does say (as well as from what not), we may safely conclude that here at least he is supposed to have seen his son *before*. It was already noted by Taubmann (1605) 763 that it remains unclear what Demipho’s business at the harbour in the early hours of the morning actually was (he just says *id quod volui* at 256); Demipho can hardly have wanted to check on the return of his son, as Taubmann suggested, as Charinus had returned on the previous day, perhaps during the previous night, see Rambelli (1957) 37, cf. *Am. 404f., Poen. 114, Per. 577* (arrival of ships at night). *cum luci simul*: ‘at the crack of dawn’, also *cum primo luci* (e.g. *Cis. 525, Ad. 841, Cic. Off. 3.112*) or *cum prima luce* (ἀ’ ημέρα, ἀ’ ἡμι), cf. *St. 364 me misisti ad portum cum luci semul* (also at line-end), see Bergk (1870) 148. Apart from a passing remark at 873 (*Sol abit*), this is the only reminder used to inform the audience of the passage of time during the play. This technique is used frequently in New Comedy, see Ireland on Men. *Dysc. 70*. *Luci* is probably a ‘fossilized’ neuter locative with temporal force (like *heri, mani, vesperi, temperi*), see Sedgwick on *Am. 165, Martin on Ad. 841, Gratwick on Men. 1006*. It is also used with attributes, e.g. *Am. 165 hoc luci, Au. 748 luci claro*, or on its own as an adverb ‘while it is light’ (e.g. *Cas. 786*).

**256 postquam id quod volui transegi, atque ego conspicor**

*atque*: The expression is a colloquial contamination of ‘After I did X, I did Y’ and ‘I did X and I did Y’; cf. perhaps *Mo. 1050, Poen. 651*?

**257 navem ex Rhodo quast heri advectus filius;**

*A B c D A bb C D A B c d+. heri advectus: bb C D A*, ‘prosodic’ hiatus. It sounds here as if Charinus is already at home and has met his father, for how else should Demipho know of the
return of his son, and who else should Charinus visit just after his arrival but his father, the person for whom he has undertaken the voyage in the first place? When they meet later on (366-375, esp. 370), however, the impression is that they have not met before.

258 conlibitumst illuc mihi nescioqui visere:

conlibitumst ... mihi: 'it came to my head', stronger than lubet; stressing the arbitrariness of the decision, cf. Cis. 127, Eu. 1056. nescioqui: (C dd A) 'somehow or other' (lit. 'I don't know how'), cf. 388; in classical Latin, -o- would be long, in Plautus not invariably, see Lindsay (1922) 173.

259 inscendo in lembum, atque ad navem devehor.

lembum at-: D A B, metrical hiatus at A/B, marking a pause, cf. 538. lembum: 'cockboat', 'lighter', can denote any sharp-bowed, undecked vessel of any size from a ship's boat to a considerable warship, see Gow on Theocr. Id. 21.12. At 193, this particular lembus is described as p auxillulus. For evidence of lembi used as harbour vessels, see Casson (1971) 162 n. 28, 330 n. 6 ("used of the rowboats that ferried people out to the ships anchored in the roads"); cf. lembus as a little shore-ship at Men. 442.

260 atque ego illi aspicio forma eximia mulierem:

A bb C dd A / B C dd A / bb c D; eg(o) ii- scans bb (IK). The line has four resolutions, contrasting with the previous heavy line (similar: 744f.). illi = illicit, 'there', without deictic suffix -c(e), see OLD s.v.

261 filius quam advexit meus matri ancillam suae

filius quam advexit: A bb C D A; dropping of final -s in filius, filius set A bb by IK.

262 quam ego postquam aspexi, non ita amo ut sani solent

For the order in which things happen to Demipho (sight - love - frenzy), cf. in particular Verg. Ecl. 8.41 ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error and the parallels (Theocr. Id. 2.82 χως τδον ως ημαν ως μοι πυρι θυμος ιροθη; Theocr. Id. 3.42 ως ιδεν, ως ημαν, ως ες βιδον βλατρι ερωται) quoted by Coleman ad loc. The idea that love is initiated by visual contact is repeated elsewhere in the play by Demipho, cf. 262ff., 299 (also by Charinus, cf. 101-105, and by Lysimachus, 501, 517). aspexi: Love-at-first sight (cf. 100f., 198) is a motif of Hellenistic poetry, see Clausen (1987) 28, 136 n.7. For the erotic quality of the gaze and the pleasures of visual stimulation see Easterling on S. Tr. 547-549, Barrett on E. Hipp. 525-526, West on Hes. Theog. 910, Page on Rufin. Epigr. 31.3-4 (= A.P. 5.87.3-4), Goldhill (1998), cf. Prop. 2.15.12. On the aspicio-motif in Roman comedy see Risom (1971) 117-124, Flury (1968) 60, cf. esp. An. 117-120: inter mulieres / quae i bi aderant forte unam aspicio adulescentulam / forma ... :: bona fortasse. :: et volu t, Sosia, / adeo modesto, adeo vemusto ut nil supra. For Greek comedy, cf. esp. Philemon fr. 126 K-A on the genesis of love (sight - marvel - consideration - hope). sani:
Demipho distinguishes between two kinds of love, *ut sani solent* (262) and *ut insani solent* (263). This distinction is interesting, as it does not occur elsewhere in Latin or Greek literature in this form, yet cf. Prodicus 84 F7 DK ('desire doubled is Eros; Eros doubled is madness'), see Dover (1974) 126f. Preston (1916) 8f. sees a possible influence of the Stoic concept of two kinds of love, (a) the rational and virtuous love of the ἐρωτευμένος σφιχτός and (b) the irrational, excessive love (ἐρωτομακάκος); see also Paschall (1939) 74. As in many cases of alleged philosophical allusions in Plautus, the evidence is inconclusive and may simply reflect popular ethical notions. Maybe Demipho simply means that ‘(a) it is improper and mad to love anyway’ (i.e. even love experienced by young people is madness), and ‘(b) it is even more improper for an old man like me to love’ (i.e. love in such a violent form should never be experienced by old people), so consequently his love has to be regarded as ‘madness squared’.

263 homines sed eodem pacto ut insani solent.

Cf. Eu. 61-63 (after an enumeration of vitia amoris, comparable to, but shorter than Mer. 18-20, 24-31) incerta (love-affairs) haec si tu postules / ratione certa facere, nihil plus agas / quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias. The idea is repeated at Mer. 264f., 292, 325, 443, 445f., 489, cf. also Cu. 176 bonumst pauxillum amare sane, insane non bonumst, Tri. 462: et stulte facere et stulte fabulari utrumque ... in aetate hau bonumst. Love and madness were thought to be states of a similar nature, cf. Cic. Tusc. 4.68-76, see Preston (1916) 8f., Kistrup (1963) 111-116, Flury (1968) 13f., Davidson (1997) 160, and erotic infatuation is commonly designated as ‘mad’, see Brown on Lucr. 4.1068-1072. *insani*: regularly used with reference to the sick mind rather than the sick body, see Paschall (1935) 97. For the ancient ideas concerning the causes of madness see O’Brien-Moore (1924) 7-53, for the concept of love as a disease see also Preston (1916) 6-8. On ‘love is a disease’, a common metaphor in Greek and Latin literature, see Flury (1968) 88-92, cf. 262f., 265, 325, 446f. On *insanus/vesanus* as frequent epithets of *amor* or its synonyms in elegiac poetry see Paschall (1939) 73f.

264 amavi hercle equidem ego olim in adulescentia, *amavi*: ‘I have been in love’, ‘I had love-affairs’, reinforced by *ego*, see Adams (1999) 109f. *equidem*: ‘to be sure’, found with *ego* and with all persons of the singular or plural (e.g. *Ep.* 603 aulescentem equidem dicebant emisse; Sall. *Cat.* 52.11, 58.4; *Prop.* 2.31.5; *Pers.* 5.45), best explained as a lengthened form of *quidem* (cf. *eheu, eho, enim*). Despite its strong association with the first person it is almost certainly not composed of *ego + quidem* (e- being an emphatic prefix). *olim in adulescentia*: common in Plautus, cf. e.g. *Am.* 1031, *Ep.* 387, *St.* 134; Demipho is lost in nostalgia The love described here by Demipho is different from the lecherous and almost criminal (203 scelestus) licentiousness described by the external observer Acanthio (cf. 180-204). The spectators may compare the two accounts which are given of the same incident, and this in itself links the servus currens scene and this dream narrative dramaturgically; if one is taken from Philemon’s play, so will be the other. Several fathers in comedy admit that they had amorous affairs in their youth (cf. *As.* 70, *Ba.* 408-410, 1079f.), but they regularly emphasize that these
affairs were of moderate proportions. That old men were fiery lovers in their youth and should be more lenient with their sons’ love-affairs is stated by the senex lepidus Callipho at Ps. 437 vel tu ne faceres tale in adulescentia ‘as if you had never done anything like that [i.e. love-affairs, esp. setting free an amica] in your youth.’

265 verum ad hoc exemplum numquam ut nunc insanio.
Cf. Am. 704 ex insana insaniorem facies ‘you’ll make her madder than mad”; cf. also Men. Mis. A12f. ὥς ἀν ἐμμενέστατα / ἔφων τις. ad hoc exemplum = ad hunc modum, see 226n.

267 vosmet videte ceterum quanti siem.
Charinus addresses the audience in virtually the same way towards the end of his monologue at 103 vosmet videte quam mihi valde placuerit (scil. mulier). This is one of many subtle parallels that Plautus draws between the adulescens and the senex amator. The irony will probably not be lost on the audience: the apple does not fall far from the tree. Such forms of audience address are also used by Menander, cf. e.g. Sam. 269. ceterum: ‘for the rest’, adverbial use of the neuter singular, see Lindsay (1907) 96.

269-270 For these two lines of A there is a single line in P: sed simia illa atque haedus timeo quid velit. Lindsay (1904) 40 and the editors follow A, Zwierlein (1990) 22 n.37 tries to vindicate P on the grounds that the two lines in A sound “unbeholfen”. However, there is a Plautine ring about the A version with its eos esse quos dicam hau scio. Moreover, the two lines in A are more suited to the context: verum hercle at 269 underlines the contrast between the preceding line and line 270. After all, Demipho talks about the identities of the simia and the haedus; a switch from this concern to timeo quid velit would be less effective. It remains unclear how the single line may have crept into the Palatine tradition.

271 sed conticiscam, nam eccum it vicinus foras.
sed conticiscam: formulaic stage-directional phrase, see Ernout on Ba. 798. Zwierlein (1992) 297 n.669 accepts sed conticiscam at Mil. 410 and Ru. 1356, but ascribes this line to an interpolator without providing reasons. eccum: cf. 330, 561, 747, from *ecce + -um, where *um stands for *hum, (ecce-*hum) the accusative of hic without the enclitic deictic particle -ce, see Walde/Hofmann s.v., Lindsay on Cap. 169; ecce can govern the accusative as if it were a verb (like vide), eccam (671), eccos, eccas, and eccillum are also found. Sometimes, like here, eccum is practically an interjection, see Shipp on An. 532, cf. Ad. 792 eccum adest communis corruptela nostrum liberum, 923 sed eccum Micio egreditur foras.
III. Discussion

1. The Dream Narratives in *Rudens* and *Mercator*

In terms of dramatic preparation Demipho’s dream narrative is unnecessary, as it does not tell the audience anything new. This has already been elaborated upon in the preceding dialogue between Acanthio and Charinus. This is one of the reasons why it has been thought a Plautine addition. In this context, much has been made of the similarities between this dream narrative and the one to be found at *Ru.* 593-612, but apart from some superficial resemblances in diction and animals figuring in the dream, it is difficult to see a far-reaching similarity. The differences are more outstanding: in *Rudens*, Labrax does not approach Daemones for help (as happens between Demipho and Lysimachus); the *senex* has him dragged out of the temple upon hearing of the disturbance he is causing; the monkey in the dream threatens to sue, but during the actual dispute, Labrax says he will have nothing to do with the law; the dream in *Mercator* is in the first half of the play (as it usually is in ancient drama), that in *Rudens* in the second.

Marx (1899), arguing for a close connection between the dream narratives in *Mercator* and *Rudens*, for the priority of the *Rudens* dream, and claiming that Plautus inserted the *Mercator* dream after modelling it on the one in *Rudens* (which in turn is based on Diphilus), laid the ground for the modern discussion of the scene, and all of the following contributions to the question fall basically into two categories, namely those who are in favour of Marx’ arguments (disclaiming Philemonian authorship for the *Mercator* dream), and those who are not. Among those in favour of Marx are e.g. Dietze (1901) 13 n.1, Jachmann (1931) 74, 78, Drexler (1934) 42f., Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 22f., Arnaldi (1948) 252f., Traglia (1954), Fraenkel (1960) 187-195, 425f., Denzler (1968) 70 n.219, Katsouris (1978a) and (1978) 69, and Lefèvre (1995) 24.

Fraenkel and Krysiniel-Józefowicz claim that Demipho’s monologue lacks unity of thought, which is regarded by them as an essential quality of monologues in Greek drama. Against this view Harsh (1937) 284f. argues convincingly that it idealizes the conventions of Greek drama; he compares the expository prologue to Euripides’ *Iphigenia Taurica* which falls into three parts (1-41, 42-60, 61-66) presenting just as great a diversity as does this monologue, and Moschion’s monologue in Menander’s *Perikeiromene* (276-300) which falls also into two parts (276-281, 282-300).

There are many voices against Marx, e.g. Leo (1912) 163, Enk (1925) 64-68, Beare (1928) 214f., Wehrli (1936) 60 n.1, Harsh (1937) 283f., Bayet (1948) 14-17, Duckworth (1952) 222 n.29, Svendsen (1971) 82f. (strongly supporting Enk’s argument for the appropriateness of the animal imagery), Schutter (1952) 88-90, Collart (1964) 155f., della Corte (1967) 108f., Averna (1988) 39, Kimura (1989); Traglia (1970/71) 95-98 thinks that the dream was in the *Emporos* but underwent complex Plautine re-elaboration. He rightly advises not to use the relationship between the dreams in *Rudens* and *Mercator* for purposes of relative indirect dating.

The *Mercator* dream is appropriate to its setting and agrees with the subsequent development of the play (see last section of this discussion), whereas the dream in *Rudens* is
unsatisfactory in several respects. They have been pointed out by Leo (1912) 163 and Beare
(1928) 214f.: the dream should foreshadow events; but we find that in some important particulars
it contradicts them. In Daemones’ dream an ape tries to climb up to a swallow’s nest, and failing
to reach it, approaches Daemones with a request for the loan of a ladder (Ru. 598-602).
Daemones pleads for the swallows, and the ape, growing angry, threatens to have the law on him,
who then resorts to mere physical violence (Ru. 602-610). This squares badly with the subsequent
events: Labrax does not appeal to Daemones for aid; on the contrary, Daemones has him dragged
out of the temple. Then, Labrax shows no desire to go to court; he will have nothing to do with
the law. Finally, he is dragged off to court despite of his protest (Ru. 660, 724-725, 881). In
addition, Hall (1926) 23-25 argues that the correspondences between the dream scenes are not as
striking as Marx would have it, and that many of those adduced by him are “too trite to have any
significance.” He rightly criticizes Marx’ impressionistic choice of alleged correspondences
between Mercator and Rudens, none of which, apart from Mer. 225f. – Ru. 593f., are convincing; see
also Thierfelder (1932a) 642.

die Erzählung darin gipfeln, daß ihm im Traum ein haedus in die Parade gefahren sei und ihn
verspottet habe (248-250). Das ist ein Vorverweis auf das invidere, dem Demipho am Ende,
besonders auch durch Eutychus ausgesetzt wird, was bei Philemon aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach
gerade nicht der Fall gewesen ist. An dieser Stelle hat also Plautus im voraus auf seine
Hauptänderung gebührend hingewiesen [my italics].” Even if the abuse heaped on Demipho in
976-1002 was mainly Plautine, it is implausible that Plautus should take pains to point out to the
spectators one of his main changes to the play, since they could not know any such things yet.
Nor does Lefèvre explain why they would care to know.

2. The Identity of the haedus
Furthermore, Marx pointed out that there is some uncertainty about the identity of the haedus.
Yet, from the point of view of the audience, Charinus is not the only possible candidate for an
identification. Considering that what the haedus is said to have done is (a) ab simia capram
abduxisse (249f.), (b) inridere (at Demipho, 250). This behaviour would not be unworthy of a
disrespectful servus callidus, and as such the audience has just met Acanthio, who has
recommended himself as a brilliant liar (212) and schemer (223f.), as a man who is not respectful
of his masters (e.g. 140, 153, 161, 203, 206f.; inridere is used of a slave’s gloating at the end of
his scheme at Mo. 1132, Ps. 1316). Charinus, on the other hand, has been introduced as an
obedient son (79-84) who, apart from being afraid of telling Father a lie (207-219), thinks that
parenti proloqui mendacium is a scelus (280f.). The behaviour displayed by the haedus is one
that is to be expected of an energetic character, not that of a listless poltroon. The audience will
wait in vain for the return of the slave until scene II.4, and they will begin to identify Eutychus as
the haedus from 485 (vin patri sublinere me os tuo?) at the latest.

Kimura (1989) 84f. notes that the haedus is seen as the rival in love, and that consequently
the audience may identify him with Charinus. Even if this is true, the two identifications may not
mutually exclude each other. On the contrary, they may serve to increase tension. The audience take it for granted that something will happen to the 'goat'. Demipho will probably acquire her some way or another. From there, once the goat (girl) is in his power, the further action is only laid out in its vaguest shape. The spectators simply do not know exactly what is going to happen, but they anticipate that it will have something to do with a clever and energetic character, and this knowledge confuses them, as they have learnt that Charinus does not possess the required qualities to a sufficient degree. They will probably guess that Acanthio and Charinus will pair up in some sort of intrigue.

For the latter part of the play, Kimura (1989) explains rightly that since Demipho’s wife never enters, it is Dorippa’s sudden return from the country that brings about the reversal, and with that shift of the focus from Demipho’s family to that of Lysimachus, there takes place a similar shift from Charinus to Euytchus.

3. The Appropriateness of the Dream Narrative in Mercator
Demipho’s dream is essential for the dramaturgical balance of the play in its present form. The interest in the characters of this play and the predominance of characterization, combined with a high degree of rapport with the audience, dictates the form of this comedy as a whole, or in other words, the characters’ states of mind are important for the organization and structure of the Mercator. Demipho’s analysis of his feelings parallels his son’s monologue and serves as a delayed plot summary for the later part of the play. The audience have heard from Charinus and from his slave Acanthio about the circumstances leading up to Charinus’ arrival with the girl and about Demipho’s subsequent accidental discovery of the girl. The established form of preparing the audience for complicated action requires an explanation of what will happen now that the senex has Pasicompsa on his mind, especially because Demipho does not act as the clues provided by Charinus would lead one to expect.

Charinus has described his father as an intentionally interfering and unsympathetic ‘blocking character’, who simply destroyed his earlier affair with a meretrix, resulting in the business trip where he met Pasicompsa in the first place. Acanthio’s description of Demipho’s behaviour towards Pasicompsa has suggested to Charinus (and the audience) that the old man was more than interested in the girl himself (cf. 203) and that he has believed Acanthio’s yarn (211), based on Charinus’ idea (208), about Pasicompsa having been bought as a maid for Mother. At this point, the monologic dream narrative offers the audience a fuller picture of the situation: Demipho can explain himself, and he has no reason to hide anything as nobody is listening. His personal involvement in every stage of his dream and the trouble he causes for the Monkey family reflect his central position in the plot as a disruptor of peace in the play. See Fields (1938) 10f. for a similar judgement of the function of this scene; he compares the beginning of the Asinaria and the Pseudolus, where the exposition is likewise spread, while later scenes serve the illustration of the information given previously. In the Pseudolus, in particular, it is important to present the situation from two different vantage points, that of Calidorus and that of Ballio. The piecemeal
r revelation of information can also be compared to the technique employed in the opening scenes of the Trinummius and the Mostellaria, see Fields (1938) 94-103.

The appropriateness of the dream can not only be demonstrated for its relation with what precedes it, but also with what follows it, in particular in relation to the use of its animal imagery. Demipho is easily identified as a senex amator and a lusty goat (cf. 275, 525, 567). The capra is a fitting object for a goat’s amorous advances. Charinus may be related to the haedus (248), another term with strong sexual connotations, but it is probably better to follow Enk in relating it to Eutychus because of the actions at the end of the play (cf. 972ff., 976, 983). I agree with Enk and Svendsen (1971) 83f. that the choice of the simia as a representation of Lysimachus is appropriate: the simia starts as friend and confidante, and later he gets angry and turns into an enemy; Lysimachus develops an interest in the girl himself (499ff., 7533f.), he undergoes a change of mind when discovered by Dorippa, the uxor dotata, (798ff.), and ridicules Demipho (981ff.) and has an angry exchange of words with him (998). By contrast, in Daemons’ dream in the Rudens, the simia is an enemy all along.
I. Introduction

1. Demipho's Interpretation of the Bad Omen
The details of the dream narrative prepare for the comic effect which follows: Demipho announces Lysimachus' entrance and overhears the instructions which he gives to his slave about the castration of a hircus. This is particularly appropriate after the dream, and is an ill omen, as Demipho appreciates in an aside. The remainder of Lysimachus’ entrance speech, containing conventional instructions to his slave, is of no interest to the eavesdropper, but lends a more realistic character to the whole setting, see Hiatt (1946) 69. The present scene marks the shift from a revelation of past events to a development of the present situation (from 'exposition' to 'action').

Crespi (1904/05) 450 has made the attractive suggestion for the staging of Lysimachus' first entrance. A producer could make Lysimachus’ mask and whole appearance bear some resemblance with the physical features of a simia (cf. 639f.). Staged this way, his appearance on stage will provoke laughter in the audience, who would easily recognize him as the monkey of Demipho’s dream.

2. Lysimachus' Character and Function
The main purpose of this scene is to expose Demipho as a senex amator. Consequently, the theme of vilipending the vetulus, decrepitus senex is predominant. The scene also introduces Lysimachus as a positive contrast figure. The first impression the audience get of Lysimachus is that of respectability, but his correctness is subtly undercut at the same time. Underneath its see-through layer Lysimachus loathes his wife and does not even abstain from lies in order to avoid her company. By the end of the scene, the extended exposition is finished, as it has been established beyond doubt that Charinus and Demipho are in love with the same girl, and that Lysimachus' wife is not in town. Things are taking shape and tension is building up, especially when Demipho is about to meet his son (329-334).

It is important to establish whether the character of Lysimachus is meant to be played as if he does really want to talk to Demipho or not, i.e. whether the polite conversation of lines 283-290 is merely conventional or an expression of true friendship between the senes. Again and again Demipho tries to evade the impact of Lysimachus' critical retorts; each time he emerges from the 'game' looking more foolish than before. Eventually, Lysimachus goes as far as turning to the audience and affirming, with all due sarcasm, that physically, Demipho is as functional as a picture of a lover painted on a wall (313). The main purpose of this scene is to show Demipho as an erroneous, comic figure.
3. The *lorarius*

The scene headings (except in *A*) are unanimous in calling Lysimachus’ slave, who is present from line 272, but is only given a half-line of dialogue on his exit (282), a *lorarius*. Although Plautus and Terence use the word *lorum*, the noun *lorarius* to refer to slaves (as silent characters limited to not more than a line of speech in a scene) never occurs in any of their plays, and they are (if at all) simply called *servi*, see Prescott (1936) 100-103 and Bader (1970) 67, 141f. All slaves that speak even a little are usually called *lorarii* in the scene headings, even if they do not perform the function *lorarii* would normally have (e.g. in *Ps.* the so-called *lorarii* do ‘normal’ slave-work). Likewise, *lorarii* who perform the ‘proper’ work of *lorarii* but who have no spoken lines are usually not incorporated in the scene headings. The Ambrosianus does on this occasion (as happens elsewhere) not give *lorarius* in the heading. It is, however, possible that the empty lines visible in some places indicate that something had been written there originally but has faded away, see Bader (1970) 65.

II. Commentary

272 LY. Profecto ego illunc hircum castrari volo

By a convention common in ancient comedy, Lysimachus talks back into the house, see Duckworth (1952) 152f. Alternatively, he may be talking to the slave accompanying him while they are both coming out of the house, an equally common convention of making an entrance appear more ‘natural’ and create a more ‘life-like’ kind of dialogue that conveys the impression that the present scene is a ‘slice’ of the ‘real’ life going on ‘backstage’. Both kinds of ‘cut-in’ dialogue are usually brief and contain matters of no great importance for the plot as a whole. Some scholars, e.g. Barbieri (1966) 254, Lefèvre (1995) 25 n. 82, think that 272-276 could not have been in the Greek original, mistakenly arguing from *decorum*, see Fraenkel (1960) 194f. *castrari*: ‘be gelded’; only here in Plautus; in the other instances (275, *As.* 237, *Au.* 251), it refers to the castration of people.

273 ruri qui nobis exhibet negotium

*ruri*: ‘on the farm’, not ‘in the country’; cf. 509, *Cas.* 105, *Cis.* 226, *Mo.* 799, *Tru.* 915. At 543, 686, 760, 766, and 924, the word is used unspecifically, ‘in the country’ (‘not in town’). The frequency of references to the country in this play is notable (only comparable to *Casina*): *rus*, 68, 656, 667, 668, 711, 804; *rure*, 586, 705, 807, 810, 814; *rusticus*, 65, 714-716. In *Casina*, it is a strongly unromantic word, similarly in the opening scene of *Mostellaria*. *nobis*: *P*; *A* has *vobis*. There is a parallel use at 396, where Demipho uses *nobis*, ‘to our household’, i.e. in his function as head of the household he uses *nos* to refer to it in its totality. *Vobis* would here rather refer to the audience (cf. 267). There is no reason why Lysimachus should exclude himself, since he is talking about his own farm. The context shows that he wants to appear as someone who with a great sense of his own importance as *dominus* and *pater familias*; see *OLD* s.v. 1b. *exhibit*
negotium: 'causes trouble' (OLD s.v. 6b); cf. Am. 894f., Men. 1072, Mo. 565, Per. 315, Poen. 239, Rv. 473, 556, also exhibere molestiam (Cap. 817, Per. 274); not in Terence; otherwise ‘task’, ‘business’ (see 279n.), also used in the phrase quid est negoti? (see 135n.).

274 nec omen illuc mihi nec auspicium placet
omen ... placet: ‘the omen is good’; see OLD s.v. omen 1b, cf. Ep. 396; Liv. 29.27.12. This is an allusion to Roman augury; in a Greek context, such an ‘omen’ would be a κληρόν, ‘chance utterance’, see Griffith on A. Prom. 486f. auspicium: (*avi-spicium, ‘an omen taken from birds’) ‘a portent or omen of any kind’; see OLD s.v. 5a; cf. Au. 147 auspicio malo, OCD3 s.v. For a similar doubling of expressions (hendiadys) cf. St. 673, Acc. Trag. 583 adverso augurio et inimico omne. Bettini on Am. 722 states that omen corresponds to κληρόν, see also Fraenkel (1960) 195, and always refers to ‘something heard’, whereas auspicium always refers primarily to ‘something seen’ (cf. Cic. De div. 2.84). In that case, Demipho would use omen to refer to Lysimachus’ order, and auspicium to refer to his dream.

275 quasi hircum metuo ne uxor me castret mea
Demipho does indeed harbour adulterous thoughts and fears that his wife will punish him severely if she finds out. Indirectly, his wife is characterised as ferox, and the audience will think of the type of the uxor dotata, as it is later exemplified by Dorippa, Lysimachus’ wife (667-802). hircum: nearest to an exact identification for Demipho, cf. 272, 575 senex hircosus; often used as a term of abuse for dirty, rustic, and unpleasant characters in Plautus; not in Terence; cf. Cas. 550, 1018, Men. 839, Mo. 40, Ps. 967 (beardedness), Poen. 873. castret: cf. 272; Stärk (1989) 50 n.190 comments on the comic inversion of roles that leads to the punishment for adultery (cf. Mil. 1408) being exercised by the uxor dotata. He compares As. 946, Cas. 1003 (both less formidable). For various kinds of verbal and physical punishment inflicted on husbands by their unforgiving uxorres, see Schuhmann (1975) 99-105.

276 ac metuo ne illic simiae partis ferat
The paradosis divides: (1) ac metuo ne illae simiae partis ferat (A), accepted by Goetz, Ussing (reading partes), Langrehr (reading illic, understanding Lysimachus), Lindsay, Kunst (1919) 149 n.1, Ernout. The offence taken against this line is summed up by Bayet (1948) 16, who brackets it: “Il est en effet absurde, mais paraît bien avoir été inéré pour rattacher l’omen rustique de la castration du bouc à l’élégante parodie du songe tragique. Rattachement arbitraire: les deux présages sont distincts; et si le public latin comprend et goûte le drame figuratif traduit du grec, il ressent davantage sans doute comme sien le frisson de Dé miphon, touché par des mots imprévus dont il se fait l’application à lui même.” Kunst (1919) 148f. rather fancifully defends the misinterpretation given to the dream by Demipho as an expression of Philemon’s “naïver Erfinderfreude” inspired by the dream narrative. (2) atque illius nunc simiae partis ferat (P), accepted by Leo (who brackets the line), Thierfelder (1929) 144, Klotz (1933) 527, Enk (Th. and E. reading hic for haec, against the MSS). The two main objections that could be raised
against either of these lines are that (a) the sense they yield is unsatisfactory (for the identification of Demipho’s *uxor* with the *simia* of his dream does not square with the fact that in the dream the monkey is definitely a man, for he is said to have an *uxor dotata* who objects to the presence of the she-goat, cf. 239-241), and (b), much less importantly, that the expression *partes ferre* for ‘to play a role’ is a hapax in Plautus, see Zwierlein (1991a) 91. The latter objection can be remedied by comparing the instances where *partes* refers to ‘(theatrical) role’ in Plautus (*Am. 62, Mil. 811*, see Lodge s.v. II.3) and by looking at similar expressions in Terence (*Eu. 151, Ad. 880*; see McGlynn s.v. III.1) and Horace (*Sat. 1.9.46*, see also *OLD* s.v. *fero* 17 ‘to play, sustain (a part)*). The former objection is harder to remedy. Consequently, the line was bracketed by Leo, following Ritschl. If the reading is sound, Demipho seems to think of the *simia* as female here, which is odd and cannot be explained by the fact that the word is feminine in Latin and may thus have suggested to the dreamer that the animal in his dream was female, since Demipho states explicitly that this *simia* had a wife. Unconvincingly, Averna (1987) 16 and (1990) 149 tries to explain this statement psychoanalytically as a running-together of two levels of identification by Demipho, who is still bedraggled after his dream. However, Demipho is no longer under the immediate influence of the dream experience (cf. 180-224, 255-261), and there is no doubt that the *simia* Demipho is talking about is male.

Even if this line was not in Plautus’ original text and was introduced in a stage-copy, as Lindsay (1904) 40f. assumes, or otherwise interpolated, an explanation is needed why a stage-manager or actor should insert this line here if it had no positive stage-effect, would be hard to understand, and would therefore annoy the audience.

The main question has to be whether this line does work as part of a comedy performed for an audience. In the light of this question, Langrehr’s emendation of *illaec* to *illic* (whereby Demipho would refer to Lysimachus as the *simia*), appears very attractive. Ritschl *Opuscula II* 705 disliked this solution, since he contended that the mere fact that Lysimachus stepped out onto the stage talking about the castration of a *hircus* does not motivate an identification with the *haedus* of the dream. Ritschl seems to have overlooked the possibility that the equivalent figure of the *hircus* in the dream may be Demipho himself, about whose outer appearance the dream narrative does not tell the audience anything. Indeed, the subsequent and sudden identification of Demipho with a *hircus* rounds off the dream narrative, for a *hircus* is the natural mate of a *capra*. Moreover, if we were to follow Ritschl and Leo in bracketing the line altogether, the joke so carefully prepared in 272-274 would lose much of its force.

The change of subject would also help to explain the reiteration of the verb *metuo* ... *ac metuo* criticised by Ritschl. Therefore, I have adopted the text of *A* with Langrehr’s conjecture: *illic* is deictic here, Demipho looks at the audience and points towards Lysimachus, and the change of subject from 275 to 276 is therefore even less objectionable.

277 *i tu hinc ad villam atque istos rastros vilico*

This sets the business-like and curt tone for lines 277-282 which contain various instructions for the *lorarius* in the short, matter-of-fact style of military dispatches. The spectators realise that the
Master is talking to his slave, and this senex’s demeanour and dignity is seen in strong contrast to Demipho’s, who is insanus (262-265): Lysimachus is a man in control of his own affairs, whereas Demipho is not. This is going to change soon (see 279n.). At the moment, however, Lysimachus is needed as a foil against which to develop the untimely and mad love of the senex amator. Lysimachus regards his lorarius as a slow-witted fellow: it is a topos that slaves can never get things right. The verbal abundance is indicative of Lysimachus’ distrust in the slave’s ability to pick up everything he says. ad villam: cf. 667, 714; Lysimachus has an estate in the country (with farming as a second source of income) as well as a town house (where his main business is based); Demipho has had a farm as well, but sold it after his father’s death (cf. 64-76). This is a common situation in New Comedy. It often assists the dramatist’s plotting, e.g. in Terence’s Eumuch, where the father’s prolonged absence in the country facilitates the amatory adventures of his sons. rastror: ‘(drag-)hoes’, see White (1967) 52-56; symbolical of country life, hard work, and poverty, cf. Ht. 88f. where they symbolize the hard work Menedemus has inflicted on himself, and Ht. 930f.; δυώξλα is used similarly, cf. Men. Dysc. 412-417, Georg. 65. The weight of hoes was notorious (Ht. 92; Verg. G. 1.164); Handley on Men. Dysc. 390 estimates the weight for a Greek mattock as about eight pounds. Lysimachus’ slave will, therefore, probably pant and gasp under the weight of the rastror that he has to carry. A question that remains is what these rastror are doing in the city. Presumably they are new ones bought in the city, and Lysimachus now sees to it that they are brought to his farm. vilico: ‘bailiff’, ‘overseer’ (of a villa), cf. e.g. Cato De re rust. 143-145; see White (1970) 350-355.

278 Pisto ipsi facito coram ut tradas in manum
Pisto: another bailiff is named at Poen. 170 (Collybiscus). The name Pistus could be given to a character in a Greek play as well. It is used as a slave-name by Philomen fr. 87 A Edmonds; Ussing ad loc. mentions that Pistus is the name of an ophthalmologist in a Roman sepulchral inscription. The use of names like Pisto-clerus (in Bacchides) by Plautus suggests that he thought his audience capable of understanding the meaning of πιστός; a Roman audience might also relate this name to the perfect participle pistus of pinsere ‘crush’ (cf. 416). coram: This line contains a subtle joke. If the bailiff Pistus (Πιστός) was really the loyal retainer his name says he is (‘Mr Faithful’), why is it necessary to hand the mattocks over to him and only him (Pisto ... ipsi) ‘face to face’ (coram, quoram < *quam-oram) and into his own hands (in manum), two adverbs denoting similar things in line with each other. Ussing’s explanation ad loc. does not help (“Eius [i.e. Pistus] curae omnia credita sunt; itaque ipsi, non aliui cuipiam servorum, rastros tradere debet.”), but shows that he saw the oddity of the statement. The triadic enumeration of pieces of redundant information continues the matter-of-fact tone Lysimachus has adopted right from his first line.

279 uxori facito ut nunties negotium
First Lysimachus mentions the hoes. Then, as if in an afterthought, he mentions his wife. This may be taken as indicative of his dislike of Dorippa (cf. 760f., 764). Lysimachus develops his excuse
for not coming to join his wife ruri slowly and profusely. To begin with, he tells the lorarius to report to his wife that he has some business (279) in town (280), and that she should not expect him: “I’ve business in town, and tell her that she shan’t expect me, for I have ... to act as a judge in three legal cases.” The metrical line-breaks of 279-281 are at places where the actor playing Lysimachus can conveniently pause and pretend to improvise an excuse as he goes along. For the audience, it is delightful to see through the veneer of correctness, control, and respectability a man who is obviously not overly fond of his wife and makes up an excuse to keep away from her. Given the knowledge of the genre, many spectators may suspect (a) that Lysimachus’ wife is going to appear later in the play, and (b) that Lysimachus is up to something clam uxorem suam. One may ask why Lysimachus does not want to go to the country. His decision, if the tres litis are an excuse, remains unmotivated. It seems that Lysimachus’ decision not to go and see his wife is necessary dramaturgically, namely to motivate the later/ensuing complication of the action when Dorippa comes home and finds Pasicompsa in their house (IV.1), which in turn is the motivation for the solution of the action of the play.

281 tris hodie litis iudicandas dicito.
The involvement in the settling of legal affairs as arbiter (δικαιοπριτῆς) is a sign of Lysimachus’ high social status, cf. Chremes in Ht. (498-502). In Greece, settlement of disputes by arbitration was a common practice, and in Athens there were two types of arbitrator, public ones, citizens over 60 appointed from each deme, and private ones, chosen for the occasion by the parties to the particular dispute. Lysimachus’s status is unclear, but he is probably of the latter type. But cf. the remarks about iudex and arbitration in this play, (1) 279-281, (2) 735-737 (cf. also 751f.). Scafuro (1997) 187-192 discusses whether the arbitrators in Roman comedy are Roman or not, but she does not mention the two passages from the Mercator. These passages prove, if nothing else, that this form of arbitration cannot have been completely unknown to the Romans. litis: ‘legal dispute’, see Kaser/Hackl (1996) 75, settled by a iudex (see 736n.) ordered to act by the praetor, see Kaser/Hackl (1996) 107-111. Lysimachus, unlike Chremes in Ht. 498-502, is not an arbiter between neighbours, and his exit to the harbour, where he is presumably supposed to be acting as arbiter, is already motivated by this line. It is not clear how long the settling of a lis would take, but three lites is certainly a high number, indicating a busy day for Lysimachus. According to the XII Tables, midday is the summum tempus for decision-making in legal disputes (III.3 post meridiem praesenti litem addicito). It is hard to see how one could deal with three lites in one day. Thus, getting such a message, Lysimachus’ wife would be well-advised to come and see her husband. These three legal cases are not mentioned again, but Lysimachus seems to use try to use them as an excuse at 736f. to explain to his wife Dorippa Pasicompsa’s presence in their household.

282 i, et hoc memento dicere. SE. numquid amplius?
A B c D A / B c d+/ aa B c d+; locus Jacobsohnianus in second D; numquid pyrrhic. The second break divides the line into 2/3 and 1/3 of an iambic senarius, or rather two iambic movements
against one, the slave's question being a metrical echo of Lysimachus' words. numquid amplius?: 'anything else?', the only words spoken by the lorarius, a variation on the usual numquid (aliud me) vis?, a polite formula whereby one might gracefully indicate a desire to terminate a conversation and withdraw. A typical example can be found in Horace's encounter with the bore (Sat. 1.9.6), see Hough (1945). It is hard to conceive of the attribution of a short speaking role to an extra who is silent elsewhere in the play in Greek tragedy, and it is unlikely in Menandrian comedy, see Bain (1981) 46 n.1, who states that in this area Plautus' technique is closer to that of Old Comedy than to his models and that the 'economy' of New Comedy is abandoned and the stage populated with slaves who acknowledge commands and do nothing else. This means to overstate the case, as can be seen in the analyses by Prescott (1936) 97-119 and (1937) 193-209: On the few occasions where such characters do speak, the comments fall mainly into one of two categories: (a) short remarks where someone is being beaten (e.g. Cap. 658f., Men. 1015-1016, Mil. 1424), or (b) witty comments or joke-cracking (e.g. Cas. 720-723, Poen. 332, Ps. 158f.; cf. also Eu. 912f.). Usually, slaves carry out their orders without talking (as at 910, 930 in this play, and e.g. Am. 949, Men. 218, Mo. 843; cf. also An. 579; similar Men. Dysc. 963f.). However, there are cases where extras respond to instructions from their masters; at Ep. 400 a servus replies quid vis? to his master's energetic question atque audin?; of the others quoted by Bain (1981) 46 only Cas. 720, Poen. 332, Eu. 913 carry conviction.

283 LY. tantumst. DE. Lysimache, salve<to>. LY. euge, Demipho, tantumst: sc. quantum dixi, 'that would be all', see Lindsay (1907) 52. salve<to>: is needed instead of salve in the MSS to avoid hiatus at C/D juncture, which is irregular though occurring in change of speaker. Moreover, the polite greeting fits the urbanitas of the exchange more than salve. euge: (eugae A, accepted by Goetz/Schoell, Lindsay, Enk, Ernout: euge P adopted by Ussing, Leo); interjection, often coupled with a vocative. The final syllable is frequently heavy in Plautus and Terence (e.g. An. 345), see OLD s.v.; on εὐγε (e∅ γε) see Denniston (1950) 127. The spelling is euge in the MSS of Terence, see McGlynn s.v., Shipp on An. 345. The orthography of this has been much discussed. In the case of Plautus, the paradosis records, for the most part, the spelling euge. However, A (six times) and B (once) preserve occasionally the spelling eugae. Richter (1890) 516f. assumed that the rarer form was supported by the scansion of An. 345, where eugae is spondaic. Lindsay (1922) 199 accepted Richter's argument and recommended the spelling eugae throughout regardless of the MS tradition. Duckworth on Ep. 9 thinks that both forms were probably used and that the authority of A is decisive for the decision about the orthography in each individual case. More recently, scholars have been rightly critical of Richter's findings, pointing out that Latin not infrequently accentuated disyllabic interjections on the second syllable, causing it to be metrically lengthened (e.g. heia, cf. Mer. 998, attât; English hurrah!), see Enk on Tru. 186, Woytek on Per. 90, Petersmann on St. 660.
284 salveto. quid agis? quid fit? DE. quod miserrimus.

quid agis?: 'how're you doing?', cf. 963; familiar form of greeting; used between slaves at As. 297, Ep. 9, Mil. 276, 1139, Per. 204, 208, 482, 576, between senes at Au. 536 and here, between an adulescens and a slave at Ep. 614, Men. 138, between husband and wife at Cas. 229, 577, between father and son at 963, and between adulescens and ancilla at Tru. 127, 917. At Mil. 170 it is used by a slave addressing a senex, but there the familiarity is warranted by the fact that the senex partakes in the intrigue. In Terence, the phrase does not occur, but quid agitur? does (Eu. 271, 456, Ph. 610, Ad. 373, 901). quid fit?: 'how are you getting on?', cf. 366 quid fit, pater?; Ba. 626, 775, 879, 979, Cas. 725, Ep. 396, Ru. 1052, 1303; Ad. 266, 883, see Duckworth on Ep. 396, Petersmann on St. 660. The phrase can also have the sense 'What's wrong?' (= quid est?), cf. Ad. 266, 768 quid fit? quid tu es tristis?, and that is perhaps the nuance here, which means that Demipho's tone of voice or outer appearance must convey some impression of his present unhappiness. quod miserrimus: sc. agit.

285 LY. di melius faxint! DE. di hoc quidem faciunt. LY. quid est?

faxint = perf. subj. (old sigmatic optative) fecerint, see Meiser (1998) 183f., Lindsay on Cap. 172, Gratwick on Men. 113. In Terence, faxo has always the sense 'I shall be after doing that', 'I shall complete doing that' (cf. 826-829), and the subjunctive is to a great extent limited to stereotyped phrases (e.g. Ht. 161 utinam ita di faxint, cf. Hec. 102, 134, 354). We should expect faxint to be in ordinary use more than forms of less common verbs, yet it is used only in prayers with di as subject or partial subject in all of its sixteen occurrences except in a passage of the Captivi (320) in a solemn entreaty. This formulaic use seems to indicate that faxint was already obsolete in Plautus' own day except in these phrases, in which it remained in ordinary use for centuries, e.g. in Cicero's correspondence, see Harsh (1940) 139, Hanson (1959) 72, Happ (1967) 87-92. di hoc quidem faciunt: comic riposte to a stereotyped phrase of common courtesy. Taking Lysimachus' standard formula of well-wishing literally, Demipho says that it is the gods who are responsible for his present predicament, so they cannot be expected to make it better. Plautus subverts the standard religious outlook, combining a piece of everyday polite conversation with a literary topos ('the gods are the cause of our afflictions, especially amatory sufferings').

286-289 This passage is mentioned by Fraenkel (1960) 356 n.2 and Haffter (1934) 57 as an example of urbanitas in New Comedy often still visible in Plautus' text. Formulas of politeness that found their way, not so much from Greek literature into Latin literature as from Greek society into Roman society, at least as early as the third century BC, cf. e.g. Ar. Lys. 412f. σω δ' ἥν σχολάσσει, ... ἐνόφρισσον, Pl. Phd. 58d, Phdr. 227b.

286 dicam, si videam tibi esse operam aut otium

operam: 'time (for work)', hence 'time to listen', see Hammond/Mack/Moskalew on Mil. 252. tibi ess(e): bb C, prosodic hiatus.
287 L.Y. quamquam negotiumst, si quid vis, Demipho

Demipho hesitates politely, Lysimachus answers urbanely; cf. Ru. 120f., see Molsberger (1989) 73. *quamquam negotiumst: the tris litis* (281), but since they are probably an invention of Lysimachus anyway, it is no wonder that he can take time and chat with Demipho.

288 non sum occupatus umquam amico operam dare

*occupatus: ‘engaged’, ‘busy’, cf. e.g. Men. 452; the use of the adnominal infinitive after it is unique to this line, see Lindsay (1907) 74, *LHS* II 350, see also 805n. *amico operam dare: ‘put oneself at a friend’s disposal’, cf. 499.*

290 quid tibi ego aetatis videor? LY. Acherunticus

*quid ... aetatis: ‘how old?’, partitive genitive with an accusative instead of an ablative of time, see Lindsay (1907) 25, Ernout on Ba. 343; cf. As. 71 *id aetatis*, Ba. 343 *hoc aetatis*, Mil. 618 istuc aetatis, 659 illuc aetatis, Per. 276 *quid sim aetatis*, Tri. 787. *Acherunticus: used facetiously here and Ba. 199, Mil. 627, cf. Mer. 606. For other unflattering attributes of old men in Plautus cf. As. 892, Cas. 158 *Acheruntis pabulum* ‘hell-fodder’, 159-161, 549f. (hircus), 535, Men. 838f. (hircus), 864 (olentem), Per. 283. The spelling *Acherunticus* is used by Lindsay and Baier (1888) 275-278. *Acheruns* has a long *A*- in Plautus, but a short one in later Latin; in Ἀχέρων the *A*- is short. *A* spells always *Acheruns*, but there are traces of the spelling *Accheruns* in *P* (possibly a way of indicating the length of the first syllable or a failed Latin attempt to represent aspiration), e.g. Tri. 525 *Accheruntis* in *B*. At Mo. 509 the reading *ad ceruntem* of the MSS may be a remnant of an older ‘mixed’ spelling *Accherunt-* (on the analogy of *bracchium*), as suggested by Havet (1911) 230, but the evidence is inconclusive. In particular, *muttus μοῦς*, *struppus στρόφος* and *moeccus* (MSS at Mil. 775) μοῦχος would by analogy suggest a spelling like *Accerunticus*. The question of spelling Greek χ in such cases arises again at 488 *Achillem*; see 488n. Since, however, *Βάκχας* are transliterated *Bacchae*, one should write *Acheruns* for Ἀχέρων, since it is not spelt *Ἀχέρων*, see also Questa (1967) 116f.*

291 senex vetus, decrepitus. DE. pervorse vides.

292 puer sum, Lysimache, septuennis. LY. sanun es,
puer: The reversal of age roles is usually regarded as highly undesirable, see Powell on Cic. Sen. 38 (senem in quo est aliquid adolescentis), McGlynn s.v. III (on Ad. 940 promisti autem? de te largitor, puer); cf. 976 where Demipho is called vetus puer, Tri. 43f. hic ille est senecta aetate qui factust puer, / qui admisit in se culpam castigabilem (also based on a play by Philemon). The topos of ‘boy and old man’ is common in ancient literature and has a long afterlife, see Curtius (1953) 98-101. As its earliest occurrences in Latin literature he mentions Verg. A. 9.311 ante annos animumque gerens curamque virilem, Ov. Ars 1.185f. (the combination of maturity and youth is only granted to demigods and emperors), Val. Max. 3.1.2 (Cato praises himself that in his tender years he already had the dignified seriousness of the later senator), but the motif is older, cf. A. Sept. 622 γέροντα τὸν νοῦν, σώρκα δ’ ἡμῶν ὁφεί; an example from Greek comedy is Phileleon at Ar. V. 1341-1387 who turns from an old man into a teenager who is called to order by his son-turned-father Bdelycleon. In later Latin literature, e.g. Claudian (Panegyric on Probinus and Olybrius 1.154), the puer senilis topos is used to express that a boy possesses already the morality and wisdom of an old man, and not - as here - that an old man has got the morality and behaviour of a child. Curtius (1953) 99 is certainly mistaken to call the topos of the puer senilis (puer senex) a coinage of late pagan antiquity. As a criticism, the expression vetus puer is already found at Mer. 976 (see n.), and the concept as such must have been present in the minds of the audience. for otherwise it could not be comically inverted, see also Carp (1980) 736-739. septuennis: ‘seven-year-old’, cf. Ba. 440, Men. 24, 1116, Poen. 66; the age when children are sent to school, see Schmitter (1971) 96f. It is also connected with the shedding of one’s milk-teeth, see 541n. and Gratwick on Men. 1116. Later in the play, Demipho is described as being ten times older (524f).

296 aiunt solere eum rusum repuerascere.
repuerascere: comic inversion of a commonplace that can perhaps be traced back to a truism like Solon’s γνάθοκα δ’ αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος (fr. 18 West), see Powell on Cic. Sen. 26. On the idea of πολιμπαδεῖς see Cēbe on Varro Sat. 44 , cf. Varro Sent. 74 Riese tam ridenda in sene puerilitas quam obstupescenda in puerro optimorum morum constantia. The same criticism is used of elderly women, cf. Pherecrates fr. 185 K-A πόλην αὐτῆς ἀναστολῆς αὐ γεραίερα. Growing up means putting away childish things, cf. Hor. Ep. 2.2.141f., Ov. Rem. 23, Pers. 1.9f. An adult, especially an old man, who persists in childish games is regarded as mad. In the Mercator, the argument that lovers are childish and therefore mad (cf. 82, 262-265) is combined with the identification of love as a mental disease (cf. 489).

298 LY. bene hercle factum et gaudeo. DE. immo si scias
bene hercle factum et gaudeo: ‘well done, I’m so happy for you’; regularly without an auxiliary, cf. Ep. 707, Mo. 207, 1147, Ps. 1099, Tri. 127, Ru. 835, see Petersmann on St. 374. si scias: ‘if only you knew’, regularly left incomplete, the apodosis hoc non/magis dicas being implied; cf. Cas. 668, Cu. 321, Ps. 749, Eu. 355, Ht. 599, see Duckworth on Ep. 451.

302 LY. audacter. DE. animum advorte. LY. riet sedulo.

303 DE. hodie ire occæpi in ludum litterarium,
Children are sent to school in their seventh year, see 292n., cf. Ba. 440. For other reference to schools and writing cf. As. 226-228, Ba. 129, 427-448, Cu. 258, Mo. 125-126, Per. 173, Ps. 23, Ru. 1305f., Tru. 735f. Schmitter (1975) discusses the evidence for compulsory schooling at Athens and Rome, finding that although such schooling did not exist, there was a strong inducement to educate sons in skills like reading and writing since the times of Solon; for similar arguments in relation to the state of affairs in third and second century BC Rome, see Bonner (1977) 20-22, Harris (1989) 157-165. Gruen (1992) 230 sets this fact in the context of the rapid Hellenization of Rome.

The visit of a hetaira is compared to going to school at As. 226f., Ba. 65f. (compared to a visit to the palaistra), Tru. 735f. litteras didicisti: quando scis, sine alios discere. On erotodidaxis and the elementary school of love, see 514n. (education of hetairai), Fraenkel (1960) 32f., Fantham (1972) 37, Cairns (1972) 173f.

304 Lysimache. ternas iam scio. LY. quid, ternas? DE. a-m-o.
This joke seems to have impressed Erasmus of Rotterdam so much that he alluded to it (Laus Stultitiae 13): Non numquam cum sene Plautino ad tres illas litteras revertitur, infelicissimus si sapiat. ternas: sc. litteras; cf. Per. 173, Tru. 735f. It sounds like a schoolboy bragging about his new skills. a-m-o: Hough (1940) 197 sees this line as one of eighty-four examples (the only one in Mercator) of definitely Roman allusions in Plautus. However, the joke works in Greek: έ-π-ω, see Bonner (1977) 35, 339 n.10, cf. Men. Her. 15. Still, the shape of the letters E-P-O is more difficult to write than A-M-O and less likely to be taught in the first lesson. Are these letters spoken ‘ah-em-oh’, i.e. each letter being pronounced on its own, or simply ‘amo’? The word occupies cD at line-end: the actor simply said amo without drawing special attention to the number of letters by pronouncing them separately, see Schulze (1933) 460f., Niedermann (1953) 10, Gordon (1973) 14, cf. Au. 325f. tun, trium litterarum homo, / me vituperas? fur! :: etiam fur, trifurcifer, Tru. 690f. quin tu ‘arrabonem’ dicis? :: ‘a’ facio lucri, / ut Praenestinis ‘coneà’ est
ciconia. The word *amo* was spelt by lovers, cf. Ov. *Ep.* 16.88. It was also used in declension tables, cf. Varro *L.L.* 8.58, 9.97ff., 101.10.48; Diomed. *GLK* 1 351.29.

305 LY. tun capite cano amas, senex nequissume?
The absence of caesura gives a staccato effect to the line, an expression of Lysimachus’ astonishment and indignation. For the sentiment cf. Flaccus Tibullus in his comedy *Melene* (Fulgent. *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* 23, p. 118.14 Helm): *tune amare audes, edentule et capularis senex?* and a fragment from Greek comedy, long believed to be Philemonian, quoted by Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 24, ‘Philem.’ fr. 179 K. (deriving from the *Comparatio Phil. et Men*.); it expresses the same sentiment, a commonplace in Greek literature: γέρων γενόμενος μη φρόνει νεώτερος/μηδ’ εις ονείδος ἔλκε τὴν σεμνὴν πολιάν. *capite cano*: ‘white-haired’, descriptive ablative, mostly depreciatory; cf. *As.* 934, *Ba.* 1101, 1163, 1210, *Cas.* 518, and most notably in conjunction with an insect comparison (see 361n.) *Cas.* 239, *Mo.* 1147, *Tri.* 874. For the motif cf. also 295ff., 544-554, 574-576, 976, 985ff. The reproach of the old lover and his untimely love (*amor senilis*) is a topos in Greek and Latin literature, and predominant among the motifs in this play; cf. e.g. *Men.* *Asp.* 256-260, fr. 198.8f. and 442 K-Th οὖκ ἄν γένοιτο’ ἐρώντως ὀθλώστερον οὐδὲν γέροντος πλην ἐτερος γέρων ἐρων, Pherecrates fr. 77 K-A, *As.* 812f. (cf. *Ph.* 1010), *Pl.* fr. inc. 8; also in love-elegy, e.g. *Tib.* 1.1.71f.; see further Leo (1912) 156. *nequissume*: superlative of *nequam* ‘not (ne-)’ in any way (*quam*) [sc. useful], probably on the analogy of *peior, pessimus*, see *Walde/Hofmann* s.v. *nequam*, see Reimers (1957) xii, 187, cf. e.g. *As.* 922.

306 DE. si canum, seu istuc rutilumst sive atrumst, amo.
This seems to mean ‘whatever colour my hair is, I’m in love.’ The exact expression is not found elsewhere but sounds proverbial, cf. Catul. 93.1f., *Cic. Phil.* 2.16.41; see Fordyce on Catul. 93.2, Willcock on *Ps.* 1196. *scit istuc* (*dd A*, prosodic hiatus) *codd., Goetz/Schoell, Ussing, Leo, Enk*: *si istuc* (*D A*) *Bothe, Ernout*; antevocalic *seu* instead of *sive*, possible but very rare, see Questa (1967) 15 n.1; Lindsay in app. (“*fort. seust hoc rutilum*”) is probably mistaken, as his emendation would unbalance the triadic enumeration. Of the attempts at conjectural emendation, Bothe’s *si* (*sei Ritschl, Goetz*) is attractive and may be supported by *Cap.* 114 *sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus volent, Ru.* 1257 *si aurum, si argentum est*. For *si ... seu* cf. also 311. *amo*: echoes 304.

308 DE. decide collum stanti si falsum loquor
It is possible that lovers used such gratuitously brutal imagery in their vows of love (similar language is found on the *defixionum tabellae*). Moreover, the mention of castration at the beginning of the scene is probably also meant to motivate how Demipho gets this ‘cutting’ idea in the first place. For similarly violent forms of asseveration, cf. *Au.* 250f. *si hercle ego te non elinguendam dedero usque ab radicibus / impero auctorque ego sum, ut tu me cuvis castrandum loces, Ba.* 251, *Ps.* 510 *excludito mihi hercle oculus, si dedero*. Such grotesquely gruesome formulas of affirmation, authorizing another character to mutilate the speaker in case what he says
is not true, do also feature in New Comedy, cf. e.g. Men. Epit. 575f., where the convention is mocked by using a surprise word (δόξωνοις) instead of the expected term (δροχεῖς), see Gomme/Sandbach ad loc., Blume (1998) 116 n.58. The ‘violence’ in this passage is also reminiscent of the chopping-block motif in Aristophanes’ Acharnians (317f., 352f.), which in turn is a parody of a similar motif in Euripides’ Telephus 706 N.² (Ἀγάμεμνον, οὖδ’ εἶ πέλεκον ἐν χειροίν ἔχων / μέλλοι τις εἰς τρόχηλον ἐμβαλεῖν ἔμων, / σιγήσωμαι δίκαια γ’ ἀντεπεῖν ἔχον). The language of this passage looks also to later, even more gruesome descriptions, as they are found e.g. in the tragedies of Seneca (e.g. Thyestes). collum: ‘neck’ as vital part of the body, OLD s.v. 2g, e.g. Cap. 902, Tri. 595; Caec. Com. 56; Mart. 3.24.8 resecat cultro colla; not in Terence. The gender of the word (collus or collum, cf. Quint. Inst. 1.6.42) cannot be determined here, but by analogy it may be assumed masculine, but cf. Ru. 888, see Leo (1912) 281. stanti: ‘as I stand here’, ‘here and now’, cf. Q. Cicero De petit. consul. 3.10 vivo stanti collum gladio sua dextera secuerit.

309 vel, ut scias me amare, cape cultrum ac seca
vel = si tu vis, ‘if you wish’, cf. 491, see Lodge s.v. 2; originally imperative of volo, as can also be seen from Au. 452, 831, Ba. 902, Cu. 611, and the examples in Langen (1880) 70f. cultrum: primarily a sacrificial knife, see Blümmer (1912) I 273, but also used of knives generally; cf. Ep. 185, Mil. 1397 (used for castration).

310 digitum vel aurem vel tu nasum vel labrum:
‘All of me (my face/head)’; expansion (amplificatio) by particularization, cf. Am. 445f. sura, pes, statura, tonsus, oculi, nasum vel labra, / malae, mentem, barba, collus: totus, Mo. 1118 cum pedibus, manibus, cum digitis, auribus, oculis, labris. For similar violence involving the biting off of lips and nose cf. e.g. Men. Phasm. 85-90.

312 Lysimache, auctor sum ut med amando - enices
A bb C D A / B c D A / B c D; metrical hiatus after amando. auctor sum ut ‘I advise, advocate (that you should ...),’ OLD s.v. auctor 5b (quoting Mil. 1094), auctor ‘one who gives his sanction to a thing’, ‘adviser’, see Duckworth on Ep. 357, Petersmann on St. 128; common in Plautus (e.g. Per. 70, Poen. 408) and Cicero; also in Terence (Ph. 625, perhaps Ad. 939), see Lindsay (1907) 3. amando enices: a peculiar expression; Enk ad loc. quotes Leo in app., followed by Zehnacker (1974) 783, that Philemon may have alluded to an Epicurean dogma: στρεβλωθή δ ο οφως είναι αὐτὸν εδδαμόνα. This view is rightly contested by Grimal (1974) 227f. Grimal’s own attempt at establishing an allusion to the Platonic doctrine of love, however, based on a misguided attempt at dating the Emporos to 322-316 BC (see 646-647n.), is equally unfounded.

313 LY. si umquam vidistis pictum amatorem, em illic est.
A B C D A / B c D A bb c D; the problem arising is whether em (= eme) is elidable like hem, as it would have to be here to make the line scan: amatorem em il- set as c D A bb by prosodic hiatus;
Lindsay (1922) 243f. argues for its elidability. 

vidistis: addressing the audience, see Barbieri (1966) 254 n. 295, Taladoire (1956) 169, cf. Mil. 21-23, 228, 1130-1133, Men. 317f., Mo. 278-290, 708-710, 1125f, Ps. 125-128. For the sentiment cf. e.g. As. 402 non potuit plictor rectius describere eiusmod formam. Demipho’s attempt at self-justification (316, 317-321, 322f.) shows that he has overheard the aside and is now reacting to it. pictum amatorem: for a collection of the passages referring to painting in Plautus and Terence see Knapp (1917) 143-157; a testimony for the importance of wall-paintings in Republican Rome, see Dant (1975) 36 n. 18, cf. Cap. 998f., Ep. 624 estne consimilis quasi quem signum pictum pulchrum asperexis?, Men. 143f., Mo. 832, Poen. 1271, St. 271, Eu. 583-585. Cicero uses signum to refer to statues of gods, see Dant (1975) 33f. Reference to paintings is also made in Greek tragedy, e.g. A. Eu. 50-56 for a reference to a pictorial representation of the Erinyes (Furies), and in Philemon, cf. fr. 75 K-A (οικε ξυγράφος ..., ὡτις ἄν πλάσαι κόλλος τοιοῦτον). The reference is probably not to murals, which did not come into fashion until the late first century BC, see Ling (1991) 1-22, but to portable panel paintings. em: see 149n. illic est: BcD, 'over there he is'; illic is adverb (or local ablative, *illi + -ce) 'over there', not demonstrative pronoun illîc (ille + -ce). It is worth noting that this is a case of iambic shortening at line-end, cf. Cu. 274, Ep. 101, Mil. 22, Tru. 596.

315 tantidemst quasi sit signum pictum in parieta.

tantidemst quasi: (= tantidem quam si) 'no more than', genitive of value in a hypothetical comparison, see LHS II 674, Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 542.

317 LY. egon te? DE. nihil est iam quod tu mihi suscenseas:

aa B C D A / B C D A B c D; containing a violation of Meyer’s law (if unaccented word-end falls in D, then it should be approached B c D/, not B C D/), but as a license it is unusual in the first senarius, even though it is followed by a left-leaning enclitic (iam); maybe scan nihil est as cc D?

nihil est iam quod: 'there is no reason why', cf. e.g. Cic. De orat. 3.89 nihil est quod quisquam magnitudinem artium ex eo, quod senes discunt, pertimescat. suscenseas: cf. 960, 1012.

318 fecere tale ante alii spectati viri

A common strategy of excusing one’s misdemeanour, e.g. Ep. 32 edepol facimus improbum. :: at iam ante alii fecerunt idem, Ad. 688 fecere alii saepe item boni. spectati viri: 'gentlemen', carrying notions of social or political 'renown' and 'fame', see Hellegouarc'h (1963) 465f. By implication, Demipho describes himself as a vir spectatus.

319-320 The paradosis divides. P has: humanum amarest humanum autem ignoscere est; A is reported to have: humanum amarest atque id vi optingit deum. The latter reportage was given by Gertz and accepted by many, e.g. Goetz, Lindsay, Enk, Ernout, Prete (1949) 169. The confident reportage of A in most critical aparatuses is misleading, contrast Ussing's reportage ad loc. Enk, based on Leo, Sonnenschein (1905) 314, and Lindsay, suggested reading two lines (319-320).
instead of one, comparing Ad. 687f. for the use of *peccare* (for *humanus*, cf. also Tru. 218, An. 218) and re-ordering the lines according to the newly-won ‘logic’ of the passage:

319 *<peccare humanumst>*, *humanum autem ignoscere est*:

320 *humanum amarest atque id vi optingit deum.*

Prete (1949) disagrees with this (what he calls) ‘harmonising method’ of those who want to keep both lines and favours what he regards as the text of A, following Gertz.

Three points can be made: (1) The phrase *vi ... deum* is not attested elsewhere in Plautus, where the instrumental ablative is more often used absolutely (on its own, or in phrases like *vi summa*). Where there is a defining genitive, it tends to be in the singular, and the examples that come perhaps closest to Gertz’ line are Mer. 4 (*<vi*> *vidi amoris*, Ussing) and 58 (*amoris vi*, Camerarius) and Tri. 658 (*vi Veneris vinctus*). The only example of *vi* being used with a defining genitive in the plural is at Am. 191 *vi militum*. In Terence, the word is always used absolutely (*vi* or *sine vi*), see McGlynn s. v. I.1. OLD s. v. 12a gives instances where *vis* is used to refer to the “influence (of a deity or sim.) over events, power, sway”. The closest parallels for the actual phrasing are perhaps Verg. A. 1.4 *vi superum*, 12.199 *vimque deum infernâm et duri sacraria Ditis* (but cf. 7.432 *caelestium vis magna*), but the connotation of *vis* is negative in both cases (and it does not mean ‘power’ in the third). Closest in sense are perhaps two differently phrased examples, Cic. Div. 1.79 *qui (sc. di immortales) ... vim ... suam longe lateque diffundant*, and Quad. Hist. 12 (applied to a manifestation of divine power) *ibi vis quaedam divina fit: corpus repente improvisus advolavit*. However, none of these is sufficiently close to Gertz’ divination. The *vox propria* would be *virtute deum*, cf. Au. 166, Cap. 324, Mi. 676, 679, Per. 390, Tri. 346, 355, see Hanson (1959) 64.

(2) The verb *obtingo* ‘to fall (to) as one’s lot, occur to the benefit or disadvantage (of)’ (OLD s. v.) is used by Plautus, see Lodge s. v., but only rarely without a personal dative, and never without a personal dative in Terence, see McGlynn s. v. On the meaning cf. also Don. Ter. Ph. 239 *‘obtigit’ pro accidit*, Isid. Diff. 1.95 *‘contingit’ eventu, ‘obtingit’ sorte, ‘accidit’ casu, ‘event’ vel malo vel bono*. Moreover, the verb can refer to actions or situations both pleasant (e.g. Mil. 1246) and unpleasant (e.g. Au. 732), but it is slightly more often than not used to refer to something pleasant and positive in Plautus, e.g. Ru. 1193f. *satin si cui homini di esse bene factum volunt, / aliquo illud pacto optingit optatum piis* (but cf. e.g. Mer. 136 *at tibi sortito id optigit*, Ru. 496). At 284f. Demipho has already called himself *miserrumus*, and his *miseria* is, he says, brought about by the gods. There is certainly a mood-swing in this passage (from 291 onwards, Demipho is no longer anxious about what the future holds in stock for him; rather, he becomes more and more exuberant), but is it that strong?

(3) The hyperbaton *vi ... deum* would put strong emphasis on the fact that it is the gods (and no one else) through whose power Demipho has been made to fall in love. However, it seems that the very concepts of *optingo* and *vi deorum* are opposed to each other. Apart from three other instances in the Mercator (4, 58, 82), the ablative singular occurs in the vicinity of ‘aggressive’ words like *rapio* (e.g. Mer. 45), *cogo, cada, pugno, comprimo*, including a passage which is also describing divine involvement in human love (*Tri. 658 vi Veneris vinctus otio aptus*
in fraudem incidi), see Lodge s.v. vis II.3. The use of both optingo and vi deorum (or similar expressions) is also unparalleled in ThLL IX.2.290f. s.v. obtingo.

Each of these objections on its own would be insignificant, but it is a different matter if one finds all these words strung together in a phrase that has only the most precarious backing of an unreliable MS reportage. On balance, the case for Gertz' reading, which has been so widely accepted, is a weak one.

It is difficult to say whether there were originally two lines or one, but if there had been two lines initially, it is hard to see how one ended up in one branch of the MS tradition, and one in the other. Moreover, it is hard to see how, if there had been just one line, the two variant readings of the second half-line could have come into existence in antiquity. If the lines had coalesced, there should be no variants, or there should be two lines extant in one of the two traditions, for there would be no reason why one of the two traditions should display one element taken from the hypothetical line 320, and the other another. Prete (1949) 170 is right in regarding such theories as unnecessarily complicated. It is hard to decide which line should be taken into the text, and I have followed Leo.

319-320 humanum amarest, humanum autem ignoscere est
Cf. Ad. 471 and 687, where the rape of a woman is called humanum (470 persuasit nox, amor, vinum, adolescencia). It is hard to tell whether the use of humanus 'characteristic of) human beings' (OLD s.v. 4) in such passages and άνθρωπηνος in similar passages from Greek comedy, cf. e.g. Men. Sam. 22 πρεγγυ᾽ ίως άνθρωπηνος (for the phrasing cf. Philemon fr. 121.2 and 195 K-A άνθρωπος δύν), is parodic and farcical (pointing to the mistake of letting an explanation be accepted as an excuse, a logical non sequitur) or serious. In any case, this strategy of excuse is commonplace in erotic contexts, excusing an act of passion. Plautus has few examples of humanus/homo in the sense of 'human', 'considerate', cf. Mo. 14, 813f., Ru. 767, see Wright (1974) 136 n.16, Schmude (1988) 226. It is more common in Terence, cf. Ad. 107, 145, 736, Hec. 554, An. 113, 236, Ht. 99 (contrast Ht. 77 homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto, which characterizes the nosy busybody), see Gratwick (1987) 234.

323 hoc facto ducas. LY. egon te? at ne di siverint.
at ne di siverint Dunsch (duce Camerario) : athene desiverint BDF : athene dessiverit C : athenae desciverint Merula : ah ne di siverint Camerarius, edd. The use of siverint is more 'pious' than that of mere sinant would be, as by using the perfect subjunctive the speaker implies that he does not presume to know what the gods will do, cf. e.g. Ad. 37. On the use of the perfect subjunctive with an optative function see Palmer (1954) 313, see also 285n. For at ne cf. Cis. 235, Men. 611, Per. 446, Ht. 918; there are no parallels for ah, ne + subjunctive; at An. 543 it is used with imperative, An. 868 with indicative, but cf. perhaps Ad. 112f. ah, ausculta, ne me optundas. At is used regularly in invocations of the gods, see Lindsay (1907) 94.
324 DE. vide sis modo etiam. LY. visumst. DE. certen? LY. perdis me.
Four-part line in rapid repartee, see 181n. vide sis: aa B, iambic shortening, see Lindsay (1922) 217, cf. e.g. Per. 413 tene sis. perdis me: B c D, see 232n., cf. e.g. Ba. 313 occidistis me, Ru. 103, 512, at line-end. The final s sounded so faintly (cf. Cic. Or. 161) that final -is or -us need not be heavy by position before an initial consonant, even in the last foot of an iambic senarius, mainly when a verb is followed by an enclitic monosyllable, see Questa (1967) 18-21, Drexler (1967) 61f., Gratwick on Men. 65 and 999. This is why Lindsay (unnecessarily) prints an apostrophe at the end of such words in his OCT.

325 LY. hic homo ex amore insanit. numquid vis? DE. vale
aa B c D A B C D A B c D; iambic shortening of line-initial hic hom- (aa), similarly (bb in a trochaic septenarius) at 951, facilitated by the fact that hi-c(h)omo is a wortbild (a set phrase phonetically equivalent to a single word). hic homo ex amore insanit: an aside spoken by Lysimachus mocking his neighbour’s silly-talk; with numquid vis he turns back to Demipho. insanit: for the love-and-madness theme cf. 262-265, 443, 446f., 951. ex: causal, cf. Am. 541, Au. 206, Hec. 299, Ph. 271, see Stockert on Au. 206. numquid vis?: ‘anything else?’, or in fact, ‘good afternoon!’; Lysimachus adopts a tone similar to the one used by his lorarius (see 282n.). After this short formula of leave-taking, Lysimachus turns round to go off.

326 LY. ad portum propero, nam ibi mihi negotium est.
Taken with 281 (tris litis), this could mean that Lysimachus is going to the harbour to adjudicate three cases, presumably as an arbiter at the emporium. Alternatively, as a merchant, he could deal with his business at the Deigma or ‘Showplace’, a part of the Piraeus particularly accessible to the sea where foreign merchants displayed their goods, and where merchants from Athens brought samples of the wares they had for export, see Hopper (1979) 51f. Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 25 sees a contradiction between 281 and 326: “Negotia ei [Lysimacho] in iudiciis fuerunt, ubi amicis auxilia ferre in animo habuit. Itaque e re esset, si nunc Lysimachus non ad portum, sed ad illas lites iudicandas in forum pergeret.” This is an unnecessarily subtle criticism. Apart from the possibility that Lysimachus was adjudicating the cases at the harbour, he might alternatively have invented the three cases altogether when talking to his slave and now go off to the harbour to amuse himself, or he simply says he is going to the harbour as an excuse to rid himself of his unwanted companion. mihi negotium est: cf. e.g. Am. 1035 ego abeo, mihi negotium est, Men. D.E. 89f. εώση ἄξειμι πρὸς ἀγορᾶν πράττων.

327 DE. bene ambulato. LY. bene vale. DE. bene sit tibi.
bene ambulato: ‘have a pleasant walk’; common formula of leave-taking in the mouth of the remaining character, cf. Cap. 452, 900, Ep. 377, Per. 50, bene ambula at e.g. As. 108, Cap. 900, Cas. 526, Mil. 936, Mo. 837, 853. It is used by freeborn characters, except for Cap. 452, where it is used by a slave posing as such. For ambulare = abire cf. e.g. As. 488, Cap. 12, Ps. 263, Tri. 1108, Hi. 379.
Demipho has a brief link-monologue after the departure of Lysimachus at 327. He decides to go to the harbour, not to the forum, as Prescott (1939) 15 thinks. At 329 he announces the sudden approach of his son. This leads him to reflect on the necessity of dealing with his son tactfully and stealthily, as he must find some way to persuade his son to sell the girl without letting him suspect that she has caught his fancy.

328 quin mihi quoque etiamst ad portum negotium.
A B c dd A / B C D / a B c D; containing an instance of an unexplained type of exception to Meyer's law, see 6n. The tone is elevated beyond what is needed to say 'I'm off to the harbour'.

329 nunc adeo ibo illuc. sed optume gnatum meum
illuc: to the harbour. sed optume: bb c D, IK, cf. Poen. 543. sed: marks a light contrast with the speaker's previous expectation (cf. e.g. Ph. 833). By 'chance', Demipho sees his son and changes his plans quite suddenly (underlined by the repetition nunc ... nunc). Meetings commonly happen 'by chance' when one character is looking for another (for a list of such conventional

330 video eccum. *opperiar hominem.* hoc nunc mihi viso opust,

*opperiar hominem:* stage-directional phrase, also in New Comedy, see Bain (1977) 152f. *hoc nunc mihi viso opust:* sc. *filio,* ‘I need to see him now’; cf. *Cap.* 225 *tamen viso opust, cauto est opus*; the use of the ablative of a perfect participle with *opus est* is common, see MacCary/Willcock on *Cas.* 502. *viso opust:* synaloepha before final *c D/*, cf. 333, 567, 655, see Drexler (1935) 228. The MSS have *visost opus*, but prodelision of *est* after a long vowel is dubious, see Leo (1912) 281f., Lindsay (1922) 74f., Questa (1967) 23f., and transposition of *-st* is frequent in *P*, see Lindsay in app., cf. 333, *Mil.* 37, *Mo.* 434, *Per.* 553.

331 huic persuadere quo modo potis siem

*potis:* looks like an adjective (*potis, -e*), but its status is debatable. It is treated like an adverb by Plautus and is accordingly invariable like *satis, magis*, see Ernout on *Ba.* 35. Forms of *esse* with *potis* (instead of *posse*) are found several times in Plautus, and occasionally in other writers (Terence, Lucretius, Varro), see *LHS* I 525. *persuadere:* ‘loose’ use of the infinitive, best taken as a continuation of the previous construction: *huic persuadere* .... sc. *opus*. *potis siem:* (*aB / cD*) infringing Luchs’ Law; the second half of the line as such is rhythmically anomalous, the syllables being distributed between feet. The speech seems to be dragged out, as if the speaker was deliberating his every word.

332 ut illam vendat nec det matri suae;

This is, in one line and in reverse order (*ὤτερον πρὸτερον*), an outline of the main objectives of the plan which Demipho manages to achieve in the next scene when he encounters his son. First, he manages to persuade his son *nec det matri suae* (390-413), then he brings about *ut illam vendat* (413-465). Here, however, Demipho says that he needs to *persuade* his son to sell Pasicompsa, but actually in the following scene he forces him in the end, using his *patria potestas* (most bluntly at 460).

333 nam ei dono advexe audivi. sed praecauto opust,

*nam ei:* one metrical place; total elision of monosyllabic *età* *advexe* = *advexisse* by syncope, cf. also e.g. 53 *illexe*, arg. I 7 *obduxe*. *praecauto opust* ‘greatest caution needs to be exercised’.

334 ne hic illam me animum adiecisse aliqua sentiat.

Cf. 467-469, where Demipho seems to have changed his mind: Having no *‘negotium’* at the harbour any more, he intends to have Pasicompsa bought by Lysimachus. He seems to have thought this scheme up only during II.3, and it is peculiar that he should not have asked
Lysimachus to buy the girl for him at the end of the present scene but that this enlisting of Lysimachus as a co-intriguer obviously takes place off-stage, for at 499f. Lysimachus has already agreed to help. adiecisse: (with animum) ‘turn (one’s thoughts) towards, set (one’s mind or heart) on’, ‘be attracted by’, OLD 42 s.v. 2a; usually used with a prepositional phrase (e.g. Eu. 143 ad virginem animum adiecit) or a dative (e.g. Mil. 909, Poen. 1174). The phrase is used with double accusative only here, see ThLL 1.666.62f.

**M. Discussion**

One might expect to find Demipho asking Lysimachus here to buy the slave-girl on his behalf and to see to her accommodation, as it is done later on (499f., 542f.). However, at the end of this scene (326-329a) both old men go off to the harbour for some negotium (326, 328). The dramaturgy was criticized as inconsequential by Lefèvre (1995) 24f.: “Mit Zuversicht wird behauptet, daß von dem Dialog II 2 zwischen Demiphos und Lysimachus nicht einVers bei Philemon gatzen kann. Es hätte Demiphos vornehmliche Sorge sein müssen, Pasicompsa bei Lysimachus einquartieren zu können. Doch darüber fällt kein einziges Wort. [...] Jedenfalls ging Lysimachus nicht zum Hafen (der zu weit entfernt war). Das ist ein plautinischer Flicken [my italics] (326), mit dessen Hilfe motiviert wird, daß Demipho dort mit Lysimachus das bespricht (467-468), was er mit ihm bei Philemon sofort auf der Bühne hätte besprechen müssen.” Similarly, the verdict of Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 23 on the style of this scene is shattering but highly subjective: “Sermo, qui inter senes incipit, ioca cum seriis tam permixta habet, ut vix aliqui versus huius scenae vestigia exemplaris Graeci retineant.” She supports this wide-ranging claim by pointing to an apparent inconsistency in the dialogue: after promising his friend that he would help him in any way (286-288), Lysimachus is not asked for help, but told the story of Demipho’s second adolescence. She overlooks the fact that operam dare in this context means ‘pay attention to’, ‘listen to’ (cf. esp. the use in conjunction with otium in line 286). Neither Krysiniel-Józefowicz nor Lefèvre have demonstrated that there was nothing corresponding to 11.2 in the Greek original, while Fraenkel (1960) 194f. and Prescott (1936) 102f. argue that the dramaturgy of the scene is Greek, and I am inclined to follow their view, while allowing for some Plautine expansion of the dialogue (e.g. 290-300, 305-312?).

Several motifs prominent in this scene can be found also in Mil. 618-632, where the young man Pleusicles asks the senex Periplectomenus if he really wants to take part in a scheme devised by the slave Palaestrio, see Paratore (1975) 32f. The execution of the scheme is called facinora puerilia (Mil. 618) and they are characterised as quae istaec aetas [Periplectomenus] fugere facta magis quam sectari solet. Periplectomenus is aghast and protests quid ais tu? itane tibi ego videor oppido Acherunicus? / tam capularis? (Mil. 627f.). Demipho is characterized as Acherunicus, / senex vetus, decrepitus (290f.), and apart from the use of Acherunicus, the terms decrepitus and capularis are used to express the same idea, ‘an old man ready for the grave’.
Demipho contradicts and says that he is actually a seven-year-old boy (292). Periplectomenus acknowledges his age of 54 years (Mil. 629), which must have been a reasonable age in antiquity. He states that he can still see well (clare oculis video), that he is quick on his feet and that his hands are mobile (Mil. 630). Interestingly, Demipho also states that he can see well (299), and actually better than before (oculis quoque etiam plus iam video quam prius). It is unclear whether Plautus is imitator sui, and if so, whether the words in the Mercator are the inspiration for those in the Miles or vice versa, or if indeed both derive from scenes in the Greek originals that may or may not be related themselves. Yet in the Mercator the ‘old-age-theme’ and the motif of puer vetus are found throughout the play and seem to be woven into its texture, while in the Miles, the discussion of Periplectomenus’ age is episodic, so that it is possible (but beyond proof) that Plautus revived in the Miles a couple of jokes which he knew to have worked before in the Mercator, which would help with the relative dating of these plays. However that may be, the speaking parts in the Miles are assigned differently, but the mood and the themes are similar; it is the same kind of actors, just wearing different masks while acting out what is basically the same kind of comic routine.
1. Staging
Charinus enters while Demipho is on stage. After taking leave of Lysimachus (325-327), Demipho is about to go to the harbour (328f.) when he catches sight of Charinus and decides to wait for him, presumably in some kind of hiding-place. Charinus does not see him when he enters (335) and only catches sight of him when Demipho has decided to approach him (365f.).

Where does Charinus come from? When he last left the stage (224), he went off hac (222), avoiding the exit to the harbour (istan), after being warned by Acanthio that his father would approach from that direction (219). Now he is probably coming back the same way (from the forum). What he has done in the meantime is unclear.

At the end of Charinus' monody, Demipho remarks, since he has heard his son's words only indistinctly quid iluc est quod solus secum fabulatur filius? The entrance monody contains some material which is already familiar to the audience but which Demipho must not be allowed to hear. Demipho's comment (364f.) is marked by a shift from song to recitative, which continues in the dialogue. It is surprising to find a scene where one character delivers a monody of this length with a second character being muted for the whole duration of the other's speech. It is not unusual to find eavesdropping characters interspersing a monody with asides, but in this case it seems that Demipho cannot hear what his son says (365f.), see Duckworth (1952) 123, cf. e.g. Men. 478f. This happens by dramatic convention, as both are audible for the audience, and thus also for each other. There are numerous examples of extended monologues delivered in isolation from the characters present on stage, cf. e.g. Tri. 843-871, where Charmides observes the monologue of the sycophanta (839-842), but does not overhear it; cf. also Ba. 640-665, Cas. 217-227, cis. 671-704, Cu. 280-303, 679-685, Ps. 1103-1123, St. 274-315, Tru. 548-577. The first example of the dramatic convention whereby a character stands aside to observe unnoticed the activity of another character or a chorus (see Taplin (1977) 335) is at the beginning of A. Ch. (Orestes at 20f. announcing his retirement from the audience's sight). It is debated whether comedy took over this convention from tragedy, but it certainly handles it differently. In tragedy there are no asides from the eavesdropper and only rarely is the audience's attention divided between him and those he observes, see Bain (1977) 91f.

Leo (1908) 74 thinks that it would be important for the development of the action if Demipho knew what his son says. On the contrary, it is important for the action of the play that he does not understand a word his son says; Plautus has a dramaturgical purpose in mind when using the conventions connected with eavesdropping. The reason
is that if Demipho understood Charinus’ words, he would know all the details, namely that his son is in love with Pasicompsa, and in that case the plot, which is at this point based on Demipho’s ignorance (as much as it is later also based on Eutychus’ ignorance, see 466-468n.), would fall apart. However, the playwright does allow Demipho to perceive that his son is agitated (366), this being the first hint that in the subsequent dialogue Demipho is going to gain the upper hand; this impression could most conveniently be reinforced by having Charinus add appropriate gestures to this words.

2. Senex amator versus adulescens amator
Segal (1987) 28 calls this scene a “marvellously ironic agon between the generations.” This is true, but it is merely the consequence of an underlying contrast, which is not between generations but comic types, namely those of adulescens amator and pater durus, who is and has at the same time the motives of a senex amator, a fact that is known to the audience but not to Charinus. This double character of Demipho is the main carrying force of this scene, and it is noteworthy in the second section, where he hypocritically makes use of seemingly honourable arguments to achieve his own dishonourable ends as he does not want Pasicompsa to become his wife’s servant (394, 395-399, 403-411). Both actors know that they are talking about something of which they know that the audience knows that they know this. When analysing such self-consciously contrived forms of comic dialogue in Plautus, one should remember the audience dimension. Audiences will derive enormous pleasure from this kind of verbivelitatio.

3. Function and Structure
So far the events presented on stage have been recapitulatory, and the main achievement of the first four scenes was to develop themes outlined initially by Charinus’ entrance monologue and his dialogue with Acanthio (I.1 and 2). The previous scene (II.2) served the purpose of exposing Demipho as a senex amator and as an illustration of his own statement at 265 mumquam ut nunc insanio. Demipho’s character is mirrored ironically. In the eyes of his son, he is a pillar of society. The audience know better already, and Charinus is only correct in one respect: he cannot keep anything secret from his father (361f.). Charinus is carried away by his over-active imagination: repeated rhetorical questions (351-363) show his hopeless despair. Like many comic lovers, he cannot muster enough initiative to look for a solution of his problem. His frequent use of exaggerations betray a lack of self-confidence.

This scene can be divided into three sections, a monody by Charinus (335-363), a dialogue between father and son about whether to keep Pasicompsa as a servant for Demipho’s wife or not (364-417), and an ‘auction’ of Pasicompsa with ‘hidden’ bidders, represented by Charinus and Demipho respectively (418-468). Charinus’ monody is
characterised by a great number of emotional words used to express anxieties, feelings, and intentions. The second section contains questions, agon-like repartee, and long enumerations (396-398, 406-409, 416). The third section contains a long ‘auction’ during which the development of the action is suspended. Financial technical terms occur particularly frequently in this section, namely terms connected with the technical side of the auctio (a lot of which can be found also in the text of the auctio of logi ridiculi at St. 218-234). They are not infrequent throughout the whole play, giving due regard to its title (Mercator). Since the ‘auction’ also contains a dispute over what is to become of Pasicompsa, there are numerous expressions of agreement and disagreement, interrogative formulae, imperatives, and expletives. At the end the audience learns that Demipho intends to sell Pasicompsa against Charinus’ wish (439, 460), forbidding his son to take part in the sale at the harbour (461-466).

II. Commentary

335-364 Canticum

There are only two cantica in this play, one delivered by Acanthio at 111-140 and the present one, delivered by the unhappy adulescens amator Charinus. The emotional monody delivered as canticum is the preferred medium of the young lover’s lamentation, see Braun (1970) 20 and 121f. Charinus’ monologue, if indeed there was a corresponding passage in the Emporos, was probably not a canticum there, but a set speech in trimeters (or tetrameters), see Blundell (1980) 66-71. For emotional cantica (not exclusively delivered by lovers) cf. e.g. Am. 1053-1071, Au. 406-410, Ba. 640-648, 1087-1103, Cap. 516-528, Cas. 621-83, 875-891, 937-46, Cis. 671-677, Men. 110-118, Per. 257-260, Ps. 574-591, Ru. 185-203, 664-73, Tri. 1115-1121.

It has frequently been observed that monologic canticum expressing pure emotion without furthering the action or providing any new information are frequent in Plautus. It has been debated whether they are to be regarded as direct adaptation, expansion, or wholesale creation by the Roman playwright. Inasmuch as they interrupt the flow of the play to provide a polymetric and often exciting interlude primarily designed to entertain, such passages are traditionally regarded as areas of Plautine expansion, see in particular Fraenkel (1960) 135ff. Some passages in Menander suggest that there were parallels for this kind of emotional expansion in New Comedy (e.g. Dydc. 153-168, Epit. 908-932). Bacchiacs are also used in entrance songs elsewhere in Plautus (and once in Terence), cf. Cis. 671-696 (mainly ba), Mo. 84-100 (and again 133-145), Men. 752-773, Ru. 906-919, An. 481-484.

Braun (1970) 121f. analyses the structure, metre and content of the canticum, dividing it into three parts of approximately equal length: in 335-343 (I) Charinus delivers a general lamentation (335-340, Ia) and gives the specific reasons for his present
plight (341-343, Ib); in 344-355 (II) he tries to think of what to do next; in 356-364 (III) after Charinus has recognised the aporetic character of the situation, he despairs utterly, and his father begins to talk.

Lines 335-361, with the exception of 339 (tr⁴), 341 (2 tr⁴ or system of 4 tr²), 356 (2 tr⁴ or tr⁵), 359 (tr⁵), may be analysed as a series of ba⁴ (337, 340 with catalexis). The bacchiacs are punctuated by trochaic units. Lines 362-364 are a transitional system of twelve trochaic measures with catalexis, bringing the canticum to a halt and leading on to the recitative. The rhythm becomes heavier and more lugubrious as Charinus goes on: the number of dragged bacchiacs (-----) as opposed to pure ones (-----) increases (esp. 344-361; dragged three times: 343, 350, 351, 357, 358; dragged head: 346, 349, 352, 360, 361; dragged tail: 345, 347; dragged head and tail: 353; ‘pure’ bacchiacs: 344, 354-355. There are only few resolutions (345, 347, 348, 354-355, 358: never more than one per line).

The basic knowledge on bacchiacs can be obtained from Lindsay (1922) 289-291, Questa (1967) 214-226, Drexler (1967) 73f. The latest treatment of this canticum is Questa’s edition of the Plautine cantica (1995). Questa’s analysis diverges at some points: he scans lines 337 and 339 as an⁴, lines 338, 340, 342 and 357 as ba⁴ ba₂, and lines 341, 356 and 362 as tr². For comments on Questa’s scansion, see my notes on each line.

Questa is too ready to invoke ba⁶ ba² instead of ba⁴ where the latter is possible metrically. There are no unambiguous examples of ba⁶ ba² in Plautus; those listed by Questa (1967) 220 (Cas. 666, Mo. 869, Tru. 461) can all be scanned as ba⁴ with (unexceptionable) hiatus after the first bacchiac. Conversely, ba² ba⁶ can readily be explained as ba⁴∧. Moreover, Questa’s scansion of the trochaic lines (esp. 341, 356) does not take into account the tendency of trochaic measures to assemble in systems in cantica contexts, usually (but not necessarily) demarcated by final catalexis, see Gratwick (1987) 268f.

335-363 Charinus’ monologue can be analysed into three parts corresponding to three different themes (335-340, 341-354/355, 356-361); this division corresponds to the metrical composition. The second part contains an illustration (‘I did not get my girl’) of the general principle stated in the first (‘I am the most miserable man on earth’), referring it to the speaker’s personal experience; cf. the conventions of Greek tragedy, e.g. E. Or. 1ff., Hipp. 616ff., 936ff., see Schadewaldt (1926) 118ff.; for Plautus cf. Alcumena’s monologue at Am. 633-653.

335 homo me miserior nullust aeque, opinor,
Hyperbolical comparisons are often found in well-defined metrical units, see Braun
(1970) 23, cf. e.g. Ba. 1087-1089, Cis. 203-05, Per. 1f., St. 274. They also occur in
Greek comedy, cf. esp. Men. Peric. 532-536 πολλών γεγονότων ἄθλιων κατὰ τὸν
χρόνον / τὸν νῦν [...] οὐδένα νομίζω τῶν τοσούτων ἄθλιον / ἄνθρωπον οὗτος ός
ἐμευρέτων ζήν ἐγώ, see Zagagi (1980) 71f. me ... aeque: Lindsay (1907) 38 notes that
Plautus associates aeque (adaeque) in comparisons with the ablative of comparison, cf.
Cap. 828, Mil. 551; probably a conflation of nullust aeque miser atque ego and nullust
me miserior, see LHS II 110.

337 satin quidquid est quam rem agere occeci,
This line is scanned as an4 by Questa (1995) 241. Rather, it should be scanned as ba4
with catalexis: ----v-|---|---- (rem age- set as ~~~~ by ‘prosodic’ hiatus).
satin: (satisne) virtually = nonne, ‘is it really the case that’ (implying ‘I wish it wasn’t
the case’, as opposed in to nimis/parum), cf. Ep. 666, see Gratwick on Men. 522. The
interrogative use of satin is indicative of ‘high’ emotion, cf. e.g. 682, Am. 633, Ep., Mo.
76, where a rhetorical question is combined with a general reflection at the lively and
emotional opening of a speech. Rhetorical questions, in turn, can either suggest (a)
grandiloquence, or (b), as here, an abrupt outpouring of thought. Cf. the use of εἰτέρο
in Greek comedy, e.g. Men. Dysc. 153f., Alexis fr. 44 K-A, 141 K-A, Amphis fr. 1 K-A,
see also Blundell (1980) 45-48. On satin ut see 481n. Terence uses satin mainly in the
phrase satin samus es?, see McGlynn s.v. satis 1.2.

338 proprium nequit mihi quod cupio evenire?
proprium: ‘(permanently) one’s own’, ‘constant’, cf. Cic. Man. 48 proprium atque
perpetuum. Similar complaints can be found elsewhere, cf. Accius 422f. fors dominatur,
neque quicquam ulli / proprium in vita est, cf. Lucil. 701 M. quam sciam nihil esse in
vita proprium mortali datum. The quantity of -pri- is doubtfull. It is scanned short by
Questa (1995) 241; he scans this line as ba" ba². If, however, -pri- can be scanned long,
the line could be scanned as ba⁴. It appears to be long at Cap. 862, Tri. 1130; Questa
(1967) 86 mentions several exceptions to vocalis ante vocalem brevis: fio, fiam, fiebas,
diei as widespread and classical; Rei, aquai, ei, huic, fui, fieri, fierem. -ui (institui at Mo.
85), pluuit at Men. 63, perpluit at Mo. 164 as exceptional and pre-classical, and some like
prius, pius and proprius as doubtfull. The adjective is etymologized as *pro-prū-us by
Lindsay on Cap. 862 and (1922) 144, followed by Ernout/Meillet s.v. At Cap. 862 metre
demands that -pri- is long (atque agnum afferrī proprium pinguem. :: cur? :: ut
sacrifices). The lengthening of the vowel may be explained in analogy to vocīvos -
vacuus, divus - deus, where the tonic syllable is shortened after the loss of -v-, see Meiser (1998) 76, 86. Thus the present line may be scanned as ba₄, which is metrically more satisfactory.

Originally the word seems to be a religious term (in unknown sense, OLD s.v. 1b; cf. perhaps Verg. Ecl. 7.31 si proprium hoc fuerit ‘an appropriate offering’, i.e. ‘giving favourable omens’, also Hor. Sat. 2.6.4f., like Greek καλλιεργείν?). Another religious term with a comparable prosodic polarity, this time with respect to lengthening by muta cum liquida, is porci sacres with long sac- at Ru. 1208 (short sa- at Men. 290). Formulaic religious language seems to retain more readily features of spoken language otherwise discarded.

339 ita mihi mala res aliqua obicitur
This line is scanned as an⁴ by Questa (1995) 241. It may also be scanned as tr⁴ (bb C dd A bb C dd A), and in view of the following system of 4 tr² (in 341) that scansion should be given preference.

340 bonum quae meum comprimit consilium.
Questa (1995) 241 scans ba° ba°; rather scan as ba₄A (奶奶奶奶) (in 341) that scansion should be given preference.

341 miser amicam mihi paravi, animi causa, pretio eripui,
animi causa: ‘for fun’ (also animi gratia, Ep. 275); cf. As. 542, Cas. 152-154, Cu. 340, Ep. 45, 91, Ru. 932, Tri. 334, Caes. B.G. 5.12.6 haec [sc. leporem et gallinam et anserem] tamen alunt animi voluptatisque causa. pretio eripui codd. (Leo in app. “fort. adiectivum latet”). Bertini ad loc. defends the paradosis unconvincingly as a metaphor. The verb eripere is used at 840 and 973 to denote a forceful action, the (violent or deceitful) ‘taking away’. Hence, the verb is used regularly, almost as a cliché, in Plautus and Terence to denote the taking away (rescue) of a girl out of the clutches of a leno or some other evil character (e.g. Mil. 814, Ps. 675, Ru. 712; Ad. 8, 328). At 176 tuquidem ex ore orationem me eripis it is used metaphorically, but still denoting force and violence. Thus pretio eripui would be an odd combination of two opposed concepts, ‘I rescued the girl ... for cash’. The ‘rescue’ action suggested by the use of the word eripui flatly contradicts what Charinus says about his purchase of the girl at 100-106 (where he buys Pasicompsa from his Rhodian hospes and at 105 dixit eius pro meritis gratum me et munem fore). This does not sound like eripere, ‘drag away’, ‘rescue’ (cf. Ad. 668f.), unless one takes it to mean ‘set free’, ‘deliver’, ‘save’ (or here, if that is the
case, ‘redeem’), as at *Men.* 1054 *quom ego accurro teque eripio vi, pugnando, ingratiis*, Caes. *B.G.* 1.53, and in the expressions *aliquem ex periculo eripere* (Caes. *B.G.* 4.12), *aliquem ex miseris eripere* (Cic. *De orat.* 1.52), *aliquem malis eripere* (Verg. *A.* 6.365). Furthermore, the use of the verb *eripui* in conjunction with *pretio* is at odds with the use of the phrase *eximam mulierem pretio* at 486f., where the use of *eximere* seems to be much more in tone with the idea of obtaining something ‘for money’, *pretio*.

A different reading of the line should be sought, perhaps *pretio exemi*, as was suggested by Ribbeck (1883) 29. In the light of 578f. (*coquom / aliquem arripiamus*) one might also think of *pretio arripui* ‘I purchased her for money’ (lit. ‘I snatched her up’). However, *arripere* poses semantic difficulties, as it is normally used of forceful actions in Plautus, see Lodge s.v., the only other exception being *Mil.* 220 *arripere opem auxiliumque ad hanc rem.*

342 *ratus clam patrem <me> meum posse habere;*
Bentley’s *<me>*, adopted by most editors, is needed if we want the line to scan as *ba¹*, which is preferable to the scansion *ba² ba²* suggested by Questa (1995) 241.

343 *is rescivit et vidit, et perdidit me;*
The line contains three dragged bacchiacs: Charinus is moaning. The ending *-it* of the perfect tense is usually long in Plautus, see Drexler (1967) 66, reflecting the old quantity of the final syllable, see Lindsay (1922) 135-137, Meiser (1998) 217, and, with a few exceptions, short in Terence, see Laidlaw (1938) 62. *rescivit*: see 107n. Charinus’ fear is unfounded; Demipho has not yet found out about his son’s plans (he does at 974f.). *perdidit*: cf. 188.

344-350 The mental effects suffered by lovers as described here are similar to those at *Enn. Trag.* 187-190 (*animus nescit quid velit ... incerte errat animus, praeter propter vitam vivitur*, cf. *E. Hipp.* 181-185; Lucr. 3.1057-1067). Cf. *Ad.* 611-613. Inner conflicts leading to the experience of an existential disunity of one’s personality is a motif of decision-taking scenes from Homer onwards (*Il.* 11.401-411; *Od.* 9.299-302), familiar from Greek tragedy (*E. Med.* 1040-1080), and Hellenistic epic (Apoll. Rhod. 3.770-801) and idyll (*Theocr. Id.* 30.11-32). See also 589n. (on the lover’s separable *animus*).

344 *neque is cum roget quid loquar cogitatumst,*
This shows that Charinus has not used the time that he has won thanks to the *servus current* Acanthio, who actually ran to see him so that he would be prepared for a cross-examination (cf. 219-224).
345 ita animi decem in pectore incerti certant
For similar etymologizing puns cf. As. 466 ego certe me incerto scio hoc daturum nemini homini; Mer. 969 qui bono sunt genere [...] <si> sunt ingenio malo. decem animi: The nominative plural of animus occurs only here in Plautus and only once in Terence (Hec. 507, where it refers to a plurality of people). The plural of animus is rare in Plautus (9 times) and Terence (4 times); perhaps also at Ht. 570, where animos should be read. The example of Cap. 242 nobis di immortales animum ostenderunt suum shows that the singular animus is used even when referring to more than one person. The use of the plural here emphasises the fact that Charinus experiences his own thoughts and feelings, his personality as such, as split into divergent parts; ἂνεσθης can be used similarly, cf. e.g. Men. fr. 742 K-Th. decem: can be used of an unspecified high number, rather like 'a thousand' in English, see Taubmann ad loc., cf. Ba. 128, 832, Cap. 494, Ep. 298, perhaps Mer. 694; ἄκ ει can be used similarly, see Siewert (1894) 50. certant: 'fight (for a decision)', see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 166.

347 scio, tantus cum cura meost error animo,

348 dum servi mei perplacet mihi consilium,
dum ... dum = modo ... modo/nunc ... nunc, 'at one time ... at another', cf. e.g. Tru. 38, Afran. Com. 372; Acc. Trag. 395f. This use of dum shows that it was originally a temporal particle ('for a time'); cf. interdum, nondum, vixdum, dudum, and the enclitic use of dum with imperatives (e.g. agedum).

349 dum rursum haud placet nec pater potis videtur
potis = potis esse = posse, cf. e.g. Ep. 227, Men. 605; on the use of potis in Plautus see 331n.

350 induci ut putet matri ancillam emptam esse illam.
Cf. 211f. neque ille credet neque credibile est forma eximia mulierem / eam me emisse ancillam matri.

352 emisse indico, quem ad modum existumet me?
quem ad modum existumet me ~ qualem existumet me; an elliptical colloquial question (dicere or facere must be supplied), see Ernout on Ba. 208, LHS II 649.
atque illam apstrahat, trans mare hinc venum asportet;
Demipho has the right and the power to sell Pasicompsa, as Charinus acknowledges himself (460-462). For the situation cf. Ael. Ep. 19, where a rustic announces that he will expel his son and sell the girl his son has ‘freed’ overseas. trans mare: ‘overseas’; Charinus later gets the idea that he has to go abroad to search for Pasicompsa (cf. 857-863, 934f., 940f., 944f.), whereas Eutychus assumes all the time (more realistically) that Pasicompsa is still in Athens (663-665, 805f.). venum asportet: The terms ‘first’ and ‘second supine’ are not applicable to Plautine Latin. It should rather be distinguished two types of the phrase -(t)um ire. Type I is passive or intransitive, corresponding to a transitive -(t)um dare, e.g. nuptum ire (Cas. 86) bears to nuptum dare the same relation as venum ire (venire) to venum dare (vendere), or as pessum ire to pessum dare, cf. venum ducere fr. 89, and venum asportare here, see Lindsay (1907) 77.

scio saevos quam sit, domo doctus. igitur
quam: may be appended enclitically to the modified word, cf. Am. 541, Cap. 102, Tru. 324, 468, fr. 114 scio axittiosa quam sit. domo doctus: ‘self-taught’ (domo ‘from one’s own resources’, ‘from one’s own case or experience’, oiuo6ev), a common alliterative expression, cf. e.g. Poen. 216, Tru. 454, see Otto (1890) 120, Hus (1965) 173.

hoccine est aware? arare mavelim quam sic amare.
hoccine: *hoc-ce-ne, see Meiser (1998) 161f.; cf. 753 haecin.
amare? arare ... amare: On the deliberately ambiguous use of the word arare see 25n. A double entendre on the meaning of arare ‘plough’ may be intended (cf. Mart. 9.21.4 Artemidorus amat, Callidorus arat), cf. As. 874, Tru. 148f., see Brinkhoff (1935) 21, 136f., López López (1980) 328f., Daube (1969) 57, more cautiously Kruse on Tru. 148. For a Greek example cf. Ar. Lys. 1173 (γεωργεῖν). There may have been a pun on ἐρω and ὀρόν in the Emporos, Leo (1896) II 8, a tempting idea, yet beyond proof. Punning is common in Plautus, see Taladoire (1956) 179, cf. e.g. As. 211ff., Ba. 55, 72, 943, Cis. 379f., Ep. 119, Men. 170. Like many others, this pun involves the taking away or adding of a letter from/to a word. For another pun on amare, cf. Cis. 68. mavelim: intermediate form between magis velim and malim, see Meiser (1998) 224. Forms of this kind (also mavolo, mavellem, nevis, nevoti) are found mostly at line-end, the preferred place for archaisms in Plautus (e.g. As. 835, Ba. 859, Cap. 516; once in Terence, Hec. 540), but also at colon-boundaries, e.g. As. 877, Au. 661, Cap. 270, Ps. 728. Some verb forms, which happen to be archaic (e.g. siet) are allowed to survive, but the positional argument (‘at line-end’) also applies to ordinary words which have the same distribution. The corollary of this practice is that it becomes unusual to deploy such forms anywhere but in
the expected place, probably because the author intuitively thinks of it as a \textit{cD}-word rather than an \textit{aB}-word.

\footnote{\textit{357} iam hinc olim <me> invitum domo extrusit ab se,\textit{\footnote{Cf. Cas. 60-62. In \textit{Casina}, however, the father sent away his son to rid himself of a rival lover; in \textit{Mercator} the son was sent abroad to improve his morals. Either Ritschl’s <me>, adopted by Ernout, or hiatus after \textit{iam}, assumed by Leo, Lindsay, and Questa (1967) 325, is needed to make this line scan as \textit{ba}^{4}. Choosing neither, Questa (1995) 241 follows the MSS and scans \textit{ba}^{5} \textit{ba}^{2}.}}\textit{\footnote{iam hinc Olim <me> invitum domo extrusit ab se,} Cf. Cas. 60-62. In \textit{Casina}, however, the father sent away his son to rid himself of a rival lover; in \textit{Mercator} the son was sent abroad to improve his morals. Either Ritschl’s <me>, adopted by Ernout, or hiatus after \textit{iam}, assumed by Leo, Lindsay, and Questa (1967) 325, is needed to make this line scan as \textit{ba}^{4}. Choosing neither, Questa (1995) 241 follows the MSS and scans \textit{ba}^{5} \textit{ba}^{2}.}\textit{\footnote{\textit{358} mercatum ire iussit: ibi hoc malum ego inveni.\textit{\footnote{This statement may contradict what we learn in 79-85, where the audience is told that the overseas trade mission had been Charinus’ idea. Yet, 73-78 shows that Demipho brought up the idea, obliquely. \textit{mercatum:} on the form (‘supine’) see 353n.; alternatively, an accusative of direction of \textit{mercatus} ‘market, fair’. The latter does not fit the rest of the story (or would be a very inadequate description), and the former does not fit the use of \textit{ibi} ‘there’. \textit{hoc malum:} remains slightly unclear. Does Charinus mean (a) the girl in particular, or (b) the whole mess his life is in?}}\textit{\footnote{\textit{359} ubi voluptatem aegritudo vincat, quid ibi inest amoeni?\textit{\footnote{This thought harks back to Charinus’ earlier ‘philosophical’ questions about the close connection of pleasure with pain (145f.) and to his catalogue of \textit{vitia amoris} (19). Preston (1916) 7f. detects Stoic ideas in the contrast between \textit{voluptas/}gaudium (\textit{θῆσφι}) and \textit{aegritudo} (\textit{λόπη}) and compares Eu. 552, Ht. 679f., An. 961, Ht. 506. Contrary to Preston (1916) 7f. and Coleman-Norton (1936) 331f., the present author does not see how these and similar remarks (Am. 633f., As. 323f., Cap. 271f., Poen. 286f., St. 119f.) could be forced into a wider self-consistent philosophical system of Plautus, containing opinions about the impossibility of acquiring pleasure without the expense of pain. Rather, all these remarks are \textit{obiter dicta}, and merely reflect common thoughts and current ‘sub-philosophical’ commonplaces. \textit{ubi voluptatem aegritudo vincat:} Two abstract nouns, one as subject and one as accusative object related to each other, Haffter (1934) 90, Molsberger (1989) 70f., cf. Am. 849f., As. 831, Cap. 320, 519, Mer. 72, St. 300, Tri. 847; at Eu. 551 three abstract nouns are joined.}}\textit{\footnote{\textit{360} nequiquam abdidi, abscondidi, abstrusam habebam:\textit{\footnote{\textit{abdidi, abscondidi, abstrusam habebam:} alliteration, assonance, and asyndeton (as often with verbs of similar meaning, cf. e.g. 407, 681, As. 784, Ba. 931, Ep. 118, Per. 332, Tru. 253; Eu. 962). \textit{abstrusam habebam:} ‘I kept her hidden’; periphrastic form of the perfect, quite frequent, especially in colloquial Latin, cf. e.g. 398, Ba. 550, Mil. 886, Ps. 607, St. 362.}}\textit{\footnote{\textit{abdidi, abscondidi, abstrusam habebam:} alliteration, assonance, and asyndeton (as often with verbs of similar meaning, cf. e.g. 407, 681, As. 784, Ba. 931, Ep. 118, Per. 332, Tru. 253; Eu. 962). \textit{abstrusam habebam:} ‘I kept her hidden’; periphrastic form of the perfect, quite frequent, especially in colloquial Latin, cf. e.g. 398, Ba. 550, Mil. 886, Ps. 607, St. 362.}}}
Palmer (1954) 327f. distinguishes between instances where habere + perfect participle has its 'full force' (as here) and such where it is 'almost indistinguishable' from the present perfect (e.g. Cis. 319 hasce aedis conductas habet). It is hard to see how this is a valid objective distinction rather than a subjective impression. This usage was so common that it took the place of the perfect (using auxiliary verbs) in the Romance languages, cf. similar usages with dabo (Mil. 209 bene coctum dabit, Ps. 926; An. 683) and reddo (Ru. 345 transactum redderet). Yet, Happ (1967) 103, comparing the relative frequency of the periphrastic construction in iambic senarii and recitatives, concludes that these forms are much more frequent in the latter and that therefore they are an element of high and not of colloquial style.

361 muscast meus pater: nihil potest clam illum haberi,
On this type of 'synthetic comparison' of 'identification joke', a strange proposition of an identification followed by an asyndetic explanation see the discussions in Fraenkel (1960) 21-54, Monaco (1963) 81-90, Molsberger (1989) 62f. (the basic formula is: x is not like y, it is y, followed by the tertium comparationis), cf. e.g. Au. 198, Ba. 1148, Cas. 360, Cu. 9, 112, 397, Poen. 248, Ps. 614, 747f., Tri. 226, 1015. On the use of the literary εἰκών, a form of ἀνυγμα or γρίφος, 'word puzzle', see Fraenkel (1960) 36, Dover on Ar. Ran. 906, Averna (1990) 24, MacDowell on Ar. V. 1308-1313, and Fraenkel on A. Ag. 1244. This kind of elaborate comparison of one thing with another, which, originating from folklore and popular speech, found its way into comedy via the display of wit in symposial contexts in the 5th and 4th century, see Arnott (1996) 160f. It is over-confident of Benz (1998) 112 to regard such identification conundrums as prime examples of the kind of entertainment used in Italiote farce. A quick glance at the Greek identifications listed by Monaco (1963) 91 f. will suffice to show that such riddling games should not be taken to be a hallmark of Italiote orality. On the wide range of animal imagery in Plautus (unlike Terence) see Fantham (1972) 76f.; note the striking comparison of Dorippa to a snake at 761. muscast: Flies were regarded as a nuisance, see Otto (1890) 236, Headlam/Knox on Herod. Mim. 1.15, Davies/Kathirithamby (1986) 159-164. 'Fly' was used of uninvited guests in Greek comedy, cf. Antiphanes fr. 193.7 K-A δειπνεῖν ἄκλητος μῦτα (cf. Antiphanes fr. 227 K-A). Obnoxious curiosity is the idea which provokes the metaphor here, pace Lilja (1965) 35, and at Poen. 689-692. The underlying idea is that of a fly busily buzzing from one piece of meat on an altar or open-air sacrifice (sacrum) to those exhibited for purchase (profanum), a real problem in antiquity, see Bodson (1978) 10-15. In addition, the other instances of musca in Plautus (Tru. 65, 284, Cu. 449f.) occur in erotic contexts, and the sexual and erotic nature of the fly is attested elsewhere (cf. Tert. Anim. 16.3). Preston (1916) 45 notes that there was an Attic hetaira called Μυία (Luc. Musc. Enc. 11). The noun οἰκτρός 'gadfly', can be used as a concrete expression of the metaphorical 'frenzy' of love, see Hunter on Apoll. Rhod.
3.276f., Griffith on A. Prom. 566, Thomas on Verg. G. 3.147f. The erotic connotations of *musca* reinforce the portrayal of Demipho as a *senex libidinosus*, see Svendsen (1971) 86f., see also MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 239, where *cana culex* ‘grey-haired gnat’, is used of a *senex amator*. *clam illum*: The preposition *clam* is usually (always in classical Latin) used with the ablative; in Plautus and Terence (and in colloquial Latin) also with the accusative, cf. e.g. 545 *clam uxorem et clam filium*, 821 *virum si clam*, Am. 107 *clam virum*; Hec. 396 *clam ... patrem*.

362 nec sacrum nec tam profanum quicquamst, quin ibi ilico adsit. Polar expression to comprise totality (with *tam* taken ἀκόνω with both *sacrum* and *profanum*). Fugier (1963) 69-70 lists instances where the combination *sacer/profanus* means ‘everything/all things in their totality’, cf. e.g. Sall. Cat. 11.6, Cic. Ver. 4.2 *neque privati neque publici, neque profani neque sacri* (‘absolutely nothing’), 44.120, Inv. 1.38; Hor. Ars 397.

364 DE. quid illuc est quod solus secum fabulatur filius? Demipho draws attention to the monologue as a stage convention (similarly, he notes the aside at 379), though *fabulari* is an odd way to refer to the song the audience has just heard. *solus*: a keyword of the tragic-style laments of Palaestra and Ampelisca in Ru. 185ff. (cf. esp. 201, 205, 227), cf. also Trag. fr. inc. 187f.

365-370 On the conventions of greeting see Sittl (1890) 78-81. A good example is found at 712ff., where Lysimachus approaches his wife Dorippa. The general principle according to the Greek code of conduct was that the more polite (or socially inferior) person makes the first approach (Theophr. Char. 24 προσέλθειν) and greets first (προσαναράσειν). The cook at 748ff. shows signs of obnoxious and impolite behaviour (at 748 he simply says *advenimus*, delivering no greeting formula). Greeting routines are common and usual in Greek and Roman comedy, cf. e.g. Per. 739f., Poen. 1076f., Ru. 1173-1175, Men. Sam. 128f. Χαίρε μου, πάτερ; *νη καλ σο γ'.* Failure to greet a close relative after a prolonged period of absence can result in bitter complaints, for it is taken to be a sign of lacking affection and respect, cf. Am. 676-717.

Accordingly, one would expect a greeting routine at this point if indeed Demipho and Charinus have not seen each other before in the play, especially because Charinus has been absent from home for two years, see Lefèvre (1995) 43. It is possible that father and son have met before in the *Emporos* and that the absence of a greeting routine is an indication of Plautus' interference with the plot of the original. Lines 371f. may also have been composed to make good for the awkward first meeting of Demipho and Charinus.
366 meus pater hic quidem est quem video. ibo, adloquar. quid fit, pater?

hic quidem est: a conventional phrase used to indicate the point at which a character has seen and identified another person entering onto (or already present on) the stage, cf. Am. 660, 1075, Au. 728, Ba. 774, 1105, Mil. 362, 1283, Mo. 447, 1063, Per. 14, 201, 309, 790, Poen. 1123, Ps. 445, St. 238, 458, 464, 655, Tri. 1055, Tru. 93. pater: simple vocative, regular in comedy and tragedy; unlike πάτερ, the use of pater without o or a possessive pronoun is not a conventionally polite form of address, and mi pater or pater mi would indicate a warmth lacking here, as Charinus does not want to talk to his father. His father addresses him more politely in the following line, gnate mi. In New Comedy there are examples of young men addressing their fathers with the vocatives πατῖκα (Philemon fr. 42.2 K-A) and πατίκα (Men. Dysc. 856).

367 DE. unde incedis, quid festinas, gnate mi? CH. recte, pater.

For the remainder of this scene, the two characters will try to outmanoeuvre each other, using the same trick (pretending that they pose for some other person interested in buying the girl) competing as rivals for the same object, namely Pasicompsa. Taladoire (1956) 199 compares the comic situations of rivalry at Mo. 1064ff., Per. 200ff.

quid festinas?: cf. Poen. 336, St. 319, Eu. 650, Ad. 323; quid properas? occurs at 564, Cas. 472 quid, malum, properas?, Per. 693 quid tam properas?, Poen. 263 quid illo nunc properas?, Ps. 241*, 922. gnate mi: The vocative of filius is not found in Plautus and Terence and rare in the poetry of all periods, only occurring nine times (see ThLL s. v.). In prose fili is found as early as Cato, who in the surviving fragments of his Praecepta ad filium twice addresses his son as Marce fili (Plin. Hist. nat. 29.7.14 and Serv. Georg. 1.46). Such combinations of name and a term designating the degree of kinship, frequent also in Ciceronian prose (e.g. Marce fili in De off.) do not appear in Plautus and Terence, who use either gnate or the name, see Gilleland (1979) 267-268. recte, pater: ‘it’s all right, Dad’; recte is used as a polite way of saying nothing without being rude, see Brinkhoff (1935) 64; Langen (1880) 8, Barsby on Eu. 341f., cf. Ht. 228 tum quod dem ei ‘recte’ est; nam ‘nil esse’ mihi religiost dicere, 518, Hec. 355 quid tu igitur lacrumas? aut quid es tam tristis? :: recte, mater (cf. Don. ad loc.). The word recte recurs, in different contexts and with different meanings, four more times in this scene (387, 412, 413, 448).

368 DE. ita volo, sed istuc quid est tibi quod commutatust color?

ita volo: Charinus means ‘never mind, excuse me, I’d rather not answer’, but Demipho seems to understand ‘things are all right’, and that is why he uses an affirmative formula here, see Mendelsohn (1907) 123. color: Charinus has turned pale, cf. 373. Remarks about facial expressions in the broadest sense are sometimes taken to prove that masks were not worn on the early Roman stage, and Taladoire (1951) 35f. bases on this
assumption a whole curious digression about actors and their ability to blush and go pale at will. However, it is now widely accepted that masks were worn, and passages like this one may actually be adduced as evidence in favour of rather than against masks, see also 501n. on Pasicompsa's eyes, 600n. on tristis, cf. e.g. Men. Dsyc. 754, where Sostratos' sun-tan is mentioned. On paleness as an expression of emotion, affection or fear see in particular Campbell on Apoll. Rhod. 3.297f. The lover's pallor is a commonplace in Plautus (Cis. 56, Per. 24), see Preston (1916) 49, Kistrop (1963) 101, and elsewhere, see Hollis on Ov. Ars 1.729, cf. Hor. Carm. 3.10.14, Prop. 1.1.22, Apul. Met. 5.25.4. This passages belongs to a wider tradition of situations where love is betrayed by physical symptoms, cf. Cis. 52ff.; see Hunter (1983) xlvii. The pallor of Charinus in Mart. 1.77 (pulchre valet Charinus, et tamen pallet ...), whose name (along with the verb pallet) is repeated six times in the epigram, may have been inspired by the present passage.

The situation Charinus is in at this point resembles the one described by Acanthio (219-222). It is, however, strange that he should still be timidus atque exanimatus after having been briefed about everything by Acanthio.

370 poste hac nocte non quievi satis mea ex sententia.
This line seems to imply that Charinus has not spent the night at home, for otherwise his father would probably know this already. However, it is peculiar that his father does not ask where Charinus has actually stayed overnight or expresses any surprise at what his son is doing at this particular time in this particular place. This line seems to assume that he was at sea (or at least on his ship), but that is at odds with 481 (tute heri ipsus mihi narrasti.). Charinus' whereabouts do not add up at all. poste: archaic for post (adv.) 'beyond that' (OLD s.v. post1 3); CD have postea, which will scan with synizesis and elision. Poste is metrically necessary at As. 915, Mo. 290, An. 483, Eu. 493, Enn. Ann. 218 Sk., see Skutsch (1943) 104.

371-372 are bracketed by Ussing, Leo, and Enk as they express the same idea as 389 (the reason for Charinus's bad disposition). Leo in app. suggests that they were a substitute in the 'revival' text for lines 373-389. The evidence of A is lacking, but mere redundancy need not be taken as a prima facie indication of inauthenticity. The repetition at 389 can be defended on dramaturgical grounds (it shows how 'innocent' Demipho is, and produces a good laugh in the audience).

371 DE. per mare ut vectu's, nunc oculi terram mirantur tui.
The disagreeable nature of sea-travel as a source of humour is also exploited at Mo. 431ff. and Tri. 820ff., cf. also Hec. 415-425. Allusions to seasickness in ancient literature are collected by Oldelehr (1977), who mentions only lines 387-389, allusions in comedy
by Knapp (1907) 293. It is interesting that Plautus seems to assume (here and at Am. 329) that seasickness can persist even until after disembarkation, a medically correct statement for which Oldelehr (1977) 21f. only compares the sickness of the shipwrecked leno Labrax (Ru. 510f.) and Sen. Ep. 53.5. ut: ‘after’, ‘as (it is natural for someone who has)’, lit. ‘in accordance with the fact that you have sailed across the ocean’; highly idiomatic, cf. Am. 329 lassus sum hercle; e navi, ut vectus huc sum, etiam mune nauseo, Ba. 107 nam uti navi vecta es, credo, timida es, Mo. 268, Ps. 278, 661; Verg. A. 8.236; Caes. B. G. 7.46; Tac. Ann. 4.53.

372 CH. magis opinor - DE. id est profecto; verum actutum apscesserit.

magis: adversative ‘rather’; magis for potius is colloquial, cf. e.g. Catul. 68.30, Verg. Ecl. 1.11, and its Romance reflexes ma, mais, etc.

373 ergo edepol palles. si sapias, eas ac decumbas domi.

Here and at 387-389, there is a nice play on the ambiguous nature of Charinus’ ‘sickness’. Demipho takes it to be of a physical nature, namely seasickness, Charinus knows it to be an ailment of his soul, love-sickness. For the phrasing cf. Per. 23-25 SA. satin tu usque valuisti?. TO. hau probe. / SA. ergo edepol palles. TO. saucius factus sum in Veneris proelio; / sagitta Cupido cor meum transfixit. The parallel is striking; cf. also Pers. 18 satin’ ergo ex sententia? (~Mer. 370). edepol: expletive used by men and women, although predominantly a male oath (in Mercator, by men here and at 422, 438, by one woman, 508; the overall proportion in Plautus is 338:26). While predominantly male in Plautus, the female characters in Terence use the oath proportionately more frequently. For various attempts to explain this phenomenon, see Adams (1984) 47ff., esp. 50ff. The Terentian usage is more ‘correct’: Gellius 11.6, quoting Varro, claims that both ecastor and edepol were originally exclusively female oaths, but that men gradually began to use edepol once the connection with Pollux ceased to be felt. This may explain why the shortened form pol remains predominantly female, see Adams (1984) 50-51. For further details, see Nicolson (1893) 99-103, Adams (1984) 47ff. si sapias: ‘you’d better take my advice and ...’, cf. 801, see also 584n. (si sapis).

374 CH. otium non est: mandatis rebus praevorti volo.

This line is (ironically?) echoed by Demipho at 463, see Schmidt (1959) 57f. Along with the repetition of the theme at 376, they add a nice touch to the indirect characterisation of Demipho.
136

375 DE. cras agito, perendie agito. CH. saepe ex te audivi, pater:
perendie: ‘the day after tomorrow’; cf. e.g. 606, Au. 154; of uncertain morphology (perhaps per + en die ‘beyond the duration of the next 24 hours’), see Walde/Hofmann s.v.

376 rei mandatae omnis sapientis primum prae vorti decet.
p rae vorti: ‘dispatch (business)’, ‘attend to’, with the dative or (with pronouns) the accusative; a common word in the comedians, cf. Cap. 460, Mil. 765, Per. 799f. The fundamental meaning of this verb is temporal, and it is often used with adverbs of time (as primum here). The aspect of actually ‘giving attention to/having preference for sth.’ is developed from that.

377 DE. age igitur; nolo advorsari tuam advorsum sententiam.
age igitur: ‘well then’, etev; very rare in Terence (only An. 598) and Plautus (only here, Ba. 89 and Men. 154). An etymological play, since igitur < agitur, see Walde/Hofmann s.v. tuam advorsum sententiam: set phrase, cf. 441 advorsum <mei> animi sententiam, 557 advorsum mei animi sententiam, Poen. 1411; not used by Terence, see McGlynn s.v. sententia. See also 93n. on (mea) ex sententia.

378 CH. salvos sum, siquidem isti dicto solida et perpetua st fides.
Spoken as an aside (cf. 379). solida: ‘firm’, see 21n. perpetuast: ‘uninterrupted’, ‘unbroken’ (not ‘lasting for ever’), cf. e.g. 387 DE. usquime valuisti? CH. perpetuo recte, dum quidem illic fui ‘I enjoyed uninterrupted good health as long as I was there’; Mo. 1035 in perpetuom modum ‘without interruption’, Ru. 370 perpetuam noctem.

379 DE. quid illuc est quod a me solus se in consilium sevocat?
The aside is noticed and the convention punctured for comic effect, cf. e.g. Au. 549, Mo. 512, Ps. 613ff., Tri. 567, illustrated by Bain (1977) 156-158, 162-171. consilium: ‘council, senate’; for this typically Plautine allusion to political institutions see Fraenkel (1960) 226, cf. similar metaphors at Au. 382f., 549, Ep. 159, Mil. 592, 594, Mo. 688, 1049. sevocat: ‘draw aside’ (OLD s.v. 1), cf. Au. 549 quid tu te solus e senatu sevocas?

381 quippe haud etiam quicquam inepte feci amantes ut solent.
Demipho declares himself to be a comic amator, cf. Ps. 238 non iucundumst nisi amans facit stulte. inepte: often refers specifically to the absurd conduct of comic lovers, cf. Eu. 227; stultitia of lovers in elegy: Catul. 6.14 (very drastic), 8.1; Tib. 1.4.24; [Tib.] 4.10.2; Ov. Ars 1.306; Mart. 1.68.8, see Paschall (1939) 28 n.154. Ineptia appears next to stultitia in the list of love’s disadvantages given by Charinus in the prologue, see 26n.
DE. quin ego hunc adgredior de illa? CH. quin ego hinc me amolior?
Two asides, structurally echoing each other, at the same time revealing the diametrically opposed aims of the two rivals in love, see Barbieri (1966) 255. This shows the self-consciously farcical nature of scenes like this: the actors know that the audience knows that they can hear what they are saying, although they are pretending that they cannot, and therefore they can parrot each other, cf. Ps. 557, Tru. 630.

eo ego, ut quae mandata amicus amicis tradam. DE. immo mane;
eo: present for future tense is a common feature of colloquial Latin (especially with eo and its compounds), see Martin on Ad. 224, cf. 962, Ad. 757. mandata: sc. sunt; the omission of a form of esse is frequent in such clauses, cf. e.g. Am. 573 resque uti facta dico. This reason for leave-taking picks up the theme of 374 and 376 again. amicus amicis CD: amicum B. Havet (1911) 67f and 235 suggests to read amicum (= amicorum) for metrical reasons, as amicus amicis would yield a split anapaest. However, amicus amicus (see also 499n.) is a fixed syntagma perceived as ‘one word’.

paucula etiam sciscitare prius volo. CH. dic quid velis.
sciscitare: ‘try to get to know by asking questions’, ‘inquire’ (OLD s.v. la); the verb occurs only twice in comedy (here and Eu. 548) but is common in later prose. This would be the only instance in Latin of the verb being active, and one should perhaps read sciscitari, see Lindsay in app.

usquine valuisti? CH. perpetuo recte, dum quidem illic fui;
usquine valuisti?: ‘Have you been well all the time?’, formulaic greeting, in Plautus much the same as vales?, cf. e.g. Am. 679, 715, Ba. 248, Ep. 17, 129, Mo. 449 (used after the first line of a greeting-routine), St. 467, 586. usquine; > usque-n(e) > usquin, cf. potin = poti-ne, mei > meei > miei (vowel change in unaccented syllables), see Meiser (1998) 67. perpetuo recte: see 378n. perpetuo: ‘uninterruptedly’, e.g. Ba. 248, Ep. 129, Mo. 449, Per. 23, Ru. 632.

verum in portum huc ut sum adventus nescioqui animus mihi dolet.
ut: ‘since (the time when)’ (= ex quo) with the perfect to denote a single action, see Lodge s.v. II.D.3, cf. Am. 733, Ep. 600, Men. 635, Mo. 470f., St. 29f., Hec. 751; frequent only in the comic writers, but occasionally later, see LHS II 636. nescioqui: see 258n.

Demipho is outrageously presented as senex libidinosus, willing to fight his son for the possession of Pasicompsa. The playwright is faced with a dramaturgical problem, namely how to make two people fight about something without them realising that they
are actually fighting against each other? This problem is far from trivial, for the audience has at the same time to be aware of exactly that fact, i.e. that Demipho and Charinus fight each other. This problem is directly related to the plot-construction of the Mercator, in which the usual intriguer and his dupe are replaced by two characters intriguing against each other.

For the solution of this problem, the playwright has made generous use of the conventions of the comic stage. Taking leave of realism, he sets up an auction where both father and son bid in the names of two other gentlemen, avoiding to question the reality of the existence of these gentlemen throughout the scene. Considering the difficulty of the task that the playwright has set himself here, this is an ingenious solution which is also employed in modern comedy, see Lauinger (1964) 148: "Die Notrettung des gefährlich gestörten Kontakts durch die indirekte Verständigung über fiktive Partner gewährleistet die kontinuierliche Durchführung der dramatischen Handlung."

In other words, neither in the Greek nor in the Roman play would any open confrontation between father and son have been conceivable, for all that would have to be said is roughly: "Father, I love this girl." - "So do I, my son." - "But I want her for myself." - "Tough luck, young man, forget it. She is mine." (Adulescens off). This, however, could barely be called effective comedy. Therefore, pace Wallochny (1992) 139 n.38 and 155f., the question of the originality of this passage cannot be settled using an allegedly different mode of working out the father-son conflict in the Greek and the Roman world, especially with regard to the different treatment of peculium in Greek and Roman law, see also 460n.

390 sed quid ais? ecquam tu advexti tuae matri ancillam Rhodo?

non edepol mala: ‘not bad at all’, ‘quite nice’ (‘pas mal’, ‘nicht übel’), hau malus ~ ἀκακος; there is a deliberate ambiguity, as it primarily refers to moral character, not looks (cf. 756). A common litotes, cf, also Ru. 35, 337, Vid. 40; Eu. 274, Ad. 480.

392 DE. ut moratast? CH. nullam vidi melius mea sententia.
De. (pressing) ‘I mean her morals.’ - Ch. (dreaming) ‘I’ve never seen a better one, as far as I can tell.’ moratast: ‘has morals (mores)’, cf. As. 390, 506, Au. 239, Cap. 107, Mo. 290, 320, Per. 554, St. 109, Tru. 99, Hec. 643f. sed quid mulieris/uxorem habes aut quibus moratam moribus?; Hor. Ars 319. The adjective is formed from a noun, like e.g. togatus, litteratus, beluatus.
393 DE. mihi quidem edepol visast quom illum vidi - CH. eho an vidisti, pater?
De. (impatient) ‘Well, it seemed, to me at least, when I saw her, that ...’ Ch. (feigning surprise) ‘What! You have seen her already?’ eho an vidisti, pater?: Charinus knows already that Demipho has seen (and talked to) the girl, since Acanthio has told him so (180-188). Still, he probably asks to embarass him.

394 DE. vidi. verum non ex usu nostrost neque adeo placet.
B C D A B C D A / B C dd a B c D. A curious and as yet unexplained exception to Luchs’ law (... a B/ c D not allowed at line-end) is the sequence dd a B consisting of a vowel-final pyrrhic the ultima of which elides with the following anapaetic word, of which there are about thirty cases in Plautus, see Luchs (1873) 13f., Lindsay (1922) 271, and Gratwick on Men. 550. See also 859n.

395-399 Cf. 403-411. The theme of Pasicompsa’s ineptitude for common household chores is taken up again at 504-510.

395 CH. †qu qui vero? DE. quia non nostra formam habet dignam domo.
The text of the MSS is corrupt: the line lacks one syllable, probably in the first cretic. None of the remedies suggested by the editors (see Ernout in app.) carries conviction. Despite of the parallel phrasing at 405, one might try qui<du>m vero (B C D A), cf. Mil. 325, Mo. 450, 1079, Ps. 1124, Tru. 732f., Eu. 273.

The motif is not unknown in Greek comedy. In Menander’s Plokion and Caecilius’ Plocium an ugly uxor dotata makes her husband get rid of a servant who works well but is too pretty for comfort (fr. 333 K-Th) and the husband says about his suspicious wife: ea me clam se cum mea ancilla ait consuetum; id me arguit, / ita plorando orando instando atque obiurgando me optudit / eam uti venderem (Com. 149-151).

396-399 The household chores of female slaves are also listed in Greek tragedy, cf. e.g. E. Andr. 166 πείθεται ταετείνην προσπεσείν τ’ ἐμὸν γόνο / σαίρειν τε δόμα (cf. 397 aedis verrat), Hec. 362-364 προσθέλς δ’ ἀνάγκην στις ποιοῦν [cf. 398, 416] ἐν δόμιοι / σαίρειν τε δόμα [a standard motif?] κερτίσκειν τ’ ἐφεσίαναι [cf. 397 pensum faciat, 416] / λυπρὰν ἀγοουσαν ἡμέραν [cf. 397 vapulet, 416] μ’ ἀναγκάσει.

396 nihil opust nobis ancilla nisi quae texat, quae molat,
Cf. Ad. 846-849 atque ibi favillae plena, fumi ac pollinis/coquendo sit faxo et molendo; praeter haec/meridie ispo faciam ut stipulam conligat:/tam excoctam reddam atque atram quam carbost.
397 lignum caedat, pensum faciat, aedis verrat, vapulet,
B C D A / B C dd A / B C D A / B c D; square verse type I.
This line is quoted verbatim at Lucil. fr. 703 Krenkel (= 736 Marx). pensum faciat: cf. 416 conficiet pensum, Ba. 1152, Men. 796; pensum 'allotment (of wool) weighed out (to be spun)'; it was assigned daily to the ancilla, cf. Quint. Inst. 1.3.2 invent eum ... pensa inter virgines partientem. aedis verrat: cf. Titinius everrite aedes, abstergete araneas; Ba. fr. III Lindsay, St. 351, 375, 389. vapulet: 'be thrashed' (OLD s. v. la), corresponding to pinsetur flagro (416); probably καρά προσδόκιαν.

398 quae habeat cottidianum familiae coctum cibum:
The line corresponds to 416 coquet; cf. Cato De agr. 143.2 (about the duties of the vilica) cibum tibi et familiae curet uti coctum habeat; fr. 1 Epem fumificum qui legioni nostrae habet coctum cibum. The phrase is a variation of cibum paratum habeo, a periphrastic perfect (see 360n.), cf. medical jargon, where medicamentum semper compositum habuit = paratum habuit, see Happ (1967) 100. It was usual not to have professional cooks but slaves or women who did the day-to-day cooking for the household, see Lowe (1985) 73, Brock (1994) 338f., cf. Men. Sam. 221f.; St. 679-681; Ht. 126, Ad. 846.

399 horunc illa nihilum quicquam facere poterit. CH. admodum.
horunc: (*horum-ce) and harunc are pre-vocalic (St. 450) and pre-consonantal (Cu. 71, Mil. 1016) forms of the genitive plural used by Plautus, see LHS I 469. nihilum quicquam: 'nothing whatever', pleonastic and colloquial, cf. 507, 666, 739, 806, 905; see MacCary/Willcock on Plaut. Cas. 1008. admodum: 'only too true' expressing strong assent, see Theslaff (1960) 49f.; lit. 'to full measure', see Lindsay (1907) 84. It is an unwarranted claim that Pasicompsa 'can't perform any of these duties', for Demipho cannot know this about Pasicompsa, since he has only talked to her once, and briefly, on the ship. Maybe he makes the chauvinistic assumption that physical beauty disqualifies for the performance of any practical tasks. Equally possible is that Plautus, who knows what Pasicompsa is going to say at 508f., also being under the influence of 414-416, has allowed himself to insert these lines as an addition to a motif found elsewhere in the play. Following his father's statement that 'this girl is not worth tuppence when it comes to household chores' (396-399), Charinus ready agreement is odd, and his explanation that "this is the very reason why I bought her for mother" (400) is a non sequitur. There is, therefore, some reason to assume that the preceding lines were not in the original. Enk's explanation ad loc. (non ancillam quoque opus rusticum faceret, sed matri pedisequam se emisse dicit Charinus) does not help. It is true that this theme is taken up at 404, but it is hard to see why Plautus would leave his audience baffled until then.
The jussive present subjunctive is linked by neve to a perfect jussive subjunctive in the second person. It is difficult to appreciate any distinction between the present subjunctive and the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions in Plautus. The perfect may be more peremptory in tone, denoting the action to stop 'at once', see Woodcock (1959) 97, cf. the aorist subjunctive with µη in Greek.

Prohibitions need to be subtle and graded. Accordingly, in many languages several nuanced ways of expressing the same idea have been developed (coexisting gradations), see further 501n. Ne + perfect subjunctive is definitely rarer (and apparently restricted to the second person singular) than ne + present subjunctive, see the lists in Lodge s.v. ne (particula negativa et coniunctio) II. A.2.d and II.A.2.c and e-f respectively. Terence shows a definite preference for ne + present subjunctive and has only two examples of ne + perfect subjunctive (Ph. 514, 742), see McGlynn s.v. ne (particula negativa et coniunctio) IX.2 and IX.3 respectively. In a hierarchy of urgency, ne dixeris is most urgent and solemn (ne + subjunctive, noli + infinitive, cave, ne + subjunctive). Unlike Terence, Plautus also uses, albeit very rarely, ne + imperfect/pluperfect subjunctive, see 60n. ne duas (BcD) was very much felt as a cretic group by Plautus; it is, like ne duis, ne duit, di duint, mainly found at the end of iambic senarii (e.g. Au. 238), or, as here, at the beginning of trochaic septenarii, see LHS I 528; on the form see Lindsay (1894) 514, LHS I 325 (in Plautus only here and Au. 238); duim is more frequent; also in composite verbs (induas, creduam, creduas, creduat, accrduas), cf. duis/duas at Cap. 331/Au. 238, perduis at Am. 845, duim/perduim at Au. 672, perduint at Poen. 610. adiuvent Dunsch : adiuvant codd. Unless Demipho continues the line ad spectatores, the subjunctive and not the indicative is required by the context. It is unnecessary to assume with Ritschl that a half-line or more is missing. Leo's argument (in app.), followed by Enk and Bertini ad loc. and by Dieterle (1980) 250, is unconvincing. Leo explains that Charinus is grateful to the gods since he thinks he does not have to give Pasicompsa to his mother and that he can keep her secretly. The context shows that Demipho argues for getting rid of Pasicompsa altogether (394-399), with the ulterior motive of putting her up for sale. Thus, when Demipho says, 'No, you won't give her to Mother nor will you tell her anything', Charinus must assume that Demipho wants to get rid of Pasicompsa. Accordingly, he will want to say 'Heaven, help!' (cf. Au. 15 ut vos, ut alias, pariter nunc Mars adiuvet) rather than 'Heaven does help!' (cf. Ep. 192, Men. 551). Moreover, Demipho's labefacto paullatim (402) shows that Charinus' reaction must have been one of visible distress.
404 neque illa matrem satis honeste tuam sequi poterit comes: a person accompanying a citizen woman to protect her pudicitia, cf. Am. 929f., Cas. 165f., see Prescott (1936) 113f., Schmude (1988) 127 n.56, Scafuro (1997) 236. When a woman does not leave the house in the company of a comes, she may incur sanctions, cf. Naev. Trag. 7 desubito famam tollunt si quam solam videre in via, see Beltrami (1988) 64f. This may explain Dorippa’s impatience when Syra walks too far behind to be recognised as her comes (670f.). Even a meretrix had to be careful of her reputation, Cis. 330f. intrabo, / nam meretricem astare in via solam prostibuli sanest (cf. Eu. 499ff., where the meretrix Thais is escorted to dinner by slaves). For the Greek convention, see Gow on Theocr. Id. 15.67, who compares Phylarchus fr. 45 M. = Ath. 12.521B, about a free woman from Syracuse: ἐκολόβετο καὶ ἡμέρας ἐξιέναι δὲν τῶν γυναικονόμων ἁκολουθοῦσης αὐτῆς μίας θεοπαίνας, cf. also Theophr. Char. 22.10, Plut. Phoc. 19. According to Fraenkel (1960) 394, the contents and the morals of lines 404-409 are, taken for themselves, Attic.


405 neque sinam. CH. qui vero? DE. quia illa forma matrem familias
matrem familias: ‘mistress of the household’, cf. 415; a mater familias is more than a mere uxor, as the term denotes dignity and high morality, cf. St. 98 (where uxores would lack colour), Suet. Aug. 69.1. The archaic genitive familias is almost always preserved in this formal phrase, especially where the term is applied in solemn (or mock-solemn) contexts, cf. e.g. 415, Am. 831, St. 98, Ad. 747.

406 flagitium sit si sequatur; quando incedat per vias,
There is a deliberate ambiguity in Demipho’s words: ‘It would be a scandal if that slave-girl followed a matrona through the streets of the city’ or ‘It would be a scandal to put such a beauty next to an old harridan’ (an impertinent tongue-in-cheek implication that his own wife is ugly enough). The expression non mala exploits the same kind of ambiguity, see 391n. flagitium: ‘scandal’ (the kind of behaviour that makes your neighbours throw up their hands), cf. 417, 423, and the phrase damnum et flagitium facere at 237, 784; Tri. 612. incedat: The professional meretrix betrays herself by her carriage (incessus), cf. Cat. 42.7-9 quae sit, quaeritis? illa, quam videtis / turpe incedere, mimicac ac moleste / ridentem catuli ore Gallicani; Cic. Cael. 49; Ov. Ars
3.299f. est et in incessu pars non contempta decoris; / allicit ignotos ille fugatque viros. On the other hand, the matrona Claudia is described in her epitaph (CIL I² 1211) as sermone lepido tum autem incessu commodo. For the importance attached by the Romans to incessus ('gait') as an index of character cf. Sen. Ep. 52.12 argumentum morum ex minimis quoque licet capere: impudicum et incessus ostendit, 66.5.

407 contemptent, conspiciant omnes, nutent, nictent, sibilent
For the asyndetic style cf. Cu. 288-297, also in a negative context (describing what is undesirable or downright annoying). For the situation envisaged here, see 406n. and cf. Naev. Com. 75-79 (de quadam impudica), a passage similar to Plautine style with its succession of antitheses, alliteration, and assonance: quasi in choro ludens datatim dat sese et communem facit. / alii adnutat, alii adnictat, alium amat, alium tenet. / alibi manus est occupata, alii percellit pedem. / anulum dat alii spectandum, a labris alium invocat. / cum alio cantat, at tamen alii dat digito litteras. contemptent: archaic doublet of the deponent contemplari, cf. e.g. Am. 441, Cis. 702, Ep. 383, 622, Mil. 1029, Mo. 172; ThLL IV 650.23 (legitur apud scaenicos, qui, si versu indicare licet, ante Terentium, activum solum admittunt) needs correction; there is a grand total of 15 occurrences of the verb in Plautus, of which eleven are active (five times imperatival contempla) and four deponents, see Flobert (1975) 77, 294. conspiciant: 'stare' (OLD s. v. 3a), see Collart on Cu. 503. nutent, nictent, sibilent: cf. As. 784 nutet, nictet, adnutat, Men. 613 non ... muto neque nicto tibi; Naev. Com. 75f. alii adnutat, alii adnictat, alium amat, alium tenet; cf. a woman's flirtatious behaviour at Antiphanes fr. 234 K-A; for nodding as a means of flirtation cf. Tib. 1.2.21, Ov. Am. 2.5.16, Ars 1.138, Trist. 2.453. Cf. also Ht. 372f. inversa verba, everas cervices tuas, gemitus, screatus, tussis, risus, and the comments elicited by the usụγa of a woman at Alexis fr. 103.11f. K-A ὑπενέδυος ἔφρομμέν αὐτήν, ὡστε τὴν ἐσπυγναν / ἀναβοῦν τοὺς εἰσιδόντας.

408 vellicent, vocent, molesti sint; occentent ostium;
occentent ostium: 'sing at (to) the door', see OLD s.v. occento 1. What Charinus does at 830-841 could be described as ostium occentat. Crook (1967) 251f. points out that the Twelve Tables treated as criminal the casting of spells on people by incantations and also occentare ("raise a hostile demonstration in the streets against someone"). The phrase could be used easily to describe a παρακλασθησθωρον, cf. Cu. 145ff. where a young lover sings an incantation to the door-posts of a house to let him in, and e.g. Per. 569, St. 572. See Gow on Theocr. Id. 3 about the κόμος as a "sequel to a symposium, when the drinkers, garlanded from the feast, sallied forth into the streets with torches (and sometimes music) to visit friends [...]. The common objective of such expeditions was the house of a mistress, before which the lover, accompanied or unaccompanied by his friends, would sing a serenade begging for admission, and beat upon the doors and
shutters to attract attention." Cf. Men. Sam. 72f. τουτονι προς ταξις θόρας/κλάον ταφός, a common situation for the unsuccessful lover in comedy, almost one of his comic stock-in-trades, cf. also Thrasonides in Men. Mis. A6. Chaireas in Men. Dyse. 58-63 suggests the love-lorn Sostratos to go to the girl's door in revel (like Phaedromus in Cu.), threatening to burn down her house with a torch unless he is allowed to carry her off.

Usener (1901) 5 thinks that the reference in the present passage is to mocking songs, but Beckmann (1923) 43 shows that the παρακαλωσιθροφοι is referred to, see also Weinreich (1929) 389f., Reimers (1957) 33 n.2, Hendrickson (1926). The genre enters literature with Alcaeus, see Bowra (1958) 377, and later becomes an established routine in comedy, cf. Ar. Eccl. 938-975; Cu. 147-154, Per. 564-572, Tru. 758-765, see Copley (1956) 7-23. Its influence is most apparent in the serenade scenes in Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae and Plautus' Curculio and the siege scenes in Menander's Kolax and Perikeirone, see Goldberg (1980) 51f. It also becomes a favourite topic of Hellenistic epigram and Latin love-poetry (e.g. Catul. 67; Tib. 1.2.7-14; Prop. 1.16.17-44; Ov. Am. 1.6).

409 impleantur elegorum meae fores carbonibus.

impleantur: may take the genitive as well as the ablative in Plautus; e.g. the genitive at Au. 552, the ablative at Mer. 795, Au. 454, Cas. 123. elegorum: This line is of value as the first mention of graffitti and of elegae (ἐλεγεῖα) meaning 'erotic verse' in Roman literature (more than just some amatory scrawl on a flat surface, like Δήμος κολάς at Ar. V. 98f.). For inscriptions written on or at the door by lovers see Gow on Theocr. Id. 23.46, cf. A.P. 5.191, 12.23; Prop. 1.16.9f.; Ov. Am. 2.1.27f., 3.1.53. Copley (1939) edits Pompeian doorway graffitti (CIL IV suppl. 5296). carbonibus: Gruter (1621) 913 provides an explanation for the ready availability of carbones: "Ego id fieri arbitror [...] cum face extincta inscribebatur famosum aliquid ostio carmen."

410-411 For the sentiment cf. Ep. 581 quid? ego lenocinium facio qui habeam alienas domi / atque argentum egurgitem domo prosus? It is probable that, if Demipho's remarks were also in some form in the Greek original, they referred to the fact that he is, as the head of an οἶκος, not supposed to do things that could well be done in a different spatial domain, namely, that of a brothel. See also Davidson (1997) 113, discussing Isaeus 3.13-15 and Ps.-Dem. 59.67: "What kind of building is Pyrrhus' home when Phile's mum, 'a woman shared by all who wanted her', comes to stay, a house surrounded by scenes of disorder, visited by bands of revellers? And when someone caught in Stephanus' house having sex with 'his daughter' Phano is let off on a charge of adultery, it is hard to know which of the implications is more alarming: that the girl is therefore a common prostitute, or that Stephanus' home is therefore a brothel. The
ergasterion turns sex into an object for sale but the roles can be reversed. A whore can turn a home into a bordello."

411 mihique obiectent lenocinium facere. nam quid eost opus?
lenocinium facere: 'run a brothel', cf. Ba. fr. XIX, Ep. 581; here lenocinium facere is a verbal noun phrase '(the) practising lenocinium', cf. Men. 842 minatur mihi oculos exurere 'he threatens me (the) burning out my eyes'.

412 CH. hercle qui tu recte dicis et tibi adsentior.
hercle qui tu recte dicis: 'Heavens, what a good idea!', cf. 436, where Charinus uses the expletive again, and 1007, where the phrase recurs, this time spoken by Demipho, cf. Men. Sam. 112 νη τον Διώνυσον εδ λέγεις. qui: enclitic exclamatory adverb (old ablative), often joined to hercle or similar expletives, cf. Am. 776, As. 930, Men. 428 hercle qui tu recte dicit, 1092, Mil. 779, Poen. 910, Ps. 473, St. 559, Tri. 464; see Gratwick on Men. 428, Lodge s. v. qui, qui (indef.) II.14, OLD s. v. qui² 6c; cf. παρ. Terence also uses the word, but sparingly and not with exclamatory expletives, see McGlynn s. v. qui (ablat. adverbialiter) II.1. recte dicit: 'you're right - I agree with you' (Greek καλός λέγεις, ἀληθῆ λέγεις). Contrast the use of recte dicere to mean more generally 'Well said!' = 'Good!' with no emphasis on the accuracy of the words, e.g. 1003, Am. 973, Men. 428. adsentior: both active (e.g. Am. 824, Ru. 975) and, as here, deponent (as in classical usage). For further examples of verbs which were predominantly active (or 'mixed') in Early Latin, but deponent in Classical usage, see Langen (1880) 59-68.

414 ancillam viraginem aliquam non malam, forma mala,
viraginem: applied to a woman slave not likely to attract men. In epic poetry, where Juturna, once loved by Jupiter (Verg. A. 12.468), and beautiful goddesses such as Pallas and Diana are so described, Servius' explanation 'mulier quae virile implet officium' seems to come near to the mark, but neither the formation of the word nor its semantics are precisely understood, see Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 220; see also Tarrant on Sen. Ag. 668 (dura virago), according to whom the word is used (a) to refer to women of masculine strength (as in this passage), or (b) goddesses/women engaged in masculine pursuits, such as hunting and war (cf. e.g. Ov. Met. 6.130, Sen. Pha. 54, Tro. 1151). It seems that in the present line the man-like qualities of the virago are supposed to make her physically less attractive. In women, man-likeness seems at all times to have been associated with an absence of attributes of physical beauty. The etymology of virago was already unclear in Late Antiquity, see Maltby (1991) 647; a popular etymology was vir/fi imjago 'likeness of a man', and whatever it may be, the word was certainly connected, rightly or wrongly, with vir. non malam, forma mala: contrasting polyptotic word-play.
Demipho probably envisages someone like the girl described at *Ht.* 1062 *virgo rufa, caesia, sparso ore, adunco naso.* For the play on *malus* (‘bad’/’ugly’) cf. 391, 756; here, *non malam* ‘moral’, ‘prim and proper’.

416 *ea molet, coquet, conficiet pensum, pinsetur flagro*

*conficiet pensum:* see 397n.; for the expression cf. *Per.* 272 *pensum meum quod datumst confeci.*

417 *neque propter eam quicquam eveniet nostris foribus flagiti*

A pompous way of saying ‘we shall not have to be ashamed of anything’. *flagiti:* see 406n., cf. 422, *Ad.* 101.

418 *CH.* *quid si igitur reddatur illi unde empta est? DE.* *minime gentium.*

*quid si igitur:* cf. 578; *igitur,* originally temporal, has here assumed an illative sense (compare the force of the English ‘then’ in ‘let’s go then’), cf. *Mo.* 393 *quid si igitur abeamus,* 1093. The particle belongs logically to the apodosis (*quid = quid fiat*), but is placed in the protasis. *minime gentium:* ‘certainly not’, lit. ‘not in this world’, emphatic denial, often at line-end, see Booth (1923) 43, Theslaff (1960) 61, cf. e.g. *Poen.* 690, *Ph.* 1033, *Eu.* 625, *Ad.* 342. The genitive is usually thought to be partitive (‘in no part of the world’), see Lindsay (1907) 16. However, it does not reinforce the preceding adverb but defines its limits (cf. phrases like 433 *ubinamst ... gentium; ubi terrarum, poò γῆς;) by setting it, in a way that is slightly different from that of the partitive genitive, into the context of a larger unit that is in itself a closed set (cf. Greek expressions like Θῆκα Βουρκαζ).

419 *CH.* *dixit se redhibere si non placeat. DE.* *nihil istoc opust:*

*redhibere:* present for future infinitive, as often in Plautus, see Taubmann ad loc., cf. e.g. *Am.* 208f., *As.* 442; also in Terence (*Ph.* 531f.). The *redhibitio* is the legal consequence of the *actio redhibitoria,* a legal instrument that could be employed when a purchaser returns the article purchased to the vendor on account of some defect, see Zulueta (1949) 46-51, Talamanca (1955) 125f., Pugsley (1974). The word is used with reference to the sale of slaves, cf. Cic. *Off.* 3.23 *in mancipio vendendo dicendane vitia, non ea, quae nisi dixeris, redhieatur mancipium iure civili,* but also other goods, cf. *Mo.* 799f. (a house).

420 *litigari nolo ego usquam, tuam autem accusari fidem;*

*litigari:* impersonal passive, not middle (‘I don’t want that there is a lawsuit’), cf. Gell. 14.2.14 *super qua re litigatur apud eum,* Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.66 *inter patres etiam filiosque ... litigatum scio.* *fidem:* ‘good name’ (*OLD* s.v. 5).
421 molto edepol, si quid faciandumst, facere damni mavolo
damni: cf. Ba. 1032, Ps. 440, As. 182, deemed by Lindsay (1907) 15 to be partitive
genitives. Woodcock (1959) 53 interprets regards such expressions (also e.g. *lucri,
compendi facere aliquid) as instances of the predicative use of the defining genitive. In
view of examples like Poen. 771 me esse hos trecentos Philippos facturum lucri, which
could be regarded as the 'full' form of such phrases. Plautus plays with the meanings of
facere and the phrase *damnnum facere, which indeed does not mean 'make' or 'produce',
as is suggested by the basic meaning of the word, which is invoked in the first half of the
line. mavolo: (*magis volo) = *malo; both forms are found in equal proportion in
Plautus, the old form e.g. at As. 835, *malo at Per. 602, see Meiser (1998) 224; in
Terence mavolo only at Hec. 540.

422 quam opprobramentum aut flagitium muliebre ecferri domo.
ecferri: 'reveal', 'divulge', lit. 'carry forth (word of something)', in this meaning only
here in Plautus, cf. Ph. 958, Ad. 626. flagitium muliebre: see 406n., cf. 417; the
adjective is used like the genitive of definition in formations like flagitium hominis,
sceles hominis ('you scandal of a man'), on which see Gratwick on Men. 489.

423 me tibi illam posse opinor luculente vendere.
tibi: 'for you' (dative of interest) is required by the context, as was seen by Boxhorn,
quoted by Gronovius (1760) 90; Demipho offers to act as seller. This implies that
Demipho does not regard the girl as part of his immediate property, which is odd in
terms of Roman law. luculente: lit. 'brightly' (*luc-ulentus 'full of light'), thus
'excellently', 'at a fine price'.

424-443
1. Auctions in Plautus
Apart from the present passage, there are several other instances of the auction motif in
Roman comedy, cf. Ba. 976-977, Cap. 179-182, Men. 1152-1161 (where the sale of a
woman is mentioned, cf. Mart. 6.66), Poen. 1424, St. 218-235, Caecil. Com. 5; Talamanca (1955) 106-109 does not discuss the Ba., Cap., and the Mer. passage. It is
surprising that the present passage has never attracted any scholarly attention as another
instance of Plautus' dramatic use of the 'auction' motif except for a short note by
Pernard (1900) 82 n.1 who rightly calls this passage "une sorte de parodie de la vente
aux enchères ou *auctio.". In his book on private auctions in Rome, being the only
comprehensive study of the subject, Thielmann (1961) 41-45, 48-53, discusses the
allusions to auctions in Menaechmi, Poenulus and Stichus, but does not even mention
this scene. This is particularly surprising since (1) there is bidding going on in the
passage, (2) the language used is typical of other auction contexts, and (3) the
appropriate gestures and body-language used during auctions are mentioned:

There is no up-to-date full-scale treatment of auctions in Republican Rome,
dealing at the same time with the socio-economic and the legal aspects of auctions and
their reflection in Roman literature, although their general importance for the functioning
of Republican Roman economy has been widely accepted, see e.g. Thomas (1957) 42,
Talamanca (1955) 105, Pringsheim (1949) 284.

In classical times, there were four parties involved in a Roman auction: the
dominus (person on whose behalf the property was sold), the argentarius who
organised, regulated and financed the sale, the praeco ('crier', see 663n.) who advertised
the sale and conducted the bidding, and the emplor whose bid was successful, see
Thomas (1957) 44f. At Greek auctions, a praeco (κηποξ) was not necessary, whereas at
Roman auctions he was, see Thielmann (1961) 42. Praecones are mentioned at Ba. 815,
St. 193-195, Men. 1154f., but not in Mercator. The argentarius is not mentioned at all as
organiser of auctions in Plautine comedy, where he features only as money-lender (e.g.
As. 116, 126, Au. 527, 529, Per. 434, 442; not in Terence), see Thielmann (1961) 43-45.
In the form of sale prevailing in the time of Plautus and Cato (cf. De agr. 146, 159) the
argentarius was not a legally necessary participant at the sale itself, see Thomas (1957)
59. The addictio was regarded as an act performed by the dominus, which would have
been impossible if the praeco had an independent status as a participant of the bidding
procedure and not simply as, so to speak, a 'mouthpiece' of the dominus. Consequently,
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argentarius was not a legally necessary participant at the sale itself, see Thomas (1957)
59. The addictio was regarded as an act performed by the dominus, which would have
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At St. 193-195, the fact that no praeco is present to conduct the auction is
specifically mentioned when the parasite Gelasimus complains that he must make do
without a praeco's assistance: haec verba subigunt med ut mores barbaros/discam
atque ut faciam praeconis compendium/itaque auctionum praedicem ipse ut venditem.
 Usually mores barbaros should mean 'Roman custom' in accordance with Plautine
usage, but here it alludes to Greek custom.

All signs point to the present passage being an auction, or at least encapsulating
something of the atmosphere of an auction proper. There is competitive bidding and
over-bidding of two prospective buyers (441), attempts are made to tease out a higher
price (443), and an allusion to signalling bids almost imperceptibly by slight nodding
(437) or lifting a finger (probably at 433-436), as it was common practice at Roman
auctions, see Sittl (1890) 218, Thielmann (1961) 42, 49-50, cf. St. 224. Both Charinus and Demipho act as if they were praecores who shout out higher and higher prices. In *Bacchides* and *Stichus*, the situation resembles more closely that of an actual auction, with one single character assuming the role (and ‘air’) of a praeco. The legal maneuvring that is shown by Charinus (and Demipho?) is quite like that of a praeco, as that of Sextus Naevius described by Cic. *Quinct.* 18-32 (esp. 25-29), 52, 61, 63. Father and Son take it in turns to step into the role of the absent praeco.

The background and literary nucleus of the allusions to auctions and at least some of the auction-scenes in comedy, especially those where women are on offer, is perhaps the habit of staging auctions of female slaves at symposia, as described by Persaeus of Citium (*SVF* I fr. 451), where we learn that a symposion could be turned into a marketplace with the staging of auctions at which the guests bid for slave-girls, see further Davidson (1997) 114f.

2. Father and Son as Covert Rivals

The senex (426) stands for Demipho himself, the adulescens (427) for Charinus. In the heat of the moment, Demipho gives himself away at 439: *nequiquam poscit: ego habebo*; the old gentleman is prone to such slips of the tongue elsewhere, see 758n. Plautus seems to have a certain predilection for such situations: In the *atvoq* told by the senex Antipho in *Stichus*, the senex who is quoted at St. 547f., 553f., and 565f. is a representation of Antipho himself, just as the adulescens quoted at St. 550f. and 565f. is meant to be his son-in-law Epigonus.

Dieterle (1980) 196 notes critically the unrealistic psychology of this scene, as it would be hard to believe that Charinus and Demipho do not realize that they are trying to cheat each other, but see Wieand (1920) 101: “The psychological improbabilities in the play from the sacrifice of probability for the sake of comic effect.”

426 DE. *tace modo: senex est quidam qui illam mandavit mihi*


427 ut *emerem* - *ad istanc faciem*. CH. *at mihi quidam adulescens, pater,*

*bb c D / a B C dd / A B C dd A B c d+;* metrical hiatuses at D/A break; Leo’s insertion of <aut> after *emerem* is attractive but metrically unnecessary, as Demipho may simply be hesitating due to self-correction: ‘There’s a certain elderly gentleman who’s instructed me to buy her - er, someone of that appearance.’ *ad istanc faciem*: ‘of that appearance’; *ad= ‘after the fashion of’, approximating to’, used to denote comparisons or similitude, see Lindsay (1907) 107. The difference between this phrase and an ablative of
description (e.g. *Ru.* 316 *nullum istac facie*) is that *ad* is used to stress that the appearance is not exactly, but only approximately the same. *faciem*: ‘looks’, ‘appearance’ (*OLD* s.v. 1), not ‘face’, cf. 428, 622, 637; a verbal noun corresponding to *facio* (cf. English ‘make’) like *effigies* to *effingo*, see *Walde/Hofmann* s.v.

429-430 This is the opening gambit of the first part of the auction, the ‘bidding’ (429-441). The second part (442-460) is less clearly defined and deals first with the themes of insane love on the part of the two mysterious gentleman in whose name both Demipho and Charinus claim to bid (442-448), then with some legal technicalities that Charinus tries to use as reasons why Pasicompsa cannot be sold: Charinus bought her *sine mancipio*, i.e. he has not gained full property rights over her [this is a Roman concept, and even if it was a Greek concept, it would be quite strange in this context, since Pasicompsa was bought in Rhodes and is now in Athens, and there is no way for a seller to claim her back anyway]: 449f.; Charinus has possession of her in shared ownership [what one would expect of a ship or similar things rather than of a slave-girl; again, the concept of *manus* and the legal background are rather Roman than Greek] (451-456); Charinus does not know whether the other owner wants to sell her (457-459). But it is all in vain: Demipho has made up his mind (460): Pasicompsa has to be sold to the gentleman he has in mind.

429 *viginti minis opinor posse me illam vendere*

The price for an accomplished and attractive female slave seems to have varied from 20 to 60 *minae*; see Schuhmann (1975) 248 for a list of the instances where prices are mentioned, ranging from twenty to fifty mines; to ‘hire’ a female slave for a year costs twenty mines at *As.* 230, 751-754. Delcourt (1948) 127 mentions cases of 40 (lines 52 and 296) and 50 mines (366, 467) in the *Epidicus*; add 60 (*Ep.* 468, *Per.* 665, 683, 743); the sum of 100 *minae* (*Per.* 662) is ludicrously high; in Terence, prices range from 20 to 30 mines, see also Spranger (1984) 42f.

431 *DE. at ego- CH. quin ego, inquam- DE. ah, nescis quid dicturus sum, tace.*

Wahl (1974) 35 takes the state of the assignation of the speaker of the latter part of the line in the MS texts here as an indication of an ‘algebraic’ notation (on the term, see 1014n.). After *at ego*, *D* assigns the next three words to *acH;* after *inquam* the MSS *BC* have *ah*, but *D*² has a superscript *hac*, the assignation to Charinus (*cH*) having been erased after the assignation to Demipho (*DEM.*) which follows *inquam*. Wahl argues that *acH* is combined out of the algebraic notation of actor *A*, which was to be found in *P*, and the ‘conventional’ notation of the speaker, *CH*, which must, so it would appear, also have been present in some form. The very fact that, if one accepts Wahl’s theory for the generation of this miswriting, there are only three isolated ‘mistakes’ of this kind in the
MSS of the Mercator (here, at 884 and 888) seems per se inconsistent with his argument from scribal carelessness. Furthermore, the use of CA, CHA or CH to designate the speaker of Charinus' role is not uniformly handled in D, and to suppose a transposition of letters is enough to explain the corruption. In addition to this, Wahl should not say that Ah (which is in B) could have been misread as the algebraic notation of the actor A. Still, even if Wahl can prove that the archetype contained a system of 'algebraic notation', such a system is unlikely to derive from Republican stage scripts. inquam: cf. 448, 457, 776, 917; affirmative particle, see Theslaff (1960) 36 n.1; it is properly used to strengthen an anaphora which confirms a previous statement made by the same speaker, sometimes it is also used to give impatient emphasis to an anaphora that makes reference to the other interlocutor's statement(s), e.g. Cap. 572, Mer. 776 nempe hinc me abire vis. :: volo, inquam. ah, nescis ...: cf. An. 649.

432 tris minas accudere etiam possum, ut triginta sient.
'I can lay out an extra three mines, so that it's thirty altogether.' accudere: like cudere, a term of the metal workers, see Glick (1941) 98f., that came to be used of striking coins (Mo. 892; Ht. 740). The Greek technical term is ὑπερβολῶν or ὑπερβολή, 'overbidding', see Pringsheim (1949) 288.

433-434 An interesting and sensible way of staging this would be to have stooges (in the fashion of the American Vaudeville theatre) seated in the audience to whom the players would point. Alternatively, the players could pick on some innocent 'victims' from among the actual audience and promote them to 'bidders', much to their (amusing) embarrassment. The imaginary bidders on whose behalf Demipho and Charinus say they are acting are most probably in the audience; Hoban (1988) 29 used this kind of audience involvement for her modern production of the Mercator. This form of involving the audience into the action of the play is already used in Greek comedy (cf. the beginning of Ar. V.). Demipho has turned towards someone in the audience, and Charinus pretends that he cannot see him.

433 CH. quo vortisti? DE. ad illum qui emit. CH. ubinamst is homo gentium?
quo vortisti?: Demipho has made a perceptible movement, turning away from Charinus and probably looking into the audience, cf. Am. 899f. quo te avortisti? :: ita <ingeni> ingenium meumst:/inimicos semper osa sum optuerier, Tru. 358. ubinamst is homo gentium?: cf. 606 musquam gentium, 858 quoquo gentium; ubinam introduces questions marked by urgency or emotion: surprise (Au. 821; Ht. 430, Ph. 484), impatience or exasperation (As. 328, Ba. 246, Men. 434, Ru. 391, Poen. 468, Tri. 1079; Ph. 827), impatient excitement (An. 965), rhetorical solemnity (Ht. 256); see Tarrant on Sen. Ag. 398a.
434-435 DE. eccillum video. iubet quinque me addere etiam nunc minas.
eccillum: (*ecce + illum) `there he is`.

436 CH. hercle illunc divi infelicent, quisquis est. DE. ibidem mihi
The hiatus after di is either prosodic, or could be avoided altogether by reading divi
infelicent (on such points of orthography the MSS are of little authority). The formula
would allow one to have divi, which would sound slightly more self-consciously solemn.
By contrast, the much-used set phrase ita me di ament does not bear any change to its
word-order; it is fixed by its constant use as a common expletive. Hercle illunc di(vi)
infelicit, however, is more of a genuine prayer. Cf. Cas. 246 di me et te infelicent, Ep.
13 di inmortales te infelicent, Poen. 449 di illum infelicent omnes, Ru. 885, 1225;
Caecil. Com. 114.

438 DE. numquam edepol me vincet hodie. CH. commodis poscit, pater.
vincet: for the phrasing in another `auction`-context cf. Cap. 186 numquam istoc vinces
me, St. 756 numquam edepol med istoc vinces. At this point, Demipho just drops his
mask and admits (inadvertently) to being the bidder himself (as he refers to himself, me).
hodie: The spectators naturally assume `during this play`, since as cras denotes `never`
(see 586n., 781n.) and heri `without any further action being necessary` (see 481n.),
hodie refers to the action of the play which is confined, as is usual in ancient drama, to
one day only. The most illuminating parallel for this use of hodie is perhaps Cas. 64f. is,
ne exspectetis, hodie in hac comoedia/in urbem non reedit. poscit: `bid for` (OLD s. v.
5), if not used with an accusative, poscere can govern either an ablative of price (here
and at St. 222) or genitive of price (490 tanti quanti poscil) in Plautus, see Petersmann
on St. 222. commodis: sc. minis, `of full size/weight` (`with [com-] the full measure
[modus]`), almost = integer, see OLD s. v. commodus1 1, Lodge s.v. II.A.2), cf. As. 725
viginti argenti commodas minas, Ru. 1318 talentum argenti commodum magnum.

441 potine ut ne licitere advorsum <mei> animi sententiam?
licitere: The transition from the technical sense of `bidding` to that of `contending` is
easy. Plautus seems to play with the two meanings here: `stop bidding against my wish`,
see Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 70, Thielmann (1961) 14f. potine ut = *pote-ne (est) ut, an
expression of exasperation, indicating frustration or annoyance `Will you please just ...`
(in the assumption that the other person has no intention of stopping what he is doing),
see OLD s.v. potis 3, Duckworth on Ep. 63, Gratwick on Men. 466, cf. 495, 779
potin(e) ut molestus ne sies?, 890 potin ut animo sis tranquillo? Unlike potin ut ... ne,
the expression potin ut ne occurs only here and Ba. 751, and is not found outside
Plautus. advorsum <mei> animi sententiam: cf. 377, 597 nimir tardus est advorsum
mei animi sententiam. The normal phrase to expect would be *advorsum me*; the more pompous expression *advorsum mei animi sententiam* is nicely tuned to emphasize the irritation of the speaker. In Plautus, any extravagant emotion is an opportunity for an extravagant expression.

443 sanus non est ex amore illius. quod posces feres.

*sanus non est*: love as a disease, see 263n.

444 CH. certe edepol adulescens ille, cui ego emo, efflictim perit

**efflictim perit**: ‘he is dying with love’, used with *amo* and *pereo*, cf. *Am.* 517 *efflictim deperit* (at line-end), *Cas.* 49, *Poen.* 96 and 1095 *efflictim perit* (at line-end), *Ps.* arg. II 2; *Naev.* Com. 37; *Pompon.* Atell. 42; *Apul.* Met. 5.6.7, 5.23.3. *efflictim*: ‘passionately’ (*‘as if bowled over’*); a favourite word in comedy; pre- and post-classical; it derives from *fligo* (*φλίγω*) ‘strike down’.* efflictim*: used of unfulfilled love, see Gulick (1941) 19f., e.g. *Cu.* 187 *pariter hos perire amando video, uteque insaniunt*, *Ps.* 300 *ita miser et amore pereo et inopia argentaria*; see 532n. on *deperire*, 124n. on *perii*. Similar expressions are widely used in Greek and Roman literature, see Headlam/Knox on *Herod.* *Mim.* 1.60 *ποθέων ἀποθνήσκει.*

446 CH. numquam edepol fuit neque fiet ille senex insanior

*B cc D a B cc D A / B c D A B c D; ille senex* filling a cretic (*B c D*), assuming apocope of final *-e* (monosyllabic *ill’* for disyllabic *ille*) rather than *B cc D* with ‘split anapaest’. *Ille* is the only inflected form that may undergo apocope (like the suffixes *-ce* or *-ne*, as in *audin’* or *hisc’*); this leads to the development of the article in Italian (*il’*). There are no examples of apocope of *iste* or *ipse*, nor examples like *amar’, reger’, fort’. It is possible that the liquid (semi-vocalic) quality of the preceding *-l(l)-* makes it easier for the final vowel to disappear. *numquam ... fuit neque fiet*: emphatic and slightly pompous form of strong denial much favoured by Plautus, cf. e.g. 539 *neque est neque erit*, *Am.* 553 *quod neque est neque fuit neque futurum est*, *Cap.* 605f., *Cas.* 684f., *Tri.* 1125. Compare the very similar form of strong affirmation at *Ba.* 1087, *Per.* 777f. *qui sunt, qui erunt quiunque fuerunt quiunque futuri sunt posthac/ solus ego omnibus antideo facile, miserrumus hominum ut vivam.* This type of rhetorical formula is not limited to Plautine diction, see Fordyce on *Catul.* 49.2f.; there are similar expressions in Greek, cf. e.g. *Hom.* *Od.* 16.437f. *οὐκ ἔσθ’ οὖσος ἄνηρ οὖδ’ ἐστετα οὖδ’ γένηται, ὅ... (also *Od.* 6.201); *Xen.* *Sym.* 2.10 χρή γυναικεί τῶν οὐσῶν, οίμαι ἐκ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων χαλεπακότητι*. Cf. the very similar use of present, future and perfect in Greek comedy: *Men.* fr. 538.6f. K-θ *φθόνος/φθορικὸν πεποίηκε καὶ ποιήσει καὶ ποιεῖ; Philemon fr. 95.1f. K-Α *ποίων ... ποιήσων ... πεποιηκὼς πάλαι.*
448 DE. quiesce, inquam. istanc rem ego recte videro. CH. quid ais? DE. quid est? quiesce, inquam: filling the first cretic; quiesce is disyllabic by synizesis (quīesce). This is to be preferred to assuming iambic shortening and measuring bb C D, qui- as a syllable containing a naturally long vowel is more unwilling to undergo iambic shortening than would be e.g. -bant in probant (where it is the consonants that lengthen the vowel). There is inscriptional evidence for a weakening of -i- after qu- in spoken Latin (e.g. quescas, inquetare, cesquant > quiescant), see LHS I 130. On synizesis at the beginning of trochaic septenarii see Lindsay (1922) 213, Drexler (1969) 242, Soubiran on Mil. 214. istanc rem ego recte videro: ‘I’ll look after this affair’, cf. e.g. 450 ego aliquid videro, Ad. 845. The future denotes that the action will certainly be carried out, postponing the consideration of a difficulty, cf. e.g. An. 456, Hec. 701, Ad. 538, 845, see LHS II 323.

449 non ego illam mancipio accepi. DE. sed ille illam accipiet. sine. mancipio: Charinus objects that Pasicompsa was bought without mancipatio, the solemn form of transaction needed for a valid transfer of possession when selling res mancipi (land, slaves, cattle), see Watson (1965) 75 n.2. For the importance of mancipatio in such transfers cf. Cu. 494-498, Per. 524-527, 532 nisi mancipio accipio, quid eo mihi opust mercimonio?; Mil. 23. On mancipatio in general see Zulueta (1949) 36-44, OCD3 s.v. accipiet: In Demipho’s answer the word may be understood to mean ‘entertain (as a guest)’, a meaning common in Plautus (cf. 99 decumbo acceptus hilare atque ampliter) and Terence (e.g. Eu. 1081, ironically at Ad. 166) instead of the technical ‘receive under mancipium’. ille illam: Plautus, and to a lesser extent Terence, show a predilection for placing different cases of the same word together, e.g. Mil. 101 ille illam, An. 772 illa illum; Per. 775a amantem amanti, Am. 726 vigilans vigilantem, Ad. 668 praesens praesenti. sine not = noli prohibere, as Enk ad loc. explains, but = quiesce (cf. 448), cf. Cu. 92. For the threatening character of the imperative cf. Au. 425, Hec. 707, see Stockert on Au. 425.

450 CH. non potes tu lege vendere illam. DE. ego aliquid videro. lege: ‘by law’, ‘lawfully’, an ablative of manner, see Woodcock (1959) 34, cf. e.g. An. 799; contrast lex = ‘condition’ at 817-829. ego aliquid videro: ‘I will find some other way’, see 448n.

451 CH. post autem communest illa mihi cum alio. qui scio

Watson (1968) 124 n.7 sees an allusion to the actio communi dividendo, which was available in all cases for the division of common property except where co-ownership was the result of an hereditas coming to co-heirs. In Athens, shared possession of hetairai was not uncommon, e.g. the purchase of Neaera by Leucas and Timanoridas [Dem.] 59.29, cf. ibid. 59.47 and Lysias 4, quoted by Davidson (1997) 333 n.70. For the
audience, this is wonderfully conceived irony. Charinus says this in the belief that he is
telling his father a lie, but of course he is telling the truth without knowing it: Pasicompsa
is indeed shared between him, Charinus, and someone else - his father! post = postremo,
see Gratwick on Men. arg. 6.

452 quid sit ei animi, venirene eam velit an non velit?
quid ... animi: partitive genitive, cf. e.g. Am. 58, 689.

453 DE. ego scio velle. CH at pol ego esse credo aliquem qui non velit.
ego scio velle: The subject of the accusative and infinitive is not only omitted when the
subjects of the two clauses are identical, but also, less regularly, when the subjects are
different, cf. Am. 935, Cap. 565, Cu. 325, Per. 651, St. 71, 82, 265, 336, 367.

454 DE. quid id mea refert? CH. quia illi suam rem esse aequomst in manu.
quid id mea refert: ‘Why should I care?’, cf. 906 quid tua referat? On the different use
of the phrase see Melander (1910) 177-179 (in Plautus, regularly with referat, except for
Am. 1003, Ru. 1086; in Terence regularly with ellipsis, except for Ph. 723). The word-
order is fixed, except for quid id referat tua at line-end (e.g. Cas. 330), see LHS II 84.
esse ... in manu: in manu esse denotes legal control or possession, particularly of male
relatives over a female, see Watson (1975) 51. The phrase istuc tibi est in manu ‘that
depends on you’, ‘that is up to you’, is a colloquial development from that; it is used
frequently in comedy, e.g. 628, Am. 80, 564, Ba. 144, Mo. 594, Poen. 52, 912, Ru. 983,

455 DE. quid ais? CH. communis mihi illa est cum illo: is hic nunc non adest.
quid ais?: usually merely calling attention to a following remark (‘hey listen’, see
516n.); it can also be used in reference to a remark just made by another character,
asking for an opinion, cf. 535, Ba. 600, Cap. 577, Cu. 190, Mo. 959, Ru. 981. Here
Charinus misunderstands quid ais? as asking for an opinion; Demipho was preparing a
question (cf. 456 prius respondes quam rogo), and asks it at 458f., see Schmidt (1959)
221; for a similar misunderstanding cf. Men. 162.

456 DE. prius respondes quam rogo. CH. prius tu emis quam vendo, pater.
An instance of par pari respondere (cf. 142, 629), see Wallochny (1992) 166 n.111. The
statement prius tu emis quam vendo is of considerable interest. At last, it seems, Plautus
has Charinus state clearly what is going on. No imaginary mandatary is mentioned; the
conflict becomes - if only for a half-line - that between father and son. prius ... emis
quam: priusquam with the present tense (instead of perfect, cf. 155 prius quam sum
elocutus scis si mentiri volo) is rare but not unparalleled, cf. Men. 276 (with reference to a particular event in present time).

457 nescio, inquam, velit ille illam necne abalienarier.
abalienarier: occurs predominantly in amorous contexts in the broadest sense, cf. As. 765, Cu. 174, Mil. 1321, Ps. 95, Tri. 513, 557; not in Terence (alienare is used at Ht. 979 of intra-familial rejection). It is probably a transfer of a legal usage (cf. the technical term alienatio) to the field of love.

458-459 Dieterle (1980) 202 has pointed out the peculiarity of this situation. Although Demipho realizes that Charinus’ argument is flawed and explodes his intrigue, he does not realize that there is an intrigue in the first place. The reason for this slightly unusual construction is dramaturgical: the play needs to be kept going. To achieve that, one needs to grant the senex a temporary triumph.

458 quid? illi quoidam qui mandavit tibi si emetur, tum volet,
illi quoidam: ‘that friend of yours whose name you have not yet told me’, cf. Tri. 342
sed ego hoc verbum quem illi quoidam dico.

459 si ego emo illi qui mandavit, tum ille nolet? nihil agis.
nihil agis: Greek οὐδὲν λέγετις (or φλοιντείς), ‘you’re wasting my time’, ‘it’s useless’, cf. e.g. Tri. 916, 976, Ad. 935.

460 numquam edepol quisquam illam habebit potius quam ille quem ego volo.
In Roman law the peculium remained part of the father’s property and was subject to his patria postestas, see OCD³ s.v., Kaser (1986) 79. In Athenian law a son over seventeen years of age was probably given at least some control over his finances, see MacDowell (1978) 91. Instead of arguing from his patria potestas right from the beginning, especially since Charinus had already acknowledged at 353 that Demipho has the ultimate right of disposal over Pasicompsa, Demipho chose to get involved in a discussion of legal technicalities.

461 CH. certumnest? DE. censen certum esse? quin ad navim iam hinc eo,
censen certum esse?: ‘well, what do you think?’; ‘echo’ of the original question; on the use of ‘questions’ as confirmative replies see Theslaff (1960) 45; such locutions have in common the idea of an interrogatory or exclamatory reference to the antecedant with the ultimate purpose of making its confirmation seem self-evident and a questioning of its validity unnecessary, cf. e.g. As. 838, Ba. 121; Eu. 191.
ibiv enibit. CH. vin me tecum illo ire? DE. nolo. CH. non places.
vin = visne; with accusative and infinitive to describe a (hypothetical) development, see
Schmitfranz (1910) 54, cf. 150 vin tu mihi opsequentem esse an nevis? non places: ‘I’m
not amused.’

CH. tu prohibes. DE. at me incusato: te fecisse sedulo.
at me incusato: ‘oh! of course, blame me’, see Lindsay (1907) 94. te fecisse sedulo: Cf.
Enk ad loc. “se fecisse sedulo solebat dicere qui a se culpam avertebant.” Cf. Pers. 46
hoc meumst ut faciam sedulo.

ad portum ne bitas, dico iam tibi. CH. auscultabitur.
However grudgingly, Charinus has to obey his father. The main characteristic of the
father-son relationship in Plautus is that of the son’s obedience and the father’s authority,
see Wlosok (1990) 52f.: “Bei Plautus fällt […] auf, daß trotz aller Komik, und zwar einer
massiven, derben Komik, die Autorität des Vaters unangetastet bleibt und große Strenge,
selbst unmenschliche Härte keinen Verlust seines Ansehens bewirken. Zu einer echten
Auseinandersetzung zwischen Vater und Sohn im Sinne eines menschlichen Konfliktes
kommt es aber gar nicht. Das Verhältnis zwischen beiden ist fast unpersönlich und als
bloßes Rechts-und Herrschaftverhältnis dargestellt. In den Stücken des Plautus ist die
Beziehung zwischen Vater und Sohn letztlich nur mittelbar, sie geht über den Sklaven
und dessen handfeste Intrige.”

Wlosok is right in drawing attention to the fact that the formal aspects of the
father-son relationship are often emphasized in Plautine comedy. However, she
overstates her case by claiming that real conflicts between father and son are never
presented and that the scheming slave is the only intermediary agent establishing a
relation between the two. This claim falls flat in plays like Mercator which do not have a
scheming slave. Indeed, the final scene of this play contains what could be described as
an overthrow of paternal authority. Demipho, when confronted with the facts, does not
insist on having it his way, but is driven by his feelings of shame, guilt, and fear (cf. 983,
993f., 1004) to admit his defeat and allow Charinus, grudgingly, to keep the girl (cf.
988f.). He is concerned to retain Pax between himself and his son; he does not want him
to be iratus (cf. 991f.). This desire to keep peace actually leads him to reduce himself to
a supplicant (Plautus uses client-patron terminology) and ask Eutychus for help (995f.).
Demipho’s wife does not get more than one half-line (1004), and it is apparent that
Demipho is more worried about not endangering the relationship with his son than about
having to face domestic trouble. This short and effective sketch of the emotional
situation of Demipho’s family could as well be found in a Greek play. bitas: rare and
archaic word for ire, cf. Cu. 141, Ps. 254, not in Terence; also in compounds (adbitere,
interbitere, perbitere, praetertibiter, rebitere). auscultabitur: with accusative ‘hear’,
(cf. 477, 568), with dative ‘obey’; cf. Au. 237, Mo. 586, Ru. 694, Poen. 311, St. 146. For the use of the impersonal passive see 776 abibitur; both instances seem to show that the speaker is somehow in a ‘distanced’ mood.

466-468 An example of the common technique of involving the exits by one or two characters in order to plan or execute action in comedy (cf. e.g. Mer. 498, 587, 663-666, 689-691, 815f., 952-956; Au. 694f., Cas. 502-514, Mo. 1036-1040, Per. 77f., Ps. 571f.; Eu. 921), exceptionally also used by Seneca (Ag. 308f.), see Johnston (1933) 148. This short passage can be classified as a ‘quasi-monologue’ functioning as an exit monologue (see 817-829n.), see Prescott (1942) 3 n.8. Prescott is wrong in assuming that the lines are overheard by Eutychus, for if they were, he would know that it is his father who later buys Pasicompsa, but he does not (615, 635, 637, 638-641), and indeed the latter part of the play relies on that fact so much that Eutychus’ ἄγνωστοι may be regarded as an integral part of the fabric of the play (cf. esp. 803-816).

467 sed Lysimacho amico mandabo. is se ad portum dixerat
Demipho speaks the words while already on his way ad portum. Cf. 326, where Lysimachus tells Demipho he is going to the harbour, where he has a negotium. It is clear that Charinus is not supposed to hear these words, probably because he is too absorbed with his misfortune, see Barbieri (1966) 256. It is possible that with ibo ad portum (466) Demipho has turned around and gone off towards the exit. Then he turns and looks (conspiratorially) at the audience, saying: ne hic resciscat opust. The purchase of the girl itself will not take place on stage. When Lysimachus enters with Pasicompsa (499), the sale is already over. This has been noted by many scholars, e.g. Marti (1959) 26, who thinks it an impossibility that the people on board the ship cannot remember to whom Pasicompsa was sold when they are later asked about the sale by Eutychus (635-637).

468 ire dudum. me moror quom hic asto. - CH. nullus sum, occidi.
me moror: ‘I’m wasting my time’ (lit. ‘I’m delaying myself’), cf. 930, Ep. 305, 631, 694, Men. 156, Mo. 1061, Poen. 1294, St. 445. After this formulaic self-address, the speaker either turns towards a new activity (Cis. 692, Mer. 930) or goes off (as is the case here), unless something unforeseen happens which attracts the attention of the character and motivates his staying on stage (Mo. 1062, Poen. 1294), see Petersmann on St. 445. Terence uses the verb less frequently and more restrictedly, notably never with an accusative, see McGlynn s.v. occidi: almost the same as perii; also at line-end at 833.
III. Discussion

Wallochny (1992) 138f. links this scene to what the audience are told by Charinus and Acanthio about Demipho's character in the exposition. She shows that Demipho is first presented to the audience as a *pater durus*. However, from the first mention of him by a character other than his son (by Acanthio at 198-203) and upon his first appearance on stage (225), Demipho is presented as a *senex libidinosus*.

Wallochny (1992) 139, 187f., and Lefèvre (1995) 26-31, 43f. argue for Plautine authorship of most of II.3. Their main arguments are: (a) lack of dramatic economy, as the continuation of the action is suspended for most of this scene to the advantage of long passages of verbal conflict; (b) lacking verisimilitude and logic of the dialogue as such; (c) expressions and discourse strategies deriving from Roman orality (*par pari respondere*), reminiscent of Fescennine abuse, at 384f., 426f., 456f., the use of the trochaic septenarius, reminding of the Roman practice of *occentatio*, further isocolon, rhyme, and alliteration. Argument (a) is subjective. As elsewhere in ancient and modern drama, the playwright seems simply to have been more interested in setting a mood and exploring the characters' motivations than in developing his plot quickly. Argument (b) is only partly correct. The peculiar nature of the dialogue can be explained by the dramatic aim the playwright had in mind, namely to confront two rivalling characters on stage without their noticing anything. This scene is, first and foremost, the encounter of two stock characters, *adulescens amator* and *senex amator* who cannot face each other directly without bringing the play to an abrupt end, especially since they are father and son (see 390-461n.). Argument (c) can only be used to prove that Plautus' surface style is uniform, and that he has been able to compose a coherent text from whatever he used as his model; the *occentatio* alluded to in 408 is not, as Lefèvre (1995) 31 thinks, the procedure described by Usener (1901), see note ad loc.

However, the unusually long stalling of one actor on stage while another delivers a monody and the absence of a greeting routine when the two characters finally catch sight of each other may be circumstantial evidence allowing us to assume that the opening section of this scene has been somewhat modified. Yet, it must remain unclear to what extent. The same applies for the dialogue, but here again Plautus has covered his tracks, e.g. none of the passages 396-399, 405-411, or 413-417 can confidently be claimed for either Plautus or Philemon.
I. Introduction

1. Eutychus’ Function and the Absence of a *servus callidus*

After the unsuccessful meeting with his father, Charinus’ girlfriend is about to be sold off. He is at the end of his tether (468) and laments his fate (469-473) in a short link monologue. These lines serve to illustrate the character of their speaker without describing plot action, see Hines (1973) 9. Dramaturgically, the present situation is a dead end. Something has to happen, otherwise the play would be over much too soon, with the *senex amator* triumphant. The spectators know that such an outcome would be contrary to the conventions of the genre. As a consequence, tension is created while they speculate about possible ways to set the ball rolling again.

They know that Demipho is going to enlist the help of Lysimachus (467), and it is perhaps not unreasonable to expect that Charinus will, in turn, also be helped by someone, a character whose appearance would, in that case, be due shortly. A prime candidate for such a dramatic ‘job’ would be Acanthio (as *servus callidus*), whose first appearance on stage (111-224) did not leave the audience with the impression that it was his last and that he could not later on return to advance his and Charinus’ primary intrigue (cf. 210-222), mainly because he was not introduced as a typical προσωπον προσωπικόν and given a more active and independent role in the dialogue with Charinus. It is only with hindsight that this treatment of Acanthio’s character can be interpreted as part of a carefully worked-out dramaturgical plan.

The spectators will be surprised to see that the playwright has assigned the role of *opitulator* not to Acanthio, but to Eutychus, Charinus’ *amicus et sodalis* (475), whose existence has not been mentioned or suggested indirectly before at all. This surprise effect is intensified by the way that Eutychus is introduced. He informs Charinus that he has overheard ‘everything’ from the doorway (477), where he has presumably been standing for some time during the dialogue between Demipho and Charinus. It is not stated but may be inferred by the audience that Eutychus is Lysimachus’ son, since they see him coming out of the same house as Lysimachus did and since both are Demipho’s *vicini* (271, 475).

2. Eutychus’ Eavesdropping

Eutychus’ sudden appearance is remarkable, since the entering character who becomes eavesdropper usually has a short entrance speech to motivate his entrance and to call the attention of the spectators to the new character on stage, see Prescott (1939) 8. Eutychus, however, appears entirely unexpectedly. Indeed, it would be most effective to stage the scene with Eutychus not being visible until line 474, and it would indeed spoil
much of the agon-like character of the auction scene if Eutychus’ presence was in some way indicated to the audience. The answer to the question exactly how he could shelter from view for such a long time invites speculation, but we may assume the existence of some kind of porch in front of Lysimachus’ house (477).

It is not clear for how long Eutychus has been present, but in view of what is said in 478-480 one might stage the scene by having him enter at about 456. Like Davus in Terence’s *Andria* (346f., 352, with *scio* occurring twice at line-end also, as *Mer.* 476f.; it is just possible that the Terentian lines hark back to the present ones; note similarly the use of the phrase *rem tenes* *An.* 349 ~ *Mer.* 478), Eutychus states that he knows ‘everything’ already and thus makes further - repetitive - explanation unnecessary. Donatus (on Ter. *An.* 347) calls the lines an example of *compendium*, economy, and instead of taking Plautus to task for putting Eutychus on stage in this manner, as was done by Lefèvre (1995) 14, one should perhaps credit Plautus and/or Philemon with the mastery of the principle of *oikovomía*. Whereas Demipho’s eavesdropping in the previous scene had been previously announced and dramaturgically prepared for but remained ultimately unsuccessful (330, 333; aside at 364f.), Eutychus’ eavesdropping remained unannounced and had not been prepared for but proves to have been very effective. On the standard formulae used to introduce eavesdropping see Barsby on *Ba.* 404.

The eavesdropper is usually not mute but at least assigned some asides (like Demipho at 364f.). There are, however, parallels for unannounced eavesdropping (i.e. eavesdropping that is neither explicitly nor implicitly announced or prepared for) combined with a ‘silent’ and unnoticed entrance, see Hiatt (1946) 19f., who compares *Ru.* 906-938, 1227, both of which are unclear cases, *Mil.* 1090, *Hec.* 607, Frost (1988) 11f. (on the various conventions in Menander), and Arnott (1965) *passim*; see also Gomme/Sandbach (1973) 259f. and Ireland on Men. *Dysc.* 821. Leaning forward through a half-opened door is explicitly described as a strategy of listening secretly to a private conversation at Men. *Epit.* 883-892 (883f. πρὸς ταῖς θύραις γυρίς ἐνδον ἀφτιῶς πολὺν / χρόνον διακούστων). For other cases in Menander see Frost (1988) 96f., 100; *Eu.* 941f. is probably not a case in point, see Arnott (1965) 373-376 and Barsby ad loc.

Eutychus’ very first words identify him as the *sodalis opitulator*, one of the stock characters of Philemonian comedy on the testimony of Apul. *Flor.* 16, see Webster (1970) 135, who is going to save the day for his friend (475 *tuos amicus et sodalis*), or even as an embodiment of *Τοξή* herself (*qui me revocat? :: Eutychus;* cf. 601 *Eutyche!*), just at the point where Charinus is so ‘desperate’ that he asks himself *cur non morior?* (471). Indeed, Eutychus - rather *like a servus callidus*, but not, as Krysinski-Józefowicz (1949) 12-14 thought, *instead of a servus callidus* (of the Greek model) - honours his name by helping his friend and suggesting the deception of Demipho (485 *vin patri sublinere pulchre me os tuo?*). Furthermore, it will be Eutychus who eventually straightens out the tangled web of the plot in V.2 and 4.
3. The Function of II.4
In the course of the scene, Charinus is, once again, presented as a love-lorn *adulescens amator*. His violent mood-swings, his suicidal thoughts, and his cluelessness are stock-in-trade and already known to the audience from his monologues in I 1 and particularly II 3 (335-363), but his insistence on mad and stupid behaviour adds another dimension to his performance of the *amator* (495 *potin ut aliud cures? :: non potest*; he shows a similar self-consciousness of the role of the comic *amator* at 647).

As a consequence of planning his father’s deception (485-495, the second intrigue of the play), Charinus is notably cheered up by Eutychus’ infectious confidence, when the latter leaves for the harbour to buy the girl for him. This fact is underlined by the use of military imagery at the end of the scene (497 *vale, vince et me serva*; 498 *face cum praeda recipias*); Charinus sees himself in the possession of the *praeda* (Pasicompsa) - a slightly surprising word to be used by a lover to refer to his beloved - and puts his trust in Eutychus’ abilities: As a result of this scene, which is crucial to the continuation of the play, the party of the *adulescens amator* is back in the game again.

II. Commentary

469-473 Charinus’ link monologue
469-470 Pentheus had an easy life compared with me
471-473 I think I should commit suicide; I’ll get some poison from the doctor

469-470 Laments of unhappy young lovers containing grotesquely hyperbolical mythological comparisons are not infrequently found in Plautine comedy, see Fraenkel (1960) 7-20, cf. e.g. *Cis.* 205-212, *Per.* 1-6 (Toxilus the slave as parody of an *adulescens amator*), see Fantham (1972) 101 and 113, Stärk (1991) 143 n.11. In Greek society, it was seen as unmanly or foolish to lament one’s misfortune, see Dover (1974) 168; it is part of the role of ‘young lover’ to display undue self-pity following from a state of mental derangement, brought about by the disease called ‘love’, see Dover (1974) 210f.

Other burlesque exaggerations and extravagant comparisons independent of the love theme can be found in many places in Plautine comedy, cf. the passages quoted by Hines (1973) 38. Mythological and historical comparisons are also used in New Comedy, cf. the passages listed by Ireland on Men. *Dysc.* 153 (Perseus): Men. fr. 198 K-Th (Eros), 718 K-Th (Prometheus); Aristophon fr. 11 K-A (Eros); Antiphanes fr. 157 K-A (Scythians); *Ba.* 925-978 (Troy), *Mo.* 775-782 (Alexander the Great, Agathocles), of which the reference to Prometheus comes perhaps closest to the present passage.
Fraenkel (1960) 8, followed by Flury (1968) 21 n.29 and 83, and Lefèvre (1995) 15, notes the bizarre nature of the present comparison and attributes the beginning of this monologue to Plautus. He compares in particular Ba. 925-935 and St. 274f. See, however, Zagagi (1980) 53f., who lists a number of Greek parallels for the use of such hyperbolical comparisons, Blundell (1980) 45f., Stockert on Au. 701-704. The possibility that this type of expression has its background in the Greek original cannot be excluded, see Law (1926) 372, who thought it by no means impossible that Plautus found such comparisons in the Greek plays very much in the form in which he presented them. At any rate, it is dangerous to use any such criterion for determining what is Plautine and what is Greek in Plautus. Less convincingly Enk ad loc., while regarding the lines as Philemonian in origin, compares Vid. fr. I (from Diphilus’ Σχεδία) on the unproven assumption, following Kunst (1919) 142, that Diphilus and Philémon had much in common, similarly Calderan on Vid. fr. I.

469 CH. Pentheus diripuisse aiunt Bacchas: nugas maxumas
B c D A bb C D A / B C D A B c D; notable homoeoteleuta in the metrically heavy lecythion.

1. The Reference to Pentheus
Pentheus was probably known to the Romans through other plays adapted from the Greek dramatic tradition that had developed round this character. At any rate, his fate featured very frequently in Greek tragedy: Apart from the perhaps most influential dramatization, Euripides’ Bacchae, plays of this title were written by Thespis, Aeschylus, and others. The theme was also treated outside tragedy, e.g. by Theocritus Id. 26, who describes the dismembering of Pentheus in gruesome detail. Roman tragedies dealing with Pentheus and the Bacchae are known to have been written by Pacuvius (Pentheus) and Accius (Bacchae), both modelled on Euripides (Pacuvius used additional material), see Rose (1926), Haffter (1966), Ribbeck (1875) 280ff., 569-576. Gruen (1990) 151 n.142 speculates that the familiarity with the Pentheus myth may derive from direct knowledge of the Euripidean Bacchae in Rome, which is beyond proof.

If the allusion to Pentheus was already used in the Emporos, Philémon may have played on Πενθέως and πόσις here, which was common in Greek literature, cf. the examples given by Gow on Theocr. Id. 26.26. Plautus would have had to substitute this word-play with a different tertium comparationis, and the imagery of ‘being torn apart’ would thus be an innovation on his part. Later, in Verg. Aen. 4.469, Dido in her madness is compared to demens ... Pentheus, and it seems that Pentheus is regarded as an almost ‘paradigmatic’ madman, an interpretation of his character that can be traced to Pacuvius’ Pentheus, who seems to have put on stage a mad Pentheus seeing the Eumenides, see
Haflter (1966) 293. Insofar it is possible that what Charinus is actually trying to say here is, 'I am a mad, torn-apart, suffering schizophrenic.'

2. The Reference to the Bacchae
References to the Bacchants, the Pentheus myth, the Bacchanalia, and the cult of Dionysus (Bacchus), on which see the introduction to Dodds (1960), are not infrequent in Plautus, cf. Am. 703 (the only instance of Baccha in the singular, proving that the term could be used generically of a 'raving madwoman'), Au. 408, 411 (bacchanal 'madhouse'), Ba. 53 (a pun on the name Bacchis), 371, Cas. 979-981 (perhaps they are also mentioned in the heavily damaged passage 983-990), Men. 834, Mil. 858 (bacchanal 'wild orgy'), 1016 (general allusion), perhaps also Ps. 109f.

There are no references in Terence, but there seem to be several references in other dramatists, see Gruen (1990) 51 with n. 81, and cf. esp. Ennius' Athamas, Trag. 120-124 J. (107-111 R.) with Jocelyn ad loc., see further Rousselle (1986/87) passim.

The cult of Bacchus had begun to exert some influence on a number of Roman citizens in Plautus' lifetime, see Gruen (1990) 150-152, Gratwick on Men. 835, and some of the passages cited above may indeed allude to this increasingly important factor of public life, as it may well have become a common topic in the drama of the time, see Stockert (1972). Rousselle (1986/87) 195 goes too far by holding the modernizing view that "the plays of Livius Andronicus, Plautus, Naevius, and Ennius presented a negative model of ecstatic Dionysiac worship and may well have played a part in forming public opinion before the persecution began." Despite of what is said by Cic. Leg. 2.14 (Bacchanalia: quid autem mihi displiceat in sacris nocturnis, poetae indicant comici, taking the comic poets as authority), such mechanisms of exerting influence on public opinion by using the 'media' are not likely to have been of crucial importance in Plautus' Rome.

The closest parallel to the present line is Vid. fr. I eiusdem Bacchae fecerunt nostram navem Pentheum. Actually, to understand (and visualize) this comparison, the spectators do not need to know more than that 'there was a man called Pentheus, and he was brutally dismembered by some madwomen called Bacchae.' On the equation Bacchae = 'madwomen', see also the following paragraph.

3. The Bacchae, Pentheus, and the Dating of Plautine Comedy
The references to Bacchae, the Bacchic cult, and the myth of Pentheus here and elsewhere in Plautus (see the passages mentioned above) do not contribute to either the relative or the absolute dating of his plays, pace Boyancé (1940), MacCary (1975), MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 979f., Pailler (1988) 230-238, Stockert (1972), Schuhmann (1977).
It would have been enough for a spectator to have had a simplistic equation like £\textit{Bacchae} = 'wild, weird Greek women' (cf. Cic. \textit{Fam.} 7.23.2 \textit{bacchæs istas cum Mūsis Metelli comparas}; like the generalising use of the Greek word βάκχου, see \textit{LSJ} s. v.) in mind to understand all of the allusions, see Pailler (1988) 141: "Dans le cas de Plaute, il est [...] évident qu'il fait de l'élément bachique un usage systématique pour connoter la présentation caricaturale de scènes et de personnages délirants." The description of the \textit{Bacchae} as 'matrons excited by madness' in the Accian tragedy of that title points in the same direction (cf. \textit{Acc. Trag.} 236 \textit{vagant matronae percitatae insania}). Moreover, the references to the Bacchants are of an episodic nature, and the motif is not developed any further in the remaining parts of the plays.

It is certainly true that the topicality of the theme would go some way towards explaining the frequency with which Bacchants and Bacchanalia are mentioned in Plautus' plays. In particular, the statement that 'now no Bacchants play' (\textit{Cas.} 979-981) is almost universally (and probably correctly) seen as a reference to the 'Bacchanalian Affair', see Gruen (1990) 34-78, which culminated in a senatorial decree of 186 BC forbidding the worship of Bacchus (Dionysus), cf. the report in Liv. 39.8-19, dating the play to between 186 and 184 BC, the supposed year of Plautus' death, see MacCary/Willcock (1976) ad loc.

Following this line of argument, many scholars have made the far-reaching assumption that all references to Bacchants in Plautine comedy are a product of the same topicality, see e.g. della Corte (1967) 81, Lefèvre (1982) 36 and nn. 148-150. A more cautious view is taken by Barsby on \textit{Ba.} 53, who points out rightly that, even if all or most of them were topical, the allusions to the Bacchants are so numerous indeed "as to make them a doubtful criterion for dating." It is a moot point whether allusions to the Bacchants come from the Greek originals or are to be regarded as Plautine additions and whether the cult is seen more through Roman or Greek eyes in these passages; the view that has most to speak for it is perhaps that of Rousselle (1986/87) 195 that the references come from the Greek originals.

Frost on \textit{Am.} 703-705 has made the plausible suggestion that we should distinguish between two types of Bacchic references in Plautus, (a) those where the \textit{Bacchae} are associated with some kind of criminal activity or sexual debauchery (the 'Roman-style' secret society), e.g. at \textit{Ba.} 53, 371-372 (sexual debauchery), \textit{Cas.} 978-979 (theft), \textit{Mil.} 1016 (secret password), and (b) those which refer directly to the killing of Pentheus or other aspects of the Greek myth, as here, \textit{Am.} 703-705, \textit{Au.} 408f., \textit{Vid.} fr. 1. Whereas, however, it is certainly true that this distinction can (and should) be made and that the examples falling under (a) are more likely to be 'Plautine' than to be 'Greek', the reverse is incapable of proof, but at least they preclude the use of such passages as an undebatable sign of the Roman origin of each such passage.
diripuisse: 'to have been caught and torn to pieces', cf. Poen. 646, An. 260; in the present line the curae are compared to the Bacchae, and the animus of the lover to Pentheus. This is the nucleus of the mythological comparison, the idea on which the application of the exemplum of Pentheus hinges, see Fraenkel (1960) 50 n.2 who compares a fragment from Antiphanes' Νεκάντικος (fr. 164 K-A), but points out that Plautus would treat the same passage by making the connection between the mythological foil and the action much more immediate, whereas the Greek playwright only hints at the myth. It is hard to see on what basis (other than an impressionistic judgement of taste) Fraenkel makes this distinction. The scene of Pentheus being torn apart was a motif in pictorial arts, see LIMC VII.1 310f. for a list of about a dozen depictions of the tearing-apart of Pentheus, some probably influenced by theatrical performances. For further pictorial evidence from, see also Dodds (1960) xxxiii-xxxvi, Bulas (1932/33) 246-248. aiunt: 'the story goes that'; regularly used to introduce proverbial expressions or, as here, a mythological exemplum, e.g. Ba. fr. XV, 949, 953, 962, Cas. 398, Mo.775 (historical comparison), Ps. 199, Tri. 549, Ht. 1036, Eu. 585; cf. the use of memorant (Ps. 199), cluent (Ba. 925), praedicant (Ba. 962, cf. Men. 715), perhibetur (St. 274) and of φοσσι (Diph. fr. 29 K-A; Men. Dysc. 433, Epit. 440, Peric. 291, Sam. 503, fr. 351.3 K-Th); λέγοντες (Philem. fr. 93 K-A); see Reinhardt (1974) 197 n.2.

470 fuisse credo, praeut quo pacto ego diversae distrahor.
B c D A / B C D A / bb C D A / B c D; fuisse by synizesis, see Questa (1967) 80; praeut always a long monosyllable by synizesis in Plautus, cf. Men. 376, 935, pace Soubiran on Mil. 20; emphatic ego heading the lecythion, following metrical hiatus after pacto, see Drexler (1932) II 261f. For the phrasing cf. Cis. 206-210, Tri. 409f., Turp. Com. 109f. intercapedine interficior, desiderio differor, / tu mihi cupiditas, suavitudo et mei animi expectatio; distraho is associated with worry, cf. An. 260 curae, quae meum animum diversae trahunt, Cic. Off. 1.9, Tac. Ann. 2.40.1, 4.40.6; Amm. Marcell. 22.10.1. praeut quo pacto: 'in comparison with how ...'; see Langen (1880) 31f., Enk ad loc. Gratwick on Men. 376; LHS II 595 is wrong in stating that either praeut or quo pacto is logically redundant.

471-473 Suicide in Comedy
Suicidal thoughts are common with lovers in comedy, especially when their love-affairs seem doomed, cf. e.g. As. 606-610, 613, 615, Cis. 638-641, Ep. 148, Mil. 1240-1241, Ps. 89-111; Ht. 971, Ph. 686; Men. Dysc. 379, Adelphoi fr. 7 K-Th (changed by Terence, see Don. on Ad. 275); Afran. Com. 151f., see Legrand (1910) 199f., Wehrli (1936) 51, Haffter (1953) 96, Rieth/Gaiser (1964) 40. The unhappily besotted young man contemplating suicide is also found in other genres, esp. elegy and novel, see Hollis
on Ov. Ars 1.372, Post (1940) 431, Polonskaya (1967) 55f. (who rightly explains the absence of a psychological motivation for the suicidal threats with the conventionality of the motif), Blume (1998) 152 with n.68. A character in Philemon fr. 172 K-A (θανεῖν κράτιστον ἐστὶν ἢ ζῆν ἄλιῳς), perhaps a young lover in distress, also seems to consider suicide.

On suicide in Roman literature and life see Grisé (1980). Suicide was a rare phenomenon among the Romans of the second century BC. On suicide and the ambiguous (partly condemning, partly approving) attitudes towards it in Greece and Rome, see further Dover (1974) 168f. and OCD3 s. v. suicide and the works cited there, add Walcot (1986). On the suicide theme in ancient drama in general, see Katsouris (1976), for its exploitation in Greek and Roman comedy especially pp. 22-36, emphasizing the fact that the tone that is found in connection with suicidal thoughts is, as one might expect, often modelled on that of tragedy; Katsouris' brief discussion of the suicide motif in the Mercator does no justice to the importance of the motif in this play. He compares the suicidal thoughts uttered by other ill-starred lovers (Polemon in Men. Peric., Thrasimedes in Men. Mis.; Argyrippus in As., Stratippocles in Ep., Calidorus in Ps., Alcæsimarchus in Cis.; Pamphilus and Charinus in An., Antipho and Phaedria in Ph.), sometimes by a woman (Planesium in Cu.) or a senex amator (Lysidamus in Cas.). A more recent study by Basaglia (1991), specifically devoted to the suicide motif in Plautine comedy, deals just as superficially with the present passage. A more detailed study remains a desideratum.

471 cur ego vivo? cur non morior? quid mihist in vita boni?
B cc DA / B C dd A / B C D A B c D; the first two questions fill BcDA twice, the last question fills the lecythion. This series of (rhetorical) questions expresses the same view that is commonly found in gnomic expressions in drama, e.g. A. Prom. 750f., E. Tro. 637 τοῦ ζῆν δὲ λυπρός κρείσσων ἐστὶ καταθνεῖν, Med. 502-505, essentially going back to Homer (e.g. Il. 9.410-416). Rhetorical questions are frequent in unhappy lovers’ monologues; a series of despairing deliberative questions, filled with emotion, is one of the features of the lament elsewhere in poetry, cf. e.g. Catul. 64.177-187, see Austin on Verg. A. 4.305-330, Thomas on Verg. G. 4.322-325. cur ...? cur ...? quid ...?: triadic series of questions affecting emotional intensity, cf. Ad. 799f.

472 certumst, ibo ad medicum atque ibi me toxico morti dabo,
Kryspinieł-Józefowicz (1949) 11f., following Fraenkel (1960) 8 in regarding lines 469f. as a Plautine addition, argues that 472f. were also not in the Emporos, as they would badly cohere with the rest of the play: “Quamquam enim Charinus simili modo ac iuvenes in aliis fabulis (cf. in Cistellaria scenam IV 1, ubi Alcæsimarchus sibi mortem consciscere vult), se sibi vitam adempturum esse minatur, tamen hoc consilium neque perficere
conabitur neque usquam in fabula Plautina ad eam rem redibit." Further, since Charinus later decides to go into exile, Krysiniel-Józefowicz argues that the latter decision is the original, taken from Philemon, while the former was inserted at an earlier point. It is not quite true that this is Charinus' only remark about suicide, since at 660 Charinus probably uses a euphemism for suicide. Furthermore, the suicide motif is linked with the medicus motif, which in turn hinges on the character of Eutychus, the sodalis opitulator, and since Eutychus offers his help, the doctor Charinus needs will no longer sell poison but offer some less drastic cure for his morbus. It is hard to detect anything here that could not have been in the Greek play. certumst, ibo: parataxis, cf. e.g. 546 certumst, antiqua recolam et servibo mihi, Am. 1048, As. 248, Cap. 778. ad medicum: cf. 489, 951 (medicus-theme). The question arises whether doctors in Rome (or Greece) sold poison to people with suicidal intentions. Contrast the Hippocratic oath which contained an explicit prohibition of such practices [the text is taken from Deichgräber (1983) 14]: οὐ δώσω δὲ οὐδὲ φάρμακον οὐδὲν αἰτηθεὶς τεκνάσωμι οὐδὲν ὑφήγησομαι ξυμβουλήν τοῦδε. The existence of such a prohibition lets it at least appear plausible that some doctors actually did sell toxic substances.

1. Medicine in Rome

The first Greek doctor to arrive in Rome according to annalistic tradition was Archagathus in 219 BC, see Marasco (1995) 35, Mazzini (1988) 47, André (1987) 16. Because of his harsh methods of treatment (cf. Plin. Hist. nat. 29.6.12f.) he soon became known as carnifex. He is probably partly responsible for the bad reputation of many Greek physicians in Rome for a long time. There may have been Greek (Sicilian?) doctors earlier than that, perhaps around 300 BC, as the evidence reviewed by André (1987) 16f. seems to suggest. At any rate, the Romans seem to have been familiar with Greek medical terminology earlier then 218 BC, see Langslow (1999) 204f. (with references).

At the time of Plautus, a Roman would probably not first think of going to a doctor to buy a poisonous preparation for the purpose of killing oneself (nor would a Greek at Athens) - or would he? Cato's polemics against Greek doctors in Rome (quoted by Pliny Nat. hist. 29.14) cast a different light on the Romans' attitude towards medici, who he suspects of a conspiracy to poison all the Romans (necare omnes medicina), vilipending the whole of Greek culture by using an epidemiological metaphor, see Vogt-Spira (1996a) 17f., Marasco (1995) 36-40.

On the other hand, Marasco (1995) 40f. has shown that the present passage may reflect public belief about Greek doctors. The personal physician of Pyrrhus was the only Greek doctor the Romans are reported to have had contact with before the arrival of Archagathus in 219 BC This physician had offered to poison his king for a bribe and whose plan was denounced to the king by the Roman consuls (cf. e.g. Val. Max. 6.5.1;

One important point is that the *medicus* in the present line is a φαρμακοπόρης, not a 'poisoner'. The drugseller was an independent character in Greek comedy, and the word is found as the title of plays by Alexis and Mnesimachus, see Arnott (1996) 312f.; apparently, the drugseller would have had much less respect than a ιατρός proper.

The ιατρός and the relationship of the doctor to his patients (οἱ νοσοδόντες) features also in Philemon fr. 78 K-A, which may be spoken by a young man in love to someone trying to give him advice; at Philemon fr. 108 K-A the soothing effect that a sincerely concerned φίλος sharing the problems of his friend has on the mood of a λυπομένος is compared with that of a ιατρός on a patient in pains. In addition to this, medical terminology is used to describe the effects of λόπη at Philemon fr. 106 K-A (it is said to cause μανία, νοσήματ' оχι ιάσιμα, and suicidal tendencies), probably in an amatory context. The evidence being thus, it seems not impossible that the use of the motif by Plautus follows the Greek model.

2. Doctors in Comedy

Doctors featured in New Comedy and Roman comedy, see Ribbeck (1882) 15-18, Legrand (1910) 127f., Gil/Rodríguez Alfageme (1972) *passim*, André (1987) 18, Gratwick (1993) 221 on Men. 884, Rodríguez Alfageme (1995) *passim*, Arnott (1996) 329 (with references), 430-432, most recently Blume (1998) 153 with n.75 and Cordes (1994), a comprehensive study on the image of the physician in Greek literature, see esp. on Greek drama 33-63 (comedy: 51-63). It is hard to say whether any allusions to physicians in Roman comedy derive from the Greek originals, but there is no *prima facie* reason to assume that they did not, see Cordes (1994) 62f.

*me toxico morti dabo*: 'I'll give myself over to a poisonous death.' For the *dativus commodi* used with verbs of motion, also called 'dative of direction', see Lindsay (1907) 20, Palmer (1954) 298, Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 391, Maurach (1995) 51f., Penney (1999) 262f. This usage belongs to poetic diction, see Töchterle on Sen. *Oed.* 310. It is controversial whether the dative of direction is a Grecism or not, see Penney (1999) 262 with references. The earliest example of this particular kind is the old formula *quiris leto datus*. (Festus 245 M.); it is used particularly if there is a personification of 'death' or 'sleep'. The construction is also used with other verbs, e.g. *manus tendere alicui* (Caes. *B. G.* 7.48.3, see *LHS* 100), cf. *As.* 608 (*morti dare*), *Am.* 809 (*ad mortem dare*): Plautine variations of *leto dare*, a phrase from sacral language (cf. Varro *De ling. Lat.* 7.42; Festus p. 304.1ff.), see Jocelyn on Enn. *Trag.* 283. The formulation is used by
Suicide by taking poison is a death chosen by some characters, historic as well as literary, but it may scarcely count as an heroic death. Yet, other methods of suicide such as hanging, drowning and jumping off heights were not practised by the upper classes, see Grisé (1982) 94. Tac. Ann. 6.49 condemns a young man’s suicide by jumping out of a window as ‘sudden and ugly’.

473 quando id mihi adimitur qua causa vitam cupio vivere.
id ... qua causa = id ... cuius causa ‘on which account’ (= ‘on account of which’), see Gratwick on Men. 490. vitam ... vivere: etymologic figure, cf. Ep. 387, Mil. 628, 726, Per. 494, see Hafer (1934) 38f.; also used by Terence (Ad. 859).

474-498 Dialogue Eutychus - Charinus

474-482 Eutychus’ sudden appearance and comprehensive knowledge
483-484 Repetition of the suicide theme (linking device)
485-498 ‘Cheer up, we’ll pull a fast one on your Dad.’
   485-495 ‘We’ll buy Pasicompsa.’
   485-487 Eutychus suggests to buy Pasicompsa for Charinus
488-491 ‘Money won’t be a problem.’
492-495 ‘But what if it will be?’ – ‘Oh, shut up.’
496-498 ‘Go and get the booty for me.’

474 EU. mane mane obsecro, Charine. CH. qui me revocat? EU. Eutychus, mane mane obsecro, Charine: paratragic tone: ‘a voice from nowhere’; the geminated imperatives are probably supported by some kind of gesture, see Basore (1908) 22. Like Pasicompsa, Eutychus is introduced by name using question and answer, see 516n.; a scene analogous to the servus currens scene with an attempt at motivation. The emotional element as basis of the haste is emphasized. The words simul vicinus proximus (475) look like an explanation of the timely appearance of the rescuer. At the same time, they are a theatrically self-conscious statement - not unlike the following one about Charinus’ telling Eutychus all about it heri (481), ‘yesterday’, i.e. not in this play, what is tantamount to saying ‘not at all, really, but I just happen to know such things because I am in the play, too, and know my part - that since there are only two houses on stage,
who else could I be but ‘the buddy from next door’? mane mane: cf. 928 mane mane, Charine; emphatic gemination of mane is common in Plautus, cf. Am. 765, As. 229, Au. 655, Men. 180 mane mane obsecro, Ps. 240; also used by Terence (Ht. 613, 736, Hec. 495f.), see Allardice (1929) 82. The excited repetition suggests some commotion on stage (cf. esp. Am. 765). The first mane scans bb by IK; the following one is elided. qui me revocat?: cf. 867, Cis. 705, Ep. 201, Poen. 850, 1212, Tru. 116, see Enk ad loc.; revocare is also used to refer to the conventional conclamatio of the dead, see Kenney on Lucr. 3.467-469; it may be that Charinus has this meaning in mind also, just as if he was already - only in his imagination - in the kingdom of the dead. qui: BCD: quis A, Leo. The MSS vary here and at Ep. 250, Men. 301, see Baier (1885) 95, who is unable to decide between qui/quis, Lindsay on Cap. 835, Lindsay (1907) 44, Drexler (1932) II 71f., 88. Enk prefers qui, since the form is lectio difficilior and frequent before consonants (cf. Am. 382, Au. 350, Cap. 833, Poen. 851, St. 222), see also Petersmann on St. 222. ). For the indiscriminate use of both qui/quis in Plautus and other early authors, see LHS II 540, Fordyce on Catul. 61.46.

475 tuos amicus et sodalis, simul vicinus proxumus. amicus: The first words Eutychus uses to characterize himself actually encapsulate quite precisely the rôle that he is going to play. On the friendship theme in Greek comedy see the meticulous and still valuable study of Zucker (1950). sodalis: The word occurs seven times in the Mercator (594, 612, 621, 845, 947, 995) and in both argomenta (I 8, II 14); the only play that has more occurrences is Bacchides, where the word is used twenty times. This underlines the importance of the character Eutychus, who is introducing himself as what indeed he is going to be for the whole duration of the play, the sodalis opitulator of Charinus. vicinus proxumus: points to the fact that (not a surprise for the audience) Charinus and Eutychus are neighbours. In Greek comedy, the corresponding phrase is ἐν γειτόνων, ‘next door’, see Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Dysc. 24.

476 CH. non tu scis, quantum malarum rerum sustineam. EU. scio. non: emphatic, ‘you don’t have the slightest idea’. scio: ‘yup’, ‘sure’, laconic and dismissive, deflating the pathos of the adulescens amator, almost as if the character was speaking for the audience, cf. Ad. 161; three consecutive lines with scio in end-position: Men. 942-944. This is unexpected news (and against theatrical convention and the expectations of the audience, since Eutychus has not been on stage before, and the audience has never been given an indication that he and Charinus met earlier), and Plautus exploits the audience’s surprise at this by placing the disyllabic word at the very end of the line, balancing Charinus’ non tu scis (and by repeating line-final scio in the following line).
In the following passage (477-482) Plautus makes fun of a dramatic convention which is frequent in his comedies, namely that another character is supposed to know things that he (if the stage was real life) could not know; this is aptly called ‘unmotivated knowledge’ by Marti (1959) 19. Unnecessarily, Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 12-14 takes Eutychus’ knowledge and the way he obtained it (by unannounced eavesdropping) as indicative of Plautine changes to the original. A similar case of unmotivated knowledge is Cu. 14 hoc Aesculapi fanum est. :: plus iam anno scio (also with laconic scio at line-end).

477 omnia ego istaec auscultavi ab ostio, omnem rem scio.
B cc D A / B C D a B c D / A B c D; `split anapaest’ om-ni(a)-eg(o)-is-taec (B c|c D A), cf. 147 nescio ego istaec (B cc D A), see Drexler (1965) 51.

This is an odd statement. If what Eutychus says is supposed to be more than just a ‘meta-theatrical’ joke at the expense of a dramatic convention (of eavesdropping), he must have entered the stage at some point. However, contrary to Greek and Roman dramatic convention, the audience were never told he did, and Eutychus never commented on what he heard through asides. In addition, it is unclear from when on exactly Eutychus has eavesdropped. The simplest explanation would be to assume that he has just eavesdropped on Charinus’ preceding monologue (469-473). Yet, he knows more than what he could glean from the moaning of an unhappy lover; he knows that Demipho wants to sell the girl (478), that she is Charinus’ amica (479) and that Charinus does not want that (479 tuis ingratis). Consequently, he must have overheard at least part of the ‘auction scene’. Another question that remains open is why Eutychus eavesdropped in the first place; he could not have known what he would overhear, and his decision to do so seems rather gratuitous.

Taking a short-cut to the next stage of the action and avoiding to tell the same things twice (which would bore the audience) is always a challenge for the comic playwright, being part of the wider principle of oikonomia; it was already practised by Menander, cf. Dysc. 821f. ἐπακήκοι όμων ἔξοδον πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ / ἄπαντας οὖς εἰρήκατ’ ἐξ ἀρχῆς λόγους, Epit. 892 (πάντα διακόσιας), see Arnott (1965) 373, Frost (1988) 60, Blume (1998) 95. Similarly in tragedy, A. Ag. 598ff., contra Taplin (1977) 300 with n.3. For Roman comedy, cf. Ba. 404, Cu. 279; Hec. 607, Afran. Com. 260, Titin. Com. 151. It is difficult to decide whether the eavesdropper was visible for the audience, see Handley (1965) 275, Gomme/Sandbach (1973) 259f., Frost (1988) 60.

omnia ego istaec auscultavi: It is in accordance with Greek and Roman scenic conventions that the eavesdropper makes the staging of a ‘silent’ entrance clear by saying ‘I’ve heard it all from the porch’ or something similar, see Barsby on Eu. 941f.

auscultavi ab ostio: Not unconvincingly, Schmidt (1959) 70 suggests a play on
auscultare and ostium. ab ostio: cf. e.g. Cic. De orat. 2.276 ab ostio quaerere; perhaps alluding to the προθυρόν of Greek drama, like ante ianuam, ante ostium, ante aedes, or vestibulum (as contrasted with in via, de via), the space before the door, for which see Rees (1915). Mooney (1914) 14 sees an allusion to a shallow recess in front of the door (comparing Au. 666). scio: repeated in the same position as in the preceding line; Lefèvre (1995) 14 has observed that different forms of the verb are repeated several times (476-480; add the synonymous expression omnem rem tenes at 478), stressing the fact that Eutychus knows all about the affair right from his first entrance. The difference between scio here and in 476 is that here it is part of the word-group omnem-rém-scio, in which rem bears the word-accent (scio being enclitic) and not, as in 476, scio. Eutychus uses scio laconically as a one-word answer again at 1012; cf. also 889.

478 CH. quid id est quod scis? EU. tuos pater volt vendere - CH. omnem rem tenes.

bb C D A/ bb c D A/ B c D A B c D; Charinus cutting in on Eutychus in the lecythion, as if to stop him saying tuam amicam. For the repeated interruption (478f.) by another interlocutor cf. e.g. Tru. 753, 756, An. 348, Ph. 793. Such interruptions are also found in the stichomythic introductions to messenger speeches in Greek tragedy, see Schwinge (1968) 171f., and the form may have been imported thence. See also 161n. omnem rem tenes = omnem rem scis; echoes 477; usually shorter, e.g. Au. 682, 782, Ps. 651, Tru. 411, An. 349 rem tenes, and merely tenes at Mil. 1163, Eu. 406. For tenere = scire see the list in Woytek on Per. 91. The verb is usually used in the second person singular; the plural occurs only once (Poen. 565). This is the second notable parallel between this passage and one in An. 345-350: And. 347f. – Mer. 476f., An. 349 – Mer. 478; add An. 345 – Mer. 946. This does of course not prove conscious borrowing by Terence.

479 EU. tuam amicam - CH. nimium multum scis. EU. tuis ingratiis.

bb c D A / bb c D A / B c D A B c D; Drexler (1965) 145f. lists 14 other cases where a line-break occurs in the flow of an utterance, cf. 621 (vis? :: idem quod me vides), that is where the lecythion is taken by two speakers. It is hard to judge whether or not this was perceived as a metrical peculiarity by contemporary audiences; see also Drexler (1932) I 111, 120, who thinks that scis. :: tuis formed one cretic group. tuam: bb (prosodic hiatus); see Drexler (1965) 150 n.11 for a list (containing, of the Mer., lines 129, 181, 208, 257, 286, 479, 586, 794, 796, 845, 888, 966, 977), and see Drexler (1932) I 110f.; tuam/amicam occurs also at 181 and 888, being good examples of hiatuses guaranteeing each other (as in the standard case of flagitium hominis). amicam: used by a woman, the word usually refers to a female friend, used by men it usually means ‘erotic partner’ or even ‘prostitute’, see OLD s.v. 2, Mart. 7.70.2, Dig. 50.16.144 (Paulus), quoted in Williams (1992) 452 n.190. tuis ingratiis: ‘against your will’, an ablative of attendant
circumstance (‘with non-thanks on your part’), used without a qualifying word where, unlike here, no ambiguity can arise, e.g. Am. 217, Mil. 449, and rarely qualified by a genitive or a possessive adjective, e.g. Cas. 315; nicely balancing *tuam amicam*. Sedgwick on Am. 369 explains it as an ablative of price (‘for un-thanks’), made up to match the Plautine *gratiis* ‘for thanks’. Lodge s.v. *ingratiis* distinguishes, not wholly convincingly, between *ingratiis* being used as a noun (Mer. 479, Cas. 315) and as an adverb (e.g. Ru. 772, Cas. 193, Mil. 449), a distinction that is also made by MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 193, but not in OLD s.v. McGlynn I 285 lists a mere three instances of *ingratiis* in Terence (Ht. 446, Eu. 220, Ph. 888), all of them without any qualifying attribute, hence belonging to Lodge’s second category.

480-482 Eutychus has previously not been on the stage and cannot know about Pasicompsa, even if he has actually eavesdropped on Charinus and Demipho. Here Plautus may ironically admit to a slight awkwardness of the plot, signalling at this point that some kind of alteration has taken place in connection with Eutychus. Alternatively, he could be criticizing a weakness of the plot already present in Philemon’s *Emporos*. As for the reception and understanding of the lines by the audience, neither case would matter; the remark is simply aimed at getting a laugh. It is amusing that a character enters for the first time and knows so much; Charinus’ question at 480 could also have been asked by some of the more attentive spectators, and it sounds almost like a trick question with which Charinus wants to catch out Eutychus, who appears to be playing extempore. This is yet another example of carefully rehearsed Plautine comedy in the guise of autoschediastic entertainment, cf. *Ps.* 720f. *quo modo? :: horum causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula: / hi sciunt qui hic adfuerunt; vobis post narravero.*

481 EU. *tute heri ipsus mihi narrasti. CH. satin ut oblitus fui*  
*tute*: emphatic *tu*, balancing the emphasis of *meam* (480): ‘You yourself told me about it.’ *heri*: ‘yesterday’, and, in dramaturgical terms, ‘off stage’, or indeed, ‘never’, see 106n., 438n., 542n. It is pointed out rightly by Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 14 that this is slightly peculiar: How and when did Eutychus meet Charinus to be told all the details, considering that Charinus has just arrived? It is possible that Plautus has at this point telescoped the Greek play to avoid a third reiteration of the facts. The closest parallel is *Per.* 116-119 (Saturio had been told about the situation yesterday; note *Per.* 118: *scio* at line-end). *satin ut*: ‘actually how’ (so translate: ‘Can it be? Did it slip my memory that I had filled you in yesterday?’); exclamatory *ut*-clause linked to *satin* (sc. *est*), the predicate of the exclamatory clause being in the indicative, see Gratwick on *Men.* 180f., cf. e.g. *Ba.* 491, *Men.* 181, 658, *Mil.* 1134, *Per.* 658, *St.* 271. *oblitus fui*: Plautus uses ‘lapses of memory’ conveniently to explain the stretching of stage conventions, e.g. *Tri.* 1137f. At such points, it is not entirely clear whether Plautus is consciously mocking the
convention, see also 1005n. Enk ad loc. glosses oblitus fui (cf. Am. 457, Cas. 980, Poen. 40) with oblitus sum (only this form in Terence), similarly Hammond/Mack/Moskalew on Mil. 118 vectus fui, but see Lindsay (1907) 62 and Woodcock (1959) 79: “With the other tenses of esse (fuisset, fui, fueram, fuero) the participle is normally an adjective denoting a state. Thus victus fui means ‘(at a particular moment in the past) I was in a beaten state (but that state has since ended)’; victus fueram, ‘(up to a particular moment) I had been in a beaten state (but that state then ended)’; victus fuero, ‘(at a particular moment in the future) I shall have been (i.e. ceased to be) in a beaten state’.” The fact that oblitus fui is a deponent verb (as is vectus fui at Mil. 118) should not make a difference. Perhaps Mo. 821 is also a case in point. The words empti fuerant olim used there are merely an equivalent of empti sunt, but Tranio seizes on the word fuerant as if Simo had meant that the house had been his, but was so no longer; cf. other verbs used in the middle: gravatus fuisti (St. 722), fui iuratus (Cu. 565), indutafuerit (Ep. 225), visum fuit (Mo. 694), and in the passive: coctum ego ... dudum conductus fui (Au. 457), see also 232n., cf. 488 expensus fuit.

482 tibi me narravisse? EU. hau mirumst factum. CH. te nunc consulo.

hau mirumst factum: ‘that was no miracle’, cf. As. 451. Lodge s.v. mirus II.C regards mirum as a noun in such phrases, similarly McGlynn s.v. mirus III (Hec. 709, Ht. 896), OLD s.v. mirus 2c (non mirum facis = ‘there is nothing strange in what you do’); see 204n. on mirum quin. consulo: The motif of asking friends how one should die, involves a semi-legal background (the consilium amicorum) which prompts the use of legal jargon here and in the following line. Basaglia (1991) 286f. aptly compares Poen. 794f. amicos consulam quo me modo/suspendere aequom censeant potissimum; similarly: St. 503f. certumst amicos convocare, ut consulam/qua lege nunc med - essurire oporteat, St. 579-583. In all these cases what follows is a surprise, as the audience will expect something like ‘I ask you ... how I can get out of this situation’ rather than ‘... how I can best kill myself.’ For a similar ἀπροσδόκητον Leo (1912) 137 compares Ar. Ach. 755: ἄνδρες πρόβουλοι τοῦτ’ ἐπράττον τὰ πόλι, ὡς τάχιστα καὶ κάκιστῃ ἀπολοίμεθα.

483 responde: quo leto censes me ut peream potissimum?

‘Answer - by what death dost thou think I had best breathe my last?’ - Dieterle (1980) 66, probably mistakenly (overlooking the παρὰ προσδοκίαν character of the joke), explains Charinus’ question psychologically: “In der Frage des Jünglings, welche Todesart ihm der Freund ratet, liegt eine Aufforderung, den Selbstmord durch eine Hilfeleistung zu verhindern.” quo leto censes me ut peream: anticipatory use (cf. οἴδας σε ἑστας εἰ), for which Plautus has an extraordinary predilection, see Lindsay (1907) 27, cf. e.g. Ru. 390, Ps. 1061. leto: originally perhaps the name of a divinity representing death, the word belongs to elevated diction; occurs frequently in republican epic and
tragedy as a synonym of mors; it has a high-falutin’ tone wherever it occurs in comedy, cf. Au. 661, Mil. 1241; see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 98, Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 389, Waszink (1966) passim. peream: cD, disyllabic by synizesis; ~ morior, see Gulick (1941) 16-18, cf. 622.

484 EU. non taces? cave tu istuc dixis. CH. quid vis me igitur dicere?
B c D A B C D A / B C dd A B c d+; synizesis of cave, see Allen (1978) 41; alternatively, scan cave as a pyrrhic (aa). non taces?: ‘shut up!’ cave tu istuc dixis: ‘don’t say such a thing’; on cave with subjunctive see Ernout on Ba. 402.

485 EU. vin patri sublinere pulchre me os tuo? CH. sane volo.
B c D A bb c D A / B c D / A B c D; the lecythion being shared between two speakers, one taking the initial cretic, the other the last iambic measure, cf. 490. It is telling that Charinus, who at 208f. said post autem mihi / scelus videtur me parent! proloqui mendacium, has no scruples at all now and allows his buddy to play a trick on Father. Calidorus in the Pseudolus is similarly ‘unprincipled’, cf. Ps. 122, 291. sublinere ... os: one of the many metaphorical expressions in Plautus to express the deception of a person, cf. 604, 631, Au. 660, 668, Cap. 656, 783, Cu. 589, Ep. 429f., 491, Mil. 110, 153, 468, Ps. 719, Tri. 558, cf. also Ad. 215; on the meaning (derived from the practical joke of painting a person’s face while he is sleeping) see Otto (1890) 259, Sutphen (1902) 257, Schmidt (1959) 394. pulchre = bene, χαλάξ, ‘properly’, is used in much the same way as probe (not used in Mercator), cf. 604, Am. 681, Cu. 585, Ep. 624, Per. 554, Ru. 908; also by other authors, e.g. Afranius 113 López pulchre hoc incendi rogum (in an etymologizing word-play on sepulchrum). It is only rarely used in its literal sense ‘beautifully’ (902, As. 802, Ep. 624). sane volo: ‘absolutely!’; Theslaff (1960) 31 lists instances where volo is used in a permission echoing a question containing vin ... ?: Am. 769, Ru. 1407 (with sane), Tru. 502; Poen. 1077.

486 EU. visne eam ad portum - CH. qui potius quam voles? EU. atque eximam
visne: the usual form is vin (attested thirty-eight times), cf. e.g. 485, Mo. 322, Tri. 1091. eam ad portum: in view of the earlier pun a portu adporto (161), may one assume a similar one here: eam (i.e. Pasicompsa) adportam? qui potius quam voles: ‘why not rather - fly (to the harbour) ?’ voles: The context shows that Charinus probably means literally ‘fly’, for Eutychus’ next question is answered by a fanciful impossibility in a similar fashion (487f.). If used transfiguratively, the verb volare is properly used only of the rapid passage of time, see OLD s.v. volo2 4. eximam: ‘ransom’, see Skiles (1940/41) 250, cf. Cap. 758.
177 mulierem pretio? CH. qui potius quam auro expendas? EU. unde erit?

Wahl (1974) 36 n.1 takes the corruption of this line in P as an indication of the presence of some form of ‘algebraic’ notation (see 1014n.) in the archetype. P has ateritis, while A seems to have er<it>, which was introduced into the vulgate by Guyet. Wahl introduces another change of speaker and suggests to read EU. unde - CH. erit: “Hier wird an typischer Stelle sermo fractus verwendet - in at liegt dann die Sigle A für Charinus. Der Sprecherwechsel wurde an den Beginn der folgenden Zeile verlegt, als er an seinem ursprünglichen Ort nicht mehr erkannt wurde.” Apart from the fact that Wahl’s suggestion yields a text that squares badly with the following line (should the text indeed run EU. unde? :: CH. erit. / Achillem orabo ...?) and presents the reader with unde? used as an isolated question and erit in a peculiarly ‘absolute’ sense, his hypothesis does not account for the presence of the letter t in ateritis, nor for the ending of the word. It seems best to follow A. pretio: cf. 341 pretio fēripui; pretio may be used in the context of hiring prostitutes, cf. Carm. Priap. 34.2 (conducta est pretio puella parvo) and see Goldberg ad loc., Turpil. Com. 8 non ago hoc per sagam pretio conductam, ut vulgo solent. auro expendas: ‘weigh her out against gold’, ‘for her weight in gold’; the nucleus that triggers off the digression about the gold Achilles took for Hector’s body. It is the second remark that contains an exaggeration about what Charinus wants Eutychus to do, altering the normal statement of his friend and taking his idea to its extreme. Whereas he has ignored Charinus’ first remark, this time Eutychus asks ironically, ‘And whence shall I get the gold?’ The expression used by Charinus is a metaphor, but Eutychus takes it literally. As a consequence, Charinus answers by quoting a case from literature/myth where a person’s body was sold for a great amount of gold (cf. Hom. II. 24.323 and 22.351f.).

Langen (1886) 161f., Dietze (1901) 73, Marti (1959) 86f. and several others, most recently Lefèvre (1995) 14f., point out that it is odd that Charinus, who said he has made a fortune on his business trip, does not have the money for the purchase of Pasicompsa by Eutychus; see e.g. Marti (1959) 87: “Es ist kein Grund anzugeben, weshalb hier Charinus statt von aliquid nicht von seinen Riesengewinnen spricht: sie sind ganz einfach vergessen; der Dichter kann an dieser Stelle nur einen verlegenen, hilflosen Charinus brauchen.” Marti calls this an ad hoc motif (Augenblicksmotiv) and compares the difference in the financial situation in Ad. 100 (inopia) and 501f. (maxume / potentes dites fortunati nobiles). Indeed it is hard to see why the playwright would like to have Charinus particularly concerned about money at this point. If Charinus still had the money, it would change nothing: Eutychus would still be too late to buy the girl, and insofar Charinus’ cash-flow problems are of no consequence to the action. It is quite possible that Charinus has spent all the money he had in order to buy the girl in Rhodes, and that none is left.
The particular scene where Priam puts gold onto the scales to redeem the body of Hector from Achilles has been the subject of a number of vase-paintings, see Döhle (1967) 136-139. The weighing in gold of Hector’s body was, although in itself not directly part of the Homeric tradition, on the testimony of Σ Hom. II. 22.351b (5.333.53 Erbse), shown on stage in Aeschylus’ Φρύγες ή “Εκτορος λύσα, see also TrGF III p. 365 Radt, Döhle (1967) 95, 137f. This may have inspired subsequent dramatists and it may also have led to ‘the weighing of Hector’s body’ becoming a stock image (as it was on vase paintings).

Mythological exempla are not uncommon in Greek comedy, cf. e.g. (perhaps in a similar context) Philemon fr. 159 K-A (Κρόισων λαλώ σοι καὶ Μίδας καὶ Ταυνάλων), Men. Kolax 123f. (‘like Odysseus coming to Troy with 60 friends’). Some of these comparisons may (but do not have to) be allusions to a specific tragedy, which would give point to them; cf. also Au. 701-704, Ba. 275. Achilles is also referred to in Chrysalus’ victory monody (Troy monody) at Ba. 938 in busto Achilli, and several times in the Miles gloriosus (61, 1054, 1290). This shows some familiarity of Plautus’ audience (or parts of them) with the myths related to the Siege of Troy.

Fraenkel (1960) 74f. doubts that such a ‘fanciful’ comparison could derive from the Greek original, but the passage quoted by Fraenkel as a parallel (Ps. 301) bears no comparison. Tierney (1945) 26 rightly criticizes Fraenkel’s line of argument. Quoting Diphilus Emporos fr. 32.7f. K-A (γόγγρον μέν, ὀσπέρ ὁ Πρίμως τὸν Ἐκτόρα, ἐς συν εὐλυκοις, τοσοῦτο κατοδείς ἐπριάμην), Tierney notes that “Fraenkel argues that in the Diphilus passage we have a real comparison, since the mythical parallel which might have been historical serves to illustrate something quite unusual, while in the Mercator passage the comparison is simply fantastic and the mythology is not felt as real. I must confess that I have not been convinced by this argument. The mythology in both passages is quite unreal, because all mythology was unreal to the Athenian New Comedy, and an historical parallel might also have stood quite as well in the Mercator passage, for instance a reference to the wealth of Harpalus.” Similar conclusion are reached by Enk ad loc. and Reinhardt (1974) 68f.; cf. further Phrynichos fr. 54 K-A (σο δὲ τιμοπόλης ὡς γ’ Ἀχιλλέως οὔδε εἶς, ‘you ask a higher price than any Achilles’). Moreover, King Pyrrhus (319/318-272 BC) proclaimed himself in Italy as descendant of Achilles and announced that through him history would repeat itself by bringing a Greek war on the Romans, i.e. colonists of the Trojans (the theme of Vergil’s Aeneid), cf. Paus. 1.12.1 (μνήμη τὸν Πόρρον τῆς ἄλογες ἐσήλθε τῆς Πύλου καὶ οἱ κατὰ ταῦτα ἄλπιζε χορήσειν πολεμοῦντι; στρατεύειν γὰρ ἐπὶ Τρῶν ἀπόκουσ Αχιλλέως ὄν ἄλπογονος). This anecdote indicates that people by the early third century, at least in the Greek communities of Sicily and southern Italy, were familiar with the identification ‘Trojans’ = ‘Romans’.
There seems to be a tendency among students of Plautus to regard every piece of information given that goes beyond naming the mythological character in question as an explanation added by the Roman playwright to render intelligible that specific allusion to the Roman barbarians with their limited knowledge of Greek mythology, see e.g. Maurach on Poen. 443 (Oedipus): "Um die Jahrhundertwende mußte Plautus derlei mythologische Anspielungen seinem Durchschnittszuschauer noch erklären." This approach is inadequate: even if the unspoken premiss was correct ('Romans of the second century BC needed some tutoring in Greek mythology'), which is unlikely in itself considering the contact with Magna Graecia, one should still expect Terence (and sometimes Seneca) to use explanatory glosses more sparingly than they actually do.

Achillem: the first syllable is long, see Soubiran on Mil. 1054. Consequently, Lindsay spells Acchillem for the phonological reason that in early Latin χ (kh) was pronounced as cch. The line taken by Lindsay is hyper-critical, see also 290n. It is possible that the Romans chose to indicate the quantity of a syllable in a word taken over from Greek by an orthographic convention, but this theory is not capable of being proved. Its major disadvantage is that it leads to variant spellings of the same word, e.g. μέχριαρα being spelt machaera at 925 and macchaera (for metrical reasons) at Ps. 593 in Lindsay's OCT. There is no way to know how Plautus spelt these words, and it seems best to adopt a less confusing convention, namely to indicate the quantity of a vowel by the usual diacritical signs where necessary. qui: (< ablative singular (here neuter, as its antecedant is aliquid), used freely as interrogative and relative pronoun in Old Latin, see Meiser (1998) 166; cf. 676. expensus fuit: 'weighed', 'valued' (as in 'to pay one's weight in gold', with the instrumental ablative expressing the counterweight), cf. Ba. 642, Ru. 1087.

489 EU. sanum es? CH. pol sanus si sim, non te medicum mihi expetam. Either (a) 'If I was healthy, I wouldn't need you as a doctor', or (b) 'if I was in my right mind, I wouldn't choose you as a doctor'; a comic misunderstanding, playing on the ambiguity of the term sanus: Eutychus means sana mente, Charinus understands (pretends to understand) physical well-being, sanò corpore, see Brinkhoff (1935) 110. On the motif of 'love as a disease', cf. Ba. 189-193, Ep. 129, Per. 18; Men. Sik. 380f., see Flury (1968) 91f. Disease as a metaphor for love is used by Menander and Plautus, but most notably by Terence, see Fantham (1972) 14-18 and Barsby on Eu. 225, Barrett on E. Hipp. 476-477, Hunter on Eubul. fr. 67 K-A λαθριαν Κύρην, αισχύσθην νόσον; Gow on Theocr. Id. 3.17. For the idea of a 'love-doctor' cf. Ov. Rem. 314 fateor, medicus turpiter aeger eram, Cis. 71-77, esp. 73f. si medicus veniat qui huic morbo facere medicinam potest; for the amicus medicus topos see 951n. The concept φίλος - ιατρός is also found in Philemon fr. 108 K-A, see Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 18,
Averna (1988) 44 n.14. si sim: In early Latin, the distinction between what may yet happen and what is no longer capable of fulfilment in hypothetical conditions is not made as strictly as later on, see Woodcock (1959) 153f., cf. As. 458. medicum: see 472n.

490 tanti quanti poscit, vin tanti illam emi? CH. auctarium

B C D A B C D A / B c D / A B c D; quadrisyllabic auctarium at line-end filling one iambic metron; hiatus at inner D/A break (-mi / auc-). tanti ... tanti: emphatic repetition, cf. e.g. 101 mulier, qua mulier, Am. 624, As. 406, Cas. 863, Mo. 751, St. 620.

auctarium: ‘overplus’ (OLD s.v.); Paul. Fest. p. 11 L. auctarium dicebant antiqui quod super mensuram vel pondus iustum adiciebatur, ut cumulus vocatur in modio; this shows that the image is from the same area as the verb expendere (weighing). The verb adicio is also used in the following line, thereby sustaining the imagery of the passage. It seems that Charinus is still in quite a ‘bidding’ mood, and this and the following line are indeed echoes of the previous scene (cf. e.g. 424-425, 434-435, 438-440, 443). The action of auctarium adicere is similar to that referred to by accudere in 432.

491 adicito vel Mille nummum plus quam poscet. EU. iam tace.

mille: in Plautus always treated as a noun (= χιλιαος) taking the genitive (like milia in classical Latin), cf. e.g. Men. 177, Mil. 1064, 1079, Ru. 1327, 1406, St. 587, Tru. 334, Tri. 425, 954, 959, 966, 970, 1139; mille nummum (= nummorum) is used frequently in Plautus (eleven times, with a strong accumulation of the phrase in Trinummus).

nummum: Gratwick on Men. 219 observes that “in Roman Comedy, nummus (> νομος, ‘standard’) is the silver didrachma alias stater current in the Greek cities of Campania and South Italy, 7-8 grams (nearly one third oz.), a little less than the Attic didrachma [...] Roman sesterces and denarii were not yet standard currency in Pl.’s days and would have no place in palliatae anyway.” The genitive in -um for -orum was standard inexpressions of measurement, weight, and currency, see Gratwick on Men. 134. Barsby on Ba. 609 suggests that nummus is an all-purpose word that can refer to coins of any size and metal, see also Richardson (1983) passim. In Terence its value is unspecific, cf. Ph. 38, Ht. 606 mille nummum poscit.

492 sed quid ais? unde erit argentum quod des, quom poscet pater?

sed quid ais?: cf. 390; after one digression, another is introduced, cf. Am. 620, Ep. 29, Men. 648. argentum: a contrast; Charinus has been talking of aurum (487, 488). quom poscet pater: Charinus and Eutychus think of Demipho as the person who actually conducts the sale of Pasicompsa. Thus, argentum quod des has to be understood as ‘the money that is paid by your order and for your account’.
493 CH. invenietur, exquiretur, aliquid fiet; enicas.

B cc D a / B C D a / bb C D A / B c D; square verse type I, illustrating Charinus’ annoyance and impatience. invenietur, exquiretur: hysteron proteron in asyndetic juxtaposition, cf. e.g. Ep. 513, Mil. 773, Ps. 283, Tri. 802; for the homoeoteleuton cf. e.g. 833, Per. 470, see Enk ad loc. For ‘rhyme’ at the second and fourth foot of a trochaic septenarius, favoured by Plautus, Enk ad loc. quotes nine cases, Duckworth on Ep. 197 twelve. For rhyming metra, see Beare (1957) 254-266, Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 8. aliquid fiet: ‘something (however unavailing) will turn up’, cf. 494 and Demipho’s statement at 450 ego aliquid videro. enicas: ‘you’ll be the death of me’, cf. the use of ἀπολεῖτε (e.g. Ar. V. 849, Nub. 1499, Plut. 390, Eccl. 775, Ran. 1245), see Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Dysc. 412. There is a play on the two meanings (real and metaphorical killing) at lines 312 and 612 of the Mercator.


‘I fear the very words ‘some solution will present itself.’’ ‘Can’t you stop moping?’ ‘Why, I don’t say a word.’ Eutychus is understandably aghast at Charinus’ uncalled-for Micawberism. Once again, Eutychus speaks just like any spectator (or any well-meaning neighbour) would if he could talk to Charinus: Eutychus is the voice of reason. istuc ‘aliquid fiet’: since the Romans did not use adverted commas, this was a way to indicate a quotation, cf. Am. 693, Au. 547, Cas. 210f., Cis. 505, Mil. 689, Mo. 71, Per. 768, Poen. 262, Ru. 1321, Tri. 438f. Occasionally, id is also used, cf. Am. 530, Mo. 338, Ad. 314; for the equivalent use of the definite article in Greek comedy see Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Asp. 190f. quin taces?: ‘be silent, can’t you’, cf. An. 399, Ht. 832; cf. the use of non taces? (211, 484, 754).

495 CH. satin istuc mandatumst? EU. potin ut aliud cures? CH. non potest.

bb C D A B C dd a / bb C D A B c D; three resolutions; a run of five shorts at the beginning of Eutychus’ question. satin istuc mandatumst?: ‘are my instructions quite clear?’; military dispatch-like style, see Barsby on Eu. 208f. (satine hoc mandatumst tibi?), on which Donatus comments (Don. Ter. Eu. 207): amatorium multiloquium [see 30n.] et vaniloquium continet ista actio; nam et repetit quod iam dictum est. This behaviour befits the young lover Phaedria just as well as it does Charinus. potin ut aliud cures?: Eutychus asks - in a tone of exasperation (on potin(e) ut see 441n.), ‘Could you worry about something else?’, i.e. ‘Stop worrying, you’re driving me crazy.’ Enk ad loc. compares Cas. 614, Mil. 929, Ps. 235, Ph. 235, and also, perhaps slightly far-fetched, Hom. Od. 7.208 ‘Ἄλκινο’, ἄλλο τι τοι μελίτω φρεύν (but cf. Od. 2.303f, Il. 24.152, and θέρσει, μήτοι ταῦτα μετά φρεύς σήσι μελόντων, Il. 13.362). non potest: ‘that’s impossible’; see Stockert on Au. 272.
496 EU. bene vale. CH. non edepol possum prius quam tu ad me redieris.
bb c D A bb C D A / bb C D A bb c d^+; maximum number (four) of resolved B’s (and another resolution if one scans the metrically ambiguous *tu ad me* as *dd A* with prosodic hiatus rather than as *D A* with total elision), cf. e.g. 744, *Men.* 789. This exchange is a play on the routine valedictory formula, to which usually no reply (or a polite one) is expected, see Schmidt (1959) 224-228; Charinus takes it literally, a kind of *Eulenspiegelei* not infrequent in *Mercator* (cf. e.g. 161, 614).

497 EU. meliust sanus sis. CH. vale, vince et me serva. EU. ego fecero.
bb C D A B c D / A B C D a a B c D; strong medial pause after *vale* (not undergoing IK).
*vale, vince et me serva*: laconic imperatival tricolon; for the alliteration *vale, vince* cf. *Cas.* 87, *Cis.* 197; *vince et vale* *Cic.* *Ep.* 10.26.3, 11.25.2; *Lamprid.* *Alex.* *Sever.* 10.8.
*ego fecero*: future-perfect, see 448n.

498 domi maneto me. CH. ergo actutum face cum praeda recipias.
Another example for the ‘dispatch style’ (cf. 495), see 277n. *maneto me*: ‘wait for me’, cf. e.g. *Am.* 546, *Cas.* 542, *Ep.* 358, *Men.* 422, *St.* 58. *face*: Plautus sometimes also writes *duce, dice* for *duc, dic* without apocope, but not *fer* for *fer*. Terence always employs the syncopated forms except *face*, and -*duce* in composite verbs, e.g. *Ad.* 482 and 910 *abduce*, 917 *trادعِce*. After the time of Terence, the short forms are always employed; see Skutsch (1892) 56. *cum praeda*: ‘with your booty’; military imagery (cf. *Cas.* 113, *Poen.* 802f.) perhaps harking back to Demipho’s *maxumam hercle habebis praedam* (442). *Praeda* is used in particular of booty that is sold in a public auction (*venditio sub corona*), see Talamanca (1955) 155-157, and cf. e.g. *Cap.* 106, *Liv.* 41.11.7. For *praeda* used of persons (‘prey’, ‘game’), see *OLD* s.v. 2b, cf. esp. *Ps.* 1124, Prop. 2.16.2, *Ov.* *Her.* 16 (15). 154. In Greek, *λίαν* is used to add bitterness to Andromache’s remark at *E. Troad.* 614, as the word is normally not used of persons but of cattle captured from the enemy. Gruen (1990) 139 points out the frequency of the use of *praeda* in Plautus “as a metaphor for the object of schemes by crafty slaves and double dealing characters.” *recipias*: sc. *te*; sometimes without a reflexive pronoun (*Ba.* 293, *Per.* 51, *Ru.* 880), but the forms with reflexives are more frequent, see Lindsay (1907) 54, Ernout on *Ba.* 293, Enk ad loc., *LHS* II 295. Like *praeda*, the word carries a military connotation (‘withdraw [to a position of safety]’, ‘return’), see *OLD* s.v. 12b. The verb is used several times at scene-ends, cf. *Au.* 119, 177, *Ph.* 462, 464, see Stockert on *Au.* 660.
III. Discussion

At this point, the difference between on-stage and off-stage time is felt strongly: Lysimachus and Pasicompsa, returning from the harbour make their entrance upon Eutychus’ exit. This means that during the previous scene Demipho has been able to make it all the way to the port, find Lysimachus, persuade him to buy Pasicompsa, and then Lysimachus and Pasicompsa were able to make it back to Lysimachus’ house, all in a few minutes of on-stage time. It is probable that there was an act-break in the Greek original after 498, covering for the off-stage action at the harbour (Lysimachus’ purchase of Pasicompsa; Eutychus’ trip to the harbour).

Lefèvre (1995) 15 claims that this scene (and with it III.4) is in its entirety Plautine. The present author hopes to have shown (a) that this scene is essential for advancing the action of the play, and that an equivalent scene must have been in Philemon’s Emporos, unless one assumes the Greek original to have been a completely different play, sharing not much more than its title with Plautus’ adaptation, and (b) that it is at least conceivable that many (if not all) of the allusions, imagery, and comparisons in this scene could occur in a Greek comedy as well, and that any attempts to assign them a priori to Plautine ingenuity betray a rather narrow concept of the conventions of Greek comedy. The structure of the link monologue and the subsequent dialogue is controlled and balanced, see the schematisations at 469-473n. and 474-498n. For the fact that II.4 and III.4 guarantee each other’s presence in Philemon’s play see also the concluding remarks of the discussion of III.4.
‘Act III scene 1’ (499-543): LYSIMACHUS, PASICOMPSA

I. Introduction

1. Staging
The play half over, Demipho appears to have won. He will have the girl, or so it would appear after the first few lines. Never again will Demipho’s intrigue be so close to success, nor Lysimachus in such a powerful position. This is obvious before a word is said: the audience see Lysimachus lead a young woman by her wrist (499).

Two things are clear immediately. First, Eutychus’ mission to go to the harbour and buy the girl for Charinus (cf. 469-498) must have failed. The contrast between the young lover’s hopeful plans and the harsh facts of life emphasizes Charinus’ utter defeat. Second, Demipho must have met with Lysimachus and instructed him to buy the girl, as he said he would (466ff.).

2. Function
The scene adds an interesting nuance to Lysimachus’ character (who is shown to be another senex lascivus) and thus helps the audience to understand his later volte-face, when he abuses Demipho in V.4. Further, it presents the spectators with a brief portrait of Pasicompsa, and gives the author the opportunity for some ambiguous allusions. Moreover, the present author would like to suggest, against Lefèvre (1995) 32, that the first three scenes of the third act are essential for the further development of the action. Almost at mid-play it seems to have come to a dead end: Plautus needs to get things going again.

3. Ambiguities and Innuendo
The most prominent feature of the present scene is what could be called ‘comedy of errors’: Pasicompsa talks of Charinus while Lysimachus consistently refers to Demipho. On yet another level, it is a scene of continuous subversion and grotesque incongruity: Lysimachus, whose reputation as a stern moralist was established in a dialogue with love-lost Demipho (283-327), takes in this scene the role of senex amator himself. Conversely, the meretrix Pasicompsa shows herself not to be the bona meretrix that Hauschild (1933) 68f. and others thought she is, overlooking the potential for innuendo and ambiguities in this scene (cf. the transformation of Phoenicium into an experienced prostitute at Ps. 227-229). Moreover, the use of elusive innuendo by hetairai is a well-known aspect of their relationships with ‘friends’, see Davidson (1997) 134f.
The fact that harmless words like facere, officium, subtemen nere, res, and operalopus can be used in an obscene sense may be accidental. It could be objected that salacious double entendres do not befit the character of the good-natured and obliging elderly gentleman Lysimachus. However, since we are watching comic characters and not real people, this argument is unconvincing.

Sexual puns, which are, as a rule, absent from Menander and Terence (but cf. e.g. Ad. 532, Men. Asp. 311, Pk. 484), are not particularly common in Plautus either and they usually occur in dialogues which elucidate the double meaning (Cas. 437-514, 909-914, Poen. 862f., Ps. 1187-1190), see Adams (1982) 218f., Woytek on Per. 194. The words are harmless and innocent, fairly frequent, and have straightforward meanings, so that each one taken by itself would not justify a deviant interpretation. Accordingly, Preston (1916) 55 assumes that Plautus is developing some flagitious jest, as is made almost certain by 523 operam accusari non sinam meam. None, however, of the words involved, in Greek or Latin (except for operam, 523) seems to be used elsewhere in erotic meanings, and it may be that the passage simply leads up to the ovis joke (524). However, Plautus actually indulges in these potentially ambiguous words. They appear in a significant cluster and are preceded by a truly ambiguous remark made by Lysimachus (518). The context suggests interpreting them in a way which takes the macrostructure of the text into account. That Roman audiences were in principle able to pick up double entendres, and that such were used for their own sake, is shown e.g. by Donatus' comment on the ambiguous nature of an expression at Ad. 215 (usque os praebui).

Lysimachus intentionally withholding information to make the girl believe that he has bought her for himself (500), see Conca (1970) 85. The fact that he has to tell her what he thinks is the 'truth' later on (528) shows that he has been successfully deceiving her. This play on the girl's lack of information and disorientation contributes to the atmosphere of tension needed for the effectivity of a series of double entendres.

Depending on the decisions taken by the producer, the spectators would not be left in doubt about the luscious character of the conversation, depending on the gestures accompanying and disambiguating the words. The text is a case of what in linguistic terms could be described as incomplete information (an amount of information that necessitates additional information, made visible by gestures of the performer at the discretion of the producer or reader of the play); see Hoban (1988) 74-76 for the discussion of a modern production of this scene. This is supported by that fact that the scene is in iambic septenarii, which according to the grammarians, were well suited for scenes that require the use of expressive gesticulations and gestures, cf. Terent. Maur. GLK 6.396f., Mar. Vict. GLK 6.135.27f.
II. Commentary

This scene could be read as an expansion of a situation like that described in a short speech by Simia, leading Phoenicium to her lover Calidorus (Ps. 1038-1043):

**SIMIA. Ne plora, nescis ut res sit, Phoenicium,
[aside, snickering] verum hau multo post faro scibis accubans.
non ego te ad illum duco dentatum virum
Macedoniensem, qui te nunc flentem facit:
quomiam esse te vis maxume, ad eum ducere:
Calidorum hau multo post faxo amplexabere.**

499 **LY. amice amico operam dedi: vicinus quod rogavit,**
Lysimachus enters from the harbour, Pasicompsa following reluctantly (cf. 500b, 542) and in tears (cf. 501f.). Demipho’s house is near the entrance from the forum. Lysimachus is probably leading Pasicompsa by the hand, see Sittl (1890) 81, cf. Cu. 339, Tru. 696f. Rarely do a courtesan and an old man meet on stage, cf. Ba. 1120-1206, where the senes trying to save their sons from the claws of two meretrices are thoroughly ridiculed, and Hec. 727-767, where the senex Laches meets the meretrix Bacchis (in Hecyra and here the interlocutors avoid calling a spade a spade). Laches is careful to point out that his age would not allow him to ‘step out of line’ (Hec. 737). He calls ‘honest women’ bonae (739), and he addresses Bacchis as mulier ‘madame’ (736), just as Lysimachus does at 522. There may have been a dialogue between Lysimachus and Demipho in the Greek model, which would have made explicit that Lysimachus is asked by Demipho to do him the favour of buying the girl, see Kryssinie-Józefowicz (1949) 28f. In the play as we have it, this is only hinted at (cf. 466f.). Yet this is incapable of proof, and such a dialogue would not be of crucial importance for the motivation of the subsequent action. **amice amico operam dedi:** 499-500a are an aside; Lysimachus turns to her in 500b. Friendship is a central theme in Mercator, cf. 287f., 466f.; for the comradeship between the senes cf. esp. 288 (similar: Cas. 241). **amice amico:** Plautus is fond of paronomastic (often polyptotic) tautologies for their sound effect (e.g. Ep. 331f., Ps. 940); he likes phrases involving amic- to express the reciprocal relationship between friends, cf. 385, 887, Ba. 386, Cu. 322, Ep. 425, Mil. 660, Per. 255, St. 765, Ph. 562, see Leo (1912) 259-262, 314. For a similar Greek phrase (ὁς φίλος φίλω) in Euripides see Nussbaumer (1938) 97.
500 hoc emi mercimonium. mea es tu, sequere sane.

hoc ... mercimonium: ‘this piece of merchandise’, i.e. Pasicompsa; commercial term (cf. *Am.* 1f. *Mo.* 904, 912, 915), also used of female slaves (*Cu.* 564, *Per.* 532, 543); the idea is Greek, cf. *Arist.* *Pol.* I 1254 a9-16, 1255 b11. Lysimachus emphasizes his ‘matter-of-fact’ attitude towards Pasicompsa. This is reinforced by the laconic assertion *mea es tu*, and the curt alliterative command *sequere sane*. *sane*: ‘come on’ (see OLD s. v. 3c); Lysimachus is impatient. Loitold (1956) 76f. points out that slaves followed behind their masters, comparing *Cap.* 449, 514, 540 (cf. also *Mer.* 670 *consequi*); to reverse the order, an explicit command was needed, cf. *Cu.* 487, *Ps.* 170 i, *puere, prae*. *mea es tu*: untrue, as Lysimachus states in 529f., where he says that she is Demipho’s property and describes the legal nature of the relationship between himself and Pasicompsa’s old *erus*. The technical term for a transaction on behalf of someone else is *mandatum*, see Watson (1965a) 147. On the legal aspects of the so-called acquisition of possession *per extraneam personam*, which became more frequent in Imperial times, see Watson (1961b) 11-16. In Plautus, such informal contracts are quite often combined with the friendship motif, being a practical consequence of the *fides* between friends (cf. 467, 495, 629-632; but *contra* 426-428, 458f.). Slaves (counting as *res mancipi*) were usually acquired by *mancipatio*, which had to be performed in person by the seller and the buyer. There is no indication that Pasicompsa has been bought that way. That may be what Lysimachus alludes to in 449, see Watson (1965a) 75 n.2. It is not clear whether a thing purchased in the name of someone else still became the property of the person in whose name it had been bought, but highly probable, see Watson (1961a) 178. Thus it remains unclear whether we are to think that Lysimachus bought Pasicompsa with his own or with Demipho’s money. The latter would be possible in Greek but foreign to Roman law, see Pringsheim (1916) 34-38, (1950) 421. Pasicompsa does not know that she does not belong to Lysimachus, whereas the spectators do: he is consciously playing with her anxieties.

501 ne plora: nimis stulte facis, oculos corrumpis talis.

*ne plora*: Pasicompsa has burst out in tears. There is a subtle gradation of urgency ranging from *ne ploraveris* (very urgent) - *ne plores* - *ne plora* - *cave plores* (less urgent); *ne plora* is sympathetic and friendly (implying ‘don’t worry’). It is not quite clear how crying would have been expressed on stage apart from the acoustic element; the actor may have hidden his face behind his sleeve or covered it with his arm, see Sittl (1891) 275, Loitold (1956) 41-43. *stulte*: cf. 540. It is hard to see how this attitude towards Pasicompsa’s intelligence squares with his praise for her rhetorical skills (514). *oculos ... talis*: Lysimachus begins to talk to the girl in relative innocence, complimenting her beauty; the first *double entendre* follows in
504f. For the idea that beautiful girls ruin the beauty by excessive crying cf. Am. 529f., Catul. 3.17f., Ov. Ars 1.129, Am. 3. 6. 57, Prop. 2. 6. 29.

503 PA. amabo ecastor, mi senex, eloquere - LY. exquire quidvis.
amabo: sc. te, cf. 538; formulaic elliptic particle, in Plautus regularly (in Terence always) used by women (or when addressing a woman, Cas. 917f.), either with an imperative or, as at 538, introducing questions, see Lindsay (1907) 60, Adams (1984) 62. The rule may be broken in Plautus where there is good reason, but it is firm for Terence. When it is used by a male character, a wheedling tone may be inferred, cf. Cas. 917-918, Men. 678, Mo. 324, Per. 765, Poen. 370, 380; homosexual byplay may be intended, cf. As. 707, 711, Per. 245. ecastor: 'by Castor'; conversational expletive used by women, especially where female interests are somehow concerned (e.g. 533, Am. 730, As. 719); regarded as a stronger oath than (ede)pol (used by both sexes, but by more men in Plautus, by more women in Terence), see Latte (1960) 173f. For statistics see Nicolson (1893), Ullman (1943/4), Adams (1984). mi senex = 508; affective use of the vocative of the possessive pronoun, regularly used by women, cf. Don. Ter. Ph. 1005, see Lorenz (1870) 430f., Lindsay (1907) 60, Gilleland (1980) 181, Adams (1984) 68-73. In Terence and, less regularly, Plautus the vocative is used especially with titles, as in mi vir 'my husband' (Am. 710), also towards strangers, e.g. mi homo (Cis. 723) and in asides (Cis. 678), see Gilleland (1979) 273-280. The vocative usually precedes the noun when the speaker is a woman (Cis. 95, Mil. 1054, 1330, Poen. 1127, Ht. 406, Pomp. fr. 49 R.). The Greek equivalent is πάτερ or πάππα, cf. Ar. Pax 120, Eccl. 645, V. 609, 652. This form of address is recommended as polite in Men. Dysc. 494 (cf. Dysc. 107), Philem. fr. 43 K-A χαίρε πάππα φίλτατε (cf. Men. Mis. 213).

504 PA. cur emeris me. LY. tene ego? ut quod imperetur facias,
This seemingly innocuous remark prepares for the first double entendre; the comic reversal of this assertion in 505 is definitely παρὲ προσδοκίαν, an inversion of social roles: the slave orders, the master obeys. It is with this paradox that the avuncular Lysimachus is suddenly transformed into an old lecher. This conversion is underlined by the exposed position of ego faciam between diaeresis and change of speaker. This half-sentence is the punch-line of the reversal, unveiling an obscene bluntness: on facere ‘to do it’ see Adams (1982) 3, 204.

505 item quod tu mihi si imperes ego faciam. PA. facere certumst
For the phrasing cf. As. 846, Per. 696, Ru. 436; an allusion to the motif of servitium amoris, the enslavement of the lover to the beloved, on which see Lyne (1979). A nice touch is the inversion of the roles of slave and master (see 504n.).
507 laboriosi nil tibi quicquam operis imperabo.
laboriosi ... operis: ‘arduous task’; *opus* (*opera*) and *labor* are used in innuendo elsewhere
(523, *As.* 873, *Tri.* 651; *Petr.* 92.9), see Janka on Ov. *Ars* 2.479f. Originally *opus* =
‘agricultural work’; consequently Pasicompsa lists tasks that one would carry out on a farm,

508 PA. namque edepol equidem, mi senex, non didici baiolare
namque edepol equidem: expressive accumulation of affirmative particles, cf. *Ba.* 1192,
*Au.* 215, see Mikkola (1964) 138. non ... nec ... nec ...: balanced tricolon; for Pasicompsa’s
lack of domestic core qualities cf. 395-398, 413-417. The skills listed are typical chores of a

509 nec pecua ruri pascere nec pueros nutricare.
pecua ... pascere: for the shepherd-motif cf. 523-526, *As.* 540f.; *βοσκεῖν* and *ποιμάνει* 
‘treat as a sheep’ can be used transfiguratively ‘to delude’, cf. e.g. Ar. *Eccl.* 81, Men. *Sam.*
530, 596.

510 LY. bona si esse veis, bene erit tibi. PA. tum pol ego perii misera.
bona ... esse: *double entendre*?; for *bonus* ‘sexually obliging’ see OLD s.v. 4a, cf. Catul.
89.1, 110.1.

511 LY. qui? PA. quia illim unde huc advecta sum, malis bene esse solitumst.
qui?: sc. *periisti*; ‘why?’, see OLD s.v. 1e (‘how does it happen that?’, ‘why?’). illim: local
adverb; attraction to the following unde (*attractio inversa*, cf. *Cis.* 62, see LHS II 567): the
directional sense of the latter induced a change from a static local adverb (e.g. *ibi*, *illi*, or
*illī*) to the directional *illī*, see Löfstedt on Per. *Aeth.* 226f. malis bene esse solitumst:
‘bad people usually fared well’; the general prosperity of the wicked and the misery of the
righteous are common themes in the speeches of the unfortunate in ancient drama and

512 LY. quasi dicas nullam mulierem bonam esse. PA. haud equidem dico
(1901) 25f. Misogynist statements are commonplace in both Greek comedy and tragedy, see
Ribbeck (1875) 294. On the ambiguity of *mulier* see 522n.
514 L.Y. oratio edepol pluris est huius quam quanti haec emptast.

oratio: 'speech', cf. 383, Hi. 384. Pasicompsa seems to be an educated, well-spoken hetaira. Epicurus, for example, is reported to have admitted women (perhaps even a hetaira) to his school, see Vatin (1970) 35 n.6. Moreover, Pasicompsa comes from Rhodes, and is possibly a Rhodian; Rhodians were reputed for wit in antiquity (Cic. De orat. 2.217); see further Davidson (1997) 93. Even Pasi-compsa's name may suggest rhetorical skills, at least to Roman ears, as comptus 'elegant' is amply documented in texts dealing with rhetoric, see OLD s.v. 2.


quid ais tu?: 'look here', also at 517; contrast 535, 751. quid nomen tibi dicam esse: Haffter (1934) 110 notes the pomposity of this question and compares Ps. 744 sed quid nomen esse dicam ego isti servo?; see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 300 for further parallels. One of the most obvious means of announcing the name of a character to the audience is to make another character ask for it. Aristophanes reveals the names of several characters in this way, giving some plausible motive for the question. Question and answer in evoking names are very infrequent in Roman comedy, and not used by Terence at all. In Plautus it is used nine times, in realistic naming for the most part, see Key (1923) 34. Respectable women, however, were not normally named in public by men talking to outsiders in fifth and fourth century Athens, and even asking a woman for her name - if she was respectable - was not the done thing, see Schaps (1977). dicam esse: periphrasis for sit/est, cf. e.g. Am. 825, Au. 804, Cap. 268, 533, 541, Cu. 12, Tri. 2. quid: Plautus makes regular use of quid instead of quod, especially in the phrase quid est (erat) tibi (ei) nomen, for statistics see Seyffert (1893) 278. The distinction between forms of quis and qui in Plautus was not as sharp as in classical Latin, see 474n. Pasicompsae: (Πασικόμπση); it seems unlikely that Philemon had this name which is not attested in Greek, and this joke is probably Plautine. On the other hand, the morphological formation of the name is in accordance with Greek principles, and both its constituent parts were in use, see Fick (1874) 67, Schmidt (1903) 376f. Such 'tell-tale names' are found elsewhere in Plautus, cf. Ba. 704, Men. 77f., Per. 204, Poen. 91f., St. 174-177, Tru. 77f. But there is more to this name than meets the eye. Mendelsohn (1907) 19, 64 interprets it as suggesting the Greek words ποσαν and κομψη and takes it to mean 'pretty in the eyes of all'. However, there might be a different nuance to the dative here, 'nice to all' ('promiscuous'). Moreover, κομψη may be used in malam partem, to refer to a person's πανουργία, cf. Phryn. Praep.soph. p. 7, 13 κομψη γαρ των πανουργων, ουτων κόπτοντα τινα κατ' ὁχληρόν, φοτόλον δὲ τῶν ἀπλοῦν, Moeris Κ 56 Hansen κομψη 'Αττικῆ.
πανοργία Ἑλληνες and κ 2 Hansen κομψός Πλάτων οὐ τοὺς πανοργίους ἀλλὰ τοὺς βελτίστους, see also LSJ s.v. κομψός 2, Chantraine (1945); Arnott on Alexis fr. 9.1 K-A points out that κομψός lends itself to malicious overtones. Her name gives it away: Pasicompsa is not a little innocent, see Lefèvre (1995) 53.

517 L.Y. ex forma nomen inditumst. sed quid ais, Pasicompsa?
The joke presupposes an immediate understanding of the meaning of the name, see Seaman (1954/55) 115-119, cf. e.g. Poen. 187, 646, 1382, and esp. Enn. Trag. 65 Andromachae nomen qui indidit, recte indidit. It is hard to believe that a little girl named ‘Omni-Pleasant’ grew up to be ‘God’s gift’. Schuhmann (1975) 65 n.1 notes that a number of the displaced virgines in Plautus have names with erotic connotations and suggests that lenones may have given the girls new names before selling them, cf. Poen. 1138-1140.

518 possin tu, si usus venerit, subtemen tenue nere?
subtemen tenue nere: double entendre?; Svendsen (1971) 82f. and Lefèvre (1995) 52f. rightly emphasize that Lysimachus is a senex lascivus, but they overlook that for the audience the equation Lysimachus = simia (of Demipho’s dream) has been established, so that the course this scene has taken does not surprise them: Lysimachus is by no means ‘apparently harmless’, as Lefèvre (1995) 52 supposes. The expression subtemen ... nere ‘spin wool for the loom’ is rare (the only other occurrence is Ht. 293, without innuendo). On subtemen ‘woof’ (κρόκη or ἐφωφή) see Blümner (1912) 142; it is the thread attached to a shuttle (radius), a sharp piece of wood or metal, like a large bodkin. The shuttle is pushed and pulled over and under the threads of the warp, pulling the woof with it. nere: Woolwork was the characteristic of the chaste and demure maiden, see Headlam on Herod. 1.37, Hunter on Eubul. 42.5. Spinning is one of the activities one might expect to form part of the daily life of a household, especially that of a villa, see Frayn (1979) 143f.; for poetic descriptions cf. Catul. 64.311ff., Ov. Ars 1.693ff. On the other hand, it was also associated with representations of hetairai in Greek art, see Davidson (1997) 88-90, and the idea that the playwright has turned the woolworking topos upside down in this passage is appealing. This may also be true for Alexis’ Παννονιάς ἡ Ἐρίθοι, where the term ἔριθοι (‘hired workers’) that provides the alternative title denotes especially women employed to spin and weave wool in private houses and public workshops, see Arnott ad loc.

520 PA. de lanificio neminem metuo, una aetate quae sit.
lanificio: refers to ‘woolwork’ just as much as it does to the work of the meretrix. It is not clear whether Pasicompsa coyly passes over Lysimachus’ ambiguous remark, as Enk ad loc.
thinks, or takes the lewdness to the extreme. **una aetate**: ‘of equal age’; ablative of quality, cf. Cap. 20; *sit* is ‘subjunctive of limitation’, see Lindsay (1907) 68f.

521 LY. bonae hercle te frugi arbitror, iam inde <a> matura aetate

*bonae ... frugi*: ‘of great value/use’, predicative final dative (*OLD* s.v. *frux* 5b), see Lindsay (1907) 22; cf. e.g. Cap. 956, Cas. 283, Mo. 133, Ps. 468, Tri. 320; the usual term of praise for a slave (the opposite is *nequam*), cf. e.g. Ad. 959; Cic. *De orat.* 2.248; an expression taken from the language of agriculture and originally used of the soil (‘fruitful’), then of people (‘of good fruit’, i.e. honest). Here the phrase might be used to evoke *frux*/*fruor*; the literal meaning ‘of good fruit’ (sexually mature) could be yet another sexual innuendo; on the sexual connotations of *fruor* (cf. As. 918) see Adams (1982) 198. **iam inde <a> matura aetate**: ‘already from your early youth on’, Luchs’ conjecture for the corrupt *matura iam inde aetate* of the MSS. Expressions like *a puero* or *ab adulescentia* can take *inde* as a temporal qualifier and *iam* as an intensifier. In such cases, *inde* usually precedes the preposition *a*/*ab* immediately, preceded by *iam*, see Luchs (1874) 109f. A variation of the pattern is e.g. Cap. 645 Philocrates *iam inde usque amicus fuit mihi a puero puer*, where *inde* is separated from *a* (cf. Mil. 1151), but the overall word-order is kept (cf. Ht. 184, Ba. 1006), see also Enk ad loc. *Maturus* may carry sexual connotations (‘ripe’, i.e. having reached the age of puberty, see *OLD* s.v. 2).

522 quom scis facere officium tuom, mulier. PA. pol docta didici.

*officium*: ‘duty’, etymological play (*facere - of-ficium* [∗opi-ficium], cf. *facinus facere*), see Martin on Ad. 69; for the sentiment cf. Per. 615f., St. 7f., 39f.; *officium* was a fashionable circumlocution for sexual activities, see Adams (1982) 163f., cf. Cas. 585, Cis. 657. **mulier**: ‘Madame’; anapaestic word at a metrically exposed position, filling *aab* after diaeresis, immediately before change of speaker, adding emphasis to the expression. The address *mulier* for a *meretrix* is in itself almost too polite (Sen. *Contr.* 2.4.6 defines *meretrix* as *mulier quae sine praefatione honeste nominari non potest*). Somewhat similar but weaker: *Am. 755 quid nunc, mulier?* ‘well then, Madame?’ **docta**: predicative ‘during my training’ (or rather ‘I have learnt, and now I am *docta*’). Like the second part of Pasicompsa’s name, the word *doctus* can have good as well as bad connotations. *Docta* can mean ‘a lady of culture’, or (if the connection with ‘woolwork’ is to be taken literally) ‘well-trained’, see Hus (1965) 172; in Plautus it is regularly used as a term for the slave experienced in intrigue, see Brotherton (1926) 33 with examples (she overlooks *Mer.* 632 and *Ps.* 94), Hus (1965) 168f.; see also 631-632n., cf. Prop. 2.13.9-16.
523 operam accusari non sinam meam. LY. em istaec hercle res est.

operam...meam: emphatic hyperbaton; for the erotic connotations of opera see Adams (1982) 151, 157. em: ‘voilà’ (imperative of emere, cf. dic, duc, fac, fer), see Lindsay (1907) 137, cf. 149, 313.

524 ovem tibi ancillam dabo, natam annos sexaginta,

ovem: B has ancillam, which was contested by Bothe, whose conjecture eccillam has been adopted into the vulgate. According to Schenkl (1881) 617f., forms like eccillum, eccillam were frequently introduced into the MSS to remove apparently illegitimate hiatuses by the insertion of illum, illam after an original ecce in the text. There have been several other suggestions (e.g. tibi aniculam Buecheler, tibi bellam/bellulam Gertz, tibi ad illam rem Ussing; Apulam Warren [1893] 459–461), none convincing. The main objection against B is that ancilla (CD have ecce illam) could not refer to a human being, but cf. Sall. Hist. 1.55.21 Fufidius ancilla turpis, Titin. Tog. 70–72 verum enim dotibus deleniti / ultro etiam uxoribus ancillantur. Still, one might prefer to change B’s ancillam to ancillae agreeing with tibi, as the Sallustian usage is unparalleled. This would go well with Lysimachus’ promise to give Pasicompsa the sheep (Demipho) as peculiarem, because it would refer to the fact that ancillae are entitled to a peculium (cf. Per. 201). The sheep is proverbially known to be a simpleton, cf. Crat. fr. 45 K.-A.; Philippides fr. 30 K.-A.; Ba. 1121-48, Per. 173; Ad. 534; Prop. 2.16.8; Ar. V. 32, 955, Nu. 1203, Eq. 264, see Lilja (1965) 32; on ovis used of the senex amator see Leo (1912) 156, cf. Tru. 657. natam annos sexaginta: The age of sixty years recurs at 1017 in the ‘law’ against senes amatores passed by Eutychus.

525 peculiarem. PA. mi senex, tam vetulam? LY. generis Graecist;

peculiarem: ‘belonging to a peculium’; for peculiaris signifying a personal slave, cf. Cap. 20, 982, 988, 1013. On the meaning of peculium see 96n. The peculium of a rural slave often consisted in the usufruct (see 832n.) of some part of the flock he tended (Var. De re rust. 1.2.17). The expression ovis peculiaris is used of the ‘true’ lover of the meretrix in As. 540f. vetulam: a rustic expression used particularly of animals, see Ernout on Ba. 1129, cf. As. 340, Cas. 535, Men. 864; vetulus denotes that something is not only old but also decrepit. generis Graecist: genitive of quality, cf. e.g. Men. 269, An. 608. Usually the ablative of quality refers to permanent qualities, particularly with genere, cf. 969 bono ... genere nati, Tri. 851, whereas the genitive of quality refers to such of a temporary nature, see LHS II 119. This is spoken ad spectatores, and would be redundant otherwise: Pasicompsa knows that both she, Lysimachus, and her new master are ‘Greek’; this remark is probably Plautine, see Fraenkel (1960) 70 who compares Ba. 1120-1148, Cap. 266-269.
526 eam si curabis, perbonast, tondetur nimium scite.

perbonast: ἀκό κοινοῦ, being the epitasis of the preceding conditional clause and a causal protasis of the following main clause. tondetur nimium scite: ‘that old ewe will be very cleverly shorn’. Fraenkel (1960) 403 n.69 thinks that the grotesque comparisons in 524-527 are Plautine additions; this is restated by Lefèvre (1998) 37f. While admitting that there are Greek parallels for tondere (κειρέων, Herod. 3.38f., see Enk ad loc.), he attributes the metaphor to Plautus (Cap. 266-269, Ba. 241ff., 1095, 1121-1148, Per. 829). He connects the frequent use of such metaphors with the practices of improvised theatre and quotes Stärk (1989) 75 on the ‘metafora continuata’ of the Commedia dell’arte. Yet there are Greek parallels, cf. Eubulus fr. 31 K-A πρὸς φθείρα κειροσκεια, Cratinus 45 K-A, see also Otto (1890) 45, Sutphen (1902) 14, Mendelsohn (1907) 91, Brinkhoff (1935) 48f. Ultimately, the motif may go back to Simonides (PMG 507) ἐπέξεσθ' ὁ Κρίως οὐκ ἀεικέως (corresponding to nimium scite), exploiting the fact that Κρίως can mean ‘ram’, cf. Hdt. 6.50.3, Ar. Nub. 1356 ἀσαί Σιμωνίδου μέλος, τὸν Κρίων, ὃς ἐπέχθη (‘to sing Krios, how he was shorn’). nimium: ‘very’ (in classical usage ‘too much’), in a neutral sense; Langen (1880) 333-335 shows that nimium is regularly used with the positive of an adjective/adverb. Contrast the different use, akin to classical practice, at 686, 695.

527 PA. honoris causa quidquid est quod dabitur gratum habebo.

honoris causa: Enk ad loc. explains ‘tui honoris causa’, comparing Am. 486. Assuming that Pasicompsa is aware of Lysimachus’ advances, this is unconvincing. Gronovius (1740) 330 understands the words in a slightly more luscious sense ut tibi obsequar, indulgeam, faciam quod tibi cordi est, probably rightly, cf. Anaxilas fr. 21 K-A (a hetaira provides her services) τοῖς δεομένοις τινῶν ὑποψηφῆ πρὸς χάριν, As. 192 and 194; in Greek comedy the χάρις of a πάρθενος has a definitely sexual meaning, see Hunter on Eubulus fr. 26.2.

529 PA. dic igitur quaeso, quoia sum? LY. tuo ero redempta es rursum;

quoia: ‘whose’, cf. 200, 720, 722, 864; the colloquial adjective appears frequently in Plautus, also in Terence (e.g. Eu. 321), and more rarely elsewhere, e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.1.142 (in a legal formula), Verg. Ecl. 3.1 (adding rustic colour), see LHS I 481. It survived in popular Latin, e.g. Spanish cuyo, cuya. Pasicompsa thinks that she belongs to the property of Charinus, Lysimachus thinks that she belongs to the property of Demipho, who as pater familias controls all the property of his son. But this does not explain the misunderstanding, as one might assume that Pasicompsa would know that Charinus has a father; actually, she has met him (cf. 188). The ambiguity exists only for the charcaters on stage, owing to an
asymmetrical distribution of knowledge between audience and characters on stage, see Mendelsohn (1907) 135, Brinkhoff (1935) 17 n.47, Rissom (1971) 45. Similar ambiguities e.g. at Am. 508, As. 942, Au. 755. These ambiguities can only arise through the use of 'generic' terms or pronouns rather than real names.

530 ego te redemi, ille mecum oravit. PA. animus rediit, mecum oravit: either 'speak with me' or 'ask me a favour', see Woytek on Per. 117, Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 17. animus rediit: return of the 'soul' to its body, cf. Ep. 569, Tru. 367, Hec. 347.

532 ille te homo: ita edepol deperit, atque hodie primum vidit. The identity of Pasicompsa's master is concealed by the use of ille instead of his name; a solution of the mutual misunderstanding is elegantly avoided. deperit: 'he is dying (with love)'; hyperbolical, solely used with reference to love, see Gulick (1941) 19f.; 21 instances in Plautus, one in Terence (Ht. 525). atque: 'and yet', adversative, cf. 742, see OLD s. v. 9.

533-540 Griffin (1985) 118 mentions this passage along with As. 504-544, Cis. 68-119, Mo. 157-312, Ps. 50-73, An. 131-136, Eu. 197-206 as examples of the “loving meretrix, the girl who refuses to act the rapacious and heartless role which belongs to her.” This characterization is certainly adequate for the following lines (if one discounts one possibly 'cheeky' remark at 540), but one should remember that only a few lines ago Pasicompsa agreed 'to do whatever I think you (Lysimachus) want me to do' (cf. 505f., 521-523, 527 - all of this is in contradiction to the promises exchanged with Charinus, 536f.); a kind (and psychologizing) critic might ascribe this behaviour to an 'instinct for self-preservation' that overcomes her love for Charinus and makes her act this way. In dramaturgical terms, her change of behaviour marks the beginning of a passage of innuendo possibly inserted by Plautus. At 533, she regains her 'old self' and continues to be a meretrix bona for the remainder of the scene.

533 PA. ecstor iam bienniumst, quom mecum rem coepit. It remains unclear how the love-affair could have lasted for two years. In the prologue Charinus reports his first encounter with the girl on Rhodes (101), his purchase of the girl on the following day (103), and his departure from Rhodes (105, cf. also 481); it is clearly intended to give the spectators the impression that the girl and Charinus have been together for not more than a few days (certainly not for two years), see 106n. The only other mention of 'two years', biennium iam factum est postquam abii domo (12), refers to the total period
of Charinus' absence from home, and not to the time for which he has known Pasicompsa. The introduction of this fact here in the connection with his love-affair seems completely gratuitous for the sake of a joke. rem: 'affair', 'sexual encounter', see Adams (1982) 203 and below 535n. coepit: required by metre to be trisyllabic (coēpit), see Lindsay (1922) 149, Stockert on Au. 626.


536 et inter nos coniuravimus, ego cum illo et ille mecum,
The authenticity of 536-536* has been questioned. Some regarded one line as a gloss on the other, some found it difficult to establish the original word-order; Ussing brackets 536. Spengel (1863) 674f. defends the reading of P against A (where 536* is lacking because of an omission due to homoeoteleuton), see also Leo and Enk in app. coniurauimus: (DABcd+) a word of five syllables with locus Jacobsohniamus, adding weight to Pasicompsa's words. For oaths between lovers cf. Cis. 241, 460. The other way of securing the favours of a girl for oneself is a written contract, syngraphus, cf. As. 238, 746-808, [Dem.] Against Neaera 26, see Leo (1912) 154 n.4, Reitzenstein (1912) 9f., Davidson (1997) 97. Pasicompsa may be referring to a foedus (δρκος φιλας), a loyalty-oath, between herself and Charinus, especially because of the complicated, all-inclusive phrasing of the actual condition (cf. 536*) in the form of a double disjunction; for such oaths cf. e.g. Men. Sam. 279, An. 277f., see Preston (1916) 57. In Catullus, the concepts of fides and foedus are applied to his feelings for Lesbia, see Williams (1992) 478 n.48, 479 n.52.

536* ego cum viro et ille cum muliere, nisi cum illo aut ille mecum,
muliere: bb c d+, locus Jacobsohnianus, see 26n.

537 neuter stupri causa caput limaret. LY. di immortales!
caput limaret: a euphemism for sexual intercourse and for kissing, since caput can mean the tip of the tongue, see André (1991) 61. With the exception of the present line, the expression invariably appears in the same order (verb - noun) at the end of the metrical line (as do various other verb + caput combinations) in dramatic verse, see Wright (1974) 170; cf. Liv. Andr. Trag. 28, Caecil. Com. fr. 139f.; Turp. Com. fr. 112, Ba. fr. XVII, Poen. 292f., 494, Schem. fr. 1 L. For similar phrases see Preston (1916) 43. There is a clash of
stylistic levels between *neuter stupri causa* (formulaic, as if in a contract) and *caput limaret* (vivid sexual imagery). *stupri*: 'sexual intercourse with unmarried women or widows' (*OLD s.v. 2b*). Pasicompsa is not married to Charinus, so she cannot speak of *adulterium*. It is surprising that Pasicompsa should say this, since she was a few moments ago doing her best to comply with Lysimachus' advances (cf. 505f., 527, perhaps 520, 523). This may be another hint that the middle of this passage is a Plautine innovation; the Greek play probably contained a 'straight' dialogue (without turning Lysimachus into an old lecher and Pasicompsa into a versatile young lady). *di inmortales*: vocative, 'by the immortal gods' (*ποτις τῶν θεῶν*); only rarely an exclamation of pleading (*Poen. 953*); more often it expresses incredulity, cf. Don. Ter. An. 716 *admiratio* *adverbium* cum *exclamatione*.

538 *etiam cum uxor non cubet? PA. amabo, an maritust?*  
Lysimachus seems to have taken the word *mulier* (536a) to mean (or at least include) 'wife'. *cubet*: euphemism for sexual intercourse (= *συγκατασκευασμένος*), see Adams (1982) 177. *amabo, an*: hiatus (in pausa) after *amabo*, see Maurach (1971) 47 n.24; *an* marks an emphatic break. *amabo*: 503 n.; introducing an astonished question, see Blase (1896) 491.

539 *neque est neque erit. LY. nolim quidem. homo hercle periuravit.*  
*neque est neque erit*: (*a B c dd*) anomalous in metre and arrangement; one expects *neque erit neque est* (*a bb c D*). The disjunction is used to exhaust the whole scope of meaning of the idea, see 446n., cf. 700. It appears occasionally in Greek drama, cf. E. Tr. 468, 499, and with considerable frequency in Roman, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 270. Since this remark seems to be more a reply than the affirmative answer to a rhetorical question asked by the same person (Pasicompsa), one might consider an alternative attribution of speakers in this passage: *PA. amabo, an maritust? - LY. neque est neque erit. - PA. nolim quidem. - LY. [aside] homo hercle periuravit. - PA. nullum adulescentem plus amo* This would yield a nicely balanced dialogue, and a paronomasia on *nolim - nullum*. *nolim quidem*: 'I for my part would not like it'; Gurlitt and Enk attribute these words to Pasicompsa; Ussing, Leo, Nixon and others to Lysimachus ('well, I wish he weren't'). *homo hercle periuravit*: attributed to Pasicompsa in *P*, to Lysimachus in *A* (and since Acidalius by all editors). The reason is that *hercle* would not be expected from a female character on stage (nor in daily usage), cf. Don. Ter. An. 486, see Lodge s.v. *hercle*. However, there is at least one instance of *hercle* uttered by a female character in Plautus (Cis. 52), see the figures in Ullman (1943/4) 88. In fact, there are several places where *hercle* is attributed to a female speaker in the MSS, see Gagnér (1920) 85-87: *Mer. 722* (doubtful), *Cis. 52* (used by a *meretrix*), *Cas. 982* (doubtful; used by a *mulier*), *Ru. 361* (doubtful). Echols (1951) 295 accepts the
instances in *Casina* and *Cistellaria*, adding that the total ratio (men:women) of *hercle* in Plautus and Terence is 673:2. As a consequence, it must be asked whether one should alter the speakers in order to make the evidence conform with the opinions of the ancient grammarians. They might over-simplify, or even just be mistaken, see Woytek on *Per.* 237, who modifies Gellius’ statement to the effect that it might just be referring to upper-class women, see also Gilleland (1980) 182, Bickel (1950). It would be dramatically effective to imagine a professional prostitute, undergoing an unexpected mood-swing, start to talk ‘male’ language, if only for a moment, after which she re- assumes her old *persona* and ‘remembers’ that she is expected to say ‘I love no one more than him’, see Gagnér (1920) 87. On the other hand, by emphasizing her masculinity, this would characterize Pasicompsa in a way that does not seem appropriate to ‘Miss Stun-em-all’. The position of *hercle* is doubtful, at least irregular; it should emphasize the preceding word, *homo*. *periuravit*: allegation of perjury uttered against an absent person also at *Men.* 584, *Ru.* 651, *Cu.* 479, see Reimers (1957) 124 n.1.

540 PA. *nullum adulescentem plus amo.* LY. *puer est ille quidem, stulta.*
Arguably the most successful comic effects of this scene are achieved by the insertion of physical cross-references to Charinus and Demipho (*adulescens - puer/vetus puer*), as here. *nullum adulescentem plus amo*: These words either mean ‘I love no young man more than him (and he’s the only one I love)’ or, in a cheekier sense, ‘I love no young man more than him (but I have a few more up the sleeve).’ *puer est ille quidem, stulta*: ‘he’s still a boy, you fool’; *quidem* does not emphasize the demonstrative pronoun, it is closely related metrically; so-called ‘emphatic *quidem*’ acts as a sentence adverb, meaning ‘really, truly, indeed’, see Solodow (1978) 98f. The repetition of *quidem* (three times in three lines) is remarkable.

541 nam *illi quidem hau sane diust quom dentes exciderunt.*
*hau sane diust quom*: ‘it is indeed not a long time since’, cf. *Am.* 302, *Per.* 137. *dentes*: Lysimachus means Demipho’s second teeth, but he makes a joke of it: if Demipho was a little boy, it could be his milk-teeth. This joke might already have been in the Greek original. For a certain milktooth (*γνώμα*) as a proof of age see Gratwick on *Men.* 1116. There might have been a pun on *δχνόμα* in Philemon, playing with its meanings ‘one who does not have his *γνώμα*’ (said of horses) and ‘one who is in want of sense’, probably even ‘one who can no longer perform (sexually)’ (at Diog. *Ep.* 35 *γνώμα* is used *sensu obsceno*). It is also possible that this line was an allusion to *Men. Epit.* 576 in Philemon’s play, where it is likely that the word *δχνόντας* is used instead of the expected term *δχνει*, see
Gomme/Sandbach ad loc., Blume (1998) 116 n.58. Alternatively, both this and Menander’s passage are echoes of a joke or allusions to another play in which ‘teeth’ replaced ‘genitals’. This joke would then, it seems, quite naturally have been lost on a Roman audience, and Plautus re-worked it by relating it to the puer-senex-motif. This hypothesis would also offer another reason why Lysimachus cannot answer Pasicompa’s astonished question in the following line. For the puer-senex motif cf. the jokes in 290-296 and 303-304, esp. 295f., cf. also 976, 997. According to ancient current opinion, the age of seven (number symbolism) was the period when children lose their milk-teeth, cf. Plin. Hist. nat. 7.68, Gell. 3.10.12.

542 PA. quid, dentes? LY. nihil est. sequere sis. hunc me diem unum oravit
Pasicompsa’s fourth misunderstanding (540-542) is triggered by Lysimachus’ joke about Demipho’s age and about him losing his second teeth (or milk-teeth, respectively). Instead of asking why Pasicompsa could possibly imagine Demipho to be a young man, Lysimachus seems to assume that her words have to be taken ironically and tops her remark with a joke that harks back to the puer-vetus joke in 290-296. hunc ... diem unum: ‘for this one single day’, accusative of time, hunc emphatic (hyperbaton); cf. Au. 847 unum hunc diem perpetere ‘put up with this one day’; unum predicative ‘this day as one and only one’: Lysimachus makes it clear that he is unwilling to extend his hospitality any further. Indeed, there is no more than this single day anyway, and all the action will happen during ‘this one single day’. The spectators know this, but the characters (pretend they) do not, see 438n. For the situation (a senex asking a neighbour for help in an amatory affair) cf. Cas. 478f., 537.

543 ut apud me praehiberem locum, ideo quia uxor rurist.
apud me = ‘at my place’, cf. 585, see OLD s.v. apud 4a. praehiberem locum: sc. <tibr>; ‘give shelter’; unsyncopated form of praeberem (the reading of A); both forms are well attested in the MSS of Plautus, see Lindsay (1894) 54; for praehiberem cf. Ps. 368. On the overall distribution of contracted and uncontracted forms in Plautus see Langen (1880) 273f. locum: c d+ (locus Jacobsohnianus). quia uxor: D A, total elision, see Soubiran on Mil. 1278.
III. Discussion

1. The Nature of the Misunderstandings

The scene is structured (a) by Pasicompsa's misunderstandings, and (b) by the change in Lysimachus' position towards her (oscillating between fatherly protector and shameless sugar-daddy). Several asides and interjections are employed to break the scene down into units of dialogic interplay which form a series of jokes, united by the interest Lysimachus has developed for Pasicompsa. Pasicompsa's first misunderstanding (529f.), caused by the vagueness of the phrase tuo ero. Pasicompsa's second misunderstanding (533f.), leads to a misunderstanding on Lysimachus' side (537f., the implausible biennium is introduced for this effect). This leads to Pasicompsa's third misunderstanding (538f.), actually shared by both interlocutors. Pasicompsa's fourth misunderstanding (540-542), due to Lysimachus' joke about Demipho's age and his teeth is introduced for comic effect. Instead of enquiring why Pasicompsa could possibly think of Demipho as a young man, Lysimachus tops her remark with a joke - this is comic discourse, and the rules and expectations of everyday conversation and its probabilities do not apply. When Pasicompsa asks in amazement quid, dentes?, the dialogue, which would now lead to the discovery of the identity of the erus, is - in a typically Plautine fashion - cut short: nihil est. sequere sis.

Plautus is not interested in unravelling the dramatic 'knots' he has used for comic effect. If the aim is to extract the maximum amount of humour from the combination of the two characters on stage, he has to exploit the asymmetric distribution of information for as long as possible, and the characters on stage must be allowed to blunder through puzzling situations without comprehending why things are so confused. Plautus' characters are regularly endowed with a remarkable inability to see the truth which is staring them in the face. The misunderstandings are important as they keep suspense high; the spectators do not know how the problem is going to be resolved.

2. Lysimachus' Interest in Pasicompsa

Enk claims that Lysimachus has a bad conscience about the meretrix because he felt attracted to her when she had been entrusted to him. Apart from the evidence assembled by Enk, one can also refer to the dream-narration scene of Demipho (225-271), where an ape - the symbol of shamelessness and lack of restraint in ancient oneirocritical literature - is mentioned as an opponent of Demipho, preparing the identification of Lysimachus with the ape. One would expect a less abrupt unveiling of these circumstances, but Plautus seems to have changed the Greek original in this respect, see note to 326-329a. On Lysimachus' love for Pasicompsa and the jealousy shown towards Demipho see also Nadjo (1971) 105f.
Svendsen (1971) 83f. Consequently, the audience expect to see a Lysimachus who is himself interested in the slave-girl.

3. Structure and Originality
The passage is clear and coherent; the difficulties are far less serious than some scholars have realised. Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 29 argues that the scene was the subject of Plautine intervention, and that the speaking part given to Pasicompsa here is unnecessary for the promotion of the action. That, however, can be said of many passages in ancient comedy. Zwierlein (1992) 325f. attributed lines 510-523 to an interpolator. However, his reasons for such a rigid excision remain unclear. He states that the use of cues (‘Stichworttechnik’) in 509 (pecua ruri pascere) and 524f. (ovem peculiarem) binds these lines together. Yet, the same phenomenon in lines 507 (laboriossi ... operis)/508 (non didici baiiolare) - and 522 (pol docta didici)/523 (operam accusari non sinam meam), is ascribed to the interpolator. This line of argument is hard to follow. Actually, the continuity of the double entendres warrants for the authenticity of the passage. In the second half of the scene, Pasicompsa is not portrayed as the typical éταifer who rejoices in broken homes (Men. Epit. 166) and wants men to fall in love with her (Men. Epit. 432ff.); in the middle part she seems to have slightly less honourable intentions. The scene was probably shorter in the original, the innuendo (in the present form) being Plautine elaboration, see Lefèvre (1995) 32 (who prefers, however, to ascribe the whole scene to Plautus). It could be assumed, with reasonable caution, that lines 499-about 504a and 528-543 are Greek in origin, the remainder being Plautine elaboration, see also Lefèvre (1995) 44. That is, the main portion of the sexual innuendo is located in the ‘Plautine’ part of this scene, and not in the original. In 533 and 535, res means the same as ἔργον, bearing the same connotations. Then, in 538, cubare cum aliquo corresponds to κατωκλίνειν, συγκλίνειν, see Adams (1982) 177. Such a Greek (Philemonian) innuendo may have inspired Plautus in the first place to expand on this motif. Thus it seems unconvincing to attribute all the sexual innuendo of the scene to Plautine elaboration, as is done by Lefèvre (1995) 44; at least the milder innuendo of the ‘Greek’ parts (especially after 528) may with some confidence be attributed to Philemon.

According to Lefèvre (1995) 52f. the main aim of Plautus in this scene is to expose the venerable institution of the pater familias to ridicule in the persons of Demipho and Lysimachus, the latter being an impudens (or lascivus) senex. But he is only verbally impudens, and therefore the “Abfuhr, die er bei Plautus - im Gegensatz zu Philemon - erhält, im Vergleich zu der, die Demipho erwartet, gelinder.” This does not agree with what Lefèvre says ibid. 32: “Auch bei Philemon hatte Demipho eindeutige Absichten hinsichtlich
Pasicompsas." Why should Lysimachus, if he has made advances to Pasicompsa both in Philemon and in Plautus, only be 'given a rebuff' in Plautus, and not so in Philemon?
I. Introduction

1. Staging
Lysimachus has just mentioned him to Pasicompsa: enter Demipho, the senex amator. The Mercator contains several instances where an entrance-monologue (or dialogue) separates the exit and re-entrance of a character and sets the stage, as it were, for the oncoming action. At 543 Lysimachus and Pasicompsa enter the house; Demipho appears and delivers a monologue; in 562 Lysimachus leaves his house to find Demipho and starts a conversation with him. The vacant stage at 543 does not break the action. Similarly, Dorippa’s exit and re-entrance are separated by Lysimachus’s monologue at 692-699. At 956, the exit of Charinus and Eutychus is followed by the entrance of Demipho and Lysimachus; at the end of their entrance-dialogue Eutychus re-enters (962) in search of his father, see Conrad (1915) 60f.

2. Demipho’s ‘Philosophy’
The passage is in iambic senarii, which is in accordance with the pensive character of Demipho’s monologue, while the preceding scene which contained innuendo and presented a meretrix on stage was a recitative (iambic septenarii). Demipho is shown as a senex lepidus; he is an old man with a simple philosophy: ‘make merry, for life is short’, a theme common in Hellenistic and Roman poetry, cf. e.g. Ad. 859f., Hor. Carm. 1.9.13-24, see Arnott (1996) 668, who compares Alexis fr. 237 and 222 K-A, and Coleman-Norton (1936) 333, who links this theme with Epicurean exhortations to enjoy the good things of life while one can and compares Am. 995f., Ba. 1193-1195, Cu. 28-38, 176, Mer. 1021-1023, Mil. 677, 706, Ht. 343-347, Caecilius Com. 70. The idea that one should be grateful for past pleasures in life is Epicurean. Epicurus recommends that an old man should be a philosopher so that ‘though growing old, he should renew his youth in benefits through thankfulness for the past’ (Epic. Ep. ad Men. 122), cf. Sen. Ben. 3.4.1. On the attitudes towards old age and the appreciation of youth in Greek literature, see Schadewaldt (1960), Dover (1974) 102-106, cf. e.g. Ar. Ach. 209ff.; Pl. Ba. 816-820. Demipho does the opposite; he does not strive to renew the past through thankfulness, but to create a ‘second youth’ for himself (vetus-puer motif), thus presenting the audience with what could be called a travesty of the Epicurean concept.
3. Structure
The structure of Demipho's monologue is as follows: (a) 544-548 (introduced by tandem): verbs in the first person singular show that Demipho's personal situation is referred to; (b) 549-554 (introduced by nam): reasons why Demipho thinks that it is good for things to be as they are; introduced by an impersonal expression (nimio/st aequius) in 549, followed by verbs in the second person singular and further impersonal expressions expressing general 'truths' (550-554a); in 554b Demipho changes back to the first person singular, using the future tense (persequar) to indicate what he is going to do now; (c) 555-560 (introduced by nunc 'now'): Demipho's plans for the immediate future; he uses the future tense throughout (except for 556, where he talks about his uxor); he uses the first person singular, except for 556-557, where he uses the third person to refer to things that he imagines his uxor to be about to do; (d) 561 prepares the entrance of Lysimachus with a standard formula (atque eccum it foras). Demipho's monologue is a highly controlled formal set-piece; the playwright varies the perspective by using persons, tenses, and moods in specific ways.

II. Commentary

544-549 Pierce (1998) 140 comments on this passage in her discussion of the description of love-affairs of 'mature men' in Plautus and observes that Demipho is quite willing to put aside his wife's feelings "so that he can have some fun" and that "these 'mature men' like to excuse their actions by claiming that they are permanently verbally harassed by their wives. This tends to be a circular argument, as their behaviour often deserves the nagging that they complain about. A notable exception to this is Plautus' Casina, where Lysidamus is a lusty old lech, but his wife is never seen to give him any undeserved harassment."

Yet, Demipho is not a mature man but a senex amator, a comic stock character, and his behaviour is not dependent on nor consistent with considerations of moral decorum, but the demands of the comic genre. Behind the mask of Demipho is a clown, the same clown that is behind the mask of Dorippa and the other characters (and not a 'mature man'). Moreover, the irony of Demipho's first words is lost on Pierce. Forer (1979) 206 has seen the irony: "Demipho beginnt gleich mit Selbstironie: 'tandem impetravi' 544 läßt einen Objektsatz erwarten, der etwas längst Gewünschtes beinhaltet. Dies, nämlich 'emptast amica', erfahren wir aber erst im nächsten Vers." Forer is right in stating that the audience will expect something like that rather than me ut corrupperem, which a 'normal' person would not regard as his prime objective when picking up a female 'escort'. It is precisely
because Demipho is not 'normal' but a comic clown that his is a different goal, namely, _se corrumpere_, the comic 'job' of the _senex amator_.

544 DE. tandem impetravi egomet me ut corrumperem:

_A B c D A / bb C D A B c D_; metrical hiatus (-vi / e-) at _A/B_; Leo's transposition _ut egomet me_ is unnecessary, the text of _A_ is sound. Rissom (1971) 83 notes that Plautus varies the usual _corrumpere_ motif that is related to the _adulescens amator_ (e.g. _As_. 875, _Ba_. 419, 1040, _Cis_. 316f., _Ep_. 268, _Ps_. 446, _An_. 396, _Ad_. 97) by applying it to the situation of a _senex amator_. With his first words, Demipho acknowledges that he is destroying himself, but (in a manner not unlike that of the characters of Senecan tragedy) he does so as if he was merely describing 'from the outside' something in fact not happening to him but to his dramatic _persona_, commenting on his values and decisions. His seemingly contrite remark is followed up by a set-piece speech dealing with the theme of 'wine, women, and song', and the necessity for the _senex_ to enjoy his life to the full. What he says is an inversion of the conventions of society that would ascribe the more relaxed attitudes to the young, but expects the observance of a certain _decorum_ from older people, whereas he states that (a) the young should work harder and make money, for in them there is still the 'sap of youth' (550f.), whereas the old man should try to spice up whatever short period of life is left (552-554). This contrast is just as grotesque as e.g. the inversion of the roles of father and son in _Ar_. _V_. 1351-1359. _egomet_: emphasised _ego_, cf. 697, 852-854, 904, 930.

545 emptast amica clam uxorem et clam filium.

It is not clear how Demipho knows that Lysimachus was successful (at 562 he actually asks _Lysimachus est mulier intus?_ since he does not know). However, the audience have seen that the purchase of the girl has taken place, and that is enough to concede to Demipho this power of divination. Another explanation would be that Demipho is simply sure of the fact that Lysimachus will have been successful. _clam ... clam ..._: denotes that Demipho is up to no good, which is the general idea conveyed by the use of this preposition in Plautus; for statistics, especially of _clam uxorem_, see 819n.

546 certumst antiqua recolam et servibo mihi.

Demipho's statement 'I shall return to my old ways' contradicts what he will say at 550f. (_adulescens quom sis, tum quom est sanguis integer, rei tuae quaerundae convenit operam dare_), for obviously he has not followed that ideal when he was young. Further, it squares badly with Charinus' account of his father's self-stylisation as a sober-minded businessman in the prologue (cf. 61-68, 73-77), where Demipho says, in effect, 'When I was your age, _I_
was not idling around like you.' This seeming contradiction is not due to Plautine carelessness. On the contrary, it adds another dimension to Demipho's character. He is shown to be a kind of Catonian moralist who is merely concerned with maintaining a façade, not the essence, of morality. The use of the adjective Catonian is not meant to imply that this passage is necessarily Plautine: Catonian characters are not a specifically Roman phenomenon. Indeed, Demipho's character, which is shown the audience from so many sides, would be a worthy creation also of Menandrian comedy. The pathos of the ideals that are upheld is comically undercut by the exposure of the inadequacy and farcical ineptitude of the characters who utter them. Demipho's monologue may have gained a certain status of celebrity in antiquity, for it is possible that Cic. Sen. 72 (illud breve vitae reliquum) is an allusion to the present passage (547-549), see Powell (1988) 246f. servibo: cf. Men. 1101, Per. 15, 307, 628. The bo-future is frequent with some verbs of the fourth conjugation in Plautus (e.g. ibo, scibo, audibo, servibo), being the original form of the fourth conjugation future.

547-549 On the motif of the short remaining life-span cf. also Ba. 416f., St. 81; Hec. 543. Ad. 859f.; Caecil. Com. 242. The majority of the ideas uttered by Demipho 547-554 (enjoying the moment, shortness of life) derives from similar themes developed in symposiastic contexts in Greek literature, see Muecke on Hor. Sat. 2.6.93-97, cf. E. ALC. 782-802.

547 breve iam reliquum vitae spatiumst: quin ego A: decurso [in]spatio breve quod vitae reliquumst P. The text of P is closer to Cic. Sen. 72, a possible allusion to this passage. It is possible that there were two independent versions of the text one of which was known to Cicero. It contains the commonplace metaphor of 'running life's race', see Fantham (1972) 68, 182, cf. Alexis fr. 237 K-A, St. 81 decurso aetatis spatio; Ad. 860 prope iam excursus spatium; Cic. Sen. 72, Tusc. 1.15 video calcem, ad quam cum sit decurrem, nihil sit praeterea extimescendum; Lucr. 3.1042 decurso lumine vitae. The Palatine reading arose probably from the incorporation of this tag as a gloss. See also Lindsay (1904) 41 and Enk ad loc. who assign the text of A to Plautus. breve ... spatiumst: 'life is short', a sententious commonplace, cf. Mo. 725; Sall. Iug. 1.1; Hor. Carm. 2.16.17 (with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc.), see Otto (1890) 375.

548 voluptate, vino et amore delectavero.
voluptate, vino et amore: for the (mainly pre- and postclassical) use of et after an asyndetic enumeration (a, b et c) cf. e.g. 678f., Am. 1011, As. 571, Cap. 134, 873, Mil. 739, Ps. 44,
549 nam hanc se bene habere aetatem nimiost aequius.
nam: indicates that Demipho is now going to give reasons for his personal behaviour. hanc ...
... aetatem: accusative of duration; old age was frequently known as mala aetas, cf. e.g.
Men. 758; Acc. Trag. 85; Turpil. Com. 175; Afran. Com. 382. se bene habere: cf. Au. 372
bene me haberem, Mil. 717 te bene habes, 724 et rem servat et se bene habet. nimio:
ablative of measure, see also 479n. (nimium).

550 adulescens quom sis, tum quom est sanguis integer,
Old age was regarded as a state of pervasive ill-health, e.g. Ph. 575 senectus ipsast morbus
(cf. Apoll. Car. fr. 24 K-A) For the complaint that old people are deprived of the
The blood of old people is thought to be weaker, cf. Varro Logistorici (quoted by Non. p.
494 M.) amuis enim ut sanguis deterior, sic lac. sanguis: for the quantity cf. Lucr. 4.1050,
Ov. Met. 12.127, see Kieckers (1931) II 42, LHS I 145 (from *-in-s-). integer: often found
in contexts of health coupled (or contrasted) with youth, e.g. Cic. Sen. 72, see Nisbet-
Hubbard on Hor. Carm. 1.31.18. For the combination of sanguis and integer, cf. Verg. A.
2.639 vos, o quibus integer aevi sanguis; Quint. Inst. 8 pr. 19 corpora sana et integri
sanguinis.

551 rei tuae quaerundae convenit operam dare;
AB CD A /B c d+ / as Bc d+; synizeses of rei, tuae; locus Jacobsohnianus in second D.

552 demum igitur quom sis iam senex, tum in otium
dемum igitur: ‘then at length’, ‘then finally’, cf. Am. 473, 876, Mo. 380, Ru. 930, Tri. 781.
quom ... iam: = quoniam; after Plautus’ time the conjunction began to lose its temporal and
retained its causal sense, see Lindsay (1907) 135f. otium: the ‘counter-world’ to Demipho’s
negotium as a businessman, who always told his son (376) rei mandatae omnis sapientis
primum praevorti decet.

553 te conloces, dum potes ames: id iam lucrumst
A B c D / A bb c D / A B c D; potes an unusual subject of IK, cf. Men. 16 adest benignitas
(dd a B c D). Alternatively, this could be an early instance of ês (cf. Enn. Ann. 578), see
Meiser (1998) 221. id iam lucrumst: For a similar thought cf. Ph. 241-246 (quicquid
praeter spem eveniat, omne id deputare esse in lucro), which in turn corresponds closely to a passage in Euripides’ Theseus (fr. 964 N.), translated by Cic. Tusc. 3.29. Old men proverbially cling to life, cf. S. fr. 63 N. τοῦ ζῆν γὰρ οὖσεις ὡς ὁ γηράσκων ἔρξ, Arist. Rhet. 2.13.8 καὶ φιλόξως καὶ μᾶλλα έπι τῇ τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἀπόντος εἶναι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν (‘because they want what they cannot have’), see further Griffin (1931) 182f. The noun lucrum is applied to time gained beyond expectation, cf. e.g. Hec. 287, Hor. Carm. 1.9.14f., Cic. Fam. 9.17.1, see Crampon (1985) 201f.; Apollod. Car. fr. 10 K-A (οἱ γὰρ ἀτυχοῦντες τὸν χρόνον κερδοίμονεν) shows that the idea is Greek, see Fantham (1972) 58. \[\text{lucrum} \text{A} : \text{lucrost} \text{P}; \] a final decision is impossible, as Plautine usage admits both nominative and predicative dative, see Lindsay (1907) 19. dum potes: a catch-phrase in such contexts, cf. Ht. 345 fruare dum licet; Hor. Carm. 4.12.26. It is possible that this is a joke along the same lines as Men. Asp. 311 (δονήσεται δὲ;) and Peric. 489. The senex Lysidamus at Cas. 217ff. praises love as the very spice of life.

554 quod vivis. hoc ut dico, factis perseverar.

This may allude to the opposition λόγος - ἔργον (dico - factis). \[\text{hoc ut dico: brachylogy, = hoc ita ut dico; cf. e.g. Am. 693, As. 54, Cap. 778, Mil. 1204, Ru. 316, Tri. 662, 827.}\]


555 interea tamen huc intro ad me invisam domum \[\text{nunc tamen interea ad me huc invisam domum} \text{ ΔP.} \] In P it is followed by another line of similar wording (interea tamen huc intro ad me invisam domum) that was put in the text by Leo, approved by Zwierlein (1990); see also Leo (1912) 18 n.1, Thierfelder (1929) 3. On dittoographies in the Plautine corpus see Goetz (1876), Coulter (1911), Blänsdorf (1967) 49-53. \text{tamen: used in a weakened adversative sense, denoting transition, see Stockert on Au. 539. invisam: cf. Ba. 529, and for visere with object and adverbial expression Ru. 1286.}\]

556 uxor me exspectat iam dudum essuriens domi;

Cf. the complaints by Charinus (596) and Dorippa (670-671) that the appearance of other characters is overdue, see Hough (1936) 248. As time advances, the audience will feel that
the appearance of Lysimachus’ uxor is imminent. Hough’s reference to the fact that Demipho seems to be hungry is based on a misunderstanding.

558 verum hercle postremo, utut est, non ibo tamen,
Marti (1959) 37f. notes Demipho’s sudden change of mind (Absichtsperipetie); first he states that he wants to go inside to see his wife and then he decides to go to Lysimachus first. This need not be a sign of uncouth dramaturgy; Bertini ad loc. explains the sudden change of mind psychologically: “Dopo averci ripensato Demifone decide di non andare subito a casa: non se la sente di affrontare le sfuriate della moglie, e poi muore dal desiderio di avere notizie di Pasicompsa dal suo amico Lisimaco.” verum = sed, cf. St. 53; for the development into an adversative particle see LHS II 495. postremo: ‘after all’, indicating that the speaker is thinking over the state of affairs, cf. As. 49, Ep. 708, St. 53. utut: = utcumque, quoquo modo, cf. Don. Ter. Ad. 630 ‘ut’ enim certam qualitatem significat, ‘ut ut’ incertam, see Ernout on Ba. 403.

559 sed hunc vicinum prius conveniam quam domum
a B C D A / bb C dd A / B c D; IK of prius (bb). ‘I must meet this neighbour of mine, before [i.e. ‘sooner than’] I return home.’ prius ... quam: referring to the future taking the present indicative with the main clause being a positive statement of fact (as e.g. Men. 921, Tri. 198) and the subjunctive only when, as in this case, the main clause contains an expression of will or a wish (containing a subjunctive or its equivalent), so that the idea of purpose is clear, see Woodcock (1959) 184, cf. 601, Au. 336, Men. 845. Originally priusquam did not introduce subordinate clauses; hence it is naturally followed by the same mood as precedes it. For Terentian usage see Allardice (1929) 143 (mainly with indicative; some seven occurrences of the subjunctive, explained as potential or caused by attraction/oratio obliqua). Yet, it is hard to see the difference between 1010 hanc volo prius rem agi quam meum intro refero pedem (indicative) and 167 multa exquirere etiam prius volo quam vapulem (subjunctive).

560 redeam; ut mihi aedis aliquas conducat volo
aa B c D A / bb C D A B c D; synizesis of mihi, which behaves as mỊ in ‘prosodic’ hiatus: this form of the pronoun implies emphasis, as it would usually undergo total elision. Setting up hetairai in rented accommodation is a practice that appears not to be mentioned in Greek literature. However, in [Dem.] In Neera, several other arrangements are scurrilously suggested: at 33-35 it looks as though Neaira is living ‘with’ Phrynion; and though she appears to have a place of her own at 35, that is in Megara. At 39, on the other hand, she is apparently given a house of her own in Athens by Stephanos, and the prosecution alleges
that she plied some trade from there; but it is not rented accommodation. Still, it is not unreasonable to assume that all kinds of arrangements would be possible in such situations, depending on the precise status of the individuals concerned. *conducat volo*: on *velle* with hypotaxis see Schmitfranz (1910) 38, cf. e.g. *Ba.* 77 *ut ille te videat volo. ut mihi aedis* ...

*conducat volo*: Krysińiel-Józefowicz (1949) 31 and Rambelli (1957) 34 note a contradiction between what Demipho says here (‘I will ask my neighbour to rent a house where the woman can live’) and what Lysimachus says at 584-587, where he asks Demipho to find some other place for Pasicompsa to stay: “Utrumque senem in exemplari Graeco idem a se invicem petisse veri simile non videtur.”

**561 ubi habitet istaec mulier. atque ecce it foras.**

*istaec mulier*: Pasicompsa is regularly referred to as *mulier* in this play, e.g. 101, 260, 487, 684f., 706, 720, 806, 816. On the ambiguous character of the word see 522n. Here, *istaec* may convey a certain tone of contempt, for although Demipho wants to keep Pasicompsa as his mistress, he does not appear to care about her as a person. However, it is equally possible that *iste* is used to refer to a person who is not present on stage (as e.g. *Au.* 410, *Ru.* 1291, *St.* 677). *atque eccum it foras*: this type of ‘talk-of-the-devil’ entry is very common in Plautus, cf. e.g. 109, 597. *atque eccum*: see 256n., cf. 671.
I. Introduction

1. Lysimachus' Behaviour and the Dramaturgy of the Mercator

The playwright is at a loss: the scene is set, and all that seems to remain for Demipho to do is to go inside and have fun with the girl he has bought through the agency of his neighbour. However, we are only in the middle of the third act, and something has to happen to prevent Demipho from going inside. Since Demipho is not likely to change his mind on his own, especially not after what he said about wine, women and merrymaking in the preceding monologue, a blocking-character is needed.

The change of Lysimachus' character (from stern moralist to old lecher) has variously been criticized for its suddenness. Such criticism overlooks that for the audience the equation between Lysimachus and the simia of Demipho's dream (225-271) has already been established, so that the course the action has taken is not in the least a surprise for them, and that Lysimachus is - in the eyes of the audience - by no means 'apparently harmless' at the beginning of the present scene, as Lefèvre (1995) 52 would have it. The oddity that it has to be Demipho's comrade-in-arms Lysimachus, having promised to Pasicompsa on leaving the house 'I'll bring him to you when I see him' (562), who shall prevent him from going inside (and thus taking possession of the girl), has been noted by Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 28 and Dieterle (1980) 221, but the latter's attempts at an explanation of this curious fact do not convince: it is quite implausible that Lysimachus got to know about Charinus' love for Pasicompsa off-stage and is therefore trying to support the adulescens amator. Dieterle's second suggestion is more attractive; it is possible that Lysimachus has developed an interest for the girl himself, but still, the motivation of barring Demipho from the house is not in the main psychological but dramaturgical. The two adulescentes will interact similarly in V.2. The situation is broadly parallel: Eutychus will prevent Charinus from entering the house and seeing Pasicompsa (914-916). The use of verbal and thematic parallels to point out the similarity between scenes is not, of course, limited to Roman Comedy: For examples of such 'mirroring' in Old and New Comedy cf. Men. Dysc. 459ff/498ff. ~ 911ff.; a similar principle is at work in Men. Sam. 357ff. ~ 519ff., see Frost (1988) 112 n.22. On the general subject of 'mirror-scenes', especially in Greek tragedy see Taplin (1977) 100-103.
2. Lysimachus’ House as Focus of Interest

From III.1 on, the house becomes more and more the focus of the play, and obtaining control over who is allowed to enter the house (and thus meet Pasicompsa) is an increasingly important aspect of the play. This is nicely underlined by the topography of the locative domi in the Mercator: In the passage from 1-498, the word occurs five times, in the passage from 499-1026, of almost equal length, it occurs eleven times. See Lodge s.v. domus I. The control of the doorway is a feature that is already used in Greek tragedy, see Taplin (1977) 300 (on Clytemnestra in Agamemnon). For Plautus, compare e.g. the control exerted over the entrance to the house by Tranio in Mostellaria. The person in control of the doorway is in control of an important part of the backstage world, namely of the house and all that is in it: Lysimachus is in control of his house and in particular of Pasicompsa. In the Greek original, Lysimachus may also have prevented Demipho from entering the house, but he was probably motivated by scruples rather than a selfish interest in the girl.

The pacing of the dialogue is speedy: most of the time, the lines are split between the speakers, sometimes more than once. The rapid dialogue mirrors Demipho’s eagerness to get to Pasicompsa. The way in which the erotic element is implied (cf. e.g. 567) without being expressed adds to the spectators’ enjoyment, in much the same way as in III.1.

II. Commentary

562 LY. adducam ego illum iam ad te, si convenero.
Lysimachus speaks back into the house to Pasicompsa. He was first introduced at 272, where he probably spoke back into the house as well (or to the slave accompanying him). For the convention, see Duckworth (1952) 125f., Barsby on Ba. 179-181, Fraenkel (1960) 137, 154-156. Another way of creating ‘backstage space’ is the entry of characters in mid-conversation, see 957n.

563 DE. me dicit. LY. quid a<g>is, Demipho? DE. est mulier domi?
quid a<g>is Skutsch Hermes 32 (1896) 92f. with reference to Ep. 17: quid ais codd. Quid agis? as a standard formula of greeting is needed here; quid ais? was also criticized by Seyffert (1870) 411. Metrically, both agis and ais are possible, but the transition - without any kind of greeting routine - is harsh enough as it is. mulier: ‘the lady’, see 522n.
565 DE. quid faciam? LY. quod opust facto facito ut cogites.
Lysimachus uses the same formal tone he used earlier when dispatching his slave to the country (275-283). However, now he is talking to a social equal, and by his choice of words Lysimachus assumes an air of authority that verges on the impolite. quod opust facto facito ut cogites: ‘consider what must be done’, cf. Tri. 584. For a discussion of all constructions with opus est see Sedgwick on Am. 169 and see 330n. (hoc mihi viso opust).

567 ut illo intro eam. LY. itane vero, vervex? intro eas?
ut illo: aa by IK, cf. 828. intro eam: probably a double entendre here and at 570. Enk ad loc. rightly states that the verb is taken sensu obsceno by Lysimachus, even though Demipho may not have intended an obscenity. Intrare and ingredi are capable of being used in an obscene sense, see Adams (1982) 175f., 190f.; Sen. Contr. 1.5.9 ambulet in masculos, where ambulare in seems to be a circumlocution for introire, is perhaps the closest parallel. There are several passages in comedy which may also allow an obscene interpretation, esp. Hec. 550-553 (exire and introire ad amicam), Tru. 352f. num tibi nam, amabo, tania est mordax mea, / quo introire metuas, mea voluptas? This interpretation may be supported by the following enumeration (570f.): nam nunc si illo introieris, ampecti volues, confabulari atque osculari, a passage that reminds of the cook’s words at 745. Here Lysimachus implies that Demipho wants to jump the finer points of getting to know Pasicompsa and that he will force himself on her once he has the opportunity. Moreover, the fact that Lysimachus calls Demipho vervex indicates that he has taken intro eam in an obscene sense. Demipho’s astonished answer ‘What else should I do?’ (568), again probably uttered in ignorance of the ambiguity, will raise a further laugh. vervex: ‘you wether’; Reimers (1957) 213 suggests that this term of abuse is used to characterize “undiplomatic and imprudent behaviour”, but the word implies more than that. Sexual impotence (wether = a castrated ram, cf. Varro De ling. Lat. 5.19, 5.98) rather than stupidity is the tertium comparationis, see Paschall (1939) 25 n.131, Monaco (1963) 89 n.15, Lilja (1965) 32, Svendsen (1971) 90f., Forehand (1973) 256 n.17, MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 535. Lysimachus has frequently remarked on Demipho’s old age and general unfitness for the pursuit of love (290f., 305, 540f.), and the animal epithet he chooses reflects his previous comments, cf. also 272f., 524. By using the animal comparison, Lysimachus labels Demipho’s desire as animalistic, cf. Chalinus’ aside about the two ‘wild boars’ at Cas. 476, see Slater (1985) 163.
568 DE. quid aliud faciam? LY. prius hoc ausculta atque ades:


570 nam nunc si illo introieris, amplecti voles,
amplecti: cf. 745, Ht. 900 mitto iam osculari atque amplexari. The combination osculari atque amplexari occurs at Mil. 1433. At Cas. 457, amplecti (used in an allusion to homosexual practices, on which see 203n.) is used in the context of ‘riding’ on another person’s back.

571 confabulari atque osculari. DE. tu quidem
confabulari atque osculari: cf. 745 (and 101-105, 262: ‘love at first sight’). osculari: The MSS have ausculari, cf. 575, 745 where the MSS offer both spellings. Ernout on Ba. 478 opts for au- in all places. There could be a pun here, confabulari atque ausculari - ‘chatting and listening (hanging on the other’s lips)’; the imperative ausculta is uttered only a few lines before (568). Moreover, the verb confabulari occurs only here, at 188 and at Cis. 743f. At 188 and here almost = ‘chat someone up’. At Cis. 743f. rem meam magnum confabulari/tecum volo, it denotes a one-to-one talk.

Plepelits (1972) 267-274 and Kimura (1977) claim a distinction between osculum (kiss between relatives) and savium (kiss between amatores); this distinction goes ultimately back to Don. Ter. Eu. 456, Serv. Aen. 1.256, see also Fordyce on Catul. 5.7. Still, osculari is used on both occasions in comedy, there being no verb saviari in Plautus or Terence (though cf. Pomp. Tog. 84). The innuendo in Am. 801 (iam illud non placet principium de osculo) should be noted, in view of which it seems more likely that osculum was not merely limited to signifying a dutiful kiss of greeting, but could be applied to kisses of lovers, though in general it may indicate an embrace of greater modesty than savium.

572 meum animum gestas: scis quid acturus siem.
meum animum gestas: ‘you know my mind’ (lit. ‘you carry my mind’); for the transfigurative use cf. Am. 1083, Ba. 375, Ps. 427, for the expression animum gesto Apul. Apol. 40.

573 LY. pervorse facies. DE. quodne ames? LY. tanto minus.
quodne ames? codd.: quodne amem? Scaliger. The text has been the focus of a long debate. Enk ad loc. discusses Scaliger’s conjecture and recants his earlier position, Enk
(1925) 73 where he defends the paradosis, quoting Lambinus’ explanation: “an ideo dicis quod tu ipse ames?” In his commentary Enk quotes from a private communication by Sedgwick: “If you translate ‘because you are in love’ with emphasis on in love, then it would be absolutely necessary to read amas.” However, here the subjunctive may merely be used to indicate that the reason is not the speaker’s own. Moreover, Scaliger has produced a lectio facilior by conjecture, which is methodically problematic. See also 577n.

574 iaiunitatis plenus, anima foetida,

iaiunitatis plenus: for similar oxymora cf. Au. 84, Cap. 466. The Plautine MSS attest the spelling iaiunitas here and elsewhere for the second century BC, see Meiser (1998) 80; the classical spelling is ieiumus. A little curiosity in her study of the treatment of odours in ancient literature, Lilja (1972) 127 provides a ‘realistic’ explanation of this epithet: “As regards the old man in the Mercator in particular, it should be noted that old people’s breath is usually malodorous because of the oxidized debris of old glandular secretions.” It may, in the same way, be related to the poor state of his teeth (cf. 541). Repulsive bodily smells were regarded as one of the disadvantages of old age and a number of terms of abuse were targeted at it, see Reimers (1957) 245-247. anima foetida: cf. As. 894f. dic amabo, an foetet anima uxoris tuae? :: nauteam/bibere malim, si necessum est, quam illam oscularier, Caec. Com. 160f. savium dat ieiuna anima, Turp. Com. 4 ei peril! Viden ut osculatur cariem?, Titin. Com. 20 foetida anima nasum oppugnat; Lefèvre (1995) 32 excludes Greek ‘ýý; origin of the bad breath motif, overlooking Pherecr. fr. 25 K-A ὀσπερ τῶν αἰγιδίων ζειν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος.

575 senex hircosus tu osculere mulierem?

senex hircosus: nominative for vocative, see LHS II 24f., cf. Cis. 53 sed tu ..., meus ocellus, mea Selenium. hircosus: For the sheep-motif in connection with Demipho cf. 272, 524f., 567. Goats stank (Hor. Carm. 1.17.7); they were also proverbially lusty (Hor. Epod. 10.23, Carm. 3.13.3-5). For the obscene connotations of hircus cf. also Suet. Tib. 43.2 and 45 (=Atell. inc. fr. 4), Isid. Etym. 12.1.14 hircus lascivum animal et petulcum et fervens semper ad coitum cius oculi ad libidinem in transversum aspiunt; Mart. 3.39.11 (the stink of the he-goat is worse in the state of rut), 4.4.4, 6.93.3. For the combination of the themes of lust and malodour cf. Catul. 71.6, 69.6, Mart. 12.59.5, Pers. 3.77. Bad body odours, particularly bad breath, are associated with the he-goat (cf. Mo. 40), see Lilja (1965) 32 and (1972) 151, MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 550, W. Richter, art. Ziege, RE (II) X.A, 430f. Offensive smells from the arm-pits were likened to those of male goats, cf. Hor. Epod. 12.5; Ar. Pax 811-813 (τραγομάσχαλοι ‘with goatish armpits’), Ach. 852f., Plut. 294; Mart. 11.22.7 (tragus
‘armpit stink’). osculere: deliberative (‘repudiating’) subjunctive in unwilling or indignant questions, cf. see 154-155n. and Woodcock (1959) 131f.

576 utine adveniens vomitum excutias mulieri?
excutias: for the imagery cf. Ht. 167 lacrumas excussit mihi, Tri. 74 omnibus amicis morbum tu incuties gravem.

577 <DE.> scio pol te amare, quom istaec praeemostras mihi.
At this point in the action, it would be peculiar if Lysimachus said to Demipho ‘I know that you are in love’, since he has already been told so by Demipho (cf. 304f., 313-315). Therefore this line should be assigned to Demipho, who after a first suspicion (cf. 573: quodne ames?) states now that Lysimachus has indeed revealed his own love for the girl. The attribution of speaking parts in 577-581 has been the object of much debate, see Enk ad loc. Much depends on the question whether Lysimachus should be assumed to be also in love with Pasicompsa (and thus Demipho’s rival) or not. Lysimachus’ lecherous behaviour in III.1 may be taken as an indication that he has developed an interest for the girl himself. Moreover, Lysimachus’ love for Pasicompsa would also explain and motivate his absolute unwillingness to admit Demipho into the house alone, but that he wants to have his share in the fun (if one takes line 578 to be spoken by Lysimachus). MS D may have preserved the attribution of speakers for 577f. At the beginning of 577, it has a colon (;) as an indication of change of speaker after a passage given to Lysimachus (573-576), assigning scio ... mihi to Demipho (attributed to Demipho in F and by Merula, Ritschl, Goetz, and Ernout, against Ussing, Leo, and Lindsay). quom: ‘because’; used with indicative and subjunctive in Plautus, see Lindsay (1907) 120f.

578 quid si igitur unum faciam hoc? si censes, coquom
unum ... hoc: ‘this one thing’, cf. Au. 365; cf. formulaic unum hoc scio, e.g. Mo. 72, Eu. 877. The phrasing of Gulielmius’ conjecture replacing the corrupt unum factum [unam factum in C; unam factam in D] hoc of the MSS is peculiar; it is adopted by Leo, Lindsay, Enk. Pius’ cenam faciam, adopted by Ritschl, Goetz, and Ernout, does not fit the context. The present author has adopted Gulielmius’ text faute de mieux (read perhaps una with F and faciamus instead of factum hoc?). coquom: for the etymology of coquus (*peqv>quevo>quoqu>coqu) see Meiser (1998) 97f. The pronunciation of qua- was labio-velar, see Allen (1978) 16f., like Latin c, but with simultaneous rounding and protusion of the lips: Cicero’s pun on the vocative coque and quoque illustrates this, cf. Quint. Inst.
6.3.47. Plautus may have written cocus, coquos, or quoquus, traces of all spellings being extant in the MSS. Most editors adopt a uniform spelling of some kind.

581 nunc tu sapienter loquere atque amatorie.
The statement is an effective joke παρὰ προοδοκιαν: a sapiens would not be expected to speak amatorie, as the terms are mutually exclusive.

582 quid stamus? quin ergo imus atque opsonium
opsonium: ‘provisions from the market’, see Gratwick on Men. 220; ὑφόνιον, ‘salary, wages’, i.e. the means of buying cooked food, see Stockert on Au. 280, Shipp (1960) 53. The normal word is ὑφος, ‘food eaten with bread’, see MacDowell on Ar. V. 301; it also means ‘relish’, ‘sauce’ (Hom. II. 11.360), and, especially at Athens, ‘fish’. A good discussion of the Greek terminology is provided by Kalitsunakis (1926). Cf. 695, 754, 780.

583 curemus, pulchre ut simus? L.Y. equidem te sequor.
curemus codd., Sonnenschein, Enk: curamus Camerarius, Ritschl, Goetz, Ussing, Lindsay, Leo, Ernout. The subjunctive is parallel to imus and can be explained as adhortative (quin imus? = eamus!), see Sonnenschein on Mo. 614, Enk ad loc. (with parallels). pulchre ut simus: pulchre esse ~ bene esse ‘enjoy oneself’ (cf. κολαξ ἕξειν); see Enk ad loc. Lindsay (1907) 79f., OLD s.v. sum 13a, Gratwick on Men. 485, cf. Mo. 57 victitare pulchre, Tru. 172, Eu. 728, Ph. 529; also with other adverbs, e.g. 528 ne tu frustra sis.

584 atque hercle invenies tu locum illi, si sapis:
This squares badly with what Demipho stated a few moments ago (559-561), when he said that he wants Lysimachus to go and rent some house for him. However, he does not mention this intention to him in the present scene. Moreover, it is odd that Demipho says at 587 res parata est, which in this case refers to the accommodation for Pasicompsa, for exactly the opposite is the case. invenies: The future is not infrequently used like a present subjunctive to express a wish or command, see Stockert on Au. 401, cf. Mo. 515 non me apellabis, si sapis. Conversely, the subjunctive can be used to express futurity, see 352n. si sapis: ‘take my advice ...’; frequent formula with a colloquial admonitory touch, see Enk ad loc.; cf. si sapias (373, 801).

585 nullum hercle praeter hunc diem illa apud med erit.
The audience know that this plan is doomed to failure: there is only hic dies, and no ‘tomorrow’, see 586n.
586 metuo ego uxorem, cras si rure redierit,

ego uxorem: set as bb C D A; the species of 'prosodic' hiatus after ego to secure bb is unusual but legitimate, see Lindsay (1922) 248-250, Questa (1967) 90f., Soubiran (1988) 253, 298, Gratwick (1993) 254, and Enk on 286, where a similar case arises (tibi esse); cf. also Men. 389 tibi et, 690 tibi hab(e), 827 tibi aut. cras: The use of cras 'tomorrow', i.e. 'not in this play' may suggest to the experienced spectator that Dorippa's return is imminent. Similarly, Moschion's promise to marry the girl he has wronged if ever his father returns from abroad (Men. Sam. 52f.) raises the expectation that his return is due to take place, see Hunter (1980) 222f. Why does Lysimachus assume that his wife will return from the country cras? All the audience has been told so far is that she had been expecting him 'today' at the country estate (280f.). The assumption Lysimachus makes remains unexplained. Yet, this is no reason to take offence or to assume that such slight 'illogicalities' or inconsistencies could not also have been in the Greek original.

587 ne illam hic offendat. DE. res parata est, sequere me.

As often in Plautus, one character worries about an impending threat, whereas the other character simply brushes all doubts away by saying 'everything's fine' when in fact nothing is fine and no solution is in sight. This is the ultimate expression of comic laisser-faire. On the vanquishing of all obstructions as a typical feature of festive comedy see Charney (1987) 135-142. res parata est: 'it's as good as done'. Enk ad loc. changes to erit, pedantically, as the perfect may be taken to be anticipatory, indicating the suddenness with which an action will occur, cf. e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.3.145 si eodem animo paulum adnixi eritis, milites, vicimus, Att. 5.15.1 si prorogatur, actum est.
I. Introduction

The theme of Charinus' entrance monologue (588-597) is his impatient expectation of Eutychus' arrival. Eutychus returns (598), but he has bad news for Charinus: the girl had already been bought when he came to the ship in the harbour (616). Although Eutychus protests his innocence as far as the unfortunate turn that the intrigue has taken is concerned (626), the young lover chides his best friend for his unloyal behaviour and his stupidity (629-632). Eventually, he decides to go into exile (644-647, 658-660), against the advice of his friend (649-657), who decides to go and look for the girl all over the city (662-666).

The scene serves two purposes. First, it shows Eutychus as a patient, self-sacrificing sodalis opitulator, bearing with equanimity the unjust accusations heaped on him by his friend. Second, it keeps the audience in suspense as to the further fate of Charinus who threatens to go into exile or even to commit suicide (660). Incidentally, it reinforces the impression that Charinus is a typical adulescens amator, who can neither face up to any difficulties and obstacles nor react in a rational way to the well-meaning advice given by friends.

As suits Charinus' pathetic state, the language of the passage is dominated by paratragic expressions and phrases, exaggerations, and rapid repartee. The grotesque description of Pasicompsa's buyer (639f.) and the gratuitously long list of possible places of exile (646f.) add a lighter note to the scene, while Eutychus' philosophical diatribe against going into exile (649-657) is a thoughtful excursus in a scene that is elsewhere dominated by Plautine farce. Here, Eutychus has, as the only character in the play, been assigned a passage of coherent argument by the playwright that is meant to sound serious (that is, as serious as such lines can possibly sound in the context of Plautine comedy) and that are in accordance with a coherent set of widely current and generally accepted moral precepts. The scene is in trochaic septenarii, as befits its pace and predominantly farcical nature.

II. Commentary

588-597 Charinus' entrance monologue (a well-balanced set speech)
588-591 Charinus' general state: His restless soul torments him
592-597 Charinus hopes for the successful return of his friend Eutychus
592-594 There is still hope, as long as Eutychus returns
595-597 Eutychus has not come yet; slowness is his worst vice
589 si domi sum, foris est animus; sin foris sum, animus domist.
The 'separable' *animus* is a common conceit of love and friendship. Lovers in Plautus are quite typically 'out of their minds', and Plautus exploits this idea with relish; a prime example of a schizophrenic lover is Mnesilochus at *Ba*. 500-511, see Gratwick (1995) 97-106. Plautus is fond of playing with the paradox of the present body and the absent mind in a deliberately reductive manner; much of Plautine entertainment exploits the dichotomous mood of the personalities created by him, and he likes to make his players comment on this fact themselves, cf. e.g. the statements of the *amatores* at *Cis*. 212f. *ubi sum, ibi non sum, ubi non sum, ibi est animus;* *ita mihi omnia sunt ingenia,* *Per.* 709, *Tru.* 866; Enk ad loc. also compares *Au.* 181, *Ar. Ach.* 398 ὁ νοὸς μὲν ἐξὼ ἐξαλέγον ἐπὸλλαμο/οὐκ ἔνδον, αὖτος δ' ἔνδον. Cf. also *Ba.* 194f. *animast amica amanti: si abest, nullus est/si adest, res mullast: ipsus est nequam et miser,* 713, *Cu.* 174, *Ps.* 34, *Eu.* 196, 816, *Ht.* 390, 1063; *Hec.* 297, *Enn. Trag.* 190f. (cf. *Cas.* 570-573), Q. Lutatius Catulus, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (ed. Morel) p. 43 *aufugit mi animus; credo, ut solet, ad Theotimum / devenit. sic est: perfugium illud habet,* *Cic.* *Att.* 12.12.1.

In the present line, the identity of one's own self is defined by the experience of the absence of the experience of such identity, that is, by suffering the experience of a 'split identity' or 'multiple identity'. From this point of view, love may be defined as a loss, namely the surrender of one's heart (*animus*), cf. *As.* 141, *Cis.* 211, *Tru.* 865f., see further Flury (1968) 31f. and 34, Milbradt (1974) 1435, MacCary/Willcock on *Cas.* 572, Zagagi (1980) 78-80, 134-137, Konstan (1986) 376f., and compare similar statements made by Cato the Elder, Plut. *Erot.* 759c-d ('Cato used to say that the soul of the lover dwelt in that of the beloved' (cf. id. *Ant.* 946d) and *Cat. Ma.* 9.28. Barsby on *Eu.* 196 states the commonly held opinion that this is an essentially Roman view of love. Yet the motif of the 'extra-body' sensation and of the soul's leaving its body and going somewhere else is also common in Hellenistic literature, and the lover's soul (*ψυχή*) can be said to vacate the body under Eros' influence and run off in search of the object of its desire, leaving its owner half-dead in the process (*Call. HE* 1057f.), see Campbell on Apoll. Rhod. 3.446f. This may have been inspired by passages like *Il.* 15.80f. or *Od.* 11.222 (*ψυχή δ' ἥνε ὅνευρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται*); see also Lilja (1965) 195-197, Sier (1988) 137, 205.

590 ita mi in pectore atque in corde facit Amor incendium:
in pectore atque in corde: complementary expression (κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν), cf. *Men.* 761; *cor* is regarded as the seat of reason ('brain'), *pectus* of feeling ('heart'). Amor: personification ("Ερως"). incendium: 'arson'; only used metaphorically elsewhere in
republican drama, cf. As. 919 ex amore tantumst homini incendium, Tri. 675, An. 308, Ht. 367, see Preston (1916) 48, Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 41. The imagery is grotesque. One can of course say ‘my heart is on fire’, yet who but a young lover would say ‘Love committeth arson in my heart and soul’?

591 ni ex oculis lacrumeræ defendant, iam ardeat credo caput.
Fire metaphors are very common with reference to ‘ardent’ love. Here, the commonplace image is varied (and given a twist towards the grotesque) by combining it with the idea that, if the head is burning, the tears bursting forth will have the effect of quenching the fire; the result is a grotesque inversion of the amatory pathos, see Flury (1968) 83. The underlying image is that of a burning house. First, the fire burns the middle, then it finds its way up to the rooftops, cf. As. 919, Ep. 554f., Per. 801*cb, Tri. 675f., Eu. 67-69, 84f., see Fantham (1972) 10, Preston (1916) 48 n.73 (with Greek examples). lacrumeræ: on the topos of the crying lover see Kistrup (1963) 101f. ni: ‘but for the fact that’, cf. Verg. G. 4.455f. ardeat: cf. 600 pectus ardet, haereo, 617 montes ... mali ... ardentis, Am. 1067, Cap. 594, Cas. 354, 937, Ep. 555, Men. 841. The image of Love’s consuming fire and burning passion is commonplace in Graeco-Roman literature, cf. e.g. Sappho fr. 31.10 LP, Theocr. Id. 2.38-40, Meleager AP 12.127; Hor. Carm. 2.9.10-12, Verg. Ecl. 2.68, Aen. 4.1f.; Manil. Astr. 5.471f.; Sen. Phaedr. 103f., see López López (1980) 322. iam ardeat credo caput: relaxed rhythm, fitting the absurdly detached and objective mode of expression of a man commenting on his emotional state like a bystander: ‘But for the fact that my tears are keeping it at bay, I think my head would catch fire any minute.’

592 Spem teneo, Salutem amisi; redeat an non nescio:
Spem ... Salutem: personifications like Amor (590), cf. 593, 867. amisi: not = perdidi ‘I have lost’, but = e manibus dimisi ‘sent away’, ‘let go of’ (as a boat floating off or a bird released), implies that the speaker has surrendered control, cf. 869 and the other examples listed by Lodge s.v. II.1 and ThLL I 1921.7-1922.3 s.v. I a+b; Lodge lists the present instance mistakenly under II.4 perdere. redeat an non nescio: sc. salus; parenthetic disjunctive question, preparing for Eutychus’ imminent entry (in conjunction with the complaints at 595-597); a standard device of ancient drama, cf. e.g. Men. Dysc. 78f., S. Oed.R. 289, see Frost (1988) 11f.

593 si opprimit pater quod dixit, exsulatum abit Salus;
Charinus fears that Demipho could have sold Pasicompsa to his alleged friend (cf. 426) instead of Eutychus.
si ... sin: Plautus is fond of giving the same idea a positive and a negative form, cf. e.g. Ba. 192, Men. 93, Trin. 320f., see 598n. exsulatum abiit: for the exile imagery see Fantham (1972) 54; cf. 43.

595 sed tamendem si podagrosis pedibus esset Eutychus, tamendem: appears to have the same force as tamen, if the text is sound; see Enk ad loc. and Lindsay (1907) 117, who reads tamendem also at Mil. 585 (against Leo) and An. 521 (where Donatus attests tamenidem). However, the readings are doubtful and the word may well be an artefact, see Soubiran on Mil. 585. For apparently enclitic -dem cf. idem, itidem. However, the morphology and the meaning of tamendem remain obscure, as it cannot simply be analysed as tamen-dem, since e.g. idem is *id-em ‘just that’, -d- being retained in other forms by misdivision, see Meiser (1998) 161. At any rate, tamendem refers forward to the main clause: ‘But in any case, even if ..., he could have ...’ podagrosis: used as an adjective only in Plautus and once by Lucilius fr. 354f. W., see Reimers (1957) 246.

597 quod nimis tardus est advorsum mei animi sententiam. Complaints about the slowness of other characters are frequent in ancient comedy, cf. e.g. Poen. 504f. advorsum mei animi sententiam: cf. 441; an absurdly pompous way of saying odiose, imitating Roman officialese.

598 sed isne est quem currentem video? ipsus est. ibo obviam. The announcement of another character seen rushing onto the stage by the very person expecting him, is conventional in Greek and Roman drama, see Enk ad loc. isne est: instead of the text in A (adopted by Ernout), in est (P, adopted by Leo) is equally possible (by contraction and apocope). currentem: suggests that Eutychus has an important message to deliver (like a servus currens). Indeed, Eutychus’ function resembles that of a servus so much that Grimal (1975) 150 actually mistook him for a slave in this scene. Strangely enough, at line 600 he seems to have stopped running. Alternatively, one might understand currentem as an ironic comment on Eutychus’ slowness: ‘But isn’t that him? And look, how fast he’s running!’ This would be in keeping with Charinus statement at 601 prius quam recipias anhelitum, which would be a funny remark if Eutychus was not out of breath at all. Unlike Acanthio, Eutychus does not react anyway.

598’-598b, also transmitted in the MSS at 842f.; should be bracketed here for dramaturgical reasons. The transition from line 598 to 599 is smooth (with aposiopesis after restat, Charinus changing from optimism to pessimism): ‘I’ll approach him. From now on things
will (... be O.K.) - oh no! I don't like the look of his face!' Theatrically, it is more convincing to have Charinus go straight up to Eutychus to meet him after he announces the intention to do so at line 597 ('I'll approach him'), then to catch sight of him (598 'Now I can see him - I don't like his looks'). It would be awkward to make Charinus stop in the middle of this straight movement to deliver two lines of ill-motivated prayer. See further 842-843n.

599 nunc, quod restat - ei disperii! voltus neutiquam huius placet;
The description of Eutychus' features has special point if he is wearing a mask (changes to the fixed expression need constantly to be interpreted to the spectators). **nunc, quod restat:** 'now, what's left ...'; Enk's explanation ad loc. ("dicere vult Charinus: nunc quod gradum sistit mihi non placet, sed prae timore dicit ei disperii") is unconvincing, as it does not explain restat, which cannot easily be understood to refer to Eutychus' pace or the fact that he is lagging behind (Nixon's translation 'oh, he is stopping' is equally misleading), cf. Cis. 188, Ru. 1287, Tru. 20. **neutiquam:** 'in no wise', cf. Cap. 586, Mil. 631, Poen. 199, An. 330, Ht. 357, Hec. 403.

600 tristis cedit (pectus ardet, haereo) quassat caput.

**B C D A / B c D A / B c D / A B c d+; mixed-type square verse.** Here, Eutychus' entry is almost a reversal of a servus currens routine; he does not behave unlike the lingering messenger at S. Oed. R. 223f. **tristis cedit (BcD) Bothe:** tristis incedit (Bc/cD) codd. 'Split dactyl' is avoided in the trochaic septenarius: Bothe deleted the prefix and reads tristis cedit, in which he was followed by Goetz, Ussing, Ernout, and, faute de mieux, the present author. Havet (1911) 289 also opted for the deletion of the prefix as a later scribal insertion (taking incedit as a gloss on cedit), cf. As. 405, Ba. 1069, Mil. 897, Poen. 577, Tru. 463. It is suspicious that this metrical problem arises in similar contexts. In all these cases, emendation remains problematic, see Leo in app. ad As. 405 and Leo (1912) 258f., Lindsay (1922) 129-135; for a counter-example, cf. Caecil. fr. 271 si quassante capite tristes incedunt; cf. Men. Sic. 124 καὶ σκοθρωπὸς ἑρχεται. **tristis:** 'out of spirits', 'with a sour face', 'sulky', objective as always in Old Latin (not subjective 'sad'), cf. An. 360, Ad. 82. **pectus ardet:** on the fire imagery see 591n. Weissert (1959) 92f. notes rightly that the idea of a burning heart is usually connected with rage and anger, but not, as here, with grief (and love, cf. 590). **haereo:** 'I'm stuck', cf. e.g. 723, Eu. 848. **quassat caput:** 'he's tossing his head'; not a sign of disapproval, but of one violently moved, whether by sorrow, sadness (Ba. 303-305), grief (Tri. 1169), dejection, or discontent (Mil. 207, As. 403f.), see Loitold (1956) 36f., Taladoire (1951) 30f., cf. Caec. Com. 271f., Verg. A. 7.292, Sen. Oed. 913 (where the phrase refers to
a violent beating of the head with one’s hand, which is the usual meaning in Greek comedy, cf. Men. Epit. 569, Her. 4). A similar image is found in Homer, cf. Hom. Od. 5.285 κινήσας δὲ κάρπη προτὰ δὲ μυθήσατο θυμόν (a sign of repressed anger).

601 CH. Eutyches. EU. eu, Charine. CH. prius quam recipias anhelitum, Eutyches ... eu, Charine: word-play on the morphology of Eutychus’ name, see Mendelsohn (1907) 43. Charinus actually calls his friend Tyche (Fortuna). This may also be the reason why lines 842f. were put in the margin at this point and were incorporated into the text (598ABB). eu: ‘fine’, ‘splendid’ (εξ), cf. e.g. Mo. 339, Per. 668, Eu. 154. prius quam recipias anhelitum: ‘before you get your breath’; hysteron proteron. anhelitum: a standard word in servus currens contexts (see 600n.), cf. 114, Am. 233, As. 327.

602 uno verbo eloquere: ubi ego sum? hicine an apud mortuos? hicine an apud mortuos?: ‘in this world (OLD s.v. 2) or in the Underworld?’; παρὰ προσδοκαίμιν, since it is obvious that Charinus is neither dead nor in the Underworld. The use of the phrase is metaphorical; Eutychus reacts by taking it literally, a Plautine Eulenspiegelei; echoed at 606 neque hic neque Acherunti. Cf. perhaps Call. Ep. 41.1f. ἡμισὸν μὲν ψυχῆς ἐπὶ τὸ πνεόν, ἡμισὸ δ' ὄντι ὀδὴ / εἰτ' Ἐρώς εἰτ' Ἀίδης ἡρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.

603 EU. neque apud mortuos neque hic es. CH. salvus sum, immortalitas Regardless of what Eutychus intended his words to mean, Charinus seems to understand (by implication) sed in caelo es, ‘everything’s just fine’, as his exuberant reaction shows. immortalitas: Charinus thinks Eutychus has managed to secure the girl; now he has everything his heart desires and feels on a par with the gods. The death theme is maintained, but inverted: a moment ago Chrinus was almost apud mortuos, now he is immortalis. Immortality (‘being-like-the-gods’) and joy are joined, cf. Poen. 275-277, An. 959f., Ht. 693, Hec. 843, Turpil. Com. 87f., see Maurach on Poen. 276, Fraenkel (1960) 209. Deus esse is almost a synonym for ‘being overjoyed’, cf. Cu. 167, Hec. 843, Prop. 2.15.37-40, see Lieberg (1962) 35-37, Griffin (1985) 146.

604 mihi data est: hic emit illam, pulchre os sublevit patri. An aside, as is clear from the use of hic to refer to Eutychus: Charinus’ exuberance leads to a ‘conspiratory’ address of the audience, so as to share his triumph with them. This is extremely funny, as the audience know Eutychus’ message will destroy Charinus utterly. pulchre os sublevit patri: see 485n.
605 impetrabilior qui vivat nullus est. dice, opsecro:

606 si neque hic neque Acherunti sum, ubi sum? EU. nusquam gentium.

607 CH. disperii, illaec interemit me modo - oratio.
*B cc D A B c D A / B c d+ / A B c D; hiatus after modo and locus Jacobsohnianus in third D.*
oratio: The last word is spoken *para prosdokian* (oratio being an unlikely subject of *interimere*, cf. *St.* 183); a short pause before it is indicated by hiatus, cf. *Cic.* *Mil.* 34 me quidem, iudices, examinant et interimunt hae - voces.

608 odiosast oratio, cum rem agas, longinquom loqui.
The MSS give this line to Charinus, Leo and Enk (mistakenly referring to Ussing) to Eutychus. Sense and context demand that Charinus says this (cf. 609); Bothe’s transposition (609.610.608) is worth a second thought. The syntax of this line is unclear, but it seems best to take *longinquom loqui* as an epexegetic infinitive used as an attribute of *oratio*. *cum rem agas*: ‘when you are busy/on the go ...’; has a formal ring (*res* ‘a case of importance/some big business ...’), cf. *Ep.* 422f. *res magna amici apud forum agitur*, *Men.* 587, *Ps.* 645, *St.* 129; *Ht.* 354, 851, *Hec.* 774, *Ph.* 631, *Ov.* *Ars* 1.86, *Sen.* *Ag.* 867; *Ar.* *Ran.* 759, 1099 (*μήγα προσγίμα*). *rem agas*: *bb C*, ‘prosodic’ hiatus. *longinquom*: adverbial accusative; not = *diu* ‘at length’, but ‘right from the start, ab ovo’ (‘from afar’, i.e. ‘from the top’, ‘going right back to the start’), cf. *μακρόθεν*.

609 quidquid est, ad capita rerum perveni. EU. primum omnium:
This line contains a parody of a tragic messenger speech; note especially the phrase *primum omnium*, alluding to the habit of tragic (especially Euripidean) messengers to give the burden of their message in brief, see Taplin (1977) 85f. *capita rerum = τὰ κεφάλαια*; cf. e.g. *Tru.* 790, see Enk ad loc. *primum omnium*: ‘first of all’, cf. e.g. *Am.* 1135, *As.* 650, *Cas.* 118; *omnium primum* is also found, e.g. *Am.* 609, 1088, *Ca.* 389, *Mo.* 397.
610 periimus. CH. quin tu illud potius nuntias quod nescio?
periimus: laconic; cf. 135. quin tu illud potius nuntias quod nescio?: ‘Would you be kind enough to tell me what I don’t know?’

611 EU. mulier alienata est abs te. CH. Eutyche, capital facis.
bb c dd A B C D A / B c d+ / aa B c d+; locus Jacobsohnianus at third D; hiatus at A/B (te/Eu-); a run of five shorts at the beginning. capital facis: ‘you are committing a crime risking your existence-as-a-citizen’, capital being capital(e) facinus, see Bertini ad loc., Wright (1974) 116 n.49, Gratwick on Men. 92; cf. Mo. 475, Ad. 721-723; cf. 183 nugare in re capitali mea. The phrase capital facis is one in a long series of legal terms that are used with parodic intent in the following passage (611-632). Charinus’ excessive emotionality is incongruously paired with the sober language of the courtroom, some of which is used by himself, capital facis (611), liberum civem (612), fidem mecum tuam (625), deos apsentis testis memoras (627), mandata (630), mandare (632), some by Eutychus, addicta atque abducta (616), in manu (628, twice). Schmidt (1959) 319 thinks that this joke could not have come from Philemon’s play, but cf perhaps Men. Dysc. 291-293 ἡ κουφόν ἐπιτρόπων τινα / κατεργάσασθαι πράγμα θανάτων ἥξιον / πολλῶν, Sam. 514 φόνον ἕγω κρίνο τὰ τοιαύθεν ὅστις ἐπικαυσάτ' ἐποιή.

612 EU. qui? CH. quia aequalem et sodalem, liberum civem, enicas.
aequalem et sodalem: roughly equivalent to συνέφηβος, like ‘amicus and aequalis’ (Ep. 102, Tri. 48, 326, Ad. 465, Ht. 417; Afran. Com. 389, 256 R.), see also 475n. A play of Afranius is called Aequales, and several Greek comedies Συνεφηβου. liberum civem: cf. Ad. 181f. nam si molestus pergis esse, iam intro abripere atque ibi / usque ad necem operire loris. :: loris liber? :: sic erit. The legal point Plautus makes is that one has to lose one’s status as citizen (through aquae et igni interdictio) and thus be made a hostis (‘stranger’, non-citizen) before one can be executed. enicas: ‘throttle’, ‘strangle’, which was the usual form of capital punishment in Rome; a pun on the literal and the transfigurative meaning of enicare, see 114n., Adams (1973) 280ff. The end-position of the word increases the ἀπανοσᾶν effect.

613 EU. ne di sierint! CH. demisisti gladium in iugulum: iam cadam.
For the violent imagery of the ‘final kill’ see 308-312n., Fantham (1972) 30f., cf. Ad. 958. The expression seems to be proverbial (cf. Cic. Att. 1.16.2 cum illum plumbeo gladio iugulatum iri diceret) and may derive from depictions of the last moments of a fight, before the opponent is killed with the sword already held to his throat.
Charinus takes Eutychus’ advice literally, and subverts the metaphor by taking it literally. It is remarkable that, from a farcical point of view, Charinus’ statement is true, considering what he has said at the beginning of this scene (589): his animus is simply not ‘at home’, so there simply is no animus that he could lose. quaeso: used at line-opening; more urgent than parenthetic and quasi-enclitic quaeso in mid-line (e.g. Ad. 190); in front-position often followed by hercle or edepol, cf. As. 417, Mo. 897, 1026, Men. 742, or introducing the repetition of a plea (e.g. Ba. 744, Tri. 146f.). Sometimes it is clear from the context that the request is urgent, e.g. Cis. 747, And. 8, Hec. 8. animum ne desponde: ‘don’t resign your will to live’; in adhortatory contexts, there may be a certain comforting nuance to this as opposed to ne + perfect subjunctive and noli + infinitive. For the euphemism animum despondere ‘sign away one’s spirit’ (the rights over one’s spirit, to Death) cf. Men. 35, Mil. 6, 1035, perhaps also Ps. 32.

loquere porro aliam malam rem. quoi t est empta? EU. nescio.

addicta: for addico ‘knock down’ (‘sell to the highest bid’) cf. Ba. 1205, Cap. 181, see Thielmann (1961) 18f., Talamanca (1955) 106-108; the addictio was usually performed by the praeco conducting the auction. This line harks back to the auction in II.3. addicta atque abducta: play on the sound of two words with variation of the prefixes, see Brinkhoff (1935) 148. In legal terms, this phrase seems to imply that an addictio constituted the first step of the procedure of purchasing the girl (addicta est) and that the buyer then, in a separate legal transaction, either a mancipatio or traditio, gained full possession of her (abducta est); for the terminology see Thielmann (1961) 222. At 858, Charinus uses abducere in a non-technical sense. vae mihi!: cf. 161.
617 montis tu quidem mali in me ardentis iam dudum iacis.
'You've been flinging volcanoes of evil at me for ages.' montis: cf. 163, 641 (thensaurus ... mali), Ep. 84 in te inrtuent montes mali, Mo. 352f. ita mali maeroris montem maximum for similar juxtapositions of abstract and concrete expressions, see Molsberger (1989) 63. ardentis: cf. 591, 600; the fire imagery is taken up again. It is unlikely that the expression refers to some kind of torture involving pitch, as is suggested by Enk ad loc.

618 perge, excricia, carnufex, quandoquidem occepsi semel.
excrucia: See 184n. carnufex: 'hangman', '(public slave-) executioner', one of the most descriptive epithets in colloquial Latin, but only here and As. 892 with reference to liberi, see Reimers (1957) xix, Lilja (1965) 56. Here it is used as an abusive allegation of cruelty, as is made clear by the use of the verb excruciare, see Reimers (1957) 179f. (Ps. 367, quoted by Reimers, is no parallel).

619-624 Following Ribbeck (1883) 5, Lindsay in app., Thierfelder (1929) 111 and 114, Enk brackets this passage. Ritschl had already bracketed 620-624, a move applauded by Goetz (1876) 258 and 268. Indeed, it is true that this passage can be omitted without injury to the sense, but the same may be said of a good many passages elsewhere in Plautus. Unfortunately, 619-680 are not available in A, but on the testimony of Varro De ling. Lat. 7.60, line 619 was already in the text of the Mercator in the first century BC and should not without good reason be assumed to belong to a redactor's text. The line is one of the rare occasions in this play where Eutychus gives vent to his displeasure at being chided so unjustly by his lovelorn friend, and it is therefore a valuable means of Eutychus' characterization. Possible objections against the remaining lines (620-624) are: (a) the seemingly redundant question dic, quis emit at 620 (cui est empta? at 615), (b) Eutychus' answer nescio hercle (nescio at 615), (c) Charinus' reproach of his friend's failure to ask for a description of Pasicompsa's buyer at 622-624 (similar to 637). None of these objections is convincing enough to justify a deletion of the lines.

It is plausible that Charinus, after Eutychus did not react to his reproach the first time (624), should repeat it later (637), and if only to be surprised at Eutychus' answer feci (638). Charinus has mentioned two other possible courses of action Eutychus could have taken only to find out that he has done exactly what Charinus chided him for not doing (633-635: he should have asked whether the buyer was an Athenian citizen - 635: so he did; 636: he should have asked where that man lived -637: so he did). Now he introduces (with at, as if to stress the contrast) his last and, as he thinks, most powerful point: Eutychus should
have asked for the man’s facies (638). Charinus is sure to have caught Eutychus out this
time, as he takes Eutychus’ silence at 624 as a confession of guilt.

If this is the case, one should perhaps read line 638 as EU. feci. CH. <fecistin?> qua
forma esse aiebant? EU. ego dicam tibi, where the surprised question <fecistin?> would
underline the fact that Charinus had not anticipated an affirmative answer. For refutations of
objections (a) and (b), see 620n.

619 EU. nec tibi istuc magis dividiaest, quam mihi hodie fuit.
B c D A bb C dd A / B c D aa B c D; scanning as a trochaic septenarius if mihi is set as cD
with hiatus. Fortson (1996) 69 n.112 observes that the line scans better as an iambic
senarius, probably thinking of something like A bb C dd A bb C D aa B c D, but that
scansion would be dissatisfying rhythmically. Despite the difficult scansion and the fact that a
number of scholars have regarded the vicinity of this line as textually suspicious, it seems
unwise to bracket it. nec codd. (A n.1.), Goetz/Schoell: non cod. Varron. de L.L. 7.60, Leo,
Lindsay, Enk; nec is used to take up the accusations uttered by Charinus in 617f.; this is
another reason to assume against Enk that this passage is genuine. Varro’s non is due to the
fact that the line is quoted out of context, probably from memory; cf. Am. 595 neque tibi
istuc mirum <mirum> magis videtur quam mihi.

620 CH. dic, quis emit? EU. nescio hercle. CH. hem istucinest operam dare
dic, quis emit?: seems like a repetition of 615, but the two questions refer to different
things: at 615 Charinus wanted to know for whom the girl has been bought (a mode of
thought that is quite in keeping with the spirit of the intrigue planned at 486-487), now he
wants to know who bought the girl. istucinest ... ? ‘is that the way to ... ?’; istucin(e) <
*istuccin < *istudc(e) + -ne.

The infuriated accusation of a friend by a young lover is stock-in-trade in Plautus,
and the most impressive collection of allegations is perhaps Ba. 476-480; cf. below 629-632.
The adulescens amator, himself unable to conduct an intrigue or carry out any sensible
action, leaves all activity to a third party. When that strategy fails, he suddenly knows
exactly what to do and how to do it (cf. 633-635).

621 bonum sodalem? EU. quid me facere vis? CH. idem quod me vides,
bonum sodalem: sodalis, first used of Eutychus at 594; it is telling that Charinus, who has
caused Eutychus only trouble so far, refers to himself as a bonus sodalis. bonum: unusual
iambic shortening (bb), see Drexler (1965) 144, Questa (1967) 36, and 479n.; cf. Ba. 404
(troch.sept.) patrém sodalis.
622 ut pereas. quin percontatu's hominis quae facies foret
ut pereas: παρέχειν προσοδοκίαν joke (cf. 612); at the same time another good example of an
Eulenspiegelei (see 614n.). facies: 'appearance', not 'face', see 427n. Later in this scene, at
637, Charinus repeats the question concerning the outer appearance of the mysterious buyer.
Eutychus, who does not seem to react at all to the question now, will willingly provide
Charinus and the audience with a breathtaking description, see 637n.

626 EU. di sciunt culpam meam istanc non esse ullam. CH. eugepae!
eugepae: 'bravo!', 'very good!'; not found anywhere else in Greek or Roman comedy apart
from Plautus (Am. 1018, Cap. 274, Ps. 743, Ru. 170, 442, St. 381), usually at change of
speaker.

627 deos absentis testis memoras: qui ego istuc credam tibi?
A similar statement is made by Charinus in the prologue (6f.), see Zehnacker (1974) 775f.
His father Demipho holds exactly the opposite opinion about the powers of the gods: they
send dreams (225-227), they influence people's propensity to fall in love (285, 320f.).
However, none of these statements reveals anything about the two characters' theological
opinions, nor should they be regarded as allusions to the theological doctrines of Hellenistic
philosophy. Charinus is just as quick to rejoice and shout (603f.) salvos sum, immortalitas /
mihi data est; Demipho is just as quick to give purely egocentric and personal reasons for
his love (544-554). It would be mistaken to look for a consistent 'psychology' of the various
masks in this play, except perhaps for Eutychus, whose friendship is described
sympathetically by the playwright. qui: Charinus means quomodo, but Eutychus understands
cur and answers appropriately with a causal clause, see Enk ad loc., Brinkhoff (1935) 74,
Schmidt (1959) 221, Wallochyn (1992) 67; cf. 183 for a similar case, 487 (possibly), Au.
502, Cu. 705, Mil. 826.

628 EU. quia tibi in manu est quod credas, ego quod dicam, id mihi in manust.
This slightly opaque line seems to refer to the fact that both Eutychus and Charinus are
human beings endowed with a free will. In the mouth of actors acting in a play, this
observation does not fail to arouse a smile, as it is not within the powers of either Charinus
or Eutychus to believe or to say what they want. They believe and say what the playwright
wants them to. tibi in manu est: 'it depends on you', 'is up to you', a colloquial
development from a legal phrase, in manu esse, see 454n. (used literally at 926).
629 CH. de istac re argutus es, ut par pari respondeas,
B C D / A B c D / A B c D / A B c D; square verse type II; metrical hiatus at first D/A. The
metre of the second half of the line nicely expresses the par pari respondere (ABcD -
ABcD); for a similar metrical rhyme in an iambic senarius see 282n. This line is decidedly
derogatory in tone; it is a criticism of Eutychus’s lack of real ability, and not so much a
praise of his previous rhetoric, as Wallochny (1992) 67 seems to assume. par pari
respondeas: ‘swap insults (using extemore repartee)’; a kind of ‘flyting’, cf. e.g Per. 223,
Tru. 939, Ph. 212 (the full expression: verbum verbo par pari ut respondeas), see Otto
πρὸς ἐπος ἤρειδομένωθ’.

630 ad mandata claudus caecus mutus mancus debilis.
Asyndetic enumeration, giving the impression of emotions running high (cf. 407, 674).

631 promittebas te os sublinere meo patri: egomet credidi
Charinus refers to Eutychus’ earlier suggestion to deceive Demipho (485).
promittebas: the only other instance of the imperfect indicative of promittere in Plautus is
also used by someone complaining about an unkept promise (Ru. 540). The imperfect is
perhaps used to indicate a stronger emotional involvement with what was said at the time,
and to emphasize how profuse the promises really were (‘you kept going on with your big
promises’). sublinere: present (rather than future) infinitive after promitto (and spero,
voveo, minor etc.) is not uncommon in comedy, see Enk and Bertini ad loc., cf e.g. As. 377,
Ru. 541, 718, Tri. 5.

632 homini docto rem mandare, is lapidi mando maxummo.
homini docto: ‘to an expert’; in a Roman, doctus implies, more often than not, Greek
learning, while Greeks are called docti when in their own language they would be called
σοφοί, see Powell on Cic. Sen. 54. Here, however, it is more likely to be understood with an
378 nimis doctus illest ad male faciundum, 428, Mo. 1072; see also 522n. is: can refer to
ego (as here) or tu, cf. Am. 177, Ba. 122f., Ru. 1195f., see Lindsay (1907) 47. lapidi:
‘simpleton’, ‘blockhead’. It is clear from the opposition to homini docto (and the
unflattering descriptions at 630) that, unlike the English use in a phrase like ‘made of stone’,
lapidi is used of a stupid, inept, and slow-witted (rather than an unfeeling) person, see
290f., Ht. 917. Terence also uses saxum to refer to stupidity (Eu. 1085), see Lilja (1965) 29.
Greek λῆθος can be used similarly, see e.g. Headlam/Knox on Herod. *Mim.* 6.4, Monaco (1963) 75; ἄφετανος Men. *Asp.* 353; λῆθος is used of someone who does not say anything by Philemon fr. 102 K-A.

633 EU. quid ego facerem? CH. quid tu faceres? men rogas? requireres, facerem ... faceres ... requireres (... rogitares): imperfect subjunctive, `past jussive' or `retrospective command', expressing an obligation that lies in the past or a retrospective deliberation, see Ernout on *Ba.* 196, Lindsay (1907) 59.

634 rogitares quis esset auf unde esset, qua prosapia, prosapia: (lit.) 'manger', used instead of familia; on rustic elements in Latin, see 59n. Words that have a rustic connotation can have a pretentious ring about them. In the context of urban Rome, this sounds a bit quaint; cf. *Cu.* 393, Sall. *Iug.* 85. Vissering (1842) 47f. assumes astutely that this line may reflect some form of parody of a famous Homeric line (*Od.* 1.170 τίς, πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἢδε τοιχεῖς;) in Philemon's *Emporos*, cf. *Men.* 826 unde aut quis.

635 civisne esset an peregrinus. EU. civem esse aibant Atticum.
If it was not tacitly assumed that this play is set in 'Athens' (cf. 8361, 9441), this remark would remain unclear.

637 EU. nemo aiebat scire. CH. at saltem hominis faciem exquireres.
faciem: ‘appearance’, ‘looks’, see 427n. At 622 Charinus has already asked Eutychus for a description of the mysterious buyer, but Eutychus did not react at all. Now he is more than willing to provide his friend with a detailed, albeit admittedly (cf. 641) grotesque physical description of the unknown man. In view of this structural peculiarity, it seems quite possible that Plautus has inserted this piece of verbal fireworks here for comic purposes. at saltem: restrictive, ‘but, at any rate’, ‘at least’; often used in expressions of desperation, see Sedgwick on *Am.* 438.

638 EU. feci. CH. <fecistin?> qua forma esse aibant? EU. ego dicam tibi: <fecistin?> Dunsch (based on Lindsay in app.). The interrogative particle is added to express Charinus' surprise at the affirmative answer, see the discussion at 619-624n. Others suggested to insert a word after aiebant: <Euyche> is Bothe's conjecture; Leo suggested <igitur>, Camerarius <ergo>, Brakman <ilico>. The suppletion of the name is only plausible if the speaker's name was given in full in the MSS at one point; if the speakers
were designated by alphabetic or algebraic notation, the loss of a whole name is rather implausible, and one should prefer one of the suggested particles, with a preference for Camerarius' *ergo* (haplography with following *ego*). Moreover, why should Charinus gratuitously address his friend with his name? The reason for all these conjectures is that if one followed the paradosis, one would have to explain the presence of two hiatuses in the line: *feci. :: qua forma | esse | aiebant? :: ego dicam tibi. aībant*: On disyllabic forms (used frequently in Plautus) of the past tense of *aio*, see Gratwick on *Men.* 532. *ego dicam tibi*: formulaic in iambic senarii (*Cis.* 603, *Cu.* 437, *Mo.* 757, 1026⁹, *Ps.* 801, *Tri.* 1099) and trochaic septenarii (here and *Ps.* 336), always at line-end (exception: *Ru.* 388: before diaeresis), see Wright (1974) 58 n.47; to his examples add *Cap.* 646, *Ep.* 708, *Mil.* 296, *Ru.* 648, *An.* 375, *Ad.* 646.

639-640 *canum, varum, ventriosum, bucculentum, breviculum, / subnigris oculis, oblongis malis, pansam aliquantulum* 'A grey-haired fellow, bandy-legged, with a huge paunch, and puffy cheeks, rather stocky, with darkish eyes, a lantern jaw, and a bit of a flat-foot.' It is surprising to find some of the same features in the only surviving physical description of St Paul in *The Acts of Paul and Thecla* 3, quoted from Bollók (1996) 1 n.1: *ἀνδρὰ μικρὸν τῷ μεγέθει, υπλὸν τῇ κεφάλῃ, ἄγκυλον ταῖς κνήμισις, εὐδιάκτη, σύνοφρον, μικρὸς ἐπίφρονος, χάριτος πλήρης. 'A man of small stature, with a bald head and crooked legs, in a good state of body, with eyebrows meeting and nose somewhat hooked, full of friendliness.'

According to the canons of the ancient physiognomists the most important indicator of another person's character is the face, first of all the eyes, then the eyebrows, forehead, nose, mouth, and the shape of the head, though of course every part of the body plays its part in revealing mental characteristics. In the description given by Eutychus here, the eye of the beholder seems to wander *a capite ad calcem*, that is, in the first line from the head/face of the Athenian stranger (*canum*) to his legs (*varum*), up to his stomach (*ventriosum*), then back to his face (*bucculentum*), then giving a general description of his size (*breviculum*), in the second, it wanders - again - from the face (*subnigris oculis, oblongis malis*) to the legs/feet (*pansam aliquantulum*), as if the one who gave Eutychus the description was eyeing up and down the very man in question. For similarly 'flattering' terse and graphic descriptions cf. *As.* 399-401, *Cap.* 547ff. (647? ), *Cu.* 230ff., *Poen.* 1112ff., 1416, *Ps.* 663ff. (description of a woman), 1218-1220, *Ru.* 316-320, and *Hec.* 439-441, *Eu.* 687ff., *Ht.* 1061ff., Caecil. inc. fab. 20 *grammosis oculis ipsa, atratis dentibus*, Catul. 43.3.

Contrary to the opinion of Leo (1912) 132 n.1 who takes such descriptions to be "ganz im Stile des individualisierenden Zeitalters der neuen Komödie", such terse asyndetic
descriptions of personal appearance (εἰκονισμοὺς, effictio) are widely used in the Greek and Roman world as a means of legal identification or as an ornament of style in oratory, historiography, and biography, and in legal and business transactions. In Greek rhetorical theory, it is regarded as a σχῆμα (or πρότος) parallel to the χαρακτερισμός, see Misener (1924) for examples from Greek and Latin literature and non-fictional texts, such as legal papyri (e.g. the description of a runaway slave which is perhaps the earliest extant ‘wanted’ poster), see also Bollók (1996) 2-5 (and the works cited there); Plautus alludes to the status of such descriptions as equivalent to a picture, cf. As. 402 non potuit pictor rectius describere eius formam. Such visualisations are also used in forensic rhetoric, see Cèbe (1966) 129-131.

The literary iconism (iconistic description) or ‘hypotyposis’, see Monaco (1963) 88f. and Herrick (1964) 203f., had its origin in real life, see Misener (quoted above). For the use of iconism in ancient drama, Hough (1943) and Evans (1969) 28-39. Weissert (1959) 18f. mistakenly believes that the fact that extensive iconisms are rare in Greek drama can be taken as proof of the ‘originality’ of such descriptions in Plautine comedy. For similar physical descriptions in Greek comedy, cf. e.g. Ar. Plut. 265-266; Men. Adelph. fr. 11. The belief in the validity of physiognomy as a means of judging a person’s character was held widely in antiquity, for Plautine comedy cf. Au. 599 quod frons velit oculi sciant, 718 nam esse bonum ex vultu cognosco, see further Evans (1969) 37. Other physical descriptions in this play (referring to the momentary appearance): 183 (oculis ... hiantibus), 368 (commutatust color), 371 (palles), 404-406, 599-600, 671. On the drastic description of the outer appearance of other characters on stage in Menander, Plautus and Terence in general see Magistrini (1970) passim; she points out rightly ibid. 95f. that the dramatic function of this type of physical description is not to introduce an unknown character, or to prepare his or her appearance (similar in structure and dramatic purpose: Ps. 1217ff., As. 399ff., Cap. 646ff.). Lysimachus’ looks are already well known to the audience - they have seen him 273-334 and 499-543. The description of his looks serves merely as a gag: Eutychus gives a description of his own father without identifying him, see Traglia (1970/71) 115f.

640 subnigris oculis, oblongis malis, pansam aliquantulum
is evoked by this description. pansam = latipes, see Enk ad loc.; usually found as a cognomen among members of the Roman nobility. This is the only instance in Latin where it has adjectival force.

641 CH. non hominem mihi sed thensaurum nescioquem memoras mali.

thensaurum: cf. 163.

642 numquid est quod dicas aliud de illo? EU. tantum, quod sciam.
tantum, quod sciam: ‘that’s all I know’ (lit. ‘just that (and no more), as far as I know’); quod = quoad, see Gratwick on Men. 297.

643 CH. edepol ne We oblongis mialis mihi dedit magnum malum.
oblongis mialis: Charinus takes what was an ablative of quality now as an ablative of instrument. On the pun (juxtaposition of superficially similar but etymologically distinct words) with mālis and mālum see Brinkhoff (1935) 144; cf. Am. 315, 723 et mālum et mālum dare. magnum malum: ‘a good hiding’; usually the punishment of slaves (e.g. Cas. 729 dabo tibi μέγα κακόν, Ph. 644; Men. Peric. 208f. μέγα τι σοι κακόν / δόσω), see also Reimers (1957) 69-71.

644 non possum durare, certumst exsulatum hinc ire me.
exsulatum ... ire: As a true adolescens amator, Charinus takes things to their extremes. The exilium amoris was a prominent theme in love-elegy, being (apart from suicide, 472n.) another solution for a young man in a love-plight: he goes overseas, usually to fight as a mercenary in a Hellenistic army, cf. Theocr. Id. 14; Don. Ter. Ad. 275.1 amatores comici cito comminantur patriam se deserturos, ut amicam consequantur; cf. Men. Asp., Sam. 282ff., 616ff.; Cu. 284ff., Tri. 596ff., 721ff. (Philemon!), Ht. 111, 117, Ad. 385f., see Zagagi (1988) 193-209 and (1995) 35-38, Thierfelder (1936) 323 n.2. The lover reacts to the threatened loss of his beloved with the same despairing thoughts of death or exile (cf. Ter. Ht. 190, 398-400, Eu. 888, Ph. 200f., 484, 551, Ad. 275, 332) and to their prospective (re)union with the same rhapsodic delight (cf. 901f.). For Roman tragedy cf. e.g. Ennius Trag. 75-88.

646-647 Megares, Eretriam, Corinthum, Chalcidem, Cretam, Cyprum, / Sicyonem, Cnidum, Zacynthum, Lesbiam, Boeotiam.

In a misguided attempt at dating the Emporos, Grimal (1974) 229 suggests that since Thebes is not mentioned in this list and that the city was destroyed in 322 and rebuilt not
until 316 BC, one should suppose that the play was written sometime then. The argument is impressionistic and e silentio.

This catalogue of cities and countries differs from the macaronic enumerations found elsewhere (Cap. 160-163, Cu. 442-446, Mil. 13-14, 42-45, Per. 702-705), see Taladoire (1956) 175-177, in that the places named are real and not fictitious. Of the above names, those of Cyprus (933, 937), Chalcis (939), and Zacynthus (940, 943) reappear in Charinus’ report of his fantastic chariot-journey across the Mediterranean. The sequence of place-names is chosen with care: Megara and Eretria are close to Athens, Corinth and Chalcis are further away. As the line runs on, the distance (and the size) of the places increases, while at the same time the length of the words increases accordingly. The one name that does not fit is the last one, Boeotia, probably the least desirable place of residence from an Athenian perspective. Moreover, a significant number of these places feature in New Comedy; they are ‘comic places’, institutionalised within the world of comedy. Quite a number of the places are associated with sexual pleasures of some kind (see below), and all of them can be shown (see below) to belong to the topography of comedy. One would not go there for harsh exile, but rather for spending a nice fortnight’s holiday. Being in the form it is, the list is unlikely to derive from the Emporos, see Fraenkel (1960) 56 n.1. For a much shorter enumeration of place-names in a different context cf. Philemon fr. 95.6-8 K-A.

Stärk (1989) 336 states that catalogues of names like this are ordered according to alliteration and assonance, not according to geography (he compares Men. 235). The order is indeed random, but rhythmical considerations were taken into account: the rhythm of the second half of 646 is identical with that of 647 (metrical rhyme), BcD AB cD and that of the first half lines very similar, (646) bbC ddaB cDA and (647) bbCD aB cDA (which, given the complexity of these place-names, cannot be coincidental).

badly at Zacynthus' (for the innuendo see 943n.), 943, 945. Lesbiam: sc. terram; cf. the use of λεοβωξεν, Taillardat (1962) 105, 428 n.3. Boeotiam: A comedy by Plautus of which only a few lines are preserved is the Boeotia.

648 EU. cur istuc coeptas consilium? CH. quia enim me adflictat Amor.

Eutychus asks the same question that anyone from the audience could ask Charinus, and he gets an answer that is revealing: 'Why have you arrived at this decision?' And Charinus answers, in effect, 'Because I am a young lover.' coeptas: the frequentative form is rare in comedy, cf. Eu. 1025, Ph. 626. adflictät: A diagnostic case for the scansion of the ending -at in Plautus, as final cretic (BcD) requires it to be long. In Plautus, the B-positions are of ultimate importance for the determination of the length of all syllables. Cf. e.g. 696 solēt, 710 vidi, Am. 652 habēt, As. 616 amāt, 874 arāt, Cap. 11 negāt, 196 decēt, Ps. 702 resonāt. See Enk ad loc., Gratwick (1993) 49 n.66. Amor: personification (cf. 590); should be spelt with a capital A, despite of Lucr. 4.1158, where the same phrase is used, but obviously without reference to the God of Love (unless one takes lines 1157 and 1158 to form some kind of burlesque play with the names of Venus and Amor). Later on in the play, Charinus addresses Cupido, and it is clear that he has been under the influence of that god from the beginning (cf. the prologue delivered by him).

649-657 Eutychus’ diatribe against going into exile because of an unfulfilled love, basically consisting of a balanced series of rhetorical questions equivalent to assertions (649-651, 652, 653, 654, 655-657). Musso (1968) 190, accepted by Gerick (1996) 157, regarded this passage as a Philemonian “parodia della diatriba cinica περὶ φυγῆς”, providing a number of good arguments, whereas Zehnacker (1974) 776 does not commit himself to such a specific interpretation and notes that Philemon (or Plautus) “s’amuse à ridiculiser le ton de la prédication philosophico-morale.”

At any rate, it would appear that this passage is Greek in spirit and structure, see also Blänsdorf (1967) 19. A similar argument is attributed to Socrates in Sen. Ep. 28.1f. Thus the onus of proof is with those who, like Lefèvre (1995) 45, wish to ascribe this passage (indeed the whole scene) to Plautus.

It is just conceivable that Plautus’ only source for this is a schoolmaster in Rome, but it is more convincing to assume that this was in the Greek play. The theme περὶ φυγῆς is a topos of rhetorical training and sub-philosophical essay-writing, and is doubtless traceable to the early Hellenistic period.
650 si ibi amare forte occipias atque item eius sit inopia,
bb c D a B C dd A / B c D a bb c d+; prosodic hiatus si ib- (bb), monosyllabic eius (by synizesis). forte: 'by chance', 'unconsciously'; slightly ironic (cf. Men. Dysc. 52f.); the role of the lover is 'to be in love' or 'to fall in love', and thus to talk about 'chance' is not without humour. eius: It is not clear to whom the pronoun refers. Is it Amor (648), as suggested by Bertini ad loc., or is it an amica that has to be supplied to the text (cf. 657 illius ... cupiditas atque amor)? Enk ad loc. understands eius quod amas.

654 cedo, si hac urbe abis, amorem te hic relicturum putas?
This argument is common in discussion of the commutatio loci as a remedy against unhappy love, which is almost universally rejected by poets (and philosophers), e.g. Ov. Rem. 213-248; Cic. Tusc. 4.74; Prop. 1.1.29f.; cf. also Archias, A.P. 5.59.1 'Φευγεν δε τον Ἑρωτα' κενός πόνος; Verg. Ecl. 10.64ff.; and esp. As. 156ff. With a wider application Lucr. 3.1068f.; Hor. Carm. 2.16.18-20, Ep. 1.11.27. cedo = dic, see 149n.

655 si id fore ita sat animo acceptum est, centum id, pro certo si habes,
sat ... acceptum: 'take security', financial metaphor, cf. Cas. 187f., Mo. 224, 247, St. 508, Per. 477.

656 quanto te satiust rus aliquo abire, ibi esse, ibi vivere,
rus: 'country', i.e. 'place where there is no love-life for the adulescens', an anti-erotic space, cf. Ov. Rem. 169-174 (rustic work a remedy against love). The motif is Greek, cf. Men. fr. 559 K-Th ο τῶν γεωργῶν ἡδονήν ἔχει βίος/ταῖς ἐλπίσιν τάλγεινα παροιμιοθέωμενος. For rus as the realm of the un-comic, see 65n., 714n.

657 adeo dum illius te cupiditas atque amor missum facit?
bb C D A / B c dd A / B c D / A B c d+ dum illius: DA, for illi(u)s see 48n.; illius = Pasicompsa. missum facit: see 84n.

658 CH. iam dixisti? EU. dixi. CH. frustra dixisti. hoc mihi certissumumst:
iam dixisti?: 'Is that you finished?' This is an implicit criticism of the verbosity and pomposity of Eutychus' advice, which harks back to the moralising and sententiousness of advisers in tragedy. By contrast, Charinus is deliberately succinct. So is Eutychus in his reply. dixisti ... dixit: syncopated and unsyncopated form juxtaposed, see Questa (1967) 115, cf. Cu. 705, 709, Ru. 1385, Ad. 940, Catul. 110.3.; see also Marx on Ru. 1385. dixi: 'I have spoken'; cf. e.g. Au. 682, Cap. 757, Cis. 508, Mil. 185, Ru. 817, Tri. 458.
660 clam patrem patria hac ecfugiam aut aliquid capiam consili.
Bennett (1932) 12 groups this exit among the ‘characterizing exits’ and points out that the “headlong rashness of youth is exhibited by Charinus, who rushes indoors to greet his mother and father and prepare to go into exile.” It would be more to the point to say that Charinus’ early (and fast) exit is needed to prepare the stage for the entry of Dorippa and Syra in the following scene. patrem patria: The parechesis pater ~ patria occurs elsewhere, cf. Cap. 43, 686, Men. 1083, 1090, Vid. fr. XVII; cf. S. Oed.R. 1394f., E. Med. 166, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 87 ecfugiam: almost = ‘succeed in escaping’, ‘go into exile’, like (ἐκ)φυγεῖν, see 43n. aut aliquid capiam consili: ‘or I’ll settle upon some other plan’ (Nixon); most probably a euphemism for ‘or I’ll kill myself’ (cf. 863).

661-666 A short exit-monologue (see 817-829n.); the way in which future action is ‘expanded’ into grotesque proportions points at Plautine handiwork, see Prescott (1942) 8f., who lists this passage among “a few cases in which the information [about the future actions of the speaker] is trivial, humorous, or in other ways immaterial.” It is noteworthy that when Eutychus returns from the search in 805, he seems to have done the searching himself.

661 EU. ut corripuit se repente atque abiit! heu misero mihi!
This alludes to the ill-foreboding rapid exits (into the stage-house) of characters in tragedy who are about to commit or suffer some awful deed which by convention could not be shown on stage (especially murders and suicides), see Taplin (1977) 163-165. Given the allusions to suicide earlier on in conjunction with the ominous euphemism at 660, Eutychus’ worries about his friend’s rapid exit are well-grounded, and if this was not comedy, the audience would anxiously anticipate unpleasant developments. ut corripuit se repente: Enk ad loc. aptly compares Verg. A. 6.472 tandem corripuit sese (Dido), add Verg. A. 11.462. heu misero mihi!: heu usually takes an acusative of exclamation in Plautus (see Bertini ad loc. and Enk on 624); it is used with the dative only three times, here and 700f., 770.

663 certumst praeconum iubere iam quantum est conducier,
praeconum: partitive genitive with quantum est, praeeco '(professional) crier'. This remark indicates that in any decently organized polis you may go to the local praeco and hire him if you have news to publicize. The exact status of these praecones is as uncertain as that of the viatores (‘message-bearers’). Enk ad loc. aptly compares Petron. 97, where a praeco announces the search for a young boy. In allusions to auctions (see 424-442n.), the praeco is
mentioned at *Ba. 815, St. 193-195, Men. 1154f.*, but not in *Mercator*. The term *praeco* is also given to the ‘crier’ (usher?) in the theatre (*As. 4*).

664 qui illam investigent, qui inveniant. post ad praetorem ildo
In the view of Fraenkel (1960) 421 the use of the terminology of Roman administration shows that Eutychus’ monologue is a Plautine addition. When Plautus talks about Roman offices, he talks about Roman offices, and not about Greek offices in Roman translation, see Gratwick (1971) 30 n.1.

665 ibo, orabo ut conquistores det mihi in vicis omnibus;
*BCDA /BCDA /BCDA /Bcda*; square verse type I. *conquistores*: ‘detectives’ (*Enk ad loc.*), ‘inspectors’ (*OLD s.v.*); Sedgwick on *Am. 65* compares the ποιεσιακον at *Ar. Pax* 734; Abel (1955) 75 unconvincingly suggests identifying the *conquistores* with the *triumviri nocturnes or capitales*; Nippel (1995) regards them as auxiliaries of the magistrates with an everyday police function. It should perhaps not be tried to identify the *conquistores* with any specific office-bearers; the term is self-explanatory (*con-quirere*), pace Scafuro (1997) 406f. *in vicis omnibus*: ‘in all quarters of the city’, cf. *Cu. 482*.

**III. Discussion**

Up to this point Charinus has been lamenting his misfortune three times, after intervals of approximately similar length, and every time he soliloquizes about his unhappy life and ill-starred love (335-363, 469-473, 588-600), his laments seem to be variations on the same theme: the unhappy lover being split apart and having lost his inner peace and balance (this is expressed by means of very impressive imagery, e.g. 345 *ita animi decem in pectore incerti certant*, 470 *ego divorsus distrahor*, 589 *si domi sum, foris est animus, sin foris sum, animust dorm*). The motif of the ‘migration’ of the soul is picked up again later (at 844ff.), in a curious variation of the motifs of (a) *exilium amoris*, (b) the flying chariot, (c) the ‘aerial flight’/dream-like state (already at Horn. *Od. 11.222*).

The originality of the passage has most recently been discussed by Lefèvre (1995) 15-17, 33f., 45. He concludes that the passage is in its entirety Plautine. His main argument is that III.4 does not advance the action of the play. In addition, the fact that no one aboard the ship recognised Lysimachus, a fact already noted by Ritschl (1854) viii and Langen (1886) 161, leads Lefèvre to the conclusion that the whole scene, along with several others, has been inserted by Plautus to introduce into the plot of the *Mercator* a sale of the girl that
never took place in the *Emporos*, where Demipho, according to Lefèvre, went on board and took the girl away, pretending to sell her, but in fact handing her over to Lysimachus who had been persuaded to offer his home as a hideout for Demipho’s rendezvous with Pasicompsa.

Considering that the *sodalis opitulator* Eutychus is one of the main characters of the play and that friendship is one of its main themes, it seems imprudent to ascribe this scene, in which Eutychus’ friendship is put to the test and shown to endure even Charinus’ unjust accusations, in its entirety to Plautus. Anderson (1993) 35-46 has shown that the *sodalis opitulator* is at the very heart of the plays Plautus has adapted from Philemon (*Mercator, Trinummus*, perhaps *Mostellaria*), and that in the *Mercator* the role of the friend is most prominent and least subjected to change by Plautus. On the contrary, then, it would appear that, apart from some passages that are very likely (590f., 603-610, parts of 615-624) and some that are possibly Plautine expansions (592-595, 628-630, 639-643 [perhaps], 646f. [perhaps]), this scene is, on the whole, ‘Greek’ in ethos and structure. It goes without saying that the nature of Plautine adaptation is such that one cannot easily put one’s finger on the places where Plautus may have introduced changes.

Lefèvre (1995) 15 observes: “Wenn II 4 von Plautus stammt, trifft das auch auf III 4 zu.” I would like to turn Lefèvre’s argument around by stating that, if III.4 had its counterpart in the *Emporos*, then II.4, strongly linked with III.4 thematically and through verbal echoes (*sodalis, potissumum, os sublinere*) will have had, too.
I. Introduction

1. The Motivation of Dorippa's Arrival

Smith (1940) 84 claimed that Plautus "is somewhat more clever in his motivation of the cook's appearance than in that of Syra and Dorippa." However, her arrival is carefully prepared for. The audience have been waiting for Lysimachus' uxor, whom he mentions shortly after his own first appearance (279-281). Moreover, Lysimachus admonishes Demipho to remove Pasicompsa from his home before Dorippa returns cras and discovers her (585-587). He also mentions the 'one day' he will provide shelter for Pasicompsa (542f.).

At 277-281 Lysimachus had sent a messenger to his wife, who is at their country estate (ruri). Wallochny (1992) 133 n. 23 points out that since Lysimachus says at 586f. metuo ego uxorem, cras si rure redierit/ne illam offendat, he either had no reason to send the message earlier on (since he and Dorippa would not have had an agreement to see each other ruri at all, but Dorippa would come home on the following day - cras - simply according to schedule). One may add that Lysimachus should not be afraid of his wife's return - if indeed it is going to be cras. If he believes that his wife is due to arrive the following day, his nervous fluttering is pointless, since everything would be under control - for the present day. Yet, it serves to characterize their marital relationship indirectly as being seriously and fundamentally flawed. On the husband's side, the dominant emotions are extreme fear of and estrangement from his wife, on the wife's side, domination and chronic distrust seem to prevail. Wallochny rightly assumes that the (unnecessary, unwise, and dangerous) manoeuvre at 277-281 does serve the purpose of motivating Dorippa's return. Yet, one needs to go further and see that it is also part of a subtle indirect characterization of a dysfunctional marriage (or, in social terms, a dysfunctional familia).

In this context, it would appear that terms like hodie, cras, and una dies (and their equivalents in Greek comedy) are used very consciously by several playwrights, including Menander, Plautus, and Terence. In many instances the terms appear to have, apart from their mere temporal force of 'today' and 'tomorrow', a self-referential meaning referring to the theatrical performance (a so-called 'meta-theatrical' dimension), so that one could almost set up the equations hodie = 'within the duration of this play', cras = 'not in this play', i.e., for all purposes, never, see also 106n., 438n., 542n. The audience know that, when the cook is later told to leave and collect his money 'tomorrow' (770 cras petito, see note ad loc.), he is actually never going to get it at all. Likewise, when Lysimachus fearfully announces that his wife will arrive cras, the audience is held in suspense, as they know that Dorippa will certainly not appear cras,
which is impossible, but either *hodie* or, indeed, never. It is possible, but not necessary, that in the Greek model the workings of *Tοξη* caused Dorippa’s return, as was suggested by della Corte (1967) 191.

Still, the audience will be unaware of exactly when the *uxor* will return, and this will add to their anticipation and tension. Plautus has used several passages in the previous scenes to indicate the advance of time between the dispatch of the slave with a message for Dorippa at 279 and her return from the country at 667, especially the complaints by Charinus (596) and Dorippa (670-671) that the appearance of other characters is overdue, see Hough (1936) 248. As time advances, the audience will feel that the appearance of Lysimachus’ *uxor* is imminent.

The dramatic effect of Dorippa’s entrance is enhanced by the fact that it is wholly unannounced *and* onto an empty stage, a feature common to both Greek and Roman comedy, see Frost (1988) 12. This type of dramaturgy may well be Philemonian, see Lefèvre (1995) 34 and 45.

Upon seeing a *matrona* enter the stage and after she has delivered her first few words, identifying her as Lysimachus’ wife, the spectators anticipate a confrontation between the *matrona* and her husband (which will be provided in IV.3 and 4), creating an opportunity for *verbivelitationes*. The argument between husband and wife should really concern Demipho and *his* wife, but, in a gratuitously accidental and comically ludicrous reversal of the situation, it will not.

The present scene marks an important turning-point. The slow pacing of the play during the preparation leading to Dorippa’s entrance contrasts with the rapid sequence of events brought about by her arrival. In the first half of the play, there is very little incident; the livelier on-stage action, involving more actors and a greater frequency of entrances and exits, does not begin until the play is more than half over. One should, however, not confuse the turbulent scenes IV.3 and 4, which form the comic climax of the *Mercator* (and probably the *Emporos*), with its ‘action’. For the playwright the first part is as important as the second, and only when both parts are taken together that the action can be constituted. The change of focus from Demipho to Lysimachus (and from Demipho’s house to Lysimachus’ house) is prepared for all through 499-666. It will be Lysimachus’ house (and its ‘contents’, namely Pasicompsa) that will be crucial in the second half of the play after Dorippa’s arrival. In like manner, the change of mood is prepared for by a number of remarks made by Lysimachus hinting at his apprehension caused by the fear of his wife’s (unwanted) imminent return (279-281, 542f., 584-587). He expects her to return on the following day - an impossibility in comedy - to his own detriment. So the audience expect her to arrive sometime during the course of the play. Thus changes of focus and mood do not necessarily coincide with formal divisions of the structure of the play; transitions are smooth, and, in a way not untypical of Greek dramaturgy, concern for the unity of the play as a whole is never lost.
2. Syra’s Function

The character of Syra is of great interest. She enters slightly later than Dorippa at 672, leaves the stage briefly at 677, only to return at 681 and to go off with Dorippa at 691. In this scene, just as in IV.4, she is used as a ‘living telescope’, going into the house to find Pasicompsa and to tell Dorippa about her encounter. Thus any direct on-stage contact between the matrona and the meretrix is avoided. In IV.3, Syra is obviously present on stage (though mute), and thus Lindsay’s scene-heading is misleading in omitting Syra’s name against the MSS, particularly if one considers that she features in the heading of the following scene, IV.4, an infelicitous practice in which he is followed by Enk, but not by Ernout, who resorts to the half-hearted practice of Ritschl/Goetz of giving Syra’s name in brackets. Leo’s practice of omitting the scene-headings altogether is rather unhelpful and confusing. In IV.4, Syra is sent off at 788 and returns at the beginning of IV.5 (803) to remain on stage for another 27 lines before her exit at 829.

In the Menaechmi, a similar role is taken over by a mute extra (Men. 736); it is possible but beyond proof that Syra’s role in the Greek model was not much more prominent than that in Menaechmi. Syra is present on stage for a longer time than Dorippa, and her minor role is given a considerable prominence which leads to the suspicion that this could be a case of gratuitous promotion of a minor servant role of the Greek model.

II. Commentary

667-671 This short entrance monologue may be spoken ad spectatores. Who but they would actually be interested in the reason (667 quoniam) why she has come home earlier, and to whom but to the spectators would Dorippa address her aside at 671 (atque eccam incedit tandem)? Direct rapport between her and the audience is established immediately.

667 DO. quoniam a viro ad me rus advenit nuntius
a viro: ‘from my husband’. This phrase, probably along with Dorippa’s costume, identifies the woman entering onto the stage as Lysimachus’ much-expected wife; vir is used specifically, OLD s.v. 2a, Lodge s.v. II.B; McGlynn s.v. II. In Plautus, maritus (cf. 538, 1018) is less frequent (once in Terence).

668 rus non iturum, feci ego ingenium meum,
The MSS offer a corrupt text, the first of several textually suspicious or garbled lines in this scene. The expression feci ingenium is suspect, see Leo in app. Ingenium facere is a
peculiar phrase, as *ingenium*, like χαρακτήρ, denotes something that cannot be made or changed (‘natural/permanent disposition’). Yet there are some instances where it seems to be used of a temporary disposition or mood (*OLD* s.v. 1c). Ussing suggested *flexi*, which is accepted by Fantham (1972) 66. Enk ad loc. tries to defend the text of the vulgar as a colloquialism, but the explanation of this phrase given in *ThLL* (s.v. *facio*, p. 95) “executa sum, quae excogitavi” is not the meaning required by the context. Rather, the spectators need Dorippa to explain why she has come home *earlier* than expected. Thus, the context requires her to say “I’ve changed my mind (plan)”, or even “I have acted in accordance with my disposition”, not “I’ve made my disposition” (Nixon’s fanciful translation “I’ve acted upon my womanly instinct” is close, so are Ernout’s “aussi ai-je fait à ma tête” and Poynton’s “in my wifely way I’ve come to town”, so read perhaps *egi ex ingenio meo* (scanning B C D aa B C D), implying that her disposition is *always* to be chasing after her husband. *rus non iturum*: Taken together with the accusation *qui me fugit* of the following line, this statement suggests that Dorippa actually *did* expect Lysimachus in the country ‘today’. The repetition of the word *rus* emphasizes where Dorippa has come from; she is the representative of *rus*, the realm of the non-comic (see also 65n.).

669 *reveni, ut illum persequar qui me fugit.*

Entrances of enraged wives in pursuit of their husbands, performed with sufficient vigour, will not fail to achieve a vastly comic effect. For inopportun e entrances, which are quite typical of Plautine dramaturgy, cf. also e.g. *Au.* 624, *Ba.* 842, *Cu.* 533, *Mo.* 535. On chronic distrust as characteristic of the *uxor dotata* see Schuhmann (1975) 100.

670 *sed anum non video consequi nostram Syram.*

atque eccam incedit tandem. quin is ocius?
The impatient complaint about slowness of other characters is a standard motif, cf. 595-597, and e.g. Au. 46f., Men. 888, Eu. 918f., Men. Dysc. 401f., Epit. 382, see Maurach on Poen. 504-577. Here, the complaint is combined with the idea of the general slowness of old age (670n.). Dorippa’s impatience with the old woman’s slowness does not help to endear her to the audience. atque eccam incedit tandem: The extraordinary recurrence of stereotyped phrases in the introduction of characters by name in Roman comedy is noticeable. They are similar to the phraseology of formal announcements in Aristophanes, but strikingly different in the number of instances and in the fact that they are used in monologue here. The fact that they are used suggests that some conventionalizing tendency has been at work. This can be seen in particular from the mechanical use of ecce (and ecicum, eccam), of the deictic pronouns hic, ille, or is, and the use of the adversative particle sed. There are also parallels to Greek usage: Video and conspicor correspond to ὁρῶ; incedit, venit to ἐρχεται. Sed, which occurs so frequently, seems to have about the same force as the Greek καὶ μήν, καὶ δῆ, and καὶ γὰρ, which already occur in Aristophanes. On the practice of ‘visual announcements’ in comedy see Key (1923) 53f., Frost (1988) 5f.; on visual announcements in Greek tragedy see Hourmouziades (1965) 142f., Taplin (1977) 71f., 268f. incedit: used of slow walking, see Stockert on Au. 47, OLD s.v. 2ab; frequently used to announce an entrance, see Lodge s.v. II.A.1.ab (26 occurrences), only twice in Terence, once to announce an entrance, Eu. 918f. The slow walk can be stately and elegant, but it is not in this case, as Enk ad loc. assumes. On a person’s gait as an important means of characterisation see 406n. ocius: ‘faster’, a comparative adverb used in commands urging a person to hurry up; see Lodge s.v. I.a (11 times), McGlynn s.v. ociter (three times), the positive form (ociter) being found not at all and the superlative (ocissime) occasionally in Latin. In many cases the adverb has no comparative sense, see 930n. It is generally used in conjunction with verbs of motion, mainly with imperatives (e.g. Cu. 276, Mo. 679, Per. 85, Str. 353) or, as here, in urgent or nagging questions (e.g. Au. 600, Cas. 744f., Cu. 312, Ps. 1157, Ru. 799). Presumably the expression ‘quicker!’, ‘get a move on!’ has led to the fossilising of the comparative morpheme, (cf. θακετον, e.g. Hom. Od. 20.153f., S. Phil. 631, Ar. Pax 1110), see Palmer (1954) 252, Shipp on An. 724, Adams (1977) 58.

With Syra’s complaint about the disadvantages of old age in general and her particular situation cf. the complaints of the senex at Men. 753-760 and Demipho’s monologue at 544-561, esp. 550, 552-554. For the topical complaint that old age causes a lack of strength, which can be traced back to Homer, see Spallicci (1938) 58-60, Powell on Cic. Sen. 27-38.
672 SY. nequeo mecastor, tantum hoc onerist quod fero.
From her complaints here and at 675 it would appear that Syra is carrying some things that Dorippa has brought from the country. The exact nature of Syra’s burden cannot be established; a laurel spray seems to be part of it (cf. 677). The entry of a slave overburdened with luggage is a traditional comic motif, see Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Dysc. 405. It serves to explain (a) Dorippa’s late arrival, (b) marks Dorippa’s propensity for grumbling at people, (c) prepares for the entry of a large company in IV.4. tantum onerist quod fero: The topos of old age as a burden occurs frequently in ancient literature, cf. e.g. Anaxand. fr. 54.1-3 K-A, Cic. Sen. 1.2, Sen. Ep. 30.1, see Headlam/Knox on Herod. Mim. 1.15f. onerist = oneris est, see 1005n.

673 DO. quid oneris? SY. annos octoginta et quattuor; quid oneris?: Dorippa’s tone is more often than not abrupt and brusque (cf. 683, 685), a method of indirect characterization. annos octoginta et quattuor: παρὰ προεξοχίαν; if Syra is carrying some baggage, Dorippa’s question was unfeeling, and Syra retorts by giving a witty answer.

674 et eodem accedit servitus sudor sitis:
For a similar complaint about the pains of old age containing abstract subjects verging on personifications, cf. Men. 756-758 and see Gratwick (1993) 208. The lecythion (servitus sudor sitis) contains an emphatic triadic enumeration of the things that are plagueing Syra; such alliterative enumerations are quite frequent in Plautus (see also 630n.), cf. e.g. Ba. 944, Cap. 359, Cis. 93, Cu. 115, Men. 114, Mil. 1052, Per. 168, 331, Ru. 194, St. 281; cf. also e.g. Pacuv. Trag. 275. For the use of triple sibilant to add expressiveness cf. 859 sufferam solem sitim. servitus: ‘status of being a slave’, originally taken from legal language, see Ernout (1946) 227, which can be personified, cf. Per. 621. For a slave, of whatever age, to say ‘slavery wears me down’ to the face of one’s owner is quite a feat of παρπησία (not sanctioned by the standard code of conduct, cf. e.g. As. 477f.), a feature not uncharacteristic of old trusted female slaves in Greek tragedy; Syra also proves to be quite frank in her comments later on, cf. 687, 688, 812, and, in a way, the whole of her monologue (817-829). sitis: Bibulousness, to which this word may allude, is a stock characteristic of old female slaves in comedy and elsewhere; cf. in particular Tru. 903f., see Oeri (1948) 13-18, 39-46, Spranger (1984) 80, Henderson (1987) 119f. Alternatively, it may simply refer to Syra’s being thirsty after a prolonged walk.

675-680
1. The Purpose of the Prayer
Assuming that there was no prayer in the Greek original, Dorippa would have no excuse for staying behind to conduct the ceremony. As a consequence, she and Syra would enter
Lysimachus' house together, and both would find the girl. This meeting would be difficult to report to the audience, since it would be hard to motivate why Syra and Dorippa should leave the house again after finding the girl. Loud shouting ("There is a whore in our house!") would be highly improbable, considering that the stage-house is supposed to be on a public street. From a pragmatic point of view concerned with staging, it is more effective to have one character, the 'living telescope' (Syra), go inside, while the second (Dorippa) stays behind. After having met a third character (Pasicompsa) back-stage, the character who went inside rushes out again to announce to the other one (and to the audience) what she has seen. It is hard to see what other means of keeping Dorippa on stage Philemon could have used, and it is probably best to assume that the *Emporos* contained some kind of prayer, perhaps also to Apollo Agyieus.

The fact that Dorippa somehow learns that 'there is a strange woman in my home' is an essential part of the plot, as it leads to the marriage row (in IV.3 and 4), which leads to the dénouement. The prayer provides Syra with an excuse to go inside, and it covers for her short absence, so that, observing the bounds of decorum, she and not Dorippa finds the girl in the house. It also serves to characterize Dorippa as a dutiful religious matrona like Sostratos' mother in Men. *Dysc.* 404-409. Dorippa prays for the welfare of her household in general (679) and her son in particular (680) - but not for that of her husband.

It is therefore unlikely that the prayer was inserted as a specific allusion to the *ludi Apollinares* (made permanent in 208 BC, cf. Liv. 27.23). On their importance for dramatic entertainment see Duckworth (1952) 76 and 79, Beare (1964) 162, and Gagé (1955) 400-413, who also notes the extensive naming of and allusions to Apollo in the mad-scene at *Men*. 841-871. Apart from the mention of Apollo in this passage, there are some other passages that could relate to the *ludi Apollinares*, especially the *decem ... summos ... viros* (694) and the mention of a *currus* (931). At the *ludi Apollinares* the *decemviri* had the task of conducting sacrifices *Graeco ritu* (cf. Liv. 25.12.9f.); chariot races were part of the *ludi* (Liv. 25.12, 26.3; Cic. *Brut.* 20, 78). The *pax deorum*, 'peace of the gods', Dorippa asks for is strongly linked to the welfare of the state and to its inner unity and a model for the social stability of the aristocracy, see Orlin (1997) 21, Rosenberger (1998) 20-22. None of these, however, justifies the conjecture that the *Mercator* was actually produced at the *ludi Apollinares*.

2. How Does Dorippa Pray?
It is clear from passages in Menander that women conducted religious ceremonies independently, and that doing so was one of the few excuses in Greek society for a woman to move freely and unattended outside her home, see Pulleyn (1997) 168-171. On the gestures used by the Greeks and Romans while praying see Sittl (1890) 174-199, Pulleyn (1997) 188-195. The arms were stretched out towards the sky, i.e. to the Gods,
and a hand was raised to the lips to greet the god when standing before his or her statue. Very often only one hand is raised; the hands are not raised above the head, but held out in front of the praying person. Due to the almost complete absence of stage directions in the MSS of Roman comedy, the importance of silent gestures needs to be emphasised. Dorippa’s prayer is potentially very melodramatic action, and it was certainly quite impressive on the Plautine stage.

676 qui hanc vicini nostri aram <ad>augeam, <Syra>. Dunsch (augeam Merula): augeram codd.: Syra add. Camerarius. The MSS offer a corrupt line (qui hanc vicini nostri aram augeram). Enk ad loc. says that vicini nostri would probably be taken by the spectators to refer to a private altar in front of Lysimachus’ house rather than to one of Apollo in front of Demipho’s house. For the same reason, Ritschl and Havet tried to insert Apollinis to define vicini more closely. With the same aim Birt admitted hiatus after qui and suggested inserting dei after hanc. Numerous scholars have suggested various other words (e.g. rite; venerans); for details see Enk ad loc. To Enk’s list may be added Bergk (1884) 115, who suggested <Agyii> qui hanc vicini nostri aram augeam, and Camerarius, who simply added Syra at the end of the line. Leo accepted the paradosis and printed it in his edition, admitting hiatuses between qui/hanc and nostrisaram; Lindsay and Ernout also followed the MSS, but obelized the line.

The objection that the expression vicini nostri is at least ambiguous is invalid, as the spectators will have seen the altar of Apollo on stage; a gesture towards it made by the actor playing Dorippa will suffice to clarify what is meant. At Ba. 172 the god is called vicine Apollo. This cannot be used as an argument for the insertion of the deity’s name in the present line, as vicine Apollo is used in a direct address of the god in the vocative case, and not - as here - in an indirect reference, so that Ba. 172 is not an exact parallel.

Camerarius’ suggestion is sound. It is possible that the nota personae mistakenly assigning the following line to Syra in the MSS is the remains of that vocative, which would at some point have been dropped from the text and changed into a nota personae. Still, even with the insertion of disyllabic Syra, the text is one syllable short. The composite adaugere is of the required length, may be used in sacrificial contexts (cf. St. 386), and fits the context.

qui: see 487n. vicini nostri: Apollo (see 678n.), more precisely Apollo Agyieus, a domestic deity, on whose occurrence in Greek and Roman comedy see Barsby on Ba. 172, Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Dysc. 659, Shipp on An. 726, MacDowell on Ar. V. 875 (ὁ δέσποταί ἄννως, γείτον Ἀγιαμ, τοῦ ἀρχοντος προτόπλατος); for tragedy see Denniston on E. El. 221, Dingel (1967) 54, Taplin (1977) 319 n.1. Apollo is often, as here, approached in his function as ὀλέξικακος (cf. Men. Epit. 396-398), see Mikalson
(1983) 137 n.27. aram: An altar on stage, usually of Apollo, was a regular feature of the stage of New Comedy, see Duckworth (1952) 83f., Blume (1991) 74. It is hard to say whether the altar was a regular feature of the temporary stages used by Plautus and Terence, as it is not mentioned in several plays. In Aristophanic comedy, it does not seem to have been present at all times, as at Ar. Pax 938ff. an altar has to be brought outside for the purpose of conducting a sacrifice; contra Arnott (1962) 49ff.

<ad>augeam: The decoration of stage-altars with gift-offerings is not uncommon, cf. An. 726; augere can be used as a ritual term of sacrifice (Verg. Aen. 7.111, 9.407f.) whereas the frequentative auctare, a very rare word, is used of divine activity (the meaning developing from ‘increase’, ‘magnify’ to ‘bless’), cf. Am. 6 bonoque atque ampo auctare perpetuo lucro; Catul. 67.2 salve, teque bona Iuppiter auctet ope, adaugere. The verb is used once by Plautus in a sacrificial context (St. 386).

677 da sane hanc virgam lauri. abi tu intro. SY. eo.

The text of the MSS may be corrupt. The MSS assign da ... intro mistakenly to Syra, eo to Dorippa. Moreover, the line contains a suspicious hiatus at C/D (intro/eo) at change of speaker (cf. 788) The hiatus could be avoided by reading lauream. sane: (adv.) ‘come on’, with imperative, see 500n. Syra is dithering and fumbling at the things she carries, and Dorippa is getting impatient (see OLD s.v. 3c). The combination of da ... hanc virgam (to put it on Apollo’s statue) and ut des (678) nicely encapsulates the Roman concept for dealings with the divine, do ut des. lauri: laurel, Apollo’s sacred plant; laurel bushes, together with a statue of Apollo Agyieus, could form a small sanctuary, as in Ar. Thes. 489. Laurel was used in Roman religious rites, first in 207 BC, see Nilsson (1931) 88. eo: Syra off, cf. 788.

678-680
1. The Structure of the Prayer
For the conventional parts of a prayer (invocation - pars epica, where the petition is stated and reasons are given - request; a minimal combination of invocation and request is sufficient), see Pulleyn (1997) 132-155, on triadic structures especially 145f. The present prayer consists of a short invocation, followed by a tripartite request, moving from the general to the specific, first asking for pax deorum (678), then asking for the welfare of the familia (679), and finally asking for the welfare of Eutychus (680). The requests are framed by the repetition of the attribute propitius (678, 680) at line-end.

2. Prayer in Greek and Roman Comic Drama
Prayer is an extremely useful dramatic device. It can be used to reveal deep feelings and create dramatic anticipation in tragedy. In comedy, it usually invites parody, see Pulleyn (1997) 11, Hickson (1993) 13. However, apart from the fact that it is preceded and
followed by text that is racy and full of comic stock-in-trade, it is hard to detect parodic elements in Dorippa's prayer. Similar prayers for divine support and benevolence are frequent in Roman drama, cf. e.g. *Tri.* 576, *Ad.* 298, *An.* 522. Apollo Agyieus is also invoked in Greek comedy (e.g. *Men.* *Sam.* 444f., *Mis.* 314, *Ar. Th.* 748, *V.* 875) and tragedy (*E. Phoen.* 631). Prayers were also not infrequent in Roman tragedy, and there are some eighteen instances in the remaining fragments, see Hickson (1993) 23 n.16. Despite of its title ('Gebetsparodien in Plautus' Komödien'), the article by Hoffmann (1980/81) does not even mention Dorippa's prayer.

678 DO. Apollo, quaeso te ut des pacem propitius,
\[a B C D A / B C D A b b c d;\] the characteristic rhythm of the last cretic (with resolution in \(B\)) is echoed in the two following lines, lending it, together with hephthemimeres in three consecutive lines (always ending \(D A b b c D\)), a solemn clausular ring. Apollo: see 676n. quaeso: 'I ask, entreat', used in various ways by Plautus, either on its own, or juxtaposed with an imperative (e.g. 614, 850, 934, 952, 1013), or \(ut + a\) verb in the subjunctive (as here), or an indirect question (e.g. 214, 967), and in some other ways (less frequently), see Lodge s.v.; it is used similarly by Terence, see McGlynn s.v. des: 'grant' in prayer-language, see Maurach on *Poen.* 1188. pacem: 'grace, favour', a meaning probably still alive only in liturgical phrases like *pacem peto*, refers to the *pax deorum*. All Roman ceremonial prayer was directed to maintain 'the peace of the gods', a 'pact' granted by the gods, conferring freedom from divine anger or approval of current human activities, see *OLD* s.v. 2, Rosenberger (1998) 21f., Hickson (1993) 4, Jocelyn on *Enn.* *Trag.* 55, Hanson (1959) 80. *Pax* is normally spoken of as a possession (or condition) of the gods or a particular god which an individual attempts to gain for himself, cf. *Am.* 32, 388 and 390 (in parody) 1126f., *Cu.* 270f., *Poen.* 253f., 1182, *Ru.* 698, *Tri.* 837. Despite its frequency in Plautine comedy, *pax* is never so used by Terence, where it always refers to human relationships, see McGlynn s.v. It should be noted that although this prayer supposes a Greek environment (the presence of a statue of Apollo Agyieus), the formulation of the prayer is Roman, thus creating a 'Plautopolitan' (rather than Greek or Roman) atmosphere. propitius: is heavily charged with religious connotations, cf. 680, see Hickson (1993) 59f.; frequently used to express the favorable attitude of a god, cf. 956, *Cas.* 331. The word occurs 19 times in Plautus, see Hanson (1959) 71 n. 41, Lodge s.v. II.1; for the juxtaposition of *pax* and *propitius* cf. *Tri.* 837. Used of the gods, it occurs (out of a grand total of two) only once in Terence (*Ph.* 636).

679 salutem et sanitatem nostrae familiae,
salutem ... sanitatem: formulaic combination, see 174n., Hafther (1934) 67. The proximity of *sanitas* may refer *salus* more specifically to the realm of good health, which it does frequently occupy in later Roman votive inscriptions in conjunction with
Asclepius and Hygieia. It is noteworthy that (with the possible exception of Am. 720) this is the only instance in a religious context in Plautus where salus or salvus is related to the medical realm, see Hanson (1959) 76. This goes well with the theme of mad love that pervades the play, and also the medicus-motif.

680 meoque ut parcas gnato pace propitius.

This line is mentioned by Pomponius Porphyrio (in Hor. carm. saec. 33, where Apollo is addressed condito mitis placidusque telo/supplies audit pueros, Apollo): Plautus in Mercatore fabula idem sensit, cum inducit matrem familias precari Apollinem, nato suo ut parcat. Apart from learning that the Mercator was regarded as a genuine Plautine work at least from the 2nd/3rd century AD, it is interesting that Porphyrio seems to have read the prayer to Apollo in the Mercator as one that carried a wider significance than merely being a petition for domestic welfare, just as the petition in the Carmen saeculare carries significance for the entire state. gnato: cf. similar prayers for the well-being of a filius e.g. at Am. 720, Ep. 414-416, Vid. 86. pace: see 678n. parcas: used in ritual invocations of deities = φειδο (already e.g. Hom. π 185), see Fraenkel (1957) 411 n.1, Nisbett/Hubbard on Hor. Carm. 2.19.7. The verb φειδο is used in a prayer to Apollo in the inscription from Erythrai (4th cent. BC), published by Wilamowitz ‘Nordionische Steine’ Abh. Preuβ. Akad. 1909, 41: ὅ ἀνοκ Ἀπόλλον, φειδο κοῦρον. propitius: solemn, prayer-like echoing of the cretic at line-end, epiphora of propitius, combined with polyptoton pacempace, cf. 678.

681-684 This passage is mentioned by Cèbe (1966) 108 as a good example of Plautine paratragedy. In Plautine comedy, paratragedy seems to occur most frequently in situations where emotions in a scene run high, cf. also e.g. 195-198, 700-704, 830-841.

681 SY. disperii, perii misera, vae miserae mihi!

An emotional line; Syra’s agitation is underlined by a high number of resolutions. Re-enter Syra from Lysimachus’ house; she has been off stage for the duration of a mere three lines (678-680). Menander was particularly fond of the comedy of running in and out of houses, see Webster (1960) 112, cf. Men. Sam. 547, 563, 664, 670, 681, Pk. 108, 127; for Plautus, cf. e.g. Au. 202, 243, for Terence e.g. Ht. 502, 558. The distraught old woman as a herald of grave events within the house derives from tragedy, cf. e.g. S. Tr. 871ff., E. Hipp. 176ff. The comic effect of the high ‘emotion’ with which their comic descendants announce the less heroic desasters of comedy derives its tone thence, cf. Am. 1053-1075, Au. 274-279, Cas. 621-629; cf. Men. Dysc. 574 ὅ δυστυχῆς, ὅ δυστυχῆς, ὅ δυστυχῆς. disperii, perii misera: emphatic juxtaposition of simplex and compound or two nearly synonymous words, a figure of ὀξησ, common in Plautus, see Haffter (1934) 62, Drexler (1965) 107f. Where the words stand together in
asyndeton the shorter normally precedes the longer (e.g. Am. 551, 645, Cis. 209, Poen. 221); for the opposite case (as here) cf. Ba. 934 misere male, Mil. 1204 donavi dedi; An. 248 contemptus spretus, 855 confidens catus, Ht. 404 disperii perii; Enn 377 abduc duc; Pacuv. Trag. 263 retinete tenete, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 303, Renehan (1977) 244f., 248 n.19, de Meo (1986) 119. disperii: strengthened form of perii; the assertive force derives from the use of the prefix with simple verbs in which the idea of separation was already present, e.g. spargo - dispergo, and cf. the formations of discupio (Tri. 932), dispudet (Eu. 832), distaedet (Ph. 1011), discrueior (Ad. 610), disrumpor (Ad. 369).

vae miserae mihi!: vae, an exclamation of pain or fear, regularly joined with the dative of the personal pronoun, especially of the first person singular. For vae miserae mihi cf. 708, Am. 1057, An. 743, Ad. 327; for vae misero mihi cf. 181, 759, 792, Am. 726, Cap. 945, Ep. 50, Mil. 1433, Poen. 1379, Tri. 907, Tru. 342, An. 302, Ht. 250, 917, Hec. 605, Ad. 301, 383; for vae mihi misero, cf. 217, Mil. 180. The Mercator has the highest frequency of this kind of exclamation.

682 DO. satīn tu sana es, opsecro? quid eiulas?
Cf. Men. Pk. 489 μη βόα, Sam. 327 τι βοης, δινόῃς; As in the Greek passages, there is probably no rudeness implied here, only deprecation of excitement. satīn tu sana es: ‘are you in your right mind?’ satīn: cf. Am. 604, Tri. 454, Ru. 1193; for the meaning ‘quite’ cf. 481n. For satīn ‘really’, ‘quite’, ‘completely’ (OLD s.v. 9), cf. e.g. Am. 604, Ba. 627, Cas. 208, Cis. 289-291, Men. 510, Tri. 454. eiulas: ‘shriek’, ‘wail’, onomatopoetic, taken from the interjection ei; cf. Au. 318, 727, 796, not used by Terence (but later), see OLD s.v. b.

683 SY. Dorippa, mea Dorippa. DO. †quid clamas, opsecro? codd.: quid clamas, cedo Ritschl : Rodippa, Rodippa mea Leo in app. As transmitted, the line has a syllable too many in the latter half; read perhaps quid clamas <Syra>? Dorippa is introduced by name. This use of direct address may in some cases be slightly artificial and conventional, but it is certainly handled well here and full of realism, see Key (1923) 31. The possessive pronoun expresses some endearment/positive feelings towards her mistress (she may have been her nurse when Dorippa was a child). It also shows the position of confidence held by Syra. This becomes important later in the play, as it is Syra who is chosen to go and fetch Dorippa’s father later on in the play (788).

684 SY. nescioquaest mulier intus hic in aedibus.
mulier: any adult woman, see Adams (1983) 345, potentially a prostitute (cf. 44) as well as a matrona, a slave as well as a citizen; contrast femina ‘a female’ (opposed to mas, used of men and animals), mulier opposed to vir (mostly of human beings), see also 685n. intus hic in aedibus: ‘here, right here in in our home’; tautological combination
of an adverb of place with a prepositional phrase and another adverb of place (hic), cf. Mil. 483. Elsewhere, Plautus uses hic intus or intus hic (twelve times) and intus apud nos, or combinations of the two; occasionally, he uses (hic) intus plus some prepositional phrase (e.g. 187 intus intra naves; Au. 617, Ru. 689) or, once, intus with a local ablative (Cas. 763). Apart from one isolated case (Hec. 98), Terence avoids such tautologies.

The question about the strange girl ‘inside (of Lysimachus’ house)’ will be Dorippa’s most powerful weapon against her husband later on (719) and it will, almost identically phrased, but this time put by Eutychus to Syra, also lead to the solution of the dramatic knot (816). At the end of the play, it is Charinus who is referred to as ‘inside’ when Demipho asks about his son’s whereabouts (1008).

The use of intus throws some light on the importance attached to the control of who is in Lysimachus’ house and who is granted access to it by the dominant character on stage (cf. the way Lysimachus bars Demipho from entering the house in III.3 and the way Eutychus does the same with Charinus in V.2).

685 DO. quid mulier? SY. mulier meretrix. DO. veron serio?
quid mulier?: “What d’you mean, ‘a woman’?” mulier meretrix: ‘a prostitute’, cf. Men. 261, 334, St. 746, An. 755f., see Adams (1983) 345. By adding meretrix, the word mulier acquires and unambiguously negative character. Apart from being a general term for ‘woman’, mulier can be any married woman or woman with sexual experience (OLD s.v. 2), further any ‘woman who cohabits with a man, his wife or mistress’ (OLD ibid. 3); cf. Don. Ter. An. 756f. (impudenter mulier si facit meretrix) primo causa impudentia natura est [expressed by mulier], deinde conditio [expressed by meretrix]. At Tru. 12-17, the distinction between mulier and meretrix is blurred (Phronesium is introduced as mulier, not as meretrix), esp. 16f., see Abel (1953) 29; cf. also 528, where the word is best translated as ‘Madame’; for another meretrix referred to as mulier cf. Ba. 39 (in apposition to sorores), cf. also Ba. 472, 478, Men. 261, 335, St. 746. veron serio?: ‘in all seriousness?’; vero(n) serio and phrases like ioco an serio are frequent in Plautus, but rather rare in Terence (Eu. 393, Ad. 975; Ht. 541 iocone an serio). If the present attribution of speakers is correct, the phrase is an asyndeton of two adverbs, ‘really and seriously?’ ‘in all seriousness’?’, as at Ru. 468, Tru. 921, Poen. 160, 438. The shades of meaning of the two adverbs are different: vero is opposed to falso (As. 568, Cap. 567, Mo. 177), serio to ioco (cf. Am. 964).

687 quamvis insipiens poterat persentiscere
‘Any fool could have realized that [...] she is the girl-friend of your most respectable husband.’ Syra’s statement as preserved in P, if it is meant as an explanation why returning to the city was a good and wise thing for Dorippa to do, is paradoxical. Syra
should have said: ‘Since your husband did not want you in the city, and since he did not come to the country, any fool could have guessed that he has an affair with some woman.’ Yet, Syra is specific (illam). Another line, the remains of which can be traced in A, may have contained the missing link, see 687n. quamvis: ‘as you wish’ (in the sense of quantumvis in classical Latin), very frequent in Plautus (not in Terence), see Lindsay (1907) 122, LHS II 603, cf. e.g. 726, Tri. 797, Men. 318. insipiens: also used of a woman acting ‘foolishly’ at Cas. 208f.; also used of a woman at Per. 168. The adjective takes up the root sap- used in the previous line (686 sapere), cf. a similar play on the same root at Tru. 827 (insipienter - sapienter). Terence does not use the word.

ersentiscere: ‘begin (iscere) to feel (-sent-) throughout (per-)’, ‘detect’, ‘sniff out’; cf. Am. 527, Au. 63; Ht. 769, 916.

687 There was another line in A after 687, but only a shadow of its first letter could still be seen when Studemund examined the MS, so that nothing can be said about this curious fact. There is no way of restoring the line or guessing its contents, although the context requires an additional step to bridge the gap between 687 and 688, see 687n.). Misleadingly, Enk prints Leo’s suggestion for the text of this line in his edition. Similar cases are e.g. Ps. 67, a fragmentary line only preserved in A, which was lost in the P-tradition due to homoeoteleuton, and Ru. 599/600, 603/604.

688 illam esse amicam tui viri bellissumi.

amicam: is used of women who have sexual extra-marital contact with married men (see OLD s. v. 2); Demipho called Pasicompsa his amica at 545. tui viri bellissumi: (sarcastically) ‘of your most wonderful husband’, cf. 812; As. 931, Cap. 954 bone vir, Cu. 610, Ba. 345, 775, Men. 626, Mil. 364, Per. 788 bone vir, Poen. 347, 1384, Ps. 1145; Ph. 258, 287, An. 616, 846, Ad. 476, 556; cf. the use of ἄγαθος at e.g. Ar. Eq. 722, Av. 91; see also Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Sam. 408 on the ironical use of χρηστός and cf. Men. Epit. 1066 τῶν χρηστῶν αὐτῆς ἄνδρας, fr. 16 K-Th ὁ χρηστός ... μοιχός. viri: see 667n. bellissumi: on bellus as an abuse involving the allegation of moral turpitude see Reimers (1957) 187-189, who overlooks the two instances of bellissimus in Mercator.

690 tuam Alcumenam paelicem, Iuno mea.

This casual reference shows that the myth of Alcmena was familiar at Rome well before the literary activity of Ennius, probably through the influence of depictions from works of art, such as wall-paintings and silverware, see Sidgwick (1960) 6. Furthermore, Ru. 85f. (detexit ventus villam - quid verbis opust?/ non ventus fuit, verum Alcumena Euripidi) shows that plays featuring the Amphitryo-story were known among Plautus’ contemporaries, see Fraenkel (1960) 403 n.64, Waszink (1972) 889.
It would be a mistake to assume that until about 240 BC the Romans lived in splendid isolation, cut off from the cultures of Magna Graecia and Greece at large, see Wiseman (1994) passim. This is particularly true of Alcmene, the mother of Hercules, who is perhaps the most prominent figure in early Roman myth and whose cult is probably the earliest foreign cult to be received in Rome (see OCD3 688 s.v.), attested at Rome since at least 530 BC, see Wiseman (1994) 8f., 28. It is hard to imagine how Hercules could have been introduced into Rome without the story of his ‘family history’ being known as well. Thus arguing like Dietze (1901) 14 that since ‘Alcmene’ is part of the Greek mythical inventory and that therefore this passage as such can prima facie be assumed to derive from the Greek original, means drawing a hasty conclusion. On the other hand, the argument advanced by Fraenkel (1960) 90 that any extravagant use of mythical characters in comparisons like this has to be Plautine, needs to be supported by evidence of a kind that that can hardly be provided.

From a dramaturgical point of view, two things happen at once: (a) Greek mythology is used as a decorative form of metaphor or ‘atmospheric backdrop’, (b) a mortal is ‘quasi-deified’ (cf. e.g. Mil. 1054 mi Achilles, Per. 99 o mi Iuppiter). Such straightforward identifications are not as frequent as mere comparisons whose form somewhat ‘dilutes’ the element of imagery, as e.g. at 469f. Allusions to Jupiter/Juno recur several times in this play, representing the master and mistress of the house, and also perhaps the conflict and jealousy of the married couple; on the Jupiter-Juno-theme in Plautus see Jurewicz (1967) 14f., MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 230, Schmude (1988) 179 n.16, cf. Au. 556, Cas. 230, 331-337, 406-408, Tri. 208. The possibility that similar allusions were in the Emporos cannot be excluded, since the concept is Greek, cf. e.g. Theocr. Id. 15.64 πάντα γυναίκες ἱσαντι καὶ ὥς Ζεὺς ἥγανετ‘ Ἦραν (cf. Tri. 208); jests at Zeus’ wantonness - which is implied here - were common in Greek literature, cf. e.g. Men. Sam. 589-591, Men. Heros fr. 2 Sandbach, Ar. Av. 558-560.

Alcumenam: Ἀλκιμήνη; an epenthetic vowel is commonly used in such cases (anaptyxis), see Meiser (1998) 89f., Kieckers (1931) 73f., cf. e.g. mina for μνᾶ. Alcmene, the subject of a play by Euripides, and the major character in Amphitryon, was Zeus’ most well-known consort. She was also quite innocent of her deeds. Therefore, the comparison drawn up between her and Pasicompsa is especially apt (Syra cannot know that, but the audience do): Pasicompsa is unaware of which man has really purchased her as his mistress. She expects that Charinus is her master (cf. III.1); the girl is subject and object of deception as was Alcmene, see Hines (1973) 79. paelicem: παλλακίς, ‘mistress’; used by Plautus and other comic playwrights (cf. Naevius Com. 66, Caecil. Com. 156; Cis. 37, Ru. 1046f.), but not by Terence, see Wright (1974) 123f., Adams (1983) 355. On the definitions of paelex and concubina see 757n. Paelex is the attribute of Juno’s rivals at Prop. 3.22.35 and Sen. Herc. fur. 4f. Pasicompsa is variously referred
to as *meretrix, amica,* and *palex* in *Mercator.* *Iuno mea:* Dorippa, as is the usual character of a *matrona* in comedy, on which see Duckworth (1952) 283: a fiery, jealous, nagging woman, a fit earthly embodiment of *Iuno.* She is repeatedly associated with *Iuno,* just as *Lysimachus* and *Demipho* are with *Iuppiter.* At *Ba.* 217 it is clear that this is not merely a reflection of the conjugal bonds between the two partners in a marriage: *Iuno* and *Iuppiter* as archetypal couple with marital problems, cf. also *Poen.* 1220 *si sim Iuppiter,* [*...*] *Iunonem extrudem foras,* see Segal (1987) 24f. When *Chrysalus* asks *Pistoclerus* whether *Bacchis* seems *fortis* (‘obese’) to him, he answers *ni nanctus Vererem essem, hanc Iunonem dicam.* Accordingly, in a production of *Mercator,* it would be appropriate to patch *Dorippa’s* dress up accordingly. *Hines* (1973) 19 regards this as flattery, but it is likely that the attribute is used ironically. To be called a ‘*Juno*’ was hardly a compliment, since it could be used to allude to incest, cf. [*Sen.* *Oct.* 219 *terris altera Iuno*; *Sen.* *Apoc.* 8.2; [*Plut.*] *De fluviis* 11.3 (sex between brother and sister is compared to sex between *Zeus* and *Hera*).

*Fraenkel* (1960) 91 n.3 denies that a man could have called his wife (or, as here, a slave his or her master/mistress) *τὴν ἔμην Ἡραν.* However, *Hines* (1973) 15 points out rightly that an antonomasia like *meus Ulixes* (*Men.* 902, *Ps.* 1063), *mea Iuno* (*Cas.* 230, 406-408), *mi Iuppiter* (*Cap.* 863, *Per.* 99, *Ps.* 328), *meam Venerem* (*Cu.* 192; cf. *Lucr.* 4.1185) need not be regarded as a sign of *Plautine* originality, cf. e.g. *Men.* *Sam.* 336f. *τὴν ἔμην Ἐλένην. Iuno pronuba* was the patron saint of marriage (cf. *Am.* 832f. *per supremi regis regnum et matrem familias/Iunonem*; *Gell.* *N.A.* 4.3 reports that a concubine living with a married man offends *Juno*), the epitome and archetype of matronly virtue, and the goddess presiding over the wife’s share of the household. On the comparison of the *mater familias* to *Iuno,* and the *pater familias* to *Juppiter,* see *Riess* (1941) 157. Later the title *Iuno* is also applied to the Emperor’s wife, see *OLD* s.v. 1d, just as *Iuppiter* is applied to the Emperor, see *OLD* s.v. 5d; *Zeός* and *Ἡρά* are used similarly, see *LSJ* s.v. *Ἡρά* 2.

691 DO. *ecastor vero istuc eo quantum potest.*

A conventional stage-directional phrase: *Syra* and *Dorippa* off into *Lysimachus’* house. *quantum potest:* ‘as fast as possible’, frequent set phrase in *Plautus,* see *Lodge* s.v. *quantus* II.3.c, and *Terence,* see *McGlynn* s.v. *quantus* IV; *quantum* is adverbial accusative.
I. Introduction

Lysimachus enters from the forum, where he has purchased provisions and hired a cook (697, 758f.). His short entrance monologue (692-699), from which it appears that he intends to join his neighbour in the celebration, comes after Dorippa and Syra have gone off and left an empty stage (691). It is not clear when Syra enters the stage again, but she is certainly back at 787f. to be sent off to Dorippa’s father. To his surprise Lysimachus sees his door opening, and his wife, unexpectedly returned from the country, coming from the house (699). From her first words (700-704) Lysimachus suspects that she has discovered the girl whom he agreed to keep for Demipho and that she has put the obvious construction on it. Lysimachus is standing by Demipho’s house; thus Dorippa does not notice him at first when she enters the stage. Unable to hear to his satisfaction, he moves nearer (708), and finding his fears confirmed (709f.), he at least has the advantage of being forewarned when he greets his wife (712).

Hiatt groups this scene of eavesdropping under “eavesdropping as a device for furnishing information of immediate value only”, see Hiatt (1946) 47-50 for examples from Plautus and Terence. This scene is a good example for the technique of continuous action; the division in two scenes is artificial.

II. Commentary

692 LY. parumne est malae rei quod amat Demipho

The paradoxos scans only with a suspicious hiatus after parumne (at C/D juncture). A remedy accepted by most editors is the prosodical interpretation parumne est malai rei quod amat Demipho (scanning aa B c D A B C dd A B c D), involving a dubious anapaestic scansion of parumne est. For the occurrence of disyllabic -ai instead of monosyllabic -ae, see Lindsay (1922) 153f., Leo (1912) 343f., Palmer (1954) 241, Drexler (1967) 63, Questa (1967) 99, Meiser (1998) 130, and cf. 811 and 834 familial. In Plautus, -ae is usually monosyllabic, in Terence always; the text of An. 439 and Ht. 515 is corrupt, see Laidlaw (1938) 70, Shipp on An. 439. rei: a spondee (BC), see Lindsay (1922) 156 and 214, Drexler (1967) 63, Questa (1967) 100, cf. Au. 121, Mil. 103; Lucr. 1.688, 5.102. The word normally undergoes some kind of correction; the fact that it fills two positions could indicate that it is emphasized; the effect of malai rei would be paratragic. Luchs SiSt 1.26 suggested parumne sit malae rei quod amat Demipho (a B c D a B C dd A B c D) with synizesis of rei, which is a viable alternative. quod amat: (d4d4), no ‘split anapaest’, since quod amat is a wortbild (set phrase phonetically equivalent to a single word).
ni sumptuosus insuper etiam siet?

A B c D a / B c d+ / aa B c D; locus Jacobsohnianus at second D, see Questa (1967) 155. ni ... insuper etiam siet: subjunctive in ‘mixed’ condition, in which the indicative main verb expresses a fact and a further apodosis has to be inferred to match the remote protasis, here ‘(and it would be enough) even if he was not so extravagant on top of everything else’; cf. e.g. Ru. 578f., Tri. 1186, Ph. 546; insuper ‘on top of everything else’, pleonastic with etiam, cf. Eu. 1014 ni miserum insuper etiam patri indicares?

etiam siet: (aa B / c D), a phonetic unit; the Law of Bentley-Luchs is therefore not violated; cf. e.g. Cap. 362, Per. 352, St. 209, 574; An. 762, see already Luchs StSt I 15f.

694 decem si vocasset summos ad cenam viros

aa B c D A / B C D A B c D. The MSS have the unmetrical line decem si ad cenam vocasset summos viros; I follow Leo’s transposition. decem ... summos ... viros: ‘ten bigwigs’; for summus vir = ‘bigwig’, ‘member of the upper class’, cf. e.g. Am. 77, Cap. 279, St. 490, and esp. Ps. 167, 174. A Roman audience may have associated decemviri (in tmesis) rather than the ten strategoi, who may have been the object of the allusion in Philenon’s play. On the decemviri, a board of minor magistrates established between 242 and 227 BC, see OCD3 s.v.; on the ten strategoi, see OCD3 s.v. So the expectation that a dinner is good enough to entertain ‘some members of High Society’ is probably the underlying idea. This is unlikely to be a specific allusion to the decemviri, nor to senators (viri summi), nor to the ten strategoi. The numeral ‘ten’ (decem, δέκα) can refer to any ‘big number’ (cf. 345 animi decem).

695 nimium opsonavit. sed coquos, quasi in mari

aa B C D A / B c D aa B c D. For the ‘epanaleptic’ style of 695-697, which is also a notable feature of Philenonian style, Gobara (1986) 64 compares Mo. 251, Tri. 28-33, 1010-1012; see also, with similar results, Webster (1970) 124, 130. nimium opsonavit: ‘he would still have bought too much’ (for the purpose of entertaining ten ‘bigwigs’); on opsonium see 582n., for opsonare (‘get provisions’, ‘do the shopping’) cf. also 754. From opsonium we should properly expect *opsoniare, but such a verb is not attested. A deponent (opsonari) is also found (e.g. Au. 295, St. 681, Tru. 445), but the active form is used more frequently. The action of opsonare does not necessarily include the hiring of cooks, but the two actions go well together, cf. Au. 280 opsonavit erus et conduxit coquos. On the spelling opsonare/opsonium rather than obsonare/obsonium (which is also found in the MSS, as in BD against C here), the form in which the words are confusingly lemmatized in OLD, see Gratwick on Men. 220, who calls the latter spelling “a frequent variation occasioned by the accident that generally ops- and opt- in the older writers represent compunds of ob-.” It should be added that on phonetic grounds b
before t or s (as in *obtinere*, *obsides*, *absolvere*, for most of which there is inscrip
tional evidence of all periods for an alternative spelling with p) is actually likely to represen	the sound [p], an observation that was already made by the ancients, see Allen (1978) 21.

cquo: ambiguous grammatically and metrically (either accusative plural or nominative
singular); depending on the interpretation of this form, the passage becomes relevant for
the interpretation of the cook scene (741-802). If it was Demipho who drove the cooks on (as translated by Nixon and Ernout), one wonders why Lysimachus says that *he* hired a cook himself (697), and one has to explain the change from the perfect (*opsonavit*) to the imperfect (*hortabatur*, 697) without change of subject. Forehand (1968) 165 assumes that the Demipho is the logical subject of *hortabatur*: "As a merchant, he would have had practice in setting the pace for the oarsmen, in keeping with the image. He cannot wait for the meal to be cooked and is driving the cooks unmercifully. Of course, the irony is that Lysimachus, in spite of his condemnations of Demipho’s behavior, is the one who will find himself in difficulty with his wife."

If it was the cook who drove his assistants on, there is a slight stylistic awkwardness in the change of the subject from Demipho (697a, *opsonavit*) to the *coquos* (697b) and the lack of an accusative object. Furthermore, if *coquos* was an accusative plural, the change to the singular *coquem* (697) would also be slightly awkward. However, a parallel from the *Casina* may tip the scales in favour of the assumption that Demipho is indeed the logical subject of *hortabatur*, *Cas. 764-766: senex in culina clamat, hortatur coquos: / 'quin agitis hodie? quin datis, si quid datis? / properate; cenam iam esse coctam oportuit. Moreover, *hortari* is used only twice without an accusative object in Plautus (*Am. 993, As. 512), and both times an object is actually understood; Terence uses the verb once (*Hec. 64, with an accusative object). *quasi*: used for *ut* (or *quemadmodum*); very common in early Latin, cf. e.g. *Cap. 489, Per. 26, 58, Ps. 199, 955, St. 539f.; *Ad. 739, Ht. 885.*

696 solet hortator remiges hortari,

sölét: for the originally long vowel cf. e.g. *Am. 241, 652, Ba. 229, Ru. 390, 921, 1333,
*Tri. 206, 330, see Enk ad loc., Lindsay (1922) 181, Drexler (1967) 66, Meiser (1998)
77; see also 648n. on *amór. hortator*: '(chief) time beater'; the *hortator remigum*
(κελευτήρ) was the person who beat (or shouted) out the rhythm on an oared ship.
*Hortator* is a literary word found only in poetry (e.g. *As. 518, Enn. Ann. 480; Ov. Met.
3.619), the usual non-literary term being *pausarius* (Sen. *Ep. 56.5*) or *celeusta*, see
Casson (1971) 310 n.45. Seneca describes the *pausarius* as one who ‘gives the stroke
to the rowers in a piercing voice’ - and the piercing voice is probably the *tertium comparationis* here: Demipho was shouting at the people at the market. For the nautical comparison see also Fantham (1972) 23; cf. 197, 875-880.
697 ita hortabatur. egomet conduxi coquom.

egomet conduxi coquom: Some spectators, knowing that Dorippa is due to re-enter the stage soon, may at this point exclaim 'you poor fool, you're only making it worse for yourself.'

At this point, it is not quite clear exactly who has hired how many cooks. First, so Lysimachus tells us, Demipho has bought provisions (695) and 'urged on' some cooks (695-697). One way of explaining this seeming discrepancy could be to assume that the coqui referred to at 695 are really grocers and salespeople, whereas the coquos hired by Lysimachus is a professional cook. However, this is terminologically difficult. Alternatively, the coqui at 695 could refer to the cook's pompa (carrying the vasa with the 'goodies' in IV.4) that the coquos is going to bring with him. Again, this use of the word would be confusing (and, moreover, at 748 Lysimachus says coquos adest, and not coqui adsunt).

Even if the terminological difficulties could be allayed, the fact remains that Lysimachus hired the cook. Why did he do that? Originally, the hiring of a cook was Demipho's idea (578f., if the attribution of the speakers in the vulgate is correct). The question arises how many cooks were actually hired, one (by Demipho, somehow paid for - conduxi - by Lysimachus) or two (one by Demipho, 695f., and one - independently - by Lysimachus)? Wallochyny (1992) 133 speaks of "einen zusätzlichen Koch", but it seems more reasonable to assume that only one cook was hired altogether, especially when considering the phrasing of 698 sed eum [i.e. the cook] demiror non venire ut iussaram, referring to one cook in the singular. The explanation may be simple: Lysimachus had to hire the cook, so that he could be involved in a series of funny altercations with Dorippa. In Philemon's play, Lysimachus did probably not involve himself with amores, and it was Plautus who 'promoted' Demipho's confidante to the status of a second senex amator. Plautus carefully changed the role, e.g. at 279-282, 499-543 (esp. 503-527); the rest is most probably mainly Philemonian, e.g. 577-587. conduxi: cf. 747 qui nos conduxit senex. It was usual for a master to go to the forum and hire cooks to cater for a special occasion as here (cf. also Au. 280; Strato fr. 1.1f. K-A; Alexis fr. 216.1f. K-A) or to send a slave to do so (Men. Dysc. 263f., Sam. 280-282; Cas. 718). On the wages paid by the employer see 777n.

699 sed hinc quinam a nobis exit? aperitur foris.

The above line is the result of Schoell's transposition. The MSS have a slightly different word-order: sed quinam hinc a nobis exit? aperitur foris (A B C D A / B C dd A B c d+), a line which requires nobis to be a monosyllable in order to scan. As occurrences of monosyllabic nobis, Drexler (1967) 64 lists the present line, 894, 988, Cu. 84, St. 792 (add Per. 772f.). Kieckers (1931) II 124 suggests analogy to his. The metre of this line seems to require...
monosyllabic nōbis or nīs; see further Petersmann on St. 742, Woytek on Per. 772ff. If this were correct, where is all the evidence? If this correction had been readily available, one should expect to find it used more often. On balance, it seems better to accept Schoell’s transposition, see also LHS I 463f. quinam a nobis exit?: A supreme instance of comic irony: Lysimachus’ surprised remark will raise a good laugh in the audience, as they have seen Dorippa and Syra come in, and they know that the two are now inevitably due to come out, with the ensuing consequences. The audience is, therefore, in eager anticipation of the following confrontation between husband and wife. foris: ‘door’, used in the singular on numerous occasions; the plural is used in the phrases fores crepuerunt (Cu. 486, Mil. 270, 328, 410, Poen. 609f., 741), and concrepuerunt fores (Ba. 610, Cas. 936). However, it is never fores aperiuntur but aedes aperiuntur (Am. 955, Per. 80, Tri. 400), but cf. Cap. 831 aperite hasce ambas fores. Other phrases used are: aperitur ostium (Cap. 108, Cas. 4.1.21, Men. 108) and concrepuit ostium (Men. 348, 523).
I. Introduction

1. Function

The confrontation between husband and wife in scenes IV.3 and 4 is the climax of a foreseeable development beginning in IV.1 with Dorippa's arrival; some hints that Lysimachus' uxor may appear sometime had already been dropped earlier (279-281; 542f.; 586-587). Both scenes are full of dramatic irony since the audience is quite aware of the cause of the confusion which arises from the mistaken belief that Pasicompsa is Lysimachus' amica. They form a dramatic unity, see Barbieri (1966) 256.

This and the following scene have also in common that a character enters onto an already occupied stage without previous announcement of his or her entry. This effective dramatic technique is common to both Greek and Roman drama, see Frost (1988) 12 and Taplin (1977) 1lf.

Throughout this and the following scene Lysimachus, a character that stood apparently so strong against his foolish neighbour (II.2), is made out to be little more than a coward (and probably one with a bad conscience) quaking before his 'god-like' and powerful wife. In a patriarchal society, this will have had the desired comic effect. The plight of Lysimachus, his repeated protestations of innocence and his inability to name Demipho as Pasicompsa's buyer secure the continuation of his embarrassing ordeal. The greater part of this scene contains a vivid marital conflict between Lysimachus and Dorippa (continued in the following scene, where a cook is added for variation), see Stärk (1989) 32 n.115, Wallochny (1992) 131 and 159f., cf. As. 912/920-941, Cas. 229-251, Men. 602-664. All of these scenes follow a pattern: the conflict is triggered by the wife's discovery of her husband's infidelity or general misdemeanour; she uses irony (cf. 714f., 716f., 726, 736f., 738), incriminations, at the same time she conducts a cross-examination of her husband (720-735) and uses orders and ultimata (784-788) to attack him. Still, he does not surrender without a fight: he starts the conversation using witty questions with a tone of (somewhat forced) light-heartedness to throw her off the track (713f., 716, 718). When he realises that he is fighting a lost cause, the tone of his speech changes (720, 721, 722, 728, 729), becoming more and more despondent. In a final attempt, Demipho tries desperately to talk himself out of it (732-735, 738), but fails.

2. Dorippa as uxor dotata

Dorippa is characterised as a typical uxor dotata: she is distrustful, suspicious, irascible, and quarrelsome, see Schuhmann (1977) 56, Stärk (1989) 50. Following Schuhmann (1975) 81 n.1 and Stärk (1989) 47f., Wallochny (1992) 188 states that the uxor dotata
did not feature in New Comedy. However, the present author follows Csapo (1986) 68, who states that the background to Plautus' *uxores dotatae* is Greek; the distinction between marriage *in manu* and *sine manu* need not be behind the domineering wives in Plautus. Husbands have possession and use of the wife's dowry (cf. e.g. *As*. 87), but are under the obligation to pay it back in case of divorce. The husbands fear the discovery of their (real or putative) adultery because the wife might then desire or have cause to have the marriage dissolved; for divorce at the instance of the wife only, see Harrison (1968) 40-43, Schaps (1979) 10-12.

Although Plautus has undoubtedly Romanized, exaggerated, and extended the passages dealing with *uxores dotatae*, the character is not alien to Greek comedy, and the fragments show us that in four plays at least the rich wife was a character and took considerable part in the action (e.g. Menander's *Epikleros*, *Plokion*, *Hypobolimaios*, and *Misogynes*). On dowried wives and marital tyranny in Greek Comedy see further Post (1940) 429, Arnott (1996) 441-442, 443, 737, 739, showing that the motif existed in Greek literature, similarly Webster (1960) 56. It may be true that the difficult wives of Greek comedy belonged rather to the ἐπικληρος type, but nothing prevents from assuming that other kinds of wives were also portrayed as 'difficult', cf. e.g. Philemon fr. 165 K-A, or 120 K-A, where the complaint sounds heartfelt enough: ἀγαθής γυναικός ἐστιν, ὡς Νικοστράτη / μὴ κρείττων εἶναι τάνδρος, ἀλλ' ὑπήκουν / γυνῇ δὲ νικῶσ' ἀνδρα κακὸν ἐστιν μέγα.

Dorippa as presented to the audience in *Mercator* is certainly an *uxor inhibens*, as the role is called by Apuleius (*Flor.* 16) in a list of the inhabitants of Philemon' comic world, which may provide further proof that such a stock role was known in Greek comedy.

II. Commentary

700 DO. Misierior mulier me nec fiet nec fuit,
Enter Dorippa from Lysimachus' house, accompanied by Syra as silent supernumerary with one spoken word (*eo*) in the following scene (788). The presence of Syra is easily overlooked; this may explain why she is not mentioned in the scene headings (except for a brief note in app.) by either Lindsay or Enk. Her name is mentioned in the scene-headings in *BC* and omitted in *D¹*. There is no reason to relegate her name to the apparatus criticus. Actually, it is the rule rather than the exception for rich *uxores* to appear in public with at least one silent female servant in attendance, see 403n. on *comes*. In this scene there is the consequent embarrassment for Lysimachus that the topic is one which he would rather not discuss in front of a servant.

Plautus and Terence like to begin monologues with comparative or superlative expressions of good luck or misfortune, cf. 335, 469f., *Men*. 446-448, *Am*. 1060 *nec me*
miserior femina est neque ulla videatur magis, Ht. 224, 263; similar openings are also found in Greek comedy, cf. P. Ant. 15.1f. (Menander OCT, p. 327). **miserior**: tribrach at beginning of line, see 30n. **nec fiet nec fuit**: polar expression to emphasise the totality of the claim, see 539n. on polar (dyadic) expressions like *neque est neque erit*, cf. 239, 446, Am. 553 (triadic), Cap. 834, Mil. 775, Per. 479, Tri. 209, 971, 1125.

702 *em quoi te et tua, quae tu habeas, commendes viro,*
For similar complaints by unhappily married wives cf. e.g. Titin. Com. 15f., As. 888f., Cas. 248, Men. 560, 782f., Ph. 788f., 1013. **em quoi ... em quoi ...**: emphatic anaphora, cf. 130, 471; Mo. 24/25-26, 923f., Ru. 189f. **em**: see 149n.

703 *em quoi decem talenta dotis detuli,*
Dorippa is a typical *uxor dotata*, and very self-consciously so, see Wallochny (1992) 174 n.126. Apart from Dorippa, there are *uxores dotatae* in the *Asinaria* (Artemona, cf. esp. As. 897f.), *Casina* (Cleustrata), and *Menaechmi* (wife of Menaechmus I); cf. also Megadorus' words at Au. 166-169, Au. 534f. *nam quae indotata est, ea in potestate est viri; dotatae mactent et malo et damnvo viros*, and Megadorus' Utopian law, Au. 488-495. Cato fr. 113 Cugusi (*Suasio legis Voconiae*, 169 BC) sounds like a plot from a comedy involving a dowered wife: *principio vobis mulier magnum dotem adtulit; tum magnam pecuniam recipit, quam in viri potestatem non conmittit*, *eam pecuniam viro mutuum dat; postea, ubi irata facta est, servum receptiicum sectari atque flagitare virum iubet. decem talenta dotis*: The provision of a dowry, though not required by law, was nonetheless considered of vital importance. What was considered a normal dowry is difficult to assess from the references in comedy, which are often exaggerated, see Duckworth (1952) 276, Handley (1965) 278f. A talent or less was considered ample in Hellenistic times, see Ferguson (1911) 68; but at An. 950f. ten talents are offered and at Cis. 561f., we hear of twenty talents, in the *Menaechmi* (703), it is ten, in *Trimummus* (465) and *Truculentus* (794, 845), six, see Schuhmann (1975) 85. At Men. Dysc. 842-844 the amount is three talents, which is still high by real life standards, see Casson (1976) 57 who observes that a generous dowry “in Menander is 2 talents.” In real life, Athen’s wealthiest citizens provided dowries of anything from 2 talents, going as high as 4 or 5, see Casson (1976) 54, Duckworth (1951) 43.

704 *haec ut viderem, ut ferrem has contumelias!*
Chiasmus (*haec ... has contumelias*) combined with parallelism (*ut viderem, ut ferrem*): Dorippa’s anger is rhetorically stylized. The massive phrase *contumelias* is well placed at line-end for rhetorical effect.
705-712 On the several asides uttered by Lysimachus in this passage see Barbieri (1966) 256f. Lysimachus is talking more or less directly to the audience; the close ‘emotional’ rapport between him and the spectators will serve to reinforce the effect of Dorippa’s impending tirade. He manages to establish this rapport mainly because the audience know that he is ‘innocent’ (at least of the things that Dorippa suspects him of - he is by no means a harmless elderly gentleman), while he is treated as if he were not.

706 vidisse credo mulierem in aedibus.

A B c D A / bb c d+ / a B c D with metrical hiatus and locus Jacobsohnianus at second D. It is unnecessary to insert <illam> with Ritschl and Enk to avoid hiatus. Contrary to Enk’s view, no further pronoun is needed; it is clear about whom Lysimachus is talking.

707 sed quae loquatur exaudire hinc non queo.

A good example of the way in which Plautus brings about audience superiority; the audience can relish both Dorippa’s complaints and Lysimachus’ fear to the full, and Lysimachus’ inferiority lets him appear all the more ridiculous; his attempts at eavesdropping are futile. exaudire: ‘hear/understand clearly/completely (ex-)’; cf. Men. 478 nequeò quae loquitur exaudire clanculum; rare in Plautus, cf. Ep. 239, Tri. 754.

708 accedam propius. DO. vae miserae mihi! LY. immo mihi!

A B C ddA / B cc D / A B c D; synizesis and total elision of first m(īhi), while the second is disyllabic (heteroprosody, see 928n.). The elision across change of speaker may indicate that Lysimachus is cutting in on his wife’s exclamation. immo mihi: ‘no, me’, see 164n.

709 DO. disperii! LY. equidem hercle oppido perii miser:

A bb C dd A B c D aa B c d+, suggested by Enk ad loc., involves a suspicious hiatus at C/D juncture at change of speaker. disperii: see 681n. oppido: see 239n.

710 vidit! ut te omnes, Demipho, di perduint!

vidit!: This single word sums up Lysimachus’ worst fears. The laconic expression is used most effectively. Since the fatal consequences of this vidit dawn on him immediately and he - and the audience! - anticipate a fearful marital row, he follows it up with a heartfelt curse on his neighbour Demipho who is ultimately responsible for his present plight. For a similar split between a disyllabic verb laconically stating a matter of fact and the following words cf. Poen. 1058f. hic me Antidamas ... / emit et is me sibi adoptavit filium. Both emit in Poen. 1059 and vidit in this line are diagnostic cases establishing long -i- in the 3rd person singular perfect. ut te omnes, Demipho, di perduint: Curse in apostrophe, cf. 793f. Another curse between senes is found at Cas. 609. On the use of
curses involving the specified or unspecified naming of deities in Plautine comedy in general, see Reimers (1957) 1-15; for the variations of curses using the verb perdere, see Echols (1951) 297. At 967 Demipho uses a less intense curse against Eutychus (di te perdant 'go to hell!', cf. e.g. Ep. 23, Mil. 286; Eu. 302, 431), see Miniconi (1958) 163, Reimers (1957) 4; cf. further Cas. 279, Cis. 512, Men. 308, Mo. 38f., 653, Per. 292, 296, 298, Ps. 37, 815, see Lodge s.v. perdo II.4, crux II.B.2bc; for Terence, see McGlynn s.v. perdo. The Attic dramatists use similar formulas, vigorous but highly stereotyped ἀποτ, only occasionally, cf. A. Theb. 88 ἰὼ ἰическое ἀποτ, 93f., Men. Sam. 184f., see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 287; add Men. Dysc. 600f., Epit. 424f. perduint: archaic form of the aorist subjunctive - properly 'optative', see Meiser (1998) 184; used by Plautus and Terence, supposedly metri gratia at line-end (except for Hec. 134). Like a few other subjunctives in -i- (sim, velim, edim), the form is really a pure optative, and in accordance with that origin, perduint is used by Plautus and Terence only in imprecations, duint mostly in wishes. Unlike the present perfect (indicative) forms of perdere (see 188n.), the subjunctive forms are used in imprecations as the opposite of servare, cf. also 793, 967, see Gulick (1941) 26.

711 DO. pol hoc est, ire quod rus meus vir noluit.

712 LY. quid nunc ego faciam nisi uti adeam atque adloquar?
713 iubet salvere suos vir uxorem suam.

The husband bids his wife welcome. Personages of comedy who are given to paratragic pomposity sometimes issue greetings in the third person, where the speaker refers to himself and to the person addressed in a way that would be common in epistolary style (cf. e.g. *Per. 501, Ps. 41-43*). It sounds affected, pompous, unnatural, and pretentious as a greeting in everyday discourse, yet it is found not infrequently in Plautus (often ironical), cf. *Am. 676-679, Ba. 243, Ep. 126f.*, *Mil. 900, Poen. 685f.*, *Tri. 435f.*, *1151f.*, *Tru. 515*, especially in dialogues between slaves and their masters, clients and patrons. It is also, but more infrequently, found in other dramatists, e.g. *Eu. 270f.* (Don. ad loc. *haec tota locutio parasiticae elegantiae et simul eironiae plena est*), Naevius *Praet. 5*, see Forberg (1913) 15-18, Haffter (1934) 141, Duckworth on *Ep. 127*, Crosthwaite (1956) 18f. Similar formulae (third person in summonses) are sometimes found in Greek tragedy (e.g. *E. Hel. 1168*, *Or. 1226*) and comedy (e.g. *Ar. Ach. 406*), see Jocelyn (1969) 108 n.55. *suos vir uxorem suam*: an example of rhetorically balanced (chiasitic) so-called 'parataxis' of words of similar (or opposite) meanings, cf. e.g. *821 uxor virum si clam domo egressast foris*. For the juxtaposition *vir uxorem* cf. *Am. 676, Ba. 243, Mil. 900*.

714 urbani fiunt rustici? DO. pudicius

Lysimachus tries to joke in order to take the tension out of the situation. He fails. The line may be taken in two ways, since it is not clear whether *urbani* or *rustici* is the subject of the sentence: (a) ‘Are townsfolk turning into country folk?’ or (b) ‘Are people from the country turning into townsfolk?’ The explanation given by Boxhorn, as reported by Langen (1882) 776, is convincing: “Lysimachus begrüszt seine frau mit den worten *iubet salvere suos vir uxorem suam*; Dorippa, welche auf ihren mann wegen vermeintlicher untreue erzürnt ist, erwidert aber den grusz nicht, worauf Lysimachus ärgerlich versetzt urbane fiunt rustici ‘die stadtleute werden plump wie bauern’.” Cf. also Don. *Ter. Ad. 81*, where Demea pointedly fails to return Micio’s greeting. In addition, Lysimachus may imply (as a member of the comic troupe): ‘So you have come here from the realm of anti-comedy, the un-comic world, into the comic world?’

Country and City in Comedy:
The contrast of ἀστικόλ/ἀστειοί - ἀγριοι would make a nice pun, whereas the words *urbani* and *rustici* do not allow a play on their sounds; they are nevertheless found contrasted frequently in Latin literature. Aristotle (*E. N. IV.14*, 1128b 2-3) describes the character of the ἀγρουκος as one who is not able to see that relaxation and amusement are a necessary element in life; he further links boorishness to an inability to appreciate humour, see Griffin (1931) 161; see further Ribbeck (1888) 46-57, Dover (1974) 112-114, Rissom (1971) 58f. For Greek comedy cf. *Ar. Nub. 47 ἀγρουκος δν ἐξ ἀστειως,
646, 655, Men. Dyso. 956 (ἀφροκος 'boorish'); see Lilja (1965) 89; on the dichotomy between city and country in the late 4th century BC and its treatment in Menander's Dysk Polos, see Ramage (1966) 194-216.

The word urbanitas suggests the ability to use 'proper' language (with regard to both pronunciation and lexicon, cf. e.g. Trl. 609), good manners, and the ability to produce and to understand subtle irony and facetious wit, see Ramage (1960) 65-72. Though the word ἀστείος is usually a term of praise in Menander, just like urbanus in the time of Plautus and Terence. Of course, if a rusticus uses the word, he does so with a sneer, cf. Mo. 15, see Corbett (1968) 118-131. Strabax, the country boy of Truculentus, refers contemptuously to urbanos istos mundulos amasios (Tru. 658). Conversely, at Mer. 65 the work of the farmer is characterized as immundus; the country is also an 'anti-erotic' space in comedy, see 65n.

Pudicius: Dorippa's posture would most likely be a well-balanced stance with her arms akimbo, as it was usual for women during forceful and excited altercations, see Sittl (1890) 49. She answers without returning the pompous greeting. This kind of behaviour was socially unacceptable, especially if the offhand treatment occurred towards an equal, cf. Ba. 243-245, Ep. 548, Trl. 1151-1154. Her discourtesy characterizes Dorippa as a 'woman with a presence' and underlines the exceptional nature of the situation, cf. Cas. 969 (embarrassment: the husband is cornered), Men. 1065 (urgency), Ad. 80f. (brusqueness); a parallel in Menander is Sam. 430, see Gomme/Sandbach ad loc., and on the question in general, Forberg (1913) 35-37. On the motif of the matrona pudica in Plautus and the societal expectation of pudicitia in any behaviour, publicly and privately, from any freeborn, upper class woman in Rome, see Schuhmann (1975) 128-147, Hellegouarc'h (1963) 283 n. 11.

715 faciunt quam illi qui non fiunt rustici.

aa B c D A / B C D A / B c D; prosodic hiatus after quam (no IK), see Gratwick on Men. 9. Dorippa answers while not addressing the problem directly, but taking up the jocular remark made by her husband. Her answer shows what she took it to mean (see 714n.).

716 LY. num quid delinquunt rustici? DO. ecastor minus

The agon-like game of words and contest of wits continues. The question is phrased in a way that conveys both an air of innocence and a slight feeling of insult (due to what is implied to be an unjustified accusation); Stärk (1989) 34 compares Men. 620-624.

718 LY. quid autem urbani deliquerunt? dic mihi.

A B C D A / B C D A / B c D; weighty rhythm, perhaps an indication that Lysimachus feigns indignation. The last two words could also be spoken by Dorippa.
Bothe, rightly criticized by Lindström (1907) 104 but followed by Leo and others, changed the order of these lines to 721.719.720, apparently for two reasons: First, in order to assign line 721 to Lysimachus, because he thought it unlikely that hercle could be uttered by Dorippa (although the line is ascribed to her in the MSS). A similar problem arises at 539; see note ad loc. for a discussion of a number of passages (esp. Cas. 982, Cis. 52) where hercle could be uttered by a female character in Plautus. In the present case, however, Lindström (1907) 103 is probably right in pointing out that an expletive like hercle in the mouth of a Roman matrona would be highly unusual, see also Gagner (1920) 85f. Secondly, Bothe seems to want dic mihi (718) to be linked with cupio hercle scire. This is possible, but does not improve on the text. It would appear that the lines can be left in the order given by the MSS, while the attribution of speakers remains unclear, see further 721n.

DO. quoia illa mulier intust? LY. vidistine eam?
Although Lysimachus knows that Dorippa has seen Pasicompsa (710), he feigns surprise - and fails again. The fact that Dorippa does not swallow the bait at any time during their encounter suggests that either she is an extremely distrustful wife or that Lysimachus has not been an exemplary husband in the past, or (most likely) both. Lines 719-731 are filled with Lysimachus’ efforts to avoid saying who the girl is Dorippa has found inside. He is in a dilemma: If he tells his wife the truth, he betrays Demipho, but if he tries to conceal the truth, things will get worse for himself. To the great amusement of the spectators, he will of course choose the latter. For a similar situation, which also involves stuttering, but only as a minor motif in a much longer passage, cf. Tri. 901-997; cf. also Cas. 365-369 (which is more like a series of slips of the tongue), see Loitold (1956) 65f.

DO. vidi. LY. quoia ea sit rogitas? DO. resciscam tamen.
Dorippa ignores Lysimachus’ delaying question and goes straight for the heart of the matter. Her remark is a prediction as well as a threat (if it is not ad spectatores). vidi: Dorippa is just as brief and laconic as Lysimachus’ vidit at 710; cf. also 393f. quoia: see 200n., cf. 529, 722, 864. resciscam: see 107n.; an adequate job-description of the comic matrona’s main activity when confronted with her husband’s infidelity.

<LY.> cupio hercle scire - DO. sed tu me temptas sciens.
The MSS give cupio hercle scire to Dorippa. This would put the expletive hercle in the mouth of a matrona, which is found offensive by a number of scholars, see Gagner (1920) 85. Lindström (1907) 104f. suggested to read <LY.> cupio hercle: scire<s>, sed tu me temptas sciens, explaining the second half of the line as nisi tu me consulto temptares et tempus duceres. This utterance would then be followed by the stammering
of the next line. Lysimachus’ bold statement, as read by Lindström, is completely out of
costume. In fact, the timid husband is not (not even in an aside) announcing that his wife
will not get the information because she insists too much, so that he will not let her have
it, as a kind of ‘punishment’ for her insistence (taking scires as a potential subjunctive)
- on the contrary, Lysimachus is so afraid of revealing anything about the girl that he starts
to stammer and beat about the bush. Lysimachus is not the man to chastise his wife for
her inquisitiveness. Lindström (1907) 105 offers an alternative reading, <LY.> cupio
hercle scire, sed tu me temptas sciens, explaining it as an aposiopesis: volo hercle scire
quid ista omnia ad te - sed iam scio: antiquum illud tuum obtines, ut litigiosa sis. Again,
Lysimachus does not have it in him to say such things to Dorippa, and more importantly,
such a line would not square with the immediate context. It is simpler to assume that
Lysimachus continues from quoia ea sit rogitas, as if continuing the thought, cupio
hercle scire ... quoia ea sit, ‘that’s what I would like to know myself’, by Hercules,
whose she is ..., but that he has no chance to finish his sentence, as Dorippa interrupts
him (cf. 724): ‘Don’t give me that nonsense of you not knowing who she is!’ sed tu me
temptas sciens: ‘you’re testing me out on purpose’, cf. Am. 661; for sciens ‘purposely’,
‘knowingly’, cf. e.g. As. 562, Ba. 569, Cas. 675, 979, Ep. 237, Poen. 112, Ps. 92, Tru.
474, see Shipp on An. 508.

722 LY. vin dicam cuiast? illa - illa edepol - vae mihi!
Lysimachus reacts to the threat as if Dorippa had actually answered his previous question
in the affirmative, and repeats it to gain time. In the end, however, his line peters out into
a helpless stammer, cf. Tri. 907 lubet audire. :: illi edepol - illi - illi - vae misero mihi;
less colourful Ph. 386.

723 nescio quid dicam. DO. haeres. LY. haud vidi magis.
‘I don’t know what to say.’ DO. ‘You’re stuck for words.’ LY. ‘Never seen anyone
more so (stuck for words).’ The line is discussed, with special attention to the meaning
of haud vidi magis and the attribution of speakers, by Ladewig (1861) 478: “Die
übersetzung [‘im höchsten grade’] ist allerdings richtig, ob aber die worte ironisch oder
ernstlich zu nehmen seien, ist ganz durch den ton der redenden bedingt. Gehören hier
also die fraglichen worte der Dorippa, so spricht sie im ernste, gehören sie dem
Lysimachus, so will er damit seine von der Dorippa bemerkte velegenheit in abrede
stellen und spricht ironisch.” The simplest way to explain why Lysimachus uses the
phrase would appear to regard it as an aside: Dorippa does not seem to react to it.
haeres: ‘you’re stuck’, metaphorical use (always intransitive), cf. e.g. 600, 740, Cap.
531; Eu. 848, Ad. 403, Ph. 963; for its use outside comedy see Otto (1890) 32, Sutphen
(1902) 12. haud vidi magis = haud vidi, magis qui haeream, or rather haud vidi magis
haerentem; the phrase regularly indicates irony or scepticism, ‘never more so!’, ‘not a
bit’ (just as ‘very likely’, ‘I dare say’, used with an appropriate intonation). There are only three further examples of this phrase, two of which display the shortened elliptical form (Cap. 561, Poen. 141), and one instance where the punctuation is a moot point, Am. 679f., see Frost (1989) ad loc. The phrase may be explained by assuming magis = (colloquial) potius for which see 372n. Booth (1923) 62 points out that the metrical adaptability of magis to the end-position of the line is the cause for its use in tags like hau vidi magis and videatur magis (Am. 1060, Cap. 321).

724 DO. quin dicis? LY. quin si liceat – DO. dictum oportuit.
quin si liceat: ‘well, just let me ...’ dictum oportuit: sc. esse. In older (and also in classical) Latin the indicative is regular with modal verbs in unreal conditions (cf. 983* vacuom esse istac ted aetate his decebat noxiius). The combination of oportuit and a perfect participle (leaving esse to be supplied) occurs 17 times in Plautus, (once with oportebat, Men. 195), see Lodge s.v. oportet II.2.b, see further Sidey (1909) 6, Langen (1880) 54. The perfect infinitive here has a different force from the present: ‘it would be right for you to have come out with it by now’; cf. instances like Am. 944 cavisse oportuit, Au. 754 non attactam oportuit, Mil. 1336 aurem admotam oportuit.
Sometimes there seems to be little actual difference between the present and perfect infinitives, and the latter appears to be just a colloquial exaggeration, like the English ‘I meant to have written’ for ‘I meant to write.’

725 LY. non possum, ita instas; urges quasi pro noxio.
urges: sc. me; the verb is used of the prosecuting party at court, see OLD s.v. 8c. quasi pro noxio: ‘as if being of the status of a delinquent’, see OLD s.v. pro 9a.

726 DO. scio, innoxiu’s. LY. audacter quamvis dicit.
aa B c D / A B C D A / B c D; synaloepha of scio and IK (sci(o) in- set as aa), cf. 751 and e.g. Cap. 71; prodelision of innoxiu’s = innoxius es, see 1n. Maybe the entire line should be attributed to Dorippa, taking innoxius as a predicative: ‘I know. As an innocent man, then, don’t hesitate to speak.’ This would make Lysimachus hesitate much longer, and it would explain the peculiar phrase audacter quamvis dicit, especially the use of audacter, which is often employed to edge someone on to talk. It is hard to see why it should be used ironically by Lysimachus here. scio, innoxiu’s: heavily ironical, ‘I know, you’re a little innocent’, cf. An. 669, Ph. 694. scio: unemphasized, cf. e.g. Cap. 440; on the scio-motif and its use in comic dialogue by Plautus see Risssom (1971) 113 and cf. e.g. 476-481, As. 52f., Men. 434, Mil. 1319, Ps. 391, St. 474, Tri. 97; for Terence see Straus (1955) 47, cf. An. 346-352, Ad. 679f., 721-726, 926ff. audacter quamvis dicit: ‘you can say that again’, cf. Ep. 16 audacter quamvis dicit (also at line-end), Cap. 401, Cas. 901, Men. 52, Mo. 916, Ps. 828; quamvis is used by Plautus


with the subjunctive in concessive clauses only twice (Ba. 82, Tri. 554), in all other cases, as here, it is used to intensify the force of adjectives and adverbs, see Lindsay (1907) 122.

727 DO. dic igitur. LY. dicam ? DO. at qui dicundum est tamen.
For the helpless stammering and pussyfooting-around of a husband in front of his infuriated wife cf. Cas. 978-981. igitur: on Plautus’ occasional use of igitur as reinforcing a statement without a reason for the action being implicit in what preceded the statement see Langen (1880) 311ff.; cf. Cap. 293 sequere hac me igitur. at qui: a combination of at with the particle qui, cf. e.g. As. 823 at pol qui dixti rectius, Ru. 946 at pol qui audies, is in Plautus’ plays normally accompanied by a future or a gerundive and expresses a strong threat or threatening assertion, see Lindsay (1907) 95, Leo (1895) 421f. dicam?: is better put as an echoed question (cf. 749 LY. st. ab. CO. abeam?) expressing surprise (or indignation or both), implying that he does not know what his wife is talking about, ‘(Me) say (it)?’, than as a statement, as all editors would have it. This would also explain better Dorippa’s insistence atqui dicundumst tamen, which would be rather out of place if Lysimachus had just promised ‘I will say (it).’

728 LY. illast - etiam vis nomen dicam? DO. nihil agis,
Lysimachus is afraid of telling his wife Pasicompsa’s name, obviously because it would give away her identity as a meretrix and would prove his guilt in Dorippa’s eyes. No honourable and decent girl would have been baptized Pasicompsa, ‘Stun-em-all’, by her parents. nihil agis ‘it’s all in vain’

729 manifesto teneo in noxia. LY. qua noxia?
manifesto: ‘in the act’, cf. e.g. Cas. 507, Tru. 132; often used with tenere in Plautus, see Lodge s.v. manifestus II; adverbial manifesto is also common with opprimere and prehendere/prendere; not in Terence.

730 ista quidem illa est. DO. quae illa est? LY. illa - DO. *i*ohia.
A bb C D A B C D a <B c D> involving an unusual ‘prosodic’ hiatus (in a c-setting), perhaps defensible from Lysimachus’ stammering. illa ... illa ... illa: effective triadic repetition; cf. e.g. Cas. 632f. periil :: quid, periisti? :: peri et tu periisti. :: a, peri?, 978 Bacchae hercle, uxor - :: Bacchae? :: Bacchae hercle, uxor, An. 23, Ph. 510; Men. Dysc. 472f. *i*ohia: The metre requires a cretic word(-group) at line-end for the corrupt *i*ohia of the MSS. It is not clear what could be put there, but it is not likely to be an interjection of despair; oiei at Mil. 1406 is not trisyllabic (as it would have to be to fit the present line), and of dubious status at Mo. 762. Ritschl’s ohe, iam satis est is also improbable, as it involves postulating a mutilation of a number of simple words. Leo’s
quoia east? is equally unlikely. Io illa found in D² and F (adopted by Merula) is attractive, but io is not used to express despair and anxiety, and the phrase would result in a metrically faulty line-cadence (il- would need to be short). Read perhaps nihil agis or hariolas?

731 LY. iam - si nihil usus esset, iam non dicerem.
Leo in app. thinks that Lysimachus, being in a bad fix, was just about to say iam scio and give the name away. Then he has second thoughts, interrupts himself and reaffirms that he will not tell anyone. Nixon’s translation follows Leo’s interpretation: “Lys. (badly flustered) Now - (on a new tack) if it weren’t necessary, I shouldn’t tell you at present.”

732-735 DO. non tu scis quae sit illa? LY. immo iam scio:
The hiatus after illa is explained by Maurach (1971) 51 as ‘affektischer Hiat’ (parallels given by Maurach: Per. 497, Ps. 31, St. 147). Yet, it is suspicious as it occurs at inner C/D break; reading immo <et>iam <iam> scio would avoid it. Alternatively, Bothe’s illa<ec> may well be right.

736 de istac sum iudex captus. DO. iudex? iam scio:
captus: ‘appointed’, cf. iudex datus (752), see Broggini (1957) 10f., Watson (1975) 151 n. 8. In a question of fact, a referee (iudex) acceptable to both parties was selected to settle the dispute. The appointment was made by the magistrates, see Broggini (1957) 10, 119f. (for the connection between the offices of iudex and sequester); the question whether this passage is an allusion to the vindicatio, as Broggini (1957) 119 n.19 seems to think, must be left open as the text affords no evidence. For the expression captus arbiter cf. Am. arg. II 7, Cas. 966, Tru. 629, for captus iudex also Mo. 557 cape, opsecro hercle, cum eo <tu> una iudicem. Lysimachus has remembered that he had sent a message to his wife telling her that he was busy with three legal cases in town (280f.). Trying to be consistent, he tries to spin another yarn of the same kind, but again Dorippa does not believe him. iudex: ‘arbitrator’; on his position in the Roman civil trial see Kelly (1966) 102-117, Kelly (1976) 112-133, Ziegler (1971), and Kaser/Hackl (1996) 56-60. The position of the iudex privatus was prestigious and respectable, only open to senators and in the Late Republic to equites. iam scio: ‘you needn’t tell me’; Dorippa echoes her husband’s iam scio (see above) in a caustic manner. However, here its meaning shifts perhaps more towards ‘I know by this time’, i.e. ‘it’s an old story’, implying that she has heard similar excuses before - an idiomatic use of the phrase; cf. e.g. Am. 11 iam scitis, Ph. 110.
737 nunc tu in consilium istam advocavisti tibi.
This overtly caustic remark is not the response Lysimachus has hoped for. Dorippa is
going to harp on this clumsy makeshift excuse again after the arrival of the cook, cf.
751f. consilium: on the legal-technical dimension of the word in connection with the
_iudex captus_, see Broggini (1957) 84, 91. advocavisti: ‘you’ve summoned her to your
assistance’, see OLD 60 s.v. 3a, cf. esp. Cic. _Ep._ fr. 8(7).9 _eum ... amorem et eum ...
favorem in consilium advocabo.

738 LY. immo sic: sequestro mihi dataset. DO. intellego.
Ly. (defensively) ‘No, no, you get it all wrong: She has been entrusted to me in my
function as depositary.’ Do. (sarcastically and laconically) ‘I see.’ _immo_: pyrrhic (_aa_),
but properly spondaic, see Lindsay (1922) 256, Fraenkel (1928) 285, and cf. e.g. 297f.,
735. Yet, it seems that the first syllable is sometimes shortened, and then the second also,
by way of IK, see Shipp on _An._ 854, Drexler (1967) 64, Questa (1967) 78. Laidlaw
(1938) 97 points out that the pyrrhic scansion occurs in positions preceding the emphatic
_vero_ or _verum_ in Terence (in four out of six cases: _An._ 854, _Hec._ 726, 877, _Ph._ 936). In
such cases _immo_ is perhaps weakly pronounced. In the other two cases, pyrrhic _immo_
precedes emphatic _seis_ (_Hec._ 1010) and an emphasized _quod_ (_Hec._ 437); also in
Caecilius _Com._ 128. In Plautus, _immo_ precedes _sic_ here, an emphasized _istuc_ at _Cas._ 634
and an emphasized _meretrix_ at _Cis._ 565. At _Am._ 726 the text is probably corrupt anyway,
see Sedgwick _ad loc._ Since the shortening of the second syllable of _immo_ may be
explained as a result of some kind of IK, it remains to explain the seemingly unmotivated
correction of the first syllable. If the word is indeed akin to _imus_ (see OLD s.v.), it may
be possible to postulate _Imō > immo_, but nothing certain can be said about this. A
similarly curious phenomenon is the occurrence of pyrrhic _quasi_, see Meiser (1998) 78.
_immo sic_: cf. _Am._ 538, _Ps._ 542. Whereas _ita_ is properly anaphoric, _sic_ has originally a
demonstrative force; and its proper reference in the sentence seems to be pointing
forward rather than backward, see Theslaff (1960) 27, cf. _As._ 455, _Mo._ 450, _Ps._ 338, _Ru._
809 (a problematic case, where _sic_ may well have a local force); _An._ 62, 554, _Ph._ 145,
211, _Ad._ 399. _sequestro mihi dataset:_ On the phrase _sequestro dare_ see Cugusi on _Cato
Or._ fr. 175. On sequestration in Roman law and the _depositum sequestrarium_ see Kaser
(1956) 327-328, Wieacker (1988) 466 n.22. On the connection between _iudex_ and
_sequester_, see Broggini (1957) 119 n.19. It is of interest for cultural and legal history
that this is the earliest testimony (along with _Ru._ 1004, 1017ff., _Vid._ fr. 102; 97f.) of
sequestration in Roman law, see Kaser (1956) 327. It seems that in this case the _iudex
datus_ is supposed to have taken over the function of the _sequester_. _Pace_ Kaser/Hackl
(1996) § 41 with n.60, it seems as if the _iudex_ could not at the same time carry out the
function of sequestration of the goods in question in the same legal case, perhaps
because of the danger of a conflict of loyalties. This explains Demipho’s use of _immo sic_,
introducing a self-correction, or rather a correction of Dorippa’s sarcastic mock-
interpretation of what he had said first (733), not a continuation of what he has said
before. It is possible that a similar excuse was made up by Lysimachus in the Greek
model, as there existed an institution called παρακαταθήκη whereby a person could be
placed in someone’s care, see W. Hellebrand, art. ‘Παρακαταθήκη’, RE XVIII.3 (1949)
1186-1202, esp. 1200: “Π. wurde untechnisch auch zum Anvertrauen von Personen in
jemandes Obhut gebraucht.” If such an allusion was actually in the Emporos, Philemon
would be evoking a whole network of relations to similar constellations in Greek drama
(e.g. E. Alc. 1020, 1024, 1097), society (e.g. Xen. Cyr. 6.1.35, D. 28.15, Aeschin. 1.9),
and myth (Helen-Proteus, cf. E. Hel. 909ff., Plut. Thes. 31). In fact, the distinction that
Lysimachus tries to establish is a strong one from a Greek point of view: a woman who
is simply admitted to the household as a παρακαταθήκη is very different from one
introduced as a concubine (cf. esp. Xen. Cyr. 1.6.35), as she is relatively safe from sexual
advances made by the head of the household for which unfree people without this status
would normally be available. intellego: spoken with the right intonation by the actor
playing Dorippa, this word says it all: she is not going to believe him anything; his
protestations of innocence are in vain.

739 LY. nihil hercle istius quicquam est. DO. numero purigas.
numero = nimis cito, ‘too quickly’, ‘too soon’, cf. e.g. Cas. 647, Men. 287, Mil. 1400,
Poen. 1272; originally an instrumental ablative of numerus ‘musical rhythm’, and so
meaning ‘in accordance with rhythm, in rhythm’, hence ‘precisely at the right moment’,
then ironically ‘(too) quickly’, ‘too soon’, see see MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 646f.,

740 LY. nimium negoti repperi. enim vero haereo.
The lack of a real ceasura may indicate that Lysimachus is sobbing. negoti: see 273n.
enimvero: frequent in Plautus and Terence, conveying a strong asseveration resulting
from a conviction, cf. Don. Ter. An. 206 significationem habet nimium permoti atque
I. Introduction

1. The Crowded Stage

Dorippa, Syra and Lysimachus remain on stage; a cook enters with his assistants. The *coquus* takes part in the dialogue, but the *pompa* (cf. 741, 743, 746-748, 773f., 779, *sequimini* at 782: at least two people) consists of silent supernumeraries; Prescott (1936) 105f. compares the long presence of the assistant cooks (*discipuli*) at Ps. 790-891, and the *pompa* at Cas. 719-745, Au. 280-362, 406-455. The team in Menander's *Aspis* consisted of the cook, a waiter, and a scullion (*Asp. 221-233*). Prescott remarks on the dramatic function of the *pompa* in the *Aulularia* that a large number of supernumeraries on stage will have contributed to the confusion and apprehension of the characters; in a similar way, the *pompa*, entering the stage in their merriment and anticipation of a *convivium*, serve as a foil for Lysimachus' desperation. Syra, the other extra, has only one word of text (788 *eo*).

2. The Climax of the *Mercator*

Demipho's absence is well-motivated and necessary. There is nothing artificial about this scene, and nothing keeps the present author from assuming that a scene of similar structure and content was part of the Greek original, indeed, that this scene formed the 'nucleus' of the comic idea underlying the entire play. In many ways, the marriage row between Lysimachus and Dorippa is the play's climax. First, it is the visual climax, as there are more people on stage now than anywhere else in the play (three actors with speaking parts, one extra 'with a personality', and a whole entourage of minor extras, all in all perhaps eight or so people). Second, this scene is the turning point of the action. From now on, something has to happen to get Pasicompsa out of Lysimachus' house. It is noteworthy that Dorippa does nothing to throw her out onto the street for the duration of the following scenes, as it can only be after Eutychus has seen the girl (between 816 and 842) that Dorippa will have got an assurance from him that her husband is not involved in the goings-on. Third, the developments that take place during this scene force Lysimachus to put pressure on Demipho, so that a solution of the knotty problem of Pasicompsa's future whereabouts is in sight.

3. The Cook's Function

The cook's entrance is unannounced; the occupants of the stage appear to take no notice of the new arrival until the conclusion of the entrance speech, cf. *Mer.* 805 and several other passages from Plautus and Terence, see Hiatt (1946) 12. The reason may be that the playwright had calculated laughter at these particular points and that an
eavesdropping (or commenting) character could not have developed his full theatrical potential.

The cook's assistants carry some load (*haec*, 751), presumably the shoppings of Demipho and Lysimachus (*quom opsonabas*, 754), and it seems that the whole *pompa* is needed to carry the victuals and the cooking equipment (778-781): being exhausted, they are driven on by the cook (741, 747). It would be effective to stage this scene with a fairly large *pompa* bringing along a huge number of *vasa* (781), thereby making it impossible for Lysimachus to talk his way out of the situation. Stage properties play an important role in this scene; the cook and his *pompa* probably enter with knives, pots, and pans. This scene is dominated by people and stage props, which have become objects of comedy in their own right. The stage will be quite crowded, the cook and his assistants being a second audience and watching the marital row, thus adding to Lysimachus' embarrassment; Dorippa and Syra are also still present on stage. It is not clear whether the cook brought his own equipment or not, but it would add to the effect of the scene if he did. For lists of cooks' requisites in comedy cf. Alexis fr. 179 K-A, Men. fr. 671 K-Th, *Au.* 95f., 400, see Handley on Men. *Dysc.* 505ff.

The fact that there are more than three actors on stage may be taken as an indication of Plautine re-working. However, since the actual nature and status of the 'three-actor rule' remains still unclear and since the fourth actor, playing Syra, is an extra who has only one word, there is no need to assume wide-ranging Plautine interventions in the text of the Greek model. The scholarly consensus about the 'three-actor rule' has been stated most recently by Barsby (1999) 14 with n.51 (with references): the presence of more than three actors with speaking roles is generally taken to be indicative of changes introduced to the Greek model, and in a number of cases this may be so. However, after the recent criticism of the validity of the 'three-actor rule' (better 'three-speaker rule') by Blume (1998) 65-69, arguing among other things that a strict observation of the rule would in some cases lead to an unnatural role-splitting, the use of the three-speaker rule as a universally valid indicator of interventions made by the Roman playwright should at least be regarded as open.

4. Cooks in Comedy


Giannini (1960) 199 observes rightly that in this play the stock character has been treated in a novel manner, and “la novità consiste nel fatto che la sua importunità non è data dalla solita tiritera sulla τέχνη e sulla cucina; bensì dalla sua eccessiva familiarità, dal suo curiosare e pettegolezzare, invadenzia un po’ grossolana e un po’ ingenua. In questo si stacca nettamente dai cuochi blagueurs che rientrano nel gusto più tipico di Filemone.” He compares Philemon fr. 63 and 82 K-A, but the tone there is different from that in the present scene. Similarly already Duckworth (1938) 274: “On the border line between inorganic and organic characters are the cook in the Mercator and the sister of Panegyris in the Stichus. Although most of the cooks in the plays of Plautus are not only organic but also incidental characters, the cook in Mercator IV, 4 plays a more prominent role, for he advances the action by betraying the secret of the senex.”

This cook is surprising in other aspects also. He is equipped like a caterer and he is about to lend Lysimachus some vasa (781); he seems to own (or work for) a butchery/grocery shop (754, 760), and he has the opsonium carried to Lysimachus’ house by a pompa. Sometimes he seems more of a lanicus or macellarius than of a coquus; insofar the word coquus is used more like μάγευμα. On Greek cooks having the function of meat-sellers cf. e.g. Theophr. Char. 9.4, Machon 300-310 Gow, see Berthiaume (1982) 62-70, on the function of ‘caterer’ 71-78, see Handley on Men. Dysc. 393. It is hard to say whether the cook is a slave or a free citizen. Krieter-Spiro (1997) 27-29 discusses the evidence from Greek comedy with inconclusive results. It seems best to assume that both slave and free cooks co-existed in reality, and that in comedy most cooks are free but of low status, see Webster (1970) 73, Arnott on Alexis fr. 134 K-A; contra Dohm (1964) 19 n.3, Casson (1976) 36 n.22, and Spranger (1984) 77. The way in which the cook in this play conducts the bargaining over his pay and the return of the vasa (776f., 779-781) may indicate that he is in charge of the business himself and hence free, but this conclusion is not cogent. Athenaeus XIV 658f. states that in comedy all cooks are free, except for those in the plays of Posidippus. If we consider the Plautine cooks we find that in two plays (Cu., Mil.) we have no indication as to their status, in Cas., Mer. and Ps. they appear to be free, in Men. the cook seems to be a member of the household, see Dohm (1964) 244 n.2. In Plautus, therefore, cooks may be either hired caterers, or members of the household. But ‘hired caterers’ can mean either free-lance professionals or slaves hired out by their masters (a practice referred to by Posid. in Athen. XIV 659d).

At Ps. 794 the comic cook is characterised as multiloquus, gloriosus, insulsus, inutilis. On the curiosity of the cook about domestic matters see Legrand (1910) 127 who quotes Themistius Or. 21.272c. The cook in Men. Sam. 285ff. displays another regular feature of cooks in comedy, inquisitiveness (cf. also Men. Epit. fr. 1 and 2). Later
(Men. Sam. 369ff.) he will behave in an officious and interfering manner, i.e. as περιπέργος. In the present scene the cook’s conspiratorial (e.g. 755, 757, 760-761) and overfamiliar (e.g. the laconic ‘greeting’ 748, and lines 773-774, 781) manner can also be documented well.

Cooks usually had their helpers, and supervised them in the preparation of the meal (cf. Alexis fr. 133.2ff.). These they brought with them, as they did much of their equipment (cf. Men. Asp. 222, Sam. 365f.), see Nesselrath (1990) 308, Stockert on Au. 280ff.; they nearly always have a knife of their own (characteristic of their occupation: Men. Sam. 284, Asp. 222; Au. 417) which may have been worn as a kind of ‘badge’ of their profession. The character of the cook in this scene is organic, as he betrays Lysimachus to his wife, and confirms her suspicions against him. More often the character is basically inorganic, introduced simply to provide material for comic banter (which is present in this scene also) and sometimes (as in Cu. 251-279) to give an actor playing two different roles time to change his costume. However, the cook’s behaviour is far from accidental (as he himself admits, cf. 767).

741 CO. Agite ite actutum, nam mihi amatori seni
The cook enters from the same direction as Lysimachus (692). The first few lines (741-747) suffice to characterize him as a smug, garrulous and self-important ἀλογον (braggart); this in turn prepares for the interference which will soon make him the instrument of Lysimachus’ impending doom. nam mihi amatori seni: B c D A B c D, synizesis and total elision of mihi. amatori seni: cf. Poen. 1045, Ps. 41, Tru.46; the cook invokes a comic stock character. On the senex amator in Roman comedy, see Conca (1970), Pierson (1971), Ryder (1984); on old men in love in ancient poetry in general, see Stroh (1991).

742 coquendast cena. atque, quom recogito,
atque: ‘and indeed’, corrective, see Lindsay (1907) 95. quom recogito: set phrase in Plautus (Cap. 51, 1022, Cu. 375, St. 301, perhaps Am. 293), only in this form; not in Terence.

743 nobis coquendast, non <cui con>ducti sumus.
Camerarius’ <cui con> restores a good joke on the ambiguity of nobis, which is first understood as a dative of agent, picking up the lead from 741f. nam mihi amatori seni/coquendast cena, as if the assistants of the cook protested their participation, and thus meant to acknowledge their share in the work. Then, with quoI (= ei, a quo) conducti sumus, if that is what was in Plautus’ text, it becomes clear that both are datives of advantage.
744 nam qui amat quod amat si habet, id habet pro cibo
A bb C dd A / bb C dd A / B c D; an exemplary case of prosodic hiatus (in first and second B), see Drexler (1967) 46. Note the strong contrast between the skipping rhythm of this line and the salacious weight of the next with its suggestive hiatuses. qui ... quod: Figurations of this type are common in Greek (A. Ag. 67, 1287, Ch. 780, Eu. 679, S. Oed.R. 1376, O.C. 273, 336, Tr. 1234, E. El. 85, 289, Med. 1011, Or. 79, Tr. 630) and Roman drama (Ep. 554, Mo. 1100, Poen. 874), see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 228. qui amat = amator, cf. 20. quod amat = amica, see Lindsay (1907) 114, Sedgwick on Am. 106, Ernout on Ba. 219. For similarly gnomic formulations cf. Cu. 170 ipsus se excruciat qui homo quod amat videt nec potitur dum licet, Tri. 242 nam qui amat quod amat quom estemplo saviis sagittatis perculsust. id habet pro cibo: for the idea of lovers feeding on their love alone cf. Cas. 795 qui amat, tamen hercle si esurit nullum esurit, 802 tibi amor pro cibost, 725 tu amas, ego esurio et sitio, Ad. 588f. prandium corruppitur; / Ctesipho autem in amorest totus. Giannini (1960) 198 and Treu (1958) 218 n.4 point out that the idea is topical. Treu compares Anaxippus fr. 1.36f. K-A (mistakenly attributed to Anthippus by him). id: prepares for the asyndetic enumeration of infinitives in the following line, see Thierfelder (1929) 10f.

745 videre, amplecti, osculari, alloqui;
a B C D A / B c D A / B c D; metrical hiatuses (-ti / os-; -ri / al-) at both inner A/B junctures denoting the enumeration of asynthetic details, while the utterance will observe the intervals of action or gesture (cf. Men. 1158, Mo. 152). For no good reason, the hiatuses have caused scholars some uneasiness (e.g. Leo considers transposition in app.), see Ceccarelli (1993) 385-388 for a doxography. alloqui: bathos: ‘seeing, hugging, kissing ... and having a chat’ instead of ‘having sex’, see Ceccarelli (1993) 388; contrast e.g. Plat. Phdr. 255e ὑπανεί, ἀπετέθαι, φιλεῖν, συγκατακείσθαι. In Philodemus ἀλείν occurs generally in broadly erotic contexts; ‘words of love’ may stand for the act of lovemaking itself (e.g. Philodem. Epigr. 26.3)?

746 sed nos confido onustos redituros domum.
It is not quite clear here whether the cook means that he and his pompa are going to steal something from Lysimachus or whether he simply predicts that they will have to carry (implied in onustos) most of the foodstuff that they have back with them on their departure, since the senex amator will not be overly hungry and thus only eat a little, so that the cook and his men can feast on the leftovers. On the topic of ‘cooks as thieves’ see Treu (1958) 218f., Giannini (1960) 163 n.250 and 209 n.602 (not all of the examples are convincing), Dohm (1964) 129f., Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Asp. 216-249, Berthiaume (1982) 113 n.68, Lowe (1985) 75; cf. Au. 322, 326, 365-370, Cas. 720-722,
Ps. 790ff., Eu. 776; thieving tendencies are implicit at Men. Asp. 228-231 (the cook tells his honest assistant how dissatisfied he is with his honesty). The motif is referred to in New Comedy in ‘instruction speeches’, where the cook advises his helpers (cf. e.g. Diph. fr. 43.41 K-A; Euphr. fr. 1.13-15 K-A, fr. 10.1-4 K-A; Machon fr. 2.11 K-A; Posid. fr. 2 K-A); the present passage is close to Greek comic practice.

747 ite hac. sed eccum qui nos conduxit senex.

conduxit: ‘hire’, cf. 697. This settles any doubts about who had actually hired the cook. The *coquus* identifies Lysimachus as the man who has hired him, before he even had a chance to talk to him and thus before he gets angry and wants to cause trouble.

748 LY. ecce autem perii, coquus adest! CO. advenimus.

ecce autem: ‘behold now’, indicating either, as here, the speaker’s surprise at an unexpected turn of the action (cf. 792), or his feeling that the hearer will be surprised at what he is to narrate, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 267; cf. Cas. 969, Mo. 660, 676. Langen (1880) 6f. distinguishes three Plautine uses of *ecce*: (1) with *autem* (as here and e.g. Men. 784, Tri. 389), (2) governing a personal pronoun (Mer. 131, Per. 726), (3) on its own to call attention to the presence of a person (As. 109). advenimus: ‘here we are’; not exactly a polite greeting formula, but typical of the cook’s overfamiliar tone towards Lysimachus throughout the scene. Whereas Lysimachus is in utter despair over the entrance of the cook, the cook himself is cheerful and looking forward to his work.


For the syllabic nature of *st!*, counting as one long syllable, see Questa (1967) 146. The hiatuses thrice isolating *abi* in *AB* position underline the regular strong caesura and diaeresis; every possible available subdivision of an iambic senarius is used in this line. The hiatus at *B/C* in the last measure (cf. 788), though at change of speaker, is intrinsically suspicious. Hiatus at change of speaker, regardless of its position, is last argued for by Boldrini (1999) 57-59. The ‘hiatus required by logic’ (*logischer Hiat*) was first described by Klotz (1890) 102ff., 111ff., accepted by Lindsay (1922) 237-239, Laidlaw (1938) 86-88, Questa (1967) 89f., Drexler (1967) 48f., without sufficient regard for the *metrical* nature of the phenomenon of ‘hiatus’, see Gratwick (1993) 54, 254. The hiatus could be avoided by a slight alteration to the text of the lecythion, but this is perhaps too strong a cure for what may be a good text: LY. *st! abi. CO. abeam? LY. <st!> abi*, scanning *B c dd A / B c D* with synaloepha of -b(i) abe- (dd).

The furious exchange of turning away the unwanted cook and the cook’s surprised and incredulous indignation - arranged chiastically - is reflected in sentence form and metre. The speakers change four times in 749 (three times in 751 and 756). The
line contains a high proportion of resolutions, which give the impression of swift speech. Lysimachus snubs the cook almost as if he was getting rid of a dog molesting him, cf. Mo. 850f. st! abi, canes. st! abin dierecta? abin hinc in malam crucem?/at etiam restas? st! abi istinc. st! abi: ‘ssh, go away’; st, the only vowelless word in Latin, is an interjection that is (if not written extra metrum) measured as a longum in the comic poets, see Lindsay (1922) 217, Soubiran on Mil. 985. It is usually followed by an explanatory tace, cf. Cas. 148f. st, tace atque abi, 212, 350. At Ph. 743 it scans as a long syllable in an octonarius (quem semper te esse dictitasti? :: st! :: quid has metuis fores?), in fact being a syllable without a vowel, see Gordon (1973) 4f. The interjection is also introduced after 884 extra metrum by Lindsay. It stands extra metrum at Cas. 148, 213, Ep. 181, Mo. 506 (st, st!), Poen. 609, Ps. 129, 600; cf. also Naev. Com. 46 st, tace, cave verbum faxis. Lysimachus probably puts his finger (or his whole hand) to his mouth to signal silence to the cook; alternatively, he may stretch out his hand (a more imperative gesture for silence); on these gestures see Sittl (1890) 213, Basore (1908) 13. abi: scanned abithree times in succession (instead of åb&j, cf. e.g. As. 543, Cap. 452. On heteroprosody see 928n. quid, abeam?: a typical interrogative formation, expressing incredulity or admiration, see Melander (1910) 121f.; for interrupting quid-questions, see 180n. At 542 quid, dentes?, 685, the same type of question is used with a substantive. abeam?: ‘go away?’ = ‘I am to go away, am I?’; deliberative subjunctive without an interrogative particle is used to express surprise after a command, echoing the preceding verb, cf. e.g. Au. 45, 829, Mo. 578f. The final syllable of abeam (ddA) is long. Lindsay (1922) 153 states that all long vowels became shortened before -m, see also Meiser (1998) 77, but this need not concern us in this case, as the nasalization of any vowel seems to have been accompanied by some kind of secondary lengthening of any vowel that was not inherently long, see Allen (1978) 30f., Gratwick (1993) 49 n.68.

This is the beginning of a humorous scene in which Lysimachus tries to get the cook to leave, but the cook does not (or at least pretends not to) understand the situation, and his loquacity throws Lysimachus ever deeper into despair and misfortune, see Barbieri (1966) 257f.

751 CO. sed - LY. interii! DO. quid ais tu? etiamne haec illi tibi
aa bb C dd A / bb C D / A B c D with dubious IK in the first measure across change of speaker (sed in- set as aa), accepted by Drexler (1967) 52. Acidalius’ suggestion to regard sed as a miswriting for st! set extra metrum is possible. interii!: see 124n. (perii), 599n. (disperii); rarer than the two others.
752 iusserunt ferri, quos inter iudex datu's?

*quos inter*: postposition with the relative pronoun is very frequent in Plautus, see Lindsay (1907) 82, cf. e.g. *Mil.* 1047, *As.* 397; *Eu.* 542. *datu's* = *datu's es*, prodelision, cf. 756 *malu's* (which may, however, be a nominal sentence).

753 CO. haecin tua est amica quam dudum mihi

The fact that two questions - one expressing Dorippa's indignation, the other being a ribald intervention by the cook - are hurled at Lysimachus at the same time underlines his helplessness. Events are out of control, and Lysimachus is almost reduced to the role of a passive spectator of his own disaster. *haecin*: probably spoken with a gesture towards Dorippa. *amica*: ‘girlfriend’, or rather ‘lover’, not necessarily implying strong emotions, used as a synonym for *meretrix* at *As.* 812, *Men.* 741, *Ht.* 104, 328 (cf. also Catul. 72.3, 110.1), see Lilja (1965a) 213f., Goldberg on *Carm.* *Priap.* 48.3. *dudum*: ‘a short while ago’, ‘lately’ (nä*)wcti*), cf. e.g. 758, 760, *Cap.* 478, see Langen (1880) 34; similarly in Terence, see Conrad (1915) 23.

754 te amare dixti, quoin opsonabas? LY. non taces?

*qo*om *opsonabas*: At 695 it is Demipho who is said to have done the shopping, and at 697 Lysimachus says that he hired the cook. Here, it seems that Lysimachus has done the shopping. Langen (1886) 164 and e.g. Rambelli (1957) 74f. note this apparent ‘inconsistency’ and ascribe it to Plautus’ ‘carelessness in composition’. The easiest explanation is that they did the shopping together and that the phrasing of these lines is slightly (but not disturbingly) imprecise; maybe the cook also mistakes one old man for the other and confuses what Demipho said with what Lysimachus may have said; finally, the cook may simply be making this ‘fact’ up to harm the old man who has - from his point of view - wronged him. Whatever the explanation for this ‘carelessness’, it is highly unlikely than an audience would be offended by it or even notice it during a performance. Marti (1959) 26 thinks that Lysimachus had no reason to talk badly about his wife Dorippa (as he seems to have done during the shopping, cf. 760f.). However, the way Lysimachus makes up excuses so as not to see his wife in II.2 shows that he is not particularly fond of his wife. *non taces?*: ‘shut up, will you?’, probably rather whispered than spoken, see Barbieri (1966) 257. Despite of his efforts, it is quite possible that Dorippa overhears Lysimachus’ asides (748, 751, 759, 771f.), see Barbieri (1966) 258. This scene, like the previous scene, is characterised by a great number of asides used by Lysimachus, see Barbieri (1966) 256-258. The use of asides increases the ‘emotional intensity’ of these scenes and is in itself an indication that these scenes are in many ways the turbulent highlight of this comedy, with increased audience participation. *opsonabas*: see 695n.
755 CO. satis scitum filum mulieris. verum hercle anet.

'Not a bad-looking figure of a female. But, by Hercules, she’s getting on a bit.' satis: (aa) by IK. scitum: cf. 757 scitam ... concubinam; on scitus see argum. I 2n., cf. Ru. 565, 894, Ph. 110 satis scita est; used of an inanimate at Am. 288. filum mulieris: partitive genitive, explanatory and 'affective', see LHS II 56, cf. Poen. 273 monstrum mulieris, 1310, Per. 848 frustrum pueri. This use of filum 'build', 'shape' ('the outer web/texture'; the metaphor is from weaving), used like forma with reference to looks is unique in Plautus and Terence, but it occurs elsewhere, see OLD s.v. 6. On a woman ageing but still beautiful, a common theme in the Anthology, cf. Rufin. Epigr. 19 and 23 Page (= A.P. 5.48), esp. 23.2 λείψανα ... ἡλικίας; this is particularly true for the comic wife, who is never said to be beautiful, see Duckworth (1952) 283, cf. e.g. Antiph. fr. 252 K-A; Men. fr. 333.5-9 K-Th; Caecilius Com. 143.

756 LY. abin dierectus? CO. hand malast. LY. at tu malus.

abin: (aa) by IK. dierectus: see 184n. malast ... malus: play on the two meanings of malus: 'She's not bad (quite beautiful). ' - 'Well, but you are bad (morally depraved)', see Brinkhoff (1935) 109, Reimers (1957) 169, Schmidt (1959) 135f., Correa (1969) 50f., cf. Ba. 1161f. haud malast mulier. :: pol vero ista mala et tu nihil; for haud malus cf. also 391. malus: sc. es; most editors since Ritschl have malu's, but the present author is inclined to follow Melander (1910) 27 in regarding this as a case of verbal ellipsis.

757 CO. scitam hercle opinor concubinam hanc. LY. quin abis?

quin abis? A,: non abis? P. Leo, see Lindsay (1904) 70: "V. 754 ends with non taces? V. 779 ends with quin abis? Is either ending the cause of the discrepancy? or is it due to a gloss qui non (for quin) so written, quin "non?": Cf. the gloss cur non at Ps. 501. concubinam: Schuhmann (1975) 234 n.1 states that there is a difference between paelex (Merc. 690) = 'amica of a married man', 'mistress installed as a rival or in addition to a wife', see also Adams (1983) 355, and concubina = 'amica of an unmarried man', see also Watson (1967) 1-10. The fact that the cook knows that Lysimachus is married (760f.) shows that her distinction is over-subtle. At any rate, concubina, 'sexy piece', bed companion', carries potentially pejorative, sexual connotations, see Adams (1983) 348 with reference to its use in the Miles gloriosus, where the status of the girl in relation to the adulescens is described by amica, but in relation to the miles, by concubina, see also, to the same effect, Treggiari (1981) 60. On Greek concubinage and its restrictions see Vatin (1970) 203-205; on Roman concubinage and its extent, Treggiari (1981) passim.
758 non ego sum qui te dudum conduxi. CO. quid est?

quid est?: ‘What’s that?’ This phrase occurs here at the end of an iambic senarius, but otherwise often at the end of trochaic septenarii as an expression of anger or incredulity, cf. e.g. Am. 556, 735, As. 509, Cap. 578-579, Cu. 565, Men. 393, Ru. 963, and in cantica, e.g. Am. 556. conduxi: cf. 747; Lysimachus gives the game away by his slip of the tongue conduxi (instead of neutral conduxit), as noted by Leo in app.; similar jokes: Am. 619, Cas. 365-368.

760 CO. nempe uxor rurist tua quam dudum dixeras

nempe: ‘certainly’, ‘no doubt’, cf. 776. Both times, it would appear, the cook knows that he is odiosus, and nempe is used ironically. dixeras: pluperfect for perfect to refer to a past act not prior to another is common, see Lindsay (1907) 62f., Sedgwick on Am. 383, Maurach (1995) 60f.; cf. e.g. Au. 635, Cap. 194, 305, 938, Cis. 42, Cu. 426, 560, Mil. 132, Ps. 617, St. 251, Tri. 119, Hec. 561, Catul. 10.29, Caes. B.G. 2.1.1, Cic. Brut. 157, Tib. 2.5.79, Prop. 1.11.29, 1.12.11. Yet, in the light of 753f. haecin tua est amica quam dudum mihi / te amare dixti, quom opsonabas?, the use of the pluperfect in a very similar sentence just a few lines later must seem peculiar. Therefore, one may take dixeras to be more definite than dixti, a use familiar from epic poetry, see Harrison on Verg. A. 10.147, Maurach (1995) 60.

761 te odisse atque anguis. LY. egone istuc dixi tibi?

odisse: like odio (in odio esse) and odiosus, does not carry the same strong connotations as ‘hate’, and ‘hateful’; they indicate tedium or lack of respect rather than hatred, see Glick (1941) 53f., Shipp on An. 941, Fraenkel (1957) 263, Lilja (1965) 381, Gratwick on Men. 189.; cf. e.g. Titin. Com. 58, probably spoken by an uxor: sin forma odiosa sum, tandem ut moribus placeam viro. atque: usually requires a word denoting similarity or identity, e.g. aequo or a comparative, see Booth (1923) 67. For this reason an additional aeque seems to have crept into the text of CD, but atque can be used on its own, cf. Ba. 549, Mil. 764, pace Zwierlein (1991a) 103. anguis: one of the several words for ‘snake’ in Plautus, where it occurs eight times altogether; others are anguilla (twice), colubra/colubrinus (twice), and excetra (three times), cf. also the expression proserpens bestia (Per. 299). Terence has only anguis, which is perhaps the commonest word for ‘snake’ in Latin. The quarrelsome matrona by her very nature cuts short the life of her husband and must be avoided like a poisonous viper (cf. Am. 1108f.), see Svendsen (1971) 92. Apart from this, the use of the attribute ‘snake’ evokes a whole network of associations: Andromache complains in E. Androm. 269-273 that an evil woman is worse than vipers. There is a connection between snakes and repulsive female mythological characters, such as the Gorgons and the Furies, see Bodson (1978) 69-71. Moreover, the viper bites unexpectedly; hence ἔχις πολιός is said of the quarrelsome
misanthrope Knemon at Men. Dysc. 480. In addition, snakes are topically regarded as ‘cold’, cf. Theocr. Id. 15.58 τὸν ψυχρὸν ὀφέιν, Verg. Ecl. 3.93, 8.71. The image can be used of a cold and languid lover, cf. Ar. Eccl. 909 κατὰ τὴν κλίνην ὀφέιν.

764 palam istaec fiunt te odisse. LY. quin nego.

istaec: vague plural where singular would have been expected; probably due to metrical convenience; cf. e.g. Am. 283, Mo. 49, Tri. 861; a notable feature of Plautine style, see Sonnenschein on Mo. 49, LHS II 432. quin nego: ‘why, I deny it’; for emphatic quin, see OLD s. v. 2a, cf. e.g. Men. 615, Mil. 521, Per. 598, Tri. 1148, Ht. 581. For the ‘climactic-corrective’ force of quin when introducing a reply see Theslaff (1960) 34, cf. Cap. 644. The idiom is parodically ‘over-used’ at Cas. 602-609.

765 CO. non, non te odisse aiebat sed uxorem suam;
The cook turns towards Dorippa and starts talking to her.

766 et uxorem suam ruri esse aiebat. LY. haec est.
aa B C D / A B C D A / B c D; IK of et ux- (aa), synizesis of suam (D), trisyllabic aiebat (C D A). On the prosody of aiebam see Gratwick on Men. 532. Plautus uses the di- and the trisyllabic forms freely; examples of the trisyllabic form in Terence are all doubtful. haec est: Lysimachus points to Dorippa.

767 quid mihi molestu’s? CO. quia novisse me negas;

molestu’s: cf. 779; molestus is found frequently in comedy, but never in the tragic fragments. It has two idiomatic collocations: (1) as a conversational pleasantry si tibi molestum non est ‘if I am not troubling you’ (e.g. Ep. 460f., Per. 599, Poen. 50f., Ru. 120), (2), as here, as an irritated rebuff couched in polite terms potin ut molestus ne sies? ‘would you kindly stop bothering me?’ (e.g. Ep. 63, Per. 287; in the context of obnoxious behaviour the word is used at 408), see Reimers (1957) 228f. Even when used in contexts other than these two, it is usually weak in force and best translated with ‘annoying’, ‘ tiresome’, ‘bothersome’, e.g. An. 438 num illi molestae quidpiam haec sunt nuptiae?, 641; see also the short discussion by Reimers (1957) 160, 228-230; the distinction Reimers tries to establish between instances where molestus refers to “very gravely impudent behaviour” and “impudence diminishing another’s happiness” is hard to follow. The cook admits to being molestus, ‘obnoxious’, to Demipho. Obnoxious behaviour in cooks has a long tradition, going back at least as far as to the μάγεψει οἰκοπέπτες of Middle Comedy, see Wallochny (1992) 22-29. One of the characteristics of the μάγεψεις is his πεττεγολέζω (for the term cf. Theophr. Char. 13), see Giannini (1960) 210 (“curiosità e pettegolezzo”), who compares the cooks in Anaxand. fr. 1 K.-A.; Men. Epit., Sam., Dysc. (418, 443), and Plaut. Cu. II 2. Along with the πεττεγολέζω, the
cook displays “eccessiva familiarità”, Giannini compares Alexis fr. 177 K-A, Dionysius fr. 2 K-A, Athenion fr. 1 K-A; cf. also Themistius Or. 21.262c-d (πονηρὸν ἀνθρώπον ἂν καὶ <οὖν> ἐπὶ τῶν ἐργῶν εἰς τὰς ὁικίας παρεχόμενον, ἀλλ' ἵνα λαλήσῃ καὶ γινθορίση καὶ διαβόλη καὶ ἐξενέγκη ... καὶ τὰ ἄφορητα τῆς ὁικίας). quid mihi molestus?: perhaps write molestus with verbal ellipsis (cf. 756)? quia novisse me negas Δ: quia me non novisse aṣ P. The parallel Men. 750 negas novisse me? negas patrem meum?, supports the reading of A. The cook in the present scene is easily insulted and ready to react aggressively and vindictively, just like the one speaking in Caecilius Com. 19-21.

769 CO. vin me experiri? LY. nolo. CO. mercedem cedo.
experiri: ‘go to law’, cf. Ad. 350. At 771 experior means simply ‘I experience’, ‘find out (by experience)’. Perhaps one should better read me<cum> experiri, see Maurach on Poen. 1408. Taken with the preceding line (768 novisse), Lilja (1983) 26 n.53 sees an isolated homosexual insult in these two lines. On noscere in sexual contexts, see Adams (1982) 190, for experiri, cf. Cas. 812. Lilja’s argument remains unconvincing, as the atmosphere of this scene is not sexually charged. The cook gives a reason for his impudent and obnoxious behaviour, quid me novisse negas ‘because now you pretend you don’t know me.’ It would be off the mark for him to invite Lysimachus’ homoerotic interests, in particular since he knows that the old man is just about to have fun with his concubina, even though he mistakes her identity.

770 LY. cras petito; dabitur. nunc abi. DO. heu miserae mihi!
Cf. Mo. 654, where an obnoxious money-lender is disposed off in the same fashion, by a promise to give him the owed sum ‘tomorrow’: TR. petito cras. DA. abeo: sat habeo si cras fero. The fact that Lysimachus is willing to pay the cook is the last proof that Dorippa may have wanted to be fully convinced of her husband’s ‘guilt’; accordingly, she breaks out into a loud lament. cras: ‘tomorrow’ often means virtually ‘not in this play’, ad Kalendas Graecas, see IV.1 introduction, also Marti (1959) 115, cf. e.g. Men. Epit. 239; Mo. 654, Poen. 807; Ph. 1045. The fact that those who accept a promise like ‘you’ll be given the money tomorrow’ accept it and do not know that the play has no ‘tomorrow’, adds to the irony of the situation, much to the enjoyment of the audience. cras petito ... nunc abi: second (‘future’) imperative co-ordinated with a first (‘present’) imperative; the former is used for an order that does not need to be carried out until later, the latter expresses that the order has to be carried out immediately, see Woodcock (1959) 95f. cras petito, dabitur: paratactic, hasty utterance with resolved B’s and D’s underlining Lysimachus’ determination to get rid of the cook. heu miserae mihi: can be used to mark a change of speaker (cf. e.g. 217, 759), but also to begin a new sentence (cf. e.g. 681, 701; Am. 1057). All four examples from other pasages in this
play occur at line-end; cf. also *vaep miserae mihi* (708), an unusual form of the exclamation, placed in mid-line, see Kershaw (1995) 249f.

771 LY. *nunc ego verum illud verbum esse experior vetus:*

772 *aliquid mali esse propter vicinum malum.*
Cf. Hes. *Op.* 341 πὴμεια κακὸς γείτων δῶσον τ’ ἀγαθὸς μέγ’ ὀνειδώρ; *propter:* not causal but local, see *LHS* II 246; Lodge s.v. *propter* II.2.b *sub fin.* needs correction.

773 CO. *cur hic astamus?* <LY.> *quin abis?* CO. *incommodi*
A B C D A / B c D / A B c D. <LY.> *quin abis?* Bothe. The MSS give *abimus* and no indication of change of speaker, but the metre and the context suggest the above emendation, giving the words to Lysimachus and thus also rendering them more effective dramatically, cf. 757 *LY. quin abis?*. The MSS have *quin abimus*, but that would involve an unacceptably split resolution, see Gratwick on *Men.* 268 *magnus amator*, which is a similar case. Bothe’s suggestion of a change of speaker (cf. 778 *LY. quin abis?*) and a miswriting of some ligature provides a simpler cure than daggering *incommodi* as a gloss (Goetz/Schoell and Ernout). *incommodi:* ‘something bothersome/annoying’, not ‘disadvantage’, cf. *Ph.* 248-250, see Langen (1880) 256. The cook ironically underplays the nature and the dimensions of the trouble that he has caused Lysimachus. Plautus has only the singular, cf. also *Am.* 636, *Cap.* 146, *Mo.* 418. For the plural cf. e.g. *An.* 627, *Ht.* 932, *Hec.* 165, 840, *Ph.* 248; *Accius Trag.* 350; *Enn. Trag.* 131; see also Jocelyn (1967) 277.

774 *si quid tibi evenit, id non est culpa mea.*
aa bb C D A / B C D A B c D; ‘prosodic’ hiatus (not IK) of *tibi e-*, cf. *Poen.* 1078, see Questa (1967) 57; *tibi* behaves like a monosyllabic (*ti*), cf. *mihi*, see Gratwick (1993) 252, 254; shortening of *si quid* by enclisis (contact corruption, like *ecquis*), see Drexler (1965) 7, Questa (1967) 77. *id non est culpa mea* B C D / A B / c D, a well-defined dragged cadence, see Gratwick on *Men.* 294, infringing Meyer’s law (see 6n.). It remains unclear why the cook would want to affect a slow and weighty rhythm. Maybe in order to express his disdain?
776 nempe me hinc abire vis. LY. volo inquam. CO. abibitur.

abibitur: impersonal future passive of ire, see MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 758, used here and in the following line, denoting curt matter-of-factness, as if the speakers do not accept any direct involvement and responsibility, see Shipp on An. 403.

777 drachmam dato. LY. dabitur. CO. dari ergo sis iube.

drachmam = drachumam (δραχμή), both forms metrically possible; usually with anapytxis (the insertion of a glide sound, especially a svarabhaktic vowel), see Lindsay (1922) 144f., Meiser (1998) 89f. Passages like this and Ps. 85ff., 808 show that for a second-century Roman audience the drach(u)ma was a coin of little nominal value, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 268. It is slightly peculiar that the opulent provisions should cost only one drachma. The usual price for an opulent meal is a mina, cf. Tru. 445, 739f. It is likely that the drachma here is not the cook’s fee, but simply a small sum of money he expects for his pains, having come in vain with all the foodstuff, assistants, and utensils. The wages paid by the employer are never mentioned in any detail in Plautus, cf. Au. 448 nummo sum conductus, Ps. 808f., 847. Plainly such sums are neither exact nor meant to be taken as such, cf. further Euphron fr. 10.8 K-A, where the cook gets what he asks for, and Straton fr. 1.32f. K-A, where the fee was four drachmas, also Men. Asp. 223 (three drachmas for the cook), 233f. (one drachma for the caterer), see further Rankin (1907) 69f., Dohm (1964) 76 n.3. However, Richardson (1983) 29 n.12 thinks that one drachma is the standard fee for a cook and thinks that the cook’s demand of his pay at 769 is substantially the same demand that is put forward at 777. It would appear to the present author that the opulence of the meal that is implied by the whole apparatus that is brought onto the stage to be seen by the audience forbids this interpretation. The drachma is simply a tip the cook asks for so as to leave Lysimachus alone, and it is not an example of a redundancy payment. dabitur: cf. 770; like the cook in the preceding line (abibitur), Lysimachus uses the polite but distanced impersonal passive: a curt exchange, lacking in urbanitas, between two men who are not too fond of each other.

779 potine ut molestus ne sis? CO. agite apponite

potine ut molestus ne sis?: cf. Men. 627 potin’ ut mihi molestus ne sis?, cf. 767. ut ...

ne: frequent in Plautus after potin, cf. e.g. Ba. 747, Ep. 69, Men. 614, Ps. 636, Tru. 897. Cicero uses ut ne 15 times, usually after verba petendi, Livy once, Caesar never. Plautus uses potin ne only at Per. 175, but frequently potin ut, see LHS II 644. agite apponite: paratactic imperatives, expressing the cook’s haste and frustration. apponite: in connection with food, the verb usually means ‘serve’, cf. Am. 804, Men. 212, Per. 106; here it is comically inverted.
780 opsonium istuc ante pedes illi seni.
A B c D A / B cc D / A B c D; choriambic ante pedes (B cc D), not a case of 'split resolution', since ante pedes is 'one word' (fixed syntagma). opsonium: see 582n.

781 haec vasa aut mox aut cras iubebo abs te peti.
haec vasa: on the use of vasa in Plautus see Pociña (1988) 258. Baskets for the transport of victuals are also known in Greek comedy, cf. Men. Sam. 297, see Bieber (1961) 40 (nrs. 139-143).

782 sequimini. - LY. fortasse te illum mirari coquom
aa bb C D a / B C D A B c D; proceleusmatic in the first iambic measure (by IK), see Thierfelder in Fraenkel (1928) 358, Drexler (1932) I 235 and (1965) 43, Questa (1967) 139. In response to Lysimachus’ unwillingness to pay up, the cook proceeds to embarass him deliberately by ordering the slaves to dump their vasa - the physical evidence of Lysimachus’ guilt - at his feet. Then he marches off at the head of his train of assistants. This action calls for a sizeable quantity of food and kitchen utensils to make the situation really unpleasant for Lysimachus, who is left amidst the evidence with his fuming wife. fortasse te mirari: infinitive-construction (infinitive and subject accusative) with fortasse (as if it were a verb), not unlike the accusative of exclamation after edepol and hercle, cf. As. 37, Ep. 296, Poen. 1004, Tru. 680, Hec. 313, but the indicative is also used, cf. Per. 441; scilicet and videlicet are used similarly, cf. Ht. 359. sequimini: The cook is talking to his pompa. He turns his back on Lysimachus and leaves without a good-bye.

784-788 It is possible that the complaint of the uxor dotata about a husband’s disregard shown by the introduction of other women into the household had its antecedents in Greek tragedy, and that it was imported, be it independently, be it via Greek comedy, or via Roman tragedy, into Roman comedy. In Greek (perhaps less in Roman) society the introduction of another woman into a household did not only threaten a wife emotionally, but also for practical reasons involving serious questions of children’s legitimacy and of inheritance. If the woman’s status is infringed by a man, he does so at his own peril, at least in tragedy, where women tend to react most fiercely when their husbands or partners show such blatant disregard for their status as to introduce another woman into their home, cf. e.g. A. Ag. 950-955; S. Tr. 531-551, esp. 539f. and 545f.; E. Andr. 181f. (choral comment), El. 1032-1034; see further 829n.

784 DO. non miror si quid damni facis aut flagiti.
danni facis aut flagiti: for the combination of damnum and flagitium cf. 237. The phrase damnum facere occurs six times in Plautus, As. 182, Ba. 1032, Cap. 327, Ps.
440f., and at lines 237, 422 and here, see Watson (1971) 151 n.6, Zwierlein (1992) 174 n.388. The sense is ‘inflict loss on oneself’, the same meaning as in the lex Aquilia, see Watson (1971) 151-154; cf. the phrase damnum dare, Cis. 106, Tru. 228. All Plautine examples of damnum with flagitium (dedecus) are in erotic contexts, with one exception, As. 571 dedecus, see Preston (1916) 21; cf. Non. 313.16 who quotes Lucil. 866f. (qui et poscent minus et praebunt rectius multo et sine flagitio) to illustrate an old meaning of flagitium that concerns sexual relationships with maidens (vitium quod virgini interfert), see Williams (1992) 29. flagiti = flagitii, frequent in line-cadence, see LHS I 424.

786 measque in aedis sic scorta obductarier.
measque in aedis: There is subtle humour in what superficially looks like a casual statement. Dorippa talks of the house as ‘hers’, yet according to Greek and Roman law the house was ‘his’, unless it was part of the dowry, see Rambelli (1957) 78. This line shows that Dorippa knows who wears the trouses in their marriage. scorta: ‘tarts’; it is noteworthy that here the word is used by a Roman matrona, at Ht. 1041f. the same word is treated as unsuitable for use in the presence of a woman, see Adams (1984) 45. This is an indication of Dorippa’s rusticitas (cf. 714) and an unladylike brusqueness. obductarier: intensive form of obducere, for which cf. arg. I 7; rare (only here in Plautus). Its Greek equivalent, εἰσσυγεῖον, can mean ‘taking a bride to her new home’, see Hunter on Apoll. Rhod. 3.620-623. Such a connotation would lend considerable ‘bite’ to Dorippa’s words in the Greek original, see further Adams (1982) 174: “Much the same terminology is used in comedy (notably of Plautus) for taking a wife and a prostitute.”

787 Syra, i, rogato meum patrem verbis meis
verbis meis: ‘in my name’ (‘with a message from me’), cf. Am. 967, Hec. 720, Cic. Att. 16.11.8 Atticae meis verbis suavium des volo (the last example shows that the literal sense need not be felt).

Divorce in Plautus:
At Men. 775-875 the motif of ‘fetching Father’, a conventional means of threatening one’s husband with divorce, see Watson (1967) 29, is fully developed and the senex is brought on stage. The motif had its roots in social and legal realities, see Costa (1889) 52f., Krause (1995) 240-243. On divorce in Roman Republican law and society see further Watson (1975) 31-39 (for pre-Plautine times), Treggiari (1991). Petersmann on St. 204 (uxorin sit reddenda dos divorcio) argues that already in Plautus’ time a husband had to give back the dowry in the event of divorce, cf. Am. 928, Tri. 267; Hec. 501f., see Watson (1967) 66.
It is not clear at what period Roman women began to initiate divorces, but the mention of divorce by female characters in Plautus is usually taken as an indication that divorce could be initiated by women as early as the second century BC, see Watson (1967) 51f., followed by Schuhmann (1976) 24, contested by McDonnell (1983). See Fredershausen (1912) 234f. and McDonnell (1983) 55 for allusions to divorce in Plautine comedy, cf. Am. 928, Men. 719ff., 780ff., Mil. 1164-1167, 1276-1278, St. 17, 48-57, 68ff., 126ff.

788 ut veniat ad me iam semul tecum. SY. eo.

A bb C D A / B c D / A B / c D; hiatus at B/C juncture in the last iambic measure is suspicious though it occurs at change of speaker (cf. 749, 677) and despite a similar case in Terence (Ht. 83 -ti / eheu at line-end); Ritschl's simitu for simul may well be right. Dorippa may or may not plan to divorce her husband; the threat of calling in her father (and thereby involving her former family) is enough to frighten Lysimachus.

Syra has been on stage since Dorippa entered the scene from the house at 700. Her mute presence for 87 iambic verses need not be regarded as awkward, see Prescott (1937) 206. Plautus himself, probably with such stage conventions in mind, makes one of his characters remark (Mil. 1021) quid ego? hic astabo tantisper cum hac forma et factis frustra?. Syra's silence alone does not justify the prima facie assumption that Plautus has changed the plot-line of the Greek original. Mere length in the duration of silence, if one sympathetically visualizes the action on stage and the psychological conditions, is not necessarily evidence of awkwardness. A silent character can be an interested and attentive bystander. Syra's presence on stage is comparable in nature and length to that of Krateia's nurse at Men. Mis. 208-275. Yet, Menander's handling of the persona muta is technically more appealing: Krateia's nurse is twice addressed as if she had spoken (Mis. 211, 228); Syra's presence, however, is acknowledged by none of the characters on stage.

Even when Dorippa could direct some words at Syra, when she complains bitterly about her marriage (700-704), she does not, although Syra, who must already be present, would be the natural person to turn to. Yet, the fact that Dorippa uses en implies the presence of a person she is talking to (see OLD s.v. 'offering some object, fact, situation, etc., to a person's attention'). Still, Dorippa's recommendation at 702 'Just watch out to what kind of husband you entrust yourself and all you own', if directed at the 84-year-old slave Syra, would be comically incongruous. It is just as likely that Dorippa addresses the audience. All this should be staged with Syra supporting Dorippa's desperation by adequate gestures. Likewise, when Lysimachus says urbani fiunt rustici? (714), the plural could well denote the presence of Dorippa and the old nurse (similarly, the third person plural in Dorippa's answers, 715 and 717, and in Lysimachus' question, 716).
790 conceptis verbis iam iusiurandum dabo

A B C D A / B C D A B c D; an appropriately heavy line with one short syllable at line-cadence. conceptis verbis: 'in binding words', 'in formal language'; a common phrase in comedy, and at the same time a frequent technical expression accompanying the taking of oaths, cf. Ba. 1028, Tru. 767, As. 562, Cis. 98, Ps. 353, 1056, 1077. The binding force of an oath taken conceptis verbis was strong, cf. Cic. Off. 3.108, Sen. Apoc. 1.3., Serv. A. 12.13. iam iusiurandum dabo: It is typical of a mercator to swear an oath to confirm a statement, see Rauh (1993) 132-150 on the use of oaths in Greek and Roman commercial life. On the use of oaths in Roman society see Hickson (1993) 107-131. There may even be an allusion to Zeus - Juppiter here. If the equation Lysimachus = Juppiter, Dorippa = Juno still holds good (see 690n.), then this may allude to the fact that Zeus is said to have sworn falsely by the waters of Styx to Hera that he had not touched the girl Io (the cow, equalling Pasicompsa, the she-goat), and thereafter ordained that the oaths of mortals in love should carry no penalty (Ps.-Hesiod fr. 124 Merkelbach-West ἐκ τοῦ δ' ὄρκον ἔθηκεν ἐποίημιν ἄνθρωποι | νοσφαίοιν ἔργον πέρι Κύπρος; cf. also Ov. Ars 1.635f.).

791 me numquam quicquam cum illa - iamne abiit Syra?

numquam quicquam: 'nothing at all', 'nothing on earth'; regularly used by Plautus, cf. 460 (numquam ... quisquam), 957, Am. 910, As. 197, Men. 447, Ru. 581, St. 77. cum illa: Lysimachus is going to say something like 'I have never had any ... affair', but he interrupts himself (apostrophe) when he realises that nobody is listening. iamne abiit Syra?: This question, asking whether a character has already gone off, is not infrequent in Plautus, cf. e.g. Cas. 794, Men. 333, St. 632f., Tru. 634. The question is never merely uttered to the character on stage himself, but also to the audience, who can laugh at the ineptitude of the defeated. It is linked to the common phrase iamne abis?, spoken by characters who are appealing to or pleading with someone, after the person they have been appealing to walks away, leaving the other interlocutor behind ('going already?', 'must you go?', e.g. Men. 441, Mo. 991, Per. 50, Ps. 380, Ru. 384, St. 632; not in this sense in Terence). The phrase has a touch of pathos about it, and so has Lysimachus' question here.

792-802 Lysimachus' exit monologue, in which he reflects on the recent disastrous developments. On exit monologues in general see 817-829n. The mould of the monologue is in this case broken by the use of an apostrophe to his neighbour Demipho (793f.) and by a direct address to his wife, directed into the house (800-802), see Prescott (1942) 9 with n.23 for further examples of this technique. Prescott (1942) 18 states that this short exit monologue allows scanty time for the removal of the vasa and
for Syra to seek unsuccessfully Dorippa’s father, and Weissinger (1940) 71-73 posits an
act-division between IV.4 and IV.5. Weissinger overlooks that an interval in comedy
need not correspond in duration to the amount of ‘real’ time supposed to have elapsed in
the stage-world, see Conrad (1915) 30, cf. e.g. Men. 737-746/753, Cu. 527-532, Ru.
1183-1191.

792 perii hercule! ecce autem haec abiit. vae misero mihi!.

abiit: The recurrence of what Prescott (1942) 9 aptly called the ‘ille-abiit’ cliché (a
rather ‘wooden’ reference to a character who has just gone off) in two consecutive lines
is noteworthy. Lysimachus’ sad state is probably underlined by some kind of gesture or
posture, see Basore (1908) 46 on Don. Ter. Ad. 782 abiit; demisso et desperanti vultu
quid factum sit dicit.

793 at te, vicine, di deaeque perduint,
at: commonly used in prayers, curses, and angry language; Lindsay (1907) 94 compares
Cap. 622; cf. also An. 666, Eu. 431, Hec. 134; Verg. A. 2.535; Hor. Epod. 5.1; cf. the
use of Greek ὃλλά, e.g. Lucian. Gall. 1 ὃλλά σε, κάκιστε ὀλεκτρυών, δ Ζεῦς αὑτός
ἐπιτρίψειε. di deaeque perduint: see 710n.

794 cum tua amica cumque amationibus!
A bb cDA/B cD aB c d+; shortening of the second syllable of tua by ‘prosodic’ hiatus
to secure the latter element of bb; for this specific kind of ‘prosodic’ hiatus see Gratwick
(1993) 254. cum ... cumque: for this use of the preposition, indicating the reason for the
amationibus: (cDaBcd+) a six-syllable word at line-end, followed in the two subsequent
lines by a five-syllable word (795 indignissume) and a quadrisyllabic word (796
acerrumast).

795 suspicione implevit me indignissume
A heavy line, expressing Lysimachus’ outrage at being under suspicion through his
neighbour’s fault. suspicione: (instrumental) ablative, usual after compounds of -pleo,
e.g. Cas. 123, Cato Agr. 52.1, Verg. A. 1.729, 7.23, see OLD s.v. impleo Sc (‘provide in
full measure’), but the genitive occurs occasionally, cf. Am. 470, Au. 454, Men. 901. The
same is true for Cicero, see Menge (2000) 498f. Here and elsewhere (e.g. Poen. 1290)
Leo (1912) 308 wants to understand -is instead of -e, i.e. suspicionis, and claims the
word suspicione to be a genitive in disguise; see already the criticism by Lindsay (1922)
132f. Plautine syntax is more flexible than that of classical Latin, but in this case Plautus
actually appears to use the ‘classical’ ablative anyway, cf. also line 409 (with Enk’s note

796 *concivit hostis domi: uxor acerrumast.*

*concivit*: cf. *Am*. 476f. *nam Amphitruo actutum uxorī turbas conciet/atque insimulabīt eam probrī. uxor acerrumast C D/ a B c D/, breaking Meyer's law, see 6n. The rhythm may be intended to underline Lysimachus' concern.

797 *ibo ad forum atque Demiphoni haec eloquar*

*ad forum*: the lounging place of idle young men, cf. *Cap*. 478, *An*. 226. It would appear that Demipho is still at the *forum*. The fact that he did not return from there with Lysimachus in the first place (at 692) after they had done their 'shopping' (see 578-580, 694f.) would seem odd to an over-critical reader of the play. He does not even return with the cook later on (741). His absence is not commented on, so as not to draw any attention to it. The reason for his absence is obvious enough: he needs to be out of the way so that Lysimachus can be thoroughly embarrassed in IV 3 and 4, with the ensuing discovery of the girl by Eutychus (IV.5 and V.1) and the subsequent resolution of the play (V.2 and V.4). If Demipho was present, he could easily explain the situation, but *Plautus noluit* (cf. *Cas*. 65) - vel etiam Philemo?

798 *me istanc capillo protracturum esse in viam*

This and the following line may be compared to the threats of the *simia* in Demipho’s dream (cf. 243f.), although the threat uttered here would cause Demipho less trouble than if Lysimachus confronted the girl with Demipho’s *uxor*.

800-802 Beare (1964) 267 points out that Lysimachus' weak excuse for having the provisions brought inside is ultimately caused by the absence of a drop-curtain; stage props no longer wanted have to be removed, whether with or without an apology. For a similar idea (provisions, once bought, should be eaten and not wasted) cf. *Caecil*. 173 *Quid hoc futurum obsonio est ubi tantum sumpti videas?* Cf. also *Cas*. 780 *si sapitis, uxor, vos tamen cenabitis, / cena ubi erit cocta; ego ruri cenavero*, where the circumstances are different, but the phrasing is similar.

800 *uxor, heus uxor! quamquam tu irata es mihi,*

*uxor, heus uxor!:* Cf. [866], 910; interjection used for hailing people (in the vocative case); for the use of *heus* cf. *e.g.* *Cu*. 147, *Ps*. 243, see Watt (1963) 138-148. Dorippa has left the stage at 792 (if *haec* refers to her, not to Syra) or shortly after Syra. The lines 800f. (perhaps 802, which could be an aside) are shouted towards the stage building by Lysimachus.
801 iubeas, si sapias, haec intro auferrier:
The scene ends with Lysimachus calling to his wife indoors to have the vasa taken inside, for they could use them for a 'good dinner'; thus the couple is condemned to chew over their quarrel even after the action of the play has ended, i.e. their quarrel will end cras, never. iubeas ... haec ... intro auferrier: cf. Tru. 583 iube auferri intro.

802 eadem licebit mox cenare rectius.
A B c D A / B C D a / B c d+; eadem (AB) disyllabic by synizesis. eadem: sc. opera, adverbial ablative, 'by the same effort', see Enk ad loc.
I. Introduction

Syra returns from town. She has managed to get all the way to Dorippa’s father’s house and back, in just about fourteen lines of on-stage time. This is particularly humorous as Syra is a very old and very slow woman, moving across the stage at a snail’s pace. In the Greek original, there may have been an act-break after 802 to cover for Syra’s trip to the house of Dorippa’s father.

Eutychus enters exhausted and in a sad mood. He does not know where else to look for the girl. On his reappearance at 842, he will be in the opposite mood. This scene begins to unravel the play’s tangled plot. Eutychus finally finds Pasicompsa, after having looked for her all over the city ... in his own home. He only needs to tell Charinus, and one knot of the plot will have been untangled. At the end of the short exchange, Eutychus dashes off into the house. Maybe a suspicion is dawning on Eutychus that he might find Pasicompsa in the only place he has not looked for her (805 *totam urbem*).

II. Commentary

803 SY. era quo me misit, ad patrem, non est domi.

‘The place Mistress sent me to, to her father, he is not at home.’ Syra returns alone. Dorippa’s father, whom she had gone to fetch, was not at home. Unachieved aims provide the reason for early returns in a number of cases in Greek and Roman comedy, cf. e.g. *Men. Dysc.* 259ff.; *Au.* 371ff.; *Eu.* 629ff., 840ff., see Arnott (1996) 288. Stärk (1989) 57f. n.239 states that the action is not moving, since the father is not at home and Syra’s mission has been in vain. However, the action of act IV as a whole is moving much more rapidly than that of the rest of the play, and there is a much higher frequency of exits and entrances.

Lefèvre (1995) 16, following Stärk (1989) 57 n.239, thinks that the entire scene is a Plauteine addition. Dorippa sends Syra to fetch her father (787ff.), he turns out not to be at home, and Syra returns without having achieved anything, Lefèvre regards this dramatic movement as “ein blindes oder abgebrochenes Motiv”, which he deems un-Menandrian, thus un-Philemonian, and thus Plauteine. Maybe one should take a different perspective on the dramaturgical handling of this motif. Zagagi (1995a) 82 has pointed out that what she calls “pre-meditated false foreshadowing” is a feature common both to Greek and Roman dramaturgy: “The spectator is [...] led to expect a confrontation between Lysimachus and Dorippa’s father of the same type as the one offered in *Menaechmi* (753ff.). Yet no sooner has Syra returned to the scene, unaccompanied by Dorippa’s father, than he is made aware that his expectation is not to be fulfilled.” Yet,
even if Menander would conform to the idealized standards claimed by Lefèvre and others, there is nothing to keep us from crediting other Greek playwrights with a different set of dramaturgical predilections.

quo: This anacoluthic sentence changes focus three times, and none of the three short statements Syra makes is brought to a proper finish; they are linked by association, and leave quo without a proper correspondent. This is very much the way people conduct real-life conversations; it also denotes Syra's social status. For the use of quo in reference to persons cf. also Mil. 119, St. 142. This and similar usages (e.g. of unde) are not common in republican drama; they may have had a legalistic tone, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 83. ad patrem: epexegetic to quo (prolepsis of the relative clause), see and Enk ad loc., cf. Ph. 88 in quo haec discebat ludo, exactvorum ilico tonstrina erat quaedam. est: sc. pater.

804 rus abiisse aibant. nunc domum renuntio.

805 EU. defessus sum urbem totam pervenarier:
This line refers back to Eutychus' resolve to find the girl when he was last on stage (663-666). Marti (1959) 88 notes that Eutychus makes no mention here of the praecones and conquistores he said he wanted to hire. He explains this as an example of the use of an ad hoc or 'momentary' motif (Augenblicksmotiv). defessus: adjectival participle, linking up with either an ablative of a gerund (e.g. Am. 1014, St. 313; Ad. 213, 713; Pacuv. Trag. 315) or an infinitive (as here and Ep. 197 per omnem urbem quem sum defessus quaerere, 719f.), another example of the elasticity of Plautine syntax; on this 'adnominal' infinitive see 288n. The infinitive is used as a verbal noun in the ablative case to express the means or cause, cf. the examples given by Lindsay (1907) 72; Ph. 885 is particularly instructive, as it shows infinitive and gerund side by side in an identical construction.

806 nihil investigo quicquam de illa muliere.
A B C D A /B C D A bb c d+ After a sequence of long syllables, the run of four shorts at the end is notable and lends a certain tone to the word muliere (cf. 528, 684f.). nihil ... quicquam ‘not the slightest thing’. investigo: cf. 664. The use of the present tense to express unachieved action ('I can't find out the slightest thing' = 'I haven't found out the slightest thing') is noteworthy, see Lindsay (1907) 57f.
807 sed mater rure rediit, nam video Syram

This is indirect evidence for the fact that it would be such a matter of course for a matrona to be accompanied by a comes (cf. 404f.) that the mere presence of the latter would also indicate that of the former, just as today we infer someone's presence from the fact that we see their car parked in front of a house.

808 astare ante aedis. Syra! SY. quis est qui me vocat?


Σύρα, Σύρα. :: (SY.) τι ἔστι; πώς ἡμίν ἔχεις;
(SY.) μηδέποτε ἐρώτα τοῦτο, ἐπάν γέροντε ἵδης
η γραφὴν τίνι· ίσθι δ'/ εὖθες ὅτι κακῶς ἔχει.

If this fragment is indeed of the Emporos, for which there is no positive proof, since it contains a very general statement that could be used in a great number of contexts and plays and the name 'Syra' is very common for elderly slaves, it would certainly fit much better in the vicinity of lines 670-675, see Krysiniel-Józefowicz (1949) 39, Averna (1988) 42f.

809 EU. erus atque alumnus tuos sum. SY. salve, alumnule.

alumnule is Schoell's emendation of the MSS alumne, which is metrically defective; Pylades' alumne mi is also possible. This can barely mean that Syra was Eutychus' wet-nurse, as Schmitter (1971) 60 asserts, for if Eutychus is of an approximately similar age as Charinus (475 tuos amicus et sodalis) and Charinus is about twenty-two years of age (i.e. at least two years past his time as ephebos, see 40n.), then Syra, who is 84 years old (673), would have been about sixty when Eutychus was born, and therefore hardly in a position to breast-feed him. Indeed, Schmitter (1971) 47 n.1 points out that the term should be understood in a broader sense, and compares Cis. 762 nostra haec alumna est, tua profecto filia, Poen. 1123 meum alumnum pater (but there Giddenis is indeed the nutrix of the two Carthaginian girls). The Greek equivalent is τέκνον (cf. Men. Georg. 25, 63, 84, 109, Sam. 242), used particularly by older women speaking of or to younger persons for whom they felt some affection, see Bain (1984) 38. On the nutrix in Plautine comedy see Spranger (1984) 80f.

810 EU. iam mater rure rediit? responde mihi.

Eutychus concludes from seeing Syra that his mother Dorippa is back. It is not quite clear why he asks Syra 'Has Mother come back home?', since he seems to know about
his mother's arrival already (cf. 807). There seems to be a short interval of silence between Eutychus' question and Syra's answer, and he has to elicit an answer from her. **responde mihi**: cf. 917, 1011; often formulaic, regularly preceding the question proper, see Wright (1974) 18. Three times the question precedes the formula (*Am.* 848, *Mo.* 1026, and here). In the order *responde mihi*, the words are only found at line-end (iambic-trochaic), *Men.* 288, *Mo.* 635, 1026, *Ps.* 8, *Am.* 848; *Poen.* 252* (canticum, at end of colon); twice in Terence: *Ph.* 255, 1042, see Wright (1974) 18 n.8, cf. also Liv.andr. *Com.* 1 *pulices an cimices an pedes? responde mihi.*

811 SY. *cum quidem salute familiae maxuma.*

*cum ... salute*: ablative of attendant circumstances, a special case of the ablative of accompaniment, see Woodcock (1954) 31, *LHS* II 115f., cf. 964 *optuma opportunitate.* In Plautus such phrases are frequently used to describe attendant circumstances and are found with or without *cum*, cf. *Ba.* 1070 *salute nostra*, *Men.* 134 *nostrum salute socium*, *Ru.* 910 *salute horiae; Ad.* 519 *cum salute.* The expression *cum ... salute* was criticized by Camerarius, as it would have to be equivalent to *σών γε τὸ Χημ* and he emended unnecessarily to *sua quidem salute*, which was adopted by Leo. Enk ad loc. shows that the expressions are indeed equivalent; to his examples add as closer parallels Cic. *Catil.* 1.33 *hoc fecisti cum summa rei publicae salute et cum tua peste ac pernicie cumque illorum exitio; Mur.* 2 *cum vestra atque omnium civium salute* (in both cases *salute* is used with *cum* - none of Enk's examples are used in that way - and with an attributive genitive denoting the people in whose interest the action took place). *familiae*: (quadrisyllabic) is Bentley’s metrically necessary conjecture for the MSS *a familia.*

813 *amicam adduxit intro in aedis. EU. quo modo?*

When the reference is to prostitution, *domum* is an abnormal complement of *ducere*, and it was probably not as a rule understood, because it would not have been usual to bring prostitutes to one's house, see Adams (1982) 174; see also 814n. Syra restates Dorippa's main complaint, namely that the *scortum* was brought right into the family home, thereby impairing her own status as *mater familias*, cf. 784-788n., 786n. and 923f. *adduxit*: cf. 904, 924; for its occurrence in sexually charged contexts, see Adams (1982) 175, cf. *Ht.* 819, 1041, *Ad.* 965; Varro Ling. 7.84 *in Atellanis licet animadvertere rusticos dicere se adduxisse pro scorto pelliculam; Tib.* 1.7.59. *quo modo?: 'what! (I can't believe it!)*; see Petersmann on St. 252, Sedgwick on *Am.* 556.

814 SY. *adveniens mater rure eam offendit domi.*

*offendit*: cf. Lysimachus' words at 587 *ne illum hic offendat (scil. uxor)*, of which this line may be an ironical echo; for *offendere* 'come upon, meet, find (in a place specified or implied)', see *OLD* s.v. 3a. *domi*: It was not usual to bring prostitutes to one's private
home, see Adams (1982) 174, cf. C. Gracchus Or. fr. 27 si ulla meretrix domum meam introivit. This is the reason why Demipho had the plan to set Pasicompsa up somewhere in rented accommodation (560f., 584, 587).

815 EU. pol hau censebam istarum esse operarum patrem. 'Boy, I'd never have thought Father capable of that.' Instead of saying 'I am deeply shocked to find my own father involved in such vile displays of utter immorality', which would be the proper reaction in a shame culture (or even in our allegedly less restrained one), Eutychus actually expresses what amounts to admiration for his old man's supposed 'activities' as senex amator. istarum esse operarum: genitive of the 'rubric', see Woodcock (1959) 53 LHS II 71; see also 525n. operarum: 'tricks, 'shenanigans', cf. e.g. Ru. 321, see OLD s.v. opera 5a ('a particular display of activity, deed, effort').

816 etiam nunc mulier intust? SY. etiam. EU. sequere me. Despite of Eutychus' clear order, Syra's exit is delayed, and she delivers a monologue of thirteen lines (817-829) that comprises the following scene (IV.6). Contrast e.g. 543 where Pasicompsa obeys Lysimachus' order sequere sis, and Ph. 765, where, after a comparable dialogue with a matrix (728-765), she receives the same command (sequere me), and follows immediately; cf. also Caecil. Com. 273 sequere me. :: perit hercle! :: tu quid mi oscitans hietansque restas?, where the force and urgency of the order sequere me becomes clear. Marti (1959) 39 n.13 notes that there are parallels for slaves not immediately following their masters despite of clear orders, e.g. Ep. 305-319; also in Greek tragedy, cf. E. Andr. 876ff. etiam nunc: implies 'or has Mother thrown the 'lady' out already?' intust = intus est, with aphaeresis after an adverb, a rare phenomenon, cf. Am. 856, Mer. 720, Mo. 445. Contrast intus est at As. 394, Mil. 483, Mo. 988.

After this scene there is a spurious addition comprising 116 lines in Pius' edition of the text (1500), which was printed in many subsequent editions until the beginning of the 19th century. Another few lines were inserted after line 956. Whereas the first scaena suppositicia is inserted, it would appear, without much reason, the rationale of the second one is to provide a smoother transition from the mad-scene to the final scene of the play. This is a valid reason, and it is possible that Plautus actually did telescope the dialogue between Demipho and Lysimachus slightly.

For a full edition and commentary of the additional passages, see the annotated edition of the two scaenae suppositiciae by Braun (1980) 186-196. The curious hypothesis that the first inserted scene in the text actually derives from antiquity (possibly the 2nd century A.D.) that was proposed by Albizzati (1933), who focused on the allusions to Astarte contained in the additions that would betray knowledge inaccessible to the humanists of the 15th century, is rightly refuted by Braun (1980) 90f.
‘Act IV scene 6’ (817-829): SYRA

I. Introduction

1. Function
Leo (1912) 121 observed that Syra, lingering to deliver her moralizing monologue after Eutychus has dashed off into the house, behaves as one would expect of a sluggish 84-year-old (cf. 670-675). Accordingly, this scene may be staged by making Syra walk a few steps, sluggishly, as if to follow Eutychus, then stopping, turning to the audience, looking at them, then delivering her speech and hobbling off. From a dramaturgical point of view, Syra’s short moralizing speech can be classed as an exit monologue (for a quasi-monologue functioning as an extremely brief exit monologue, see 466-468n.); see in general Prescott (1942). It is preceded by a short dialogue (803-816) that serves to slow down the pace of the action gained in the preceding scene (741-802) which is full of lively banter and pantomimic elements (fabula motoria). It is followed by an entrance monologue (830-841) delivered by Charinus.

Syra proposes a moral reform - the abolition of the double standard. The tone of general reflection in this speech is in accordance with the recurrent themes found in exit monologues, namely some form of comment on the preceding action or exiting situation and an announcement of more or less immediate future action. Accordingly, exit monologues, not unlike link monologues (see 469-473n.), usually begin in a reflective or deliberative mood motivated by the immediate dramatic context, see Prescott (1942) 3.

Exit monologues usually conclude with a statement about what the speaker intends to do next. Syra’s monologue is peculiar in that it concludes with the statement of a merely hypothetical action (826-828), leaving no doubt about the Utopian nature of Syra’s wishes, see Prescott (1942) 3f. The entire speech is devoted to the discussion of a set topic, and the speech lacks a concluding announcement of immediate future action. This monologue combines with Charinus’ entrance monologue at 830-841 to cover the interval between the exit and return of Eutychus, again making a pause in the action unlikely before 830, where Renaissance convention put an act-break. There are a number of instances where the stage is vacant (without a pause in the action) between monologues, e.g. Au. 586, 623, 700, Cl. 652, Ru. 457, Eu. 922, Ad. 510, see Conrad (1915) 17 n.40.

Norwood (1932) 40 and Zwierlein (1992) 334 regard this monologue as an unwarranted insertion, either by Plautus himself (Norwood) or an interpolator (Zwierlein). However, the time elapsing during Syra’s monologue and Charinus’ prayer-turning-into-monologue (830-841) provides the interval necessary to cover for Eutychus’ discovery of Pasicompsa inside. Because of similarities to Euripidean monologues, Leo (1912) 119 (comparing E. El. 1032ff.), followed by Fredershausen
(1912) 243 n.3, declared the monologue and the social situation that is its theme to be Attic.

2. Style and Structure
There is an element of controlled emotionality in this monologue. It is a good example of set-piece rhetoric (numerous stichic correspondences, lexical repetitions, alliterations and assonances, a ring composition, 817f. mulieres - quam - viri, 829 viri - quam - mulieres, antithetical movement of lines 821-829, ecastor at 817 repeated at 826), see Fraenkel (1928) 191, Blänsdorf (1967) 183-185, Bertini (1985) 71f. It deals with women, and it is the mulieres who have the first and the last line (mulieres at line-end at 817 and 829). It also deals with men (emphatically repeated disyllabic words at line-end: 820, 823, 824 - viro - at 818 and 826 viri, in a balanced composition).

The speech has a clear structure. Syra establishes the general thesis of her argument in the first two lines (817f.) which are heightened in tone and suggest the beginning of a moralising digression of high pathos: this impression is reinforced by the fact that a significant bunching of disyllabic line-ends can be observed in this passage (818 viri, 819 suam, 820 viro, 821 foras, 823 and 824 viro, 825 siet, 826 viri, 827 suam), probably expressing the seriousness of the statements made by the octogenarian slave. The main part of Syra’s monologue falls into two sections (819-822 and 824-829), with line 823 demarcating the middle of the monologue and dividing the two sub-sections. The two sections are formally marked off by nam (‘for instance’, 819, 824, introducing illustrations of the thesis established at 817f.), see Blänsdorf (1967) 80-88, Lindsay (1907) 100. They are also closely linked by a repetition of key terms (scorlum ducere, clam uxorem, exigere) and themes (marital fidelity; unequal punishment of, husbands and wives; divorce procedures).

II. Commentary

817 ecastor lege dura vivunt mulieres
A B C D a / B C D A / bb c D; similar in rhythm to 806, with the word mulieres at line-end containing the only resolution (bb) and a tribrach after a drawn-out sequence of long syllables: an extended metrical sigh, cf. also 829. ecastor: see 503n. lege dura: Stärk (1989) 58 sees an allusion to a Roman law, taking lex to mean ‘law’, see already Taubmann (1605) 789. However, the term should be understood as ‘condition’ (see P. Nixon’s translation), ‘state’, or even, to use a similar legalistic and commercial expression, ‘term’, ‘a principle inherent in the nature of a thing, a condition of existence’ (see OLD s.v. 8); Plautus plays on the two meanings at Ps. 304f. (annorum lex me perdit quinavicensaria. / metuont credere omnes. :: eadem est lex mihi: metuo credere), cf. e.g. As. 746, Au. 255, Cap. 181, Mo. 351, Tru. 144, Cic. De orat. 1.178, Livy 21.12, Tib.
1.6.69 on the *lex amatoria* between lovers, on which see F. Leo (1912) 154 n.4: *et mihi sint durae leges, laudare nec ullam /possim ego quin oculos appetat illa meos*, Sen. Ag. 264 *lex alia solio est, alia privato toro*, and the phrase *ea lege*; see also 1016n.; cf. the untechnical use of νόμος at E. Andr. 176 and Pap. Didot I 14 (Menander OCT p. 329) in contexts also dealing with marital conventions.

Pernard (1900) 110f. has pointed out rightly that Dorippa is not willing to put up with what she thinks is Lysimachus' infidelity (785f.), and that Lysimachus is very much afraid of her - and of her father (791f.): "Evidemment Syra ne veut pas dire que, en droit, sa maîtresse ne peut pas divorcer, puisque c'est précisément pour demander divorcer qu'elle est allée chercher le père de Dorippe. A notre avis le mot *lex* n'a pas ici un sens juridique; ce n'est pas une allusion à la loi proprement dite, mais à la situation qui est faite à la femme par les mœurs et par l'opinion."

819 nam si vir scortum duxit clam uxorem suam

*scortum duxit*: 'pick up a tart', a coarse expression, see Gratwick on *Men*. 123f.; cf. 827, 1022. *clam uxorem suam*: in agreement with the construction of *celare*, *clam* may be followed by an accusative, see Enk ad loc.; echoed in 821: *virum si clam*.

820 id si rescivit uxor, inpunest viro;

*rescivit*: 107n. *inpunest viro*: At *Men*. 788f., 792-797, 799-802 the argument is that the breadwinner is entitled to greater sexual latitude than the woman, see MacDowell (1978) 88, Schmude (1988) 78-97; for Greek tragedy, see Garvie on A. Ch. 919-921, Denniston on E. *El*. 1035-1040. Still, an adulterer who had seduced a citizen woman could be punished quite severely, see Dover on Ar. *Nub*. 1083, Harrison (1968) 34f., Gomme/Sandbach on Men. *Sam*. 591, Hunter on Eubulus fr. 84.6 K-A; cf. *Mil*. 1394-1408, *Poen*. 862f.; Catul. 15.8; Hor. *Sat*. 1.2.41f.; Juv. 10.317. However, in Athenian law an affair with a prostitute did not constitute adultery. For a wife on the other hand, whose function was to produce legitimate offspring, sexual fidelity was a prerequisite. If a woman was an inmate of a brothel or an open street-walker, intercourse with her did not count as adultery as it posed no threat to the continuation of the family unit, see MacDowell (1978) 125, Barsby on *Eu*. 960f.; that is the sexual double standard Syra has in mind (cf. 819). Syra's complaint can be paralleled elsewhere, see Tarrant (1976) 221: "Seneca (*Epist.* 94.26, *Ira* 2.28.7) and some of the jurists (cf. Ulpian *apud* *Dig.* 48.5.14.5) felt it unjust for a husband to be allowed affairs while a wife was held to strict fidelity; Seneca, at least, would have concluded that both parties should be faithful. The inequity of the traditional view was seen by other enlightened writers as well, cf. Menander, *Epitr.* 530ff. (cf. Eur. *El*. 1035ff.)." Similarly Schuhmann (1975) 158 n.1.

If what Syra says was true, it would not easily square with the fact that *senes amatores* do their utmost to prevent their wives from finding out about their affairs. The
dreaded figure of the well-dowered wife would not cause so many Roman men to cower before them and their threats of divorce, or make someone like Demipho fear castration (cf. 275). Another elderly gentleman, Lysidamus in Casina, when his wife Cleustrata finds out about his love-affair, starts wheedling and assuring her that if he ever had a love-affair again, she could have him strung up and whipped with rods, a punishment fit for slaves (Cas. 1000-1003). Although divorce was legally easy, men must have been deterred from divorce by the obligation to pay back the wife's dowry, and women by the social pressures to submit to male authority, cf. the advice given from one woman to another at Cas. 206ff., see Stärk (1989) 51 n. 198, pace Schuhmann (1976) 31.

821 uxor virum si clam domo egressa est foras,
A respectable woman does not leave the house unless accompanied by a comes, see 404n., Davidson (1997) 78. However, Cohen (1991) 150f. provides evidence that Athenian women of lower social strata did participate in a wide range of activities outside their houses (e.g. Dem. 57.30-34 and 45, Ar. Pax 535, Ach. 478, V. 497, 1380-1392, Ran. 1346, Lys. 445, 456ff., Thes. 346ff., 447ff.). Still, it has to be noted that the freedom of movement was not completely suspended. The literary evidence, on which see Seidensticker (1987) 20 and 39 n.69, Arnott on Alexis fr. 340.2 K-A, Gould (1980) 40, Fuchs (1960) 37, Erdmann (1934) 19-28, should not be taken as proof that such prohibitions were always effective, see Cohen (1991) 164: "The husbands know that they [their wives] go out, but they should not be found to have been out, particularly not at an inappropriate time or without an appropriate purpose."

In Rome, if we can trust Plautus, women were better off. Several passages suggest that it was possible for matronae to move freely outside the house, especially when attended by a comes. Earlier on, Demipho maintains that it would be impossible for Pasicompsa to be his wife's comes, because her good looks would elicit staring, wolf-whistles, and naughty gestures from male passers-by (403-411; cf. St. 113f.). The fact that Dorippa, attended by Syra, comes back from the countryside to check on Demipho (667-669) shows that freedom of movement for purposes other than ceremonial or strictly defined in some other way was no alien concept for a Roman audience, see Wiles (1989) 41.

uxor: the term mulieres at 817 is inexact; Syra is now going to talk about married women (uxores), not about women in general (mulier can include mulieres meretrices, cf. 685, 755, 816). uxor virum: parataxis, heightening the effect of a factual contrast, see 713n. virum si clam: perhaps expressing some malintent of the woman, suggesting adultery; clam uxorem occurs without exception in contexts of male adultery in Plautus, and similarly clam virum, though less frequently (eleven against three times), in contexts of a wife's unfaithfulness, for clam uxorem cf. As. 942, Cas. 95, 451, 468, 1016, Men.
152, Mer. 545, for clam virum cf. Am. 107, Cas. 199f. Female infidelity was dealt with in several comedies, cf. Men. fr. 261, 366, 535, 657 K-Th, Euphron fr. 12 K-A, Baton fr. 3 K-A, An. 315f. The taking of lovers was regarded as commonplace, cf. Ar. Lys. 212; women are not to be trusted: Blepyrus in Ar. Eccl. (225, 522f.) is typical of the type of the suspicious husband, whose immediate suspicion - if his wife has been out - is that of sexual transgression (cf. Thes. 397ff., 410ff., 519, 785-791). Women are also believed to be more eager than men for sexual activity, see Dover (1974) 101f., Gould (1980) 38 n.2.

822 viro fit causa, exigitur matrumonio

From regal times, a Roman wife could not divorce her husband, but a husband his wife for a few specific causes; Plutarch (Rom. 22.3) lists poisoning a child, substitution of keys, and adultery. If he turned her out for any other reason, he forfeited his property, one half going to the wife, the other to Ceres (or Tellus). This seems to have continued until the divorce of Sp. Carvilius Ruga around 230 BC, which figures prominently in the sources as the first Roman divorce, see Watson (1965b), Watson (1975) 31f., Treggiari (1991) 442.

Carvilius had divorced his wife for childlessness. This was not a proper reason for a divorce, and under normal circumstances he would have had to pay back his ex-wife's dowry to her clan, Watson (1965b) 46f.: "Henceforward, in certain cases at least, an innocent wife might be divorced by her husband who would not be compelled to pay her the proportion of his property demanded under the old law and there would be no action available for the reclaiming of the dowry. This would cause general doubt as to the comprehensiveness of the existing law and parties to a marriage will have wanted to make their own provisions for the distribution of property in the event of divorce, at least for cases which might not be adequately covered by the old law." With this precedent, Roman marriages could no longer be conceived of as lifetime arrangements. Precautions had to be taken to secure the return of the dowry upon divorce, and a legal action (actio rei uxoriae) was developed to allow the woman and her father to make the claim. But soon husbands no longer needed to fear such odium as Carvilius had incurred, and following generations of husbands could allegedly shake off their wives on faint pretexts (cf. Val. Max. 5.3.10-12).

viro fit causa: Syra emphasizes the legal consequences of the woman's behaviour. The man gets a causa, a valid case (OLD s.v. 4). This implies that he was required to provide reasons for the divorce, probably before a consilium amicorum, see Kaser (1938) 75, Pomeroy (1976) 218, Bauman (1992) 18f., cf. Val. Max. 2.9.2 (in 307 BC L. Annius was expelled from the senate for divorcing his wife without summoning a consilium amicorum), perhaps Naev. Com. 128 sonticam esse oportet causam, quam ob rem
perdas mulierem. In Athens husbands did not need grounds for divorce, see Harrison (1968) 39f., but there is evidence that Roman husbands who divorced without cause suffered financial penalties, see Watson (1967) 54f., Treggiari (1991) 265, McDonnell (1983) 58, Scafuro (1997) 237. exigitur: ‘be divorced’, cf. 828, see OLD s.v. 1c. By Greek law the husband of an adulterous wife was required to divorce her, otherwise he might be suspected of procuring, see Post (1940) 424, Evans (1991) 11. Syra’s complaint does not account for that automatism; on the contrary, in Syra’s view men seem to wait for a causa in order to get rid of their wives. This concept is Roman.

823 utinam lex esset eadem quae uxori est viro
lex: ‘condition’, see 817n., cf. esp. Am. 77 qui minus eadem histrioni sit lex quae summo viro?

824 nam uxor contenta est, quae bona est, uno viro
This is an ironization of the ‘one-and-only’ theme (see 536n.), cf. Afranius Com. 117 nam proba et pudica quod sum, consulo et parco mihi, quoniam comparatum est, uno ut simus contentae viro; ironized at Eu. 122; cf. also Catul. 111.1f., Hor. Epod. 14.15f. Lefèvre (1995) 51f. sees a link between the formulation uno viro and the tradition of the uxor univira, probably mistakenly. On the uxor univira see e.g. Austin on Verg. A. 4.29: Roman sentiment was traditionally disturbed by second marriages, and widows who did not remarry were widely praised. However, the present passage does not deal with remarriage but with adultery and divorce. quae bonast: at 510 the phrase is used as a euphemism for sexually obliging behaviour, so it is just possible that the unus vir here is not the woman’s husband. The expression quae in se culpam commerent (828) reinforces this impression.

826-829 This passage is written in a style typical of legal Latin: the general case (si itidem plectantur viri) precedes the specific (si quis clam uxorem ...), combined in two juxtaposed clauses, see Molsberger (1989) 85, Blänzdorf (1967) 16f. with further examples.

826 ecastor faxim, si itidem plectantur viri
faxim = fecerim, see LHS I 621-624; potential subjunctive, ‘I would warrant (that)’, see Stockert on Au. 494f., cf. Am. 510f., Per. 73, Tru. 60, 348, Tri. 221, followed by another subjunctive in parataxis (829 sint), see Schmitfranz (1910) 28. plectantur: ‘be punished’, OLD s.v. 2.
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829 *plures viri sint vidui quam nunc mulieres.*

*plures*: strictly speaking the comparative is illogical, for when a couple splits up, there are two divorcees, so that the overall number will always be equal. The fact that Lysimachus brought Pasicompsa right into his family home (cf. 786) would, in terms of Athenian law, have entitled Dorippa to initiate a separation by ἀπόλευσις (cf. Men. Dyso. 22) with the consent of the archon, or by agreement, see Erdmann (1934) 284, Harrison (1968) 39-44. Hipparet, the wife of Alcibiades, initiated divorce after he had brought *hetairai* into the family home, cf. Ps.-And. *Contra Alc*. 14, Plut. *Alc*. 8, see Erdmann (1934) 395. A similar case is reported of the wife of the philosopher Polemon, cf. Diog. Laert. 4.3.17.

This corresponds with what is known from Greek tragedy, where it is “a commonplace that the marriage bed is a woman’s most vulnerable point, the thing she will fight most vigorously to protect”, Heath (1987) 160 (on S. *Tr.* 536-540, 545-551); Heath compares A. *Ag.* 1338-1347; E. *Med.* 263-266, 569-573, 1367-1369, *Andr.* 177-182, 370-373, 465-470, 904-905, *El.*1032-1035, fr. 914, see also Przychocki (1925) 124. The decent wives rebel at the prospect of having a rival living under the same roof with them since it was “the Athenian view that a woman of standing could not successfully compete with a bought rival, whether in the same house or in a separate establishment”, see Post (1940) 425, cf. Men. *Epit.* 793-796, Amphis fr. 1 K-A; *Ad.* 747 *meretrix et mater familias una in domo?* See also Hall (1997) 121f.: “For however pervasive the sexual double standard in tragedy, as in Athenian life, […] there is an immanent rule discernible in the genre by which the instalment of a concubine *in the marital home* is strictly censured. Every man who attempts it in tragedy suffers death shortly thereafter: Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, who brings back Cassandra from Troy, Heracles in Sophocles’ *Women of Trachis*, who does much the same with Iole, and Neoptolemos in Euripides’ *Andromache*, who has outraged his wife by introducing Andromache to his marital home.”

Put in this context, the point of Syra’s speech in the Greek model may have been that women simply have to *leave* the house to justify grave sanctions, whereas men have to bring a whore *into* the family home (this is implied *e contrario* in 819f.) to provide their wives with a valid reason for ἀπόλευσις. This would correspond to Dorippa’s complaint, and it would be in keeping with Greek public opinion. In his adaptation, Plautus puts less emphasis on this, probably because he was interested in toying with the logical facets of *clam uxorem* and *clam virum*, probably because Roman public opinion frowned on divorce anyway, and because Plautus intended Syra’s speech to be slightly luscious.

*vidui*: ‘wifeless’; *vidus* and *vidua* refer to one who has lost or is separated from one’s partner - by absence or legally, hence *viduus* = (a) ‘a divorcee’, e.g. Men. 113, 720, Ph.
913; (b) ‘unmarried’, e.g. Verg. A. 4.550ff., Sen. Herc. fur. 246, 542, Med. 215, see Tarrant on Sen. Ag. 195. mulieres: sc. viduae; this may allude to the loss of manpower due to the First and Second Punic Wars. Heavy military losses and the prolonged absence of many husbands must have left their mark on the demographic structure of Rome, and anxiety about the behaviour of the women left behind may have grown over the years. A number of matronae are known to have committed adultery in that time, leading to the consecration of a temple to Venus Verticordia (between 216 and 204 BC), cf. Liv. 10.31.9, 25.2.9f. (in 213 BC a number of matrons were accused of stuprum before the people by the plebeian aediles), Val. Max. 8.15.12 (quo facilius virginum mulierumque mens a libidine ad pudicitiam converteretur), see Fliedner (1974) 42f., Schuhmann (1975) 158 n.2), Pomeroy (1976) 219, Treggiari (1991) 276.

III. Discussion

This passage has been the object of a controversial scholarly debate. There are three main schools: (1) those who think that the passage is not Plautine but a later interpolation, mainly Ussing ad loc. and Zwierlein (1992) 334; (2) those who regard it as Plautine but subject to transposition, namely Bothe and Ritschl; (3) those who regard it as Plautine and as in the right place. Of the last group, some, e.g. Leo (1912) 120, Enk (1932) and Hunter (1985), regard it as a more or less faithful adaptation of a corresponding scene in the Emporos, and the present author as Plautus’ own invention to promote the status of a minor slave character who did feature in the Greek original (but much less prominently). Leo (1912) 121 regards this monologue as Philemonian in substance; Lefèvre (1995) 51f. as thoroughly Plautine. According to Stärk (1989) 58, Plautus does not allude either to Greek or Roman law and life; the proposal of a legal reform 826ff. is of a Saturnalian nature and “gehört allein dem Gesetz der Posse.” The short note by Wedeck (1928) 116 is not helpful.

In response to this plethora of scholarly opinions, two things need to be kept in mind. First, the theme of Syra’s monologue is familiar enough from Greek tragedy, and it is reasonable to assume that similar ideas were stated in comedy, see Leo (1912) 115-122, Spranger (1984) 108 n.2. Prescott (1942) 7 and Leo (1912) 122 observe that the moralizing of Megaronides as he makes his exit at M. 199ff. is similar to this topical moralizing speech; for other passages where comic characters develop phantastically scurrilous ideas about the improvement of the world cf. e.g. Au. 475ff., Cap. 492ff., Ep. 382ff., Men. 456ff., Mil. 725ff., Per. 68ff., Tru. 60ff.

Second, it might help to approach the question of Plautine originality from a different angle, looking at what is actually asked for in this speech. What would one expect a woman to ask for from her husband? Should she ask for (1) ‘I would like to see
both of us faithful and chaste, not only myself but my partner, too’, or would she say (2) ‘I would like to be just as adulterous and profligate as my husband, and I want to have an equal right to have fun’, or (3) ‘I am behaving badly, and my husband is behaving badly - he gets off and I am punished. That is no justice. I want him to be punished just as much as I am.’ Of these three wishes, we would perhaps, if asked, intuitively say, ‘Well, shouldn’t she ask for alternative (1)?’ This being Plautine comedy, the audience is duped into expecting the ‘right’ kind of moral reasoning. Syra, however, presents alternative (3), which is the least moral one. The audience do not expect an old nurse to spread immoral views, see Hunter (1985) 87: “It may also be thought that Syra’s proposal is so outrageous in terms of conventional morality that no member of the Roman audience would have even considered the possibility that it was to be taken seriously.”

To conclude, one might say that Plautus is capable of sounding Greek when he wants to. The contents and themes in Syra’s monologue are, as far as the husband-wife relationship is concerned, Greek (at least they sound Greek: women are not allowed to leave the house, the husband can put his wife out). However, there are some elements in it that seem to be Roman (a play on the ambiguity of vidui and viduae, the need for the husband to establish a valid causa for a divorce). What Plautus has created is, as often in his ovre, a blend of Greek and Roman elements, and moral standards that are claimed for ‘Athens’ actually belong to ‘Plautopolis’, see also Scafuro (1997) 235: “A double standard is evident in both the Athenian and Roman conceptions of adultery and fornication. Even a brief examination demonstrates the difficulty of isolating Greek and Roman details when that dubious standard is articulated in Roman Comedy. In both societies, a man, whether married or unmarried, is penalized only if he engages in sexual relations with a woman who is a citizen and not a prostitute. Citizen women have no such institutionalized loophole for pleasure - apparently, a social rather than a legal sanction.” The moralistic tone which is adopted by Plautus is in itself a powerful indication that truth is in short supply, cf similarly Terence at Hec. 472-481, 550-556. Despite the fact that conditions for Roman wives were different from those we know now, Syra’s complaints have broken free of reality and give voice to little more than her prejudices and homespun philosophy, hence the grotesquely inappropriate universality of their application in this monologic digression. Like the latter part of the monologue of the whimpering old nurse in Aeschylus’ Choephoroe (734-765), Syra’s monologue is an expression of a nurse’s homely preoccupations and insular wisdom.

It seems that it was Plautus who composed Syra’s monologue and Eutychus’ mock decree (1015-1024), taking some liberty with whatever might have been in their place in the Emporos (and it is probable that there was something). Instead of moral exhortation the audience gets both times - an indecent proposal (not unlike Clytemnestra’s apologetic reasoning at E. El. 1035-1040). Many scholars, e.g. Capizzi (1960) 50, tend to take Plautus’ ‘criticism’ literally: “Le sue [Syra’s] riflessioni sono
piene di senso e di senso di giustizia e rivelano uno spirito libero che riecheggia il desiderio della donna romana di liberarsi dagli assurdi pregiudizi della sua società per acquistare maggiore coscienza dei suoi valori e dei suoi diritti." This is taking Plautus too seriously: he is not a castigator morum. To a modern audience, however, Syra's observations cannot help but bring into sharp focus the dichotomy that did exist between male and female sexual morality.
‘Act V scene 1’ (830-841): CHARINUS

I. Introduction

Dramaturgically, it is necessary to get Charinus back on stage after an absence of 168 lines (661-829). This is achieved by making him leave Demipho’s house with the intention of going into exile as he had announced the last time he went inside (659ff.).

It remains unclear whether there was a farewell prayer like this in the original, but the least one can expect is a short entrance monologue delivered by Charinus talking about his unwilling determination to leave Athens: ‘Oh dear, I don’t want to leave home, but I must.’ Following immediately on Syra’s speech, Charinus’ monologue continues the interruption of the comic action which is going to remain suspended for the longer part of act V. The situation is similar to that of Tibullus 1.2, which deals with Tibullus’ unwilling departure as a soldier. In addition, Charinus’ monologue picks up the theme of exilium amoris, see Zagagi (1995) 37, and see 644n. The exile-motif serves to emphasize Charinus’ determination to do everything he can to find Pasicompsa.

Charinus is standing in front of the house, alone. A lararium is next to him (it may be represented by the same structure that was used as an altar of Apollo in IV.1). It is quite possible that Charinus has garlanded the Lar or made some other kind of offering (cf. Tib. 2.1.59ff., 1.3.34). The classification of Charinus’ serenade as παρακλαστικοῦ by Averna (1990) 28 is unfounded; Charinus does not want to enter the house, he is leaving it; the passage rather contains some topoi familiar from the propemptikon, for which see Cairns (1972) 12ff., 52, 190ff.

Keeping the dramatic form of delivery (monologue, as in IV.6), Plautus has changed the metre from ia6 to tr7, from simple spoken lines to recitative. Following Bertini (1985) 76ff., Enk (1951) 107, and Sudhaus (1909) 84, this monologue can be analyzed into three parts of equal length (four lines each):

830-833 strophe Farewell to Lintel and Threshold: ‘I am lost!’
834-837 antistrophe Farewell to the Lar and Penates: ‘Look after my parents, I will go away.’
838-841 epode Reason for Departure: ‘It’s awful here; I do not want to stay.’

Strophe and antistrophe are formally introduced by weighty vocative groups (830, 834), the beginning of the epode is marked by nam (838).

II. Commentary

830 CH. Limen superum inferumque, salve, simul autem vale:
‘Lintel high, Threshold low, hail and also farewell.’ limen: transverse beam in a door-frame (either ‘lintel’ or ‘threshold’), regarded as a magic place, cf. Cas. 815-824, Catul.
61.166-168, Tib. 1.3.19f., Prop. 1.14.21, Ov. Fast. 2.573, see Williams (1958) 17, Wagenvoort (1972) 373, Meister (1987) 55f.; often used in elevated language with a solemn ring, see Meister (1987) 52f. It had more solemn associations for the Roman mind than did νοῦς for fifth-century Athenians, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 238, Meister (1987) 54. This may indicate that the present scene has been altered by Plautus, at least from 830-833 (perhaps 836). Limen occurs in comedy only in quite formal contexts (Cis. 650, Mil. 596, Mo. 1064, Hec. 378), in tragedy once in an elaborate periphrasis (Acc. Trag. 531). There are parallels for the situation of a young man about to leave his country (Moschion in Men. Sam.; Clinia in Ht.). Still, Plautus may have composed an entire scene that does remind his audience of situations familiar from other plays, Greek and Roman, but that is entirely his own. However, the very nature of the evidence at hand makes this assertion impossible to prove or disprove. We have it on the testimony of Arnob. Adv. nat. 2.15.5 (following Varro) that the Romans worshipped Limentinus (deity of the threshold), Cardea (of the door-bolts), and Forculus (of the wings of the door). The fact that these deities are not addressed here (although they could be) makes it likely that the playwright intended the prayer to be an example of comically hyperbolical piety. It should also be noted that Charinus addresses the limina directly and does not appeal to any deity, which may be because that would have been regarded as inappropriate or blasphemous by his audience. superum inferumque: contrasting juxtaposition, not uncommon in religious contexts, cf. e.g. Au. 368, Cis. 512, Ph. 687, Liv. Andr. Carm. fr. 25 Morel, Liv. 1.32.9; also in secular contexts, e.g. Cato Agr. 149.1. There is an incongruous joke applied to the two limina: on the one hand there are ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ gods, but there is bathos in distinguishing the ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ elements of what he could simply have called ‘the door’. salve:: seems always to be accompanied by vale in formulaic farewells, cf. As. 592f., Cap. 744, Cis. 116, Cu. 522, 588, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 241f.

831 hunc hodie postremum extollo mea domo patria pedem.
B cc D A B C D A / B c D aa B c D; synizesis of mea; a suitably heavy and lugubrious line. hunc ... postremum extollo ... pedem: an extreme case of hyperbaton, bizarrely sandwiching mea domo (for similarly wide hyperbata in tr cf. 141f.), a pompous way of saying ‘leave for good’ (domo abire, cf. 12); cf. e.g. 882 confer gradum, 1010 meum intro refero pedem, Ba. 423, Cap. 456f., An. 808, A. Eum. 294 ἡ κατάπρεπη πόδα; E. Rh. 571. mea domo patria: separate ablative without preposition; domus patria is the regular expression, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 218.

832 usus fructus, victus cultus iam mihi harunc aedium
B C D A / B C D A / B c D / B c D (square verse type I) usus fructus, victus cultus: ‘use, produce, living, management’; asyndetic enumeration, frequent in Plautus between words of similar meaning, but not often with four (or three) nouns in succession, cf. e.g.
Am. 196, St. 280. Plautus follows this asyndeton up with another one in the following line. In such asyndeta, there is a tendency for the words to go in pairs; this is underlined by the metrical arrangement. Another good example of the bi-member asyndeton is at Am. 1062 strenpitus crepitus, sonitus tonitrus, see further de Meo (1983) 117, who compares the usage in early legal formulae. usus fructus: 'use' and 'enjoyment'; probably not an allusion to the legal concept of usufruct, see Watson (1968) 204.

833 interemptust, interfectust, alienatust. occidi!
B c D A / B c D A / bb c D A / B c D (square verse type I). interemptust, interfectust, alienatust: another asyndetic enumeration of near-synonyms, this time tripartite, probably in parody of the form of the asyndeton sollemne, with a pronounced sound effect - with an internal rhyme in the first half of the septenarius, see Duckworth on Ep. 198, cf. Am. 1013, As. 523, Cu. 285, 297, Ep. 230, 231, 652, Men. 403, Mil. 331, Ps. 686, 695. Unlike Mer. 607, here the verb interimo governs an inanimate object. Plautus perhaps used interimo here as an exaggeration for adimo and then having used one word which meant kill, used a synonym for further emphasis. Alliteration was probably responsible for choice of interficio. One would expect climactic word order, but alienatust is the weakest of the three words.

834 di penates meum parentum, familiai Lar pater,
B c D A / B c D A / bb c D A / B c d+ (square verse type I); synizesis of meum. Mil. 1339-1341 contains a similar farewell-prayer (delivered by the slave Palaestrio), cf. esp. 1339 etiam nunc saluto te, <Lar> familiaris, prius quam eo. It is quite possible that such prayers were topical in New Comedy. Private prayer was usually silent, especially when directed at Lares and Penates, cf. Cic. Div. 1.129, Sen. Ben. 2.1.4, Ov. Tr. 1.3.4, see Wagenvoort (1972) 356-359. di penates: 'household gods', see Liebeschuetz (1979) 51, OCD3 s.v.; properly 'protective deities of the store-cupboard', worshipped as guardians of the household, like the Lar (or Lares), in conjunction with whom they were frequently mentioned, cf. Cic. Rep. 5.7, Tib. 1.3.33f., Hor. Carm. 3.23, Serv. A. 1.378. meum = meorum; cf. e.g. Poen. 1062 tuum parentum nomina. On the morphology of the genitive in -om/-um see Palmer (1954) 243, Meiser (1998) 134. Kieckers (1931) II 5 notes that -om was preserved after u/v at least until the end of the republic (Cic. Orat. 155 declares himself free to use deum or deorum). Unsurprisingly, the spelling in the MSS is inconsistent. The words meum parentum are echoed in the following line, lending the lines a lugubrious tone; for the echo technique cf. e.g. Cap. 476f. familiai Lar pater: cf. 865 Lares viales; there is no consistent account of what the Lares were or what exactly they represented. The worship of the Lar familiaris was probably a rural cult which was gradually extended to the towns; the Lares may have been local (rather than familial or tribal) deities at first whose influence was strictly limited to a certain area. A traveller on land, like Charinus, would invoke the protection of the Lares viales,
a traveller by sea to the Lares permarini. On the obscure history of the Lares and their diverse functions, see OCD³ s.v. and Crampon (1985) 252f. The place of worship is the hearth of the household (cf. Au. 7), and the Lar receives sacrifices on all important occasions of the family’s life (cf. Au. 385-387, Tri. 39-42, Hor. Carm. 3.23.3, Cato Agr. 143.2). There were two penates in the sacrarium, one on each side of the Lar. The Lar and the penates are spoken of under the general name of Lares (or Lares familiares, Ru. 1206). The Lar changed houses with the family, cf. Au. 4, see Abel (1953) 42. He was propitiated by prayers and offerings, and decorated on all occasions of importance in the family history, as, for example, a departure, a return (Ru. 1208, St. 534; Hor. Carm. 3.23.4), a wedding (Au. 386), or on entering a new house (Tri. 39).

836-841 The following topoi (especially the allegations of perfidy and breach of friendship) suggest that Charinus’ monologue resembles an ‘inverse propemptikon’, on which see Cairns (1972) 56f.

836 ego mihi alios deos penatis persequar, alium Larem,
This is an outrageous and comically incongruous idea, since there can be only one set of penates and one Lar, especially for a man (a firstborn filius), and it is impossible to acquire another.

837 aliam urbem, aliam civitatem: ab Atticis abhorreo;
Gruen (1990) 154 takes Charinus’ statement in the context of ‘Athens, the vice capital of Hellas’: “Charinus in the Mercator makes the point more in sorrow than in anger: in Athens morals become the worse daily, a place where loyal and faithless friends are indistinguishable.” However, Charinus does not say this with a straight face. After all, he has decided to leave Athens because he has lost a prostitute that he bought in Rhodes and tried to introduce into his parents’ household, pretending her to be a gift for his mother. Furthermore, he is admittedly out of his wits. When such a man makes statements about a decline in morality (838), one need not take them at face value. His complaint about ‘faithless friends’ (839) stems from his pathological impatience (associated with his role as adulescens amator) with the efforts of his loyal friend Eutychus. The very fact that Charinus utters them shows that morals at Athens may not be so bad after all. This does not mean that Plautus would not, wherever he chooses to, introduce words like pergraecari or allusions to Greek debauchery. Gruen (1990) 154 n.156 rightly refutes the view expressed by Gagliardi (1963) 163 and, more carefully, by Segal (1987) 241 n.56 that these lines refer to Rome. Yet, they do not refer to Athens either, as Gruen thinks, but to Plautopolis.

838 nam ubi mores deteriores increbrescunt in dies

bb CDA /B cc D A /B CDA /B cD (square verse type I); prosodic hiatus (nam/ub-).
deteriores increbrescunt: a contamination of deteriores fiunt and mali increbrescunt. 

839 ubique amici qui infideles sient nequeas pernoscere

The dragged rhythm of nequeas (ccD) goes well with the tone of complaint, similar in tone to the limping iambics of Catullus; sient is so placed (similarly tuo in 840) that the usual midline break is bridged, masking the normal breakpoint after -fideles and thus redoubling the limping character of the latter half-line. amici ... infideles: The friendship motif is of great importance for New Comedy and Roman comedy, and it is frequently found elsewhere, see Leo (1912) 127-129, Zucker (1950). infideles: Since fides was regarded as the central virtue of friends (cf. Cic. Amic. 65), this allegation is probably the most fundamental and destructive one could have made in this situation, see Freyburger (1986) 177f., cf. Ba. 490-492, Catul. 30.2f. pernoscere: Zwierlein (1992) 225 n. 508, without providing reasons, regards all instances of pernoscere in the MSS (Tri. 665, Tru. 151, Au. 503, Ru. 1181) as un-Plautine.

840 ubique id eripiatur animo tuo quod placeat maxume,
eripiatur: also used at 176, 341, 973. The present occurrence is mistakenly grouped by Lodge s.v. eripio II. A. 1 de rebus, while it is actually a person (the amica) who is referred to (or at least implied), just as at 341 and 973; it is used de rebus only at 176. animo tuo: Charinus’ obsession with his animus is noteworthy. The use of the dative is ambiguous; it can be taken with quod placeat and with eripiatur.

841 ibi quidem si regnum detur, non cupita est civitas.

The very word regnum had an evil sound, see Brunt (1971) 44f. This interpretation is supported by the discussion of the use of rex in the Stichus denoting a ‘powerful person’, about which Csapo (1986) 325-329 reaches similar conclusions. The observation was already made by Harsh (1936), namely that rex in Plautus can mean ‘rich’ or ‘great man’, in Plautus often applied to the patron of a parasite, for which use Harsh finds parallels in Greek literature, notably Menander and Alexis; see also Gratwick on Men. 75f., Otto (1890) 296f., cf. Cu. 211, Ad. 175 quid hoc reist? regnumme, Aeschine, hic tu possides? (cf. also Ph. 404-406). In any case, the difference in meaning and tone would be slight: Either Charinus says, ‘Even if I was given the powers of a tyrant, I would not like to be a citizen there’,
or he says, 'Even if I had money like a sheik, I would not like to be a citizen there.' The former understanding is perhaps, in its funny incongruity, more 'Plautine' in spirit and maybe to be preferred.

III. Discussion

In many ways, this and the following scene belong together, and since the action is continuous (no empty stage after V.1), it is appropriate to deal summarily with their significance at the present point.

Charinus does not leave the stage at 841, and it seems that his monologue continues when Eutychus enters onto the stage at 842, only that no words are in the script. It would be quite awkward to stage the scene if Charinus had to stop talking upon Eutychus' appearance, especially since he is not supposed to have seen him enter (cf. 867). However, it remains uncertain how this was actually staged. For a similarly unusual interlacing of two independent speeches, cf. Men. Epit. 419-461, and see Blundell (1980) 18 and 29, Denzler (1968) 107.

Most scholars from Dietze to Enk, see Gagliardi (1963) 169, took the view that Plautus has rendered this scene more or less faithfully from the Greek, most recently Lefèvre (1995) 37; Leo (1912) 134 states that this monologue is similar to passages in Greek tragedy, comparing E. Phoen. 631-633, and adds that the influence is likely to be indirect.

Yet, it is possible that (if Charinus had a monologue in the Emporos too) Plautus has introduced changes at the micro-level of this monologue. The idea that Charinus is going to look for other di penates and another Lar is peculiar to say the least, and certainly offensive to the ears of the very deities that he purports to be praying to. It is possible that Plautus has added the second half of the monologue (836-841), either to expand what was a shorter entrance monologue in the original or to cover his tracks by replacing parts of the original monologue/prayer that he decided to change.
Act V scene II (842-956) EUTYCHUS CHARINUS Puer

I. Introduction

1. Staging and Function

Eutychus bursts exuberantly out of Lysimachus' house, joyfully thanking Fortune for having helped him find Charinus’ girl. It was pointed out by Hiatt (1946) 12 n. 1 that the interlacing of the stage action is difficult to explain: Charinus enters at 830 delivering a monologue. He fails to hear Eutychus’ monologue (842-850, 857). Not until 864 does Eutychus realize that someone is talking. The conventional form of eavesdropping is conducted by some person already on stage when a second character appears delivering an entrance speech during which he is unaware that the stage is occupied, see Denzler (1968) 106-109, Bain (1977) 135-144, Blundell (1980) 11-25, Barsby (1985) 118f. on Ba. 235-248. The New Comedy conventions concerning the length of unnoticed comment in these circumstances are much stricter than those in Plautus (cf. also 335-364), while Terence compromises. Still, such patterns of movement are not without precedent, cf. e.g. the ‘entry in search of another’, see Blundell (1980) 12, Frost (1988) 8f. Eutychus’ entrance is of that type (850 date, di, ... conveniundi mihi eius celerem copiam), although the basic pattern has been elaborated on and expanded.

At first, Eutychus and Charinus ignore each other’s presence. The ‘realistic’ excuses for the failure to see that another person is present are Eutychus’ exuberance and the fact that he wants to communicate this exuberance, presumably to the audience. In Charinus’ case, the excuse is his utter desperation: an unhappy man does not care much for what is going on around him. That strong emotions may prevent characters from realizing each other’s presence is shown to be a dramatic convention by Blundell (1980) 14f., cf. especially Men. Mis. 284-322, where the excited slave Getas leaves the house and ignores Kleinias’ presence on stage, and Men. Epit. 419-442, where both Onesimus and Habrotonon enter the stage in succession (with a short interval of time elapsing) from the stage house. Both deliver monologues and are so absorbed in their own thoughts that they do not notice each other’s presence, see Blundell (1980) 29.

Once Charinus has been persuaded to stay and listen to Eutychus’ good news, a dialogue develops. A slave (puer) is called out to receive the traveller’s coat, sword, flask, and belt. However, as it appears that Eutychus makes excuses instead of showing him the girl immediately, the desperate amator who does not trust his friend completely threatens to continue his journey. Tension is building up gradually as he puts on, one after the other, all the things that he has just given to the puer, and exchanges his pallium for a travelling coat (928). While this is happening, Eutychus keeps trying to persuade his friend to stay, but still refuses to lead him to the girl (921-928). Charinus reacts by going mad (or pretending to do so; 931-951). Finally, Eutychus leads him inside to meet Pasicompsa.
The dialogue between Charinus and Eutychus contains two rapid mood changes. The first occurs at 910. Hearing that Pasicompsa has been found, Charinus takes off his chlamys, illustrating his willingness to give up his plan to go into exile. Had this threat been a mere variation of the conventional exile-threat, scene V.2 could have ended at that point. The playwright, however, chooses to elaborate upon the theme and introduces a complex pretence of exile and madness, involving an extremely entertaining parody of a tragic stock scene. The variation of the stock threat, taking a step further beyond the traditional pattern, illustrates the playwright's ability to manipulate dramatic conventions in order to create suspense and surprise his audience. Zagagi (1994) 37 points out that the second mood change is made possible by the very nature of the characters involved. Eutychus, loyal son that he is, does not wish to let Charinus know that Lysimachus, Eutychus' own father, participated in Charinus' father's erotic plans concerning Pasicompsa (915-918). Thus, the mad-scene would be required to make Eutychus tell Charinus about Pasicompsa's whereabouts. This view is contestible. Unless illi in 918 refers to Lysimachus, Eutychus does not mention that he does not want his father to get into trouble. On the contrary, he should be interested in solving the puzzle about the girl's presence in their house as soon as possible by getting Charinus to identify her positively as 'his' girl. Rather it would appear that Eutychus is worried about his mother's anger, cf. 938 matris iam iram neglego, 953-955.

2. Tragic Echoes in the Mad-Scene

There have been various attempts to identify in detail elements from the present mad-scene as parodic allusions to specific passages from Greek and Roman tragedy.

Katsouris (1975) claims that the Emporos contained a parody of a scene from the Euripidean Hercules furens. Plautus adapted the present scene and thus also adapted the passage that reminds Katsouris of Euripides’ play; Katsouris (1975) 75 sees another allusion to Hercules furens in Cas. 655-711. In Euripides’ Hercules a servant narrates how Heracles' hallucinations made him believe that he mounted a chariot and reached Mycenae, where he wanted to kill Eurystheus' family, how he mistook his own wife and children for those of Eurystheus and killed them. The parallels listed by Katsouris - use of a chariot (Mer. 931; E. Her. 947-949) and a weapon (a sword, Mer. 926; a bow, E. Her. 942) are too vague, and the theory is unconvincing, see Frank (1932) 247.

Frank (1932) 244f., following Legrand (1910) 299 n.4, dates the Mercator with unconvincing arguments to about 189/188 BC (see 940n.) and detects a parody of Pacuvius’ Teucer; similarly Leo (1912) 134 (830-841 remind him of Teucer; the mad-scene of Hercules). Frank's main argument is that Plautus is alluding to the Roman takeover of Zacynthus in 191 BC (Liv. 36.32.9), see 940n. That such indirect dating has little value may be seen from the fact that de Lorenzi (1952) 116f. takes the mention of Chalcis to date the Mercator to 198 BC, since that place features in the Second
Macedonic War (Liv. 32.37.3). With some patience it would certainly be possible to claim numerous vague allusions of this kind.

Apart from the unproved late dating of the play, Frank detects references to *Teucer*, e.g. 933 *pater mihi exsilium parat*, which he takes to refer to the fact that when Teucer came home without Ajax, his father Telamon banished him (E. Hel. 91ff.). Yet, at 357f. Charinus utters similarly unfounded accusations against his father: Charinus simply seems to associate his father with ‘exile’. Furthermore, it could be argued that since Demipho decided against the will of his son (461) to put Pasicompsa up for sale, and thereby enabled the Athenian ‘stranger’ to buy her (635), he is ultimately responsible for the fact that Charinus has got to leave home to find his beloved (862f.). It is true as Frank observes, that Charinus should look for the girl in Athens, since she has been bought by an Athenian (635), and not anywhere else around the Aegean. This may, however, be linked somehow to Charinus’ *idée fixe* that Pasicompsa is going to be deported overseas by his father (353). Thus, Charinus’ behaviour is perhaps not logically consistent, but it does not lack a certain coherence. Further, even vaguer, points are: Charinus is headed for Cyprus; so is Teucer; Calchas, the seer, was involved in the misfortunes of Teucer, and he is mentioned here, too (945); the Bacchants are mentioned in both plays; peculiar likenesses to the long description of the storm which is assigned by all editors to the *Teucer*, where the Greek fleet had set out from Troy *occidente sole* (fr. 411), in *Mercator*, Charinus also sets out when *sol abit* (873). None of these arguments can really convince of more than the fact that Plautus’ text indeed contains common tragic motifs and diction.

Warnecke (1938) assumes that Plautus is alluding to Ennius’ *Phoenix*, or that it had already been Philemon who wrote this scene as a travesty of the rivalry between Amyntor and his son Phoinix (Hom. Il. 9.430-619). Unfortunately, this kind of structural ‘similarity’ could be claimed for many plays concerned with adultery, and for innumerable real-life scenarios; it does not prove anything for a connexion between Plautus and any *Phoinix*-play, Greek or Roman - nor does the fact that Ennius wrote a *Phoenix*, presumably based on a play by Euripides at some unknown time. All that can be said is that the love-affair of a merchant’s son is melodramatically elevated into the world of the grand passions of the heroic and divine inhabitants of tragedy.

Any identification of a specific play that has been parodied must remain impressionistic. It is telling that Frank (1932) 246 n.6 himself suggests another play that might actually have been parodied, Ennius’ *Telamon*. This remark shows the underlying arbitrariness of any such investigation better than any further comment. In addition, Buck (1940) 79 has rightly pointed out that there seems to have been a *Teucer* by Livius Andronicus (Varro De ling. Lat. 7.3, Ribbeck p. 7, no. xii), who is thought to have died around 204 BC. Buck, in turn, thinks that it is Livius Andronicus’ play that is parodied. To conclude, the tragic motifs that are evoked do not afford any help in dating the play, see Schutter (1952) 92f.
3. The Greek Novel and the *Emporos/Mercator*

Borszák (1937) noted that Charinus' journey (921-947) resembles motifs found in the Greek novel, where the heroes have to give in to the superior power of Eros. It is true that the *Mercator* contains a number of elements that are also generic to the Greek novel (sea-travel, separation from and search for one's beloved, lovers' oaths, madness, suicide, friendship, rivalry in love, the influence of Tyche), but this does not prove more than that both New Comedy and the novel derive from a shared cultural background. Thus, although prose fiction probably came into being in Hellenistic times, see Lesky (1971) 957, Borszák leaves safe ground when he claims that Philemon may have intended to parody a particular novel. Conversely, Trenkner (1950) pointed out that the story of Charinus in *Mercator* is not unlike that of Šarkân (identified with Charzanis) in Byzantine and Arab folklore. After noting several strikingly similar motifs, Trenkner overstates her case by claiming that one might take this as evidence of the influence of comedy on the oriental narrative tradition. Obviously without knowing Borszák's essay, she also comes to the conclusion that the playwright "a emprunte le motif [of Charinus' 'exile'] à un modèle narratif", but she admits that the influence of tragedy may also have played a role in the playwright's treatment of the motif. Trenkner is certainly correct in pointing to a rich tradition which is full of motifs that are shared by various genres, but a claim of direct dependence is beyond proof.

II. Commentary

**Eutychus' Invocation of Fortuna (842-843)**

The invocation of Fortuna in these lines, transmitted in the MSS here and at 598*-598b, is suspected to be a gloss or the product of some kind of dittography by several scholars. The first to reject lines 598*-598b was Acidalius; Lindsay (1904) 114f. and Havet (1911) 198 suggested a 'mechanical' corruption, similarly Zwierlein (1990) 19. Lindsay states that if Plautus did not put the couplet at both places, then its insertion was probably a feature of a 'revival text'. In a footnote, Lindsay (1904) 114 mentions quite a few examples of identical recurrence of lines in Plautus (e.g. *Ps*. 116 = 1073, 381 = 600, 409 = 788, 485 = 527). Later, Lindsay (1920) 49f. tried to defend the lines in both places, taking them as a quote from a tragedy by Livius Andronicus or Naevius, but this remains speculation. His view is convincingly contested by Enk and Bertini ad loc.

An important criterion for determining whether the lines should be kept in both places or deleted in either is their dramaturgical effectivity. Here, the lines are spoken by Eutychus, whereas at 598*-598b the lines would be spoken by Charinus. Here, the exuberant optimism that is expressed is justified; in the other context, it seems out of place and is soon shown to have been premature. These lines are an effective means of puzzling the audience at the start of Eutychus' monologue in order to arrest their
attention. They have to listen carefully to find out which deity Eutychus addresses. At the same time, addressing Fortune in this situation is probably not unnatural, even in real life. Thus the playwright uses an effective means of securing the audience’s attention and of providing the audience with a realistic situation at the beginning of the scene. On bracketing 598-598 see note ad loc.

842 EU. divom atque hominum quae speratrix atque era eadem es hominibus,
The line is a periphrasis of the name of the deity (Fortune), cf. e.g. Am. 863, Per. 819, Ru. 1, Lucr. 1.1f., Hor. Carm. 1.12.13-18. In moments of good fortune tragic and comic characters frequently address thanks to the gods, cf. e.g. S. Ant. 330f., Tra. 200f., E. Heracl. 869, Men. Sam. 269f.; Cap. 768-775, 922-927, Mo. 431-437, Per. 251-258, 753-758, Poes. 1274-1276, Ru. 906-913, St. 402-405, Tri. 820-839, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 176. divom atque hominum: ‘of heaven and all mankind’; formulaic, cf. Am. 1121, Au. 300, Ru. 9; later e.g. Lucr. 1.1; cf. e.g. Hom. Il. 1.403 ἄνδρον τε τεῦν τε. divom (divum) = deorum; safely attested three times in Plautus (see above), once in Terence (Ad. 746, guaranteed by metre); monosyllabic deum is found more frequently in both: thirteen times in Plautus, six times in Terence. On the morphology of the genitive see 834n. speratrix: ‘engenderer of hope’; a hapax attested in BCD. Several scholars have tried to replace it with some other epithet of Tyche/Fortuna. The word needed is the formation of a female nomen agentis ending in -trix, which are not untypical of the address of female deities or abstractions in elevated, hymnic diction, as e.g. Cicero’s hymn to Philosophy (Tusc. 5.5 o virtutis indagatrix expultrixque vitiorum ... tu inventrix legum). Such formations are not uncommon in Plautus, cf. e.g. Au. 41 circumspectatrix and the 34 entries of female nouns ending in -trix in Maniet (1969) 73f. However, speratrix has to be taken as a nomen agentis, ‘someone who hopes’ (sperator = ‘one who hopes’, Aug. Serm. 20.4), see also LHS I 376f., rather than in a causative sense, ‘someone who makes (others) hope, engenders hope’, or even ‘a (female) fulfiller of hopes’ (OLD s. v.), which would be required by the sense of the following line (spem speratam obtulisti). Fischer (1971) 71 actually states that Plautus uses the suffixes -tor/-trix exclusively in the former sense; Quintilian uses them, with an excuse, expressly to translate Greek terminology into Latin (Inst. 2.15.21) ut ipsis eorum verbis utar, qui haec ex Graeco translaterunt: ars inventrix et iudicatrix et enuntiatrix. This discrepancy has caused a number of scholars to search for a more fitting epithet. Unsurprisingly, all suggestions made so far have involved a female nomen agentis. Leo, following the Itali, Merula, and several editors up to Naudet print spectatrix (ἡ θεοφοβισσα), an epithet for which parallels exist, cf. Com. fr. 1326 Κ. ἡ τά θεοφοβον καὶ τά θεοκα πάντα ἐπισκοπούσα τε (cf. fr. adesp. 505 TrGF Suppl. [1964] Snell: Tyche looks upon the deeds of gods and men and grants each his rightful share); Amm. 22.3.12 humanorum spectatrix Adrastia; Apul. Pl. 2.6 spectatrix diiudicatrix omnium rerum. Ribbeck (1883) 28 suggested superatrix ‘one who surpasses or excels’ (OLD 1873 s.v.), also advocated by
Baier (1888) 271-274. Redslob proposed *servatrix* 'a female preserver, protectress' (*OLD* s.v. 1), for which there are also parallels, e.g. Pi. *Od.* 12.3 Τὸ κεφαλής *Σώτειρα* A. *Ag.* 664 τὸ χηρὶ... κατῆρ, S. *OC* 80, 1080, Men. fr. 417 (about Tyche) τον έστη τó κυβερνόν ἀπαντε, καὶ στρέφεων καὶ σθέρων; *servatrix* is used of a woman at *Hec.* 856, and of Fortuna at *CIL 7.296 Fortunae Servatrici.* Less likely are Ussing’s *imperatrix*, which he probably modelled on Jupiter’s familiar epithet *imperator divom hominumque*, and Guyet’s *regnatrix*. An apparently fitting epithet that would have the benefit of being paralleled in Terence is *gubernatrix* ‘helmswoman’ (*Eu.* 1046).

To decide if any of the above suggestions carries enough weight to justify a change to the paradosis, it should be noted that the functions of Fortune are described as (a) *speratrix* for all beings, mortal and divine, and (b) as *era* of all mortals (yet not of the gods), which implies a contrast (*eadem* ‘simultaneously’ implies an antithesis). However, not all of the epithets mentioned above do imply such a contrast to *era*. A contrast does not arise if one takes *gubernatrix* (which would also require a mildly unusual form of *IK*), *imperatrix*, *regnatrix*, or *superatrix* into the text, which are not much more than synonyms of *era*; these conjectures can therefore be dropped. *Servatrix* (Σώτειρα) is well-attested as an epithet in Greek and Roman literature, so is *spectatrix* (ἐπισκοποῦσα), but the idea that Tyche is the *servatrix* of the gods is peculiar. A lot could be said in favour of *spectatrix*.

Yet, there may be a Greek parallel for the epithet *speratrix*. Champeaux (1982) 197 n. 11 suggests that the epithet Ἑκαταίτας mentioned for the goddess Fortuna (Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 10, 322f-323a, *Quaest. Rom.* 74, 281d-e) might be *Felix*. This suggestion is based on a study of the epithets of the goddess by Carter (1900) 60-68. He argues that the enumeration of the Greek epithets in Plutarch is derived by translation from an alphabetical list of Latin epithets (Champeaux suggests that the list in *De fort. Rom.* is not based on an alphabetical, but on a geographical order). Carter’s arguments concerning the originally alphabetical order of the epithets are speculative and unconvincing (so are Champeaux’), and given the existence of the epithet *speratrix* here and as a plausible conjectural supplement to the text of a dedicatory inscription from Dacia, *CIL 3.12351* (249 AD, near Nicopolis in Romania), neither of which is mentioned by Carter (1900) 63, it seems plausible to connect the epithet *Speratrix* used in the *Mercator* and in the inscription with the epithet Ἑκαταίτας.

Furthermore, the play with *spem speratam* in the following line also seems to require something in this line to correspond to it; *speratrix* would be better suited than *spectatrix*. To sum up, despite of the morphological problem stated above, *speratrix* is *lectio difficilior* and the arguments and parallels that can be put forward in its favour allow it to be kept in the text, translating it with ‘engenderer of hope’. Taken in this way, the theological implication of this statement is that Tyche/Fortuna engenders hope both in the gods and in men, but that she is *not* the mistress of the gods. *era*: (δέκατα) an
843 spem speratam quem obtulisti hanc mihi, <tibi> grates ago.

BCDA/BcDA/BcD/ABcD (mixed-type square verse); a contrast between monosyllabic mihi (B) and disyllabic tibi (cD). spem speratam: ‘earnest hope’; etymologic figure, see 191n. Spes may also be spoken of as a possession or gift of the gods, cf. Poen. 1187f., Per. 251-254, Men. 1081, see Hanson (1959) 81. At 867 Eutychus calls himself Spes (cf. similarly ‘theomorphizing’ metonymies at Ps. 709, Ru. 246f., 680, St. 583). Spes is a deity in her own right at Cis. 670, Ru. 231. For her close link with Fortuna, see Latte (1960) 238, Nisbett/Hubbard on Hor. Carm. 1.35.21. <tibi>: not found in BCD here, but unanimously transmitted at 598b; inserted by Ritschl, Leo, Enk, and Ernout. The addition is metrically possible, paleographically plausible, and makes sense. A dative designating the person (deity) who is thanked is needed with grates ago, see the occurrences in Lodge s.v. grates. grates ago: = gratias ago; limited to addressing the gods, cf. Mil. 412, Per. 756, Tri. 821, St. 403, see Langen (1880) 14.

845-871 This passage contains several enumerations of good and bad comites. At least some, if not all, of them could be regarded as deities (see 867n.), others belong to a group that Deubner called “Augenblickspersonifikationen” (ad hoc personifications), see Hanson (1959) 68 n.37. All of these comites should be capitalized to indicate this. Such personifications are frequently used for ‘moral allegory’, see Hanson (1959) 68 and cf. the allegories in the prologue to the Trinummus, spoken by Luxuria and her daughter Inopia, the ‘housecleaning’ monologue of Philolaches in Mostellaria (135-145), and the parade of vices in Persa (555-558). A feature of particular interest here is that the deified abstractions are identified with a human being. Hanson (1959) 68 lists as parallels mea Commoditas (Men. 137, Poen. 421), mea Opportunitas (Cu. 305, Men. 137), Copia (Ps. 736), and the extended lists at Ba. 114f., Cap. 863f.; he also mentions the curious Perfidia (As. 545) and sancta Saturitas (Cap. 877), grotesquely substituted ad hoc deities in standard religious formulae. Typographically more is lost in English spelling by printing the names of deified abstractions (or even ad hoc deities) with a small letter than is gained by giving a capital; the policy should therefore be to capitalize if in doubt about the status of an abstraction, see Hanson (1959) 61: “Certainly the gods are named in Plautus. Just how many different ones can be counted depends upon the editors’ policy on capitalization in regard to the large group of abstract nouns, seriously and playfully deified at various points in the dialogue.” On deified abstractions in general see J.R. Fears ‘The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology’ ANRW 17.2, 827-948, Liebeschuetz (1979) 51f., Axtell (1907) passim.
domi erat quod quaeritabam: sex sodales repperi, domi erat: (bb c D) prosodic hiatus in the first cretic. domi ... quaeritabam: refers to the discovery of Pasicompsa in Lysimachus' house (888, 894, 901). This poses a problem: How does Eutychus know what Pasicompsa looks like? And how does he know her name? Under these circumstances, his efforts to find the girl (663-666, 805f.) seem heroic but doomed to fail. He has never seen her and Charinus never told him her name. Unlike Lysimachus and Demipho, who went off to the forum at 587 and must have met there again some time after Lysimachus left (802), since they re-enter together (presumably from the forum) at 961, Charinus and Eutychus are not supposed to have been together offstage for any amount of time that could explain Eutychus' knowledge, which has already been the object of some joking on his first entry at 476-482.

846 Vitam, Amicitiam, Civitatem, Laetitiam, Ludum, Iocum;
There are two alternative scansion, one involving the shortening of a vowel long by nature in the second syllable of amicitiam (1), the other involving reading ci(vi)tatem as a trisyllabic word (2). The lecythion Laetitiam, Ludum, Iocum (B cc D A B c D) remains unaffected in either case; (1) yields B cc dd A / B c D A /, (2) B c D aa B / C D A /. Both have been argued for, see Drexler (1967) 51 and 60. Since line 848, an enumeration of the 'bad things' is equal in rhythm (Iram Inimicitiam Maerorem = Vitam Amicitiam Civ'tatem), scansion (2) should be adopted. Plautus scans the quadrisyllabic oblique cases of civitas fully as quadrisyllables six times (in this play cf. 645, 837), but he is not even-handed in exploiting the potential ambiguities of prosody, so the absence of a precise parallel for civ'tatem is by no means decisive against it; cf. perhaps nauta - navita (e.g. Men. 226), novisti - nosti. For a similar case see 879n. on Plautus' handling of syncopation.

849 Solitudinem, Stultitiam, Exitium, Pertinaciam.
There is no reason to delete this line with Ribbeck (1883) 12 and Leo, see Prescott (1909) and Enk ad loc. It is unnecessary to assume with Ritschl, Thierfelder (1929) 57, and Enk a lacuna after it, see Prescott (1909) 22f., though Prescott thinks that the mention of sex sodales at 845 leads one rather to expect two balanced groups of six words each than one of six and one of ten. However, this argument from symmetry is impressionistic; the four comites may simply be more loosely appended to the preceding group of six in 848.

More importantly, Ritschl, followed by Thierfelder and Enk, also noted that eius in 850 would need some kind of antecedent. The expression eius ... copiam refers to Charinus, and what Eutychus says is 'Heaven above, please grant that I find him quickly.' The phrase recurs at 908, where it has a logical antecedent (907 opta ... quid vis). Yet, here no antecedent is needed, since Charinus is already on stage. For the audience, there is not a single moment during which it is unclear who is meant by eius.
This is not Plautine carelessness, but an illustrative example of how the language of a
stage script differs from a prose narrative, see in general Pfister (1997) 34-41.

850 date, di, quaeso conveniundi mihi eius celerem copiam.
Eutychus has found Pasicompsa: 'I've found her alright, now all I need is to find him
(Charinus).' This is, in fact, a very short invocation of the gods; on prayer in comedy, see
678-680n.

851-865 From here up to lines 864/867, the two characters on stage are not aware of
each other's presence, allowing the audience to enjoy two short set speeches of
contrasted mock pathos (851-856, 857-863). Charinus enters addressing the audience
(851 ut videtis) and overlooking his friend Eutychus who in turn is eagerly searching for
him. By addressing the audience, the fact that Charinus is (artificially, by dramatic
convention) ignoring his friend is made less felt. Charinus' entrance monologue is
continued over several lines before Eutychus notices him.

Charinus poses as a miles, and the present passage is reminiscent of the motif
militat omnis amans known from love-elegy, see Garcia Jurado/López Gregoris (1994)
244f.; on the connexion between comedy and love-elegy see also Polonskaya (1967) 56,
Bellido (1989) 21-34; on the comparison of lovers to soldiers in elegy see Hollis on Ov.
Ars 1.36; for its occurrence in Greek comedy, cf. Alexis fr. 236 K-A. Knapp (1907) 296,
however, rightly points to the slight incongruence of Charinus' posing as a soldier and
his declared intention of going to search for his beloved, something that he cannot really
do while hiring himself out as a mercenary. This incongruity may be explained by the
conventionality of the motif. Webster (1953) 132 points out the similarity of the figure
that Charinus cuts, dressed up for exile, with characters in tragedy, e.g. Orestes in A. Ch.
675, and the parody of a tragic hero in Antiphanes fr. 17 K-A (χλαμύδα καὶ λόγχην
ἐξών, ἄξιναπαρόλοθος, ἄποτολήκουσα), Diphilus fr. 55 K, where a soldier is
described as a walking junkshop, Moschion in Menander's Samia (313f.), and
Alcesimarchus at Cis. 284-296. For a Greek soldier's uniform and his burdens cf. Men.
Kol. 29-32 (pack, helmet, a pair of spears, a sheepskin; the text is mutilated; the
complete enumeration was twice as long). On the equipment and weapons of Greek

The comic motif reflects what seems to have been part of the social reality of
young men in 4th century Greece. The historicity of such scenarios may at first sight be
doubted, but Xenophon An. 6.4.8 reports that many of the Ten Thousand had joined up
after running away from their parents; cf. also Men. Sam. 616-640, esp. 623-632
('threat' of son to go abroad as a mercenary), Ht. 117; on the motif see Zagagi (1994)
35-38. The type of the rich adventurer, such as Charinus, was rare in reality, see Griffith
(1935) 2, Santosuosso (1997) 89-91. The economic displacement of many people in 4th
century Attica caused primarily members of lower social strata to become mercenaries, see Parke (1970) 228-234, Santosuosso (1997) 90f.

851 CH. apparatus sum ut videtis: abicio superbiam;
B c D A / B c D a / bb c D A / B c D; ‘mixed-type’ square verse. ut videtis: aside, accompanied by an appropriate gesture (Charinus’ pointing down all over himself with his hands). abicio superbiam: ‘I spurn public show’ refers to what follows: Charinus is going to be his own squire, crier, horse groom, and batman. Plautus is making the sly point that the ideal soldier ought to be self-reliant and that the aristocratic dandy who needs a platoon to go with him cannot be a very efficient soldier. The baggage of the officers of the Roman army could be considerable, probably comprising dozens of individuals, see Roth (1999) 89f.

852 egomet mihi comes, calator, equos, agaso, armiger,
bb C D a B c D A / bb c D A / B c D; metrical hiatus (-so/ar-) at A/B. Charinus’ statement implies that the departing (and returning) traveller would usually have his porters, cf. Mil. 1301-1304, 1338-1353, 1427f., Tri. 595-599, see Prescott (1936) 116f. In this context, it should be noted that Charinus’ tutor Acanthio is not re-activated although he could plausibly be re-introduced: it is an unnamed puer (and not Acanthio) who carries things in and out for Charinus later on in the scene. calator: ‘crier’ (rather than ‘personal attendant’, ‘footman’, OLD s.v. a), cf. Ps. 1009, Ru. 335. Drawing on various sources, Marcos Casquero (1976) argues that the word was used to refer to a religious office-bearer, and that the term is used figuratively in Plautine comedy, see Marcos Casquero (1976) 87. He regards the identification of calator with nomenclator (given by Enk ad loc.) as mistaken. In his view, the existence of the term nomenclator made it easier for the term calator to be used in an extravagant and burlesque way, but one word is not derived from the other; see also Smith (1996) 169-171. equos: it is not inconceivable for someone to talk of himself as his own comes (although this is slightly grotesque), but, in a situation designed to be ‘tragic’, for a man to say ‘I am my own horse’, takes the whole situation from the realm of the tragic into that of the comic, but cf. Men. Kol. 32 (said of a human being) δοστοχης δνος φερει.

854 egomet mihi fero quod usust. o Cupido, quantus es!
quod usust: probably the soldier’s pack, containing, among other things, his provisions (cf. Cas. 524, Ar. Pax 312). It remains unclear whether Charinus does actually carry a pack, but for the purpose of a modern production, the actor should be made to carry one anyway. o Cupido, quantus es!: cf. Naev. pract. 99 edepol Cupido cum tam pauxillus sis, nimis multium vales; an unexpected ending for a passage dealing in a tragic mode with a mercenary soldier’s life. The sentiment is Greek, see Flury (1968) 13-20, cf. e.g. Theoc. Id. 3.15 νον ἕγνων τὸν Ἐρωτα βαρύς θεός, Men. Sam. 632 ὁ τῆς ἐμῆς νῶν
The present use of *Cupido* in an invocation seems slightly inappropriate for two reasons. First, Charinus has stated more than once that his *animus* is with his beloved (cf. e.g. 589); then, in the present context, however ludicrous and incongruous his actual behaviour as *adulescens amator*, he is just about to leave his home (836) and sacrifice his existence as a citizen (837, 841) in order to search the Mediterranean for Pasicompsa (857-863). Even in terms of comedy, this self-sacrificial attitude (albeit with an inevitable admixture of Chaplinesque self-pity) can hardly be explained by a merely carnal desire. Thus it appears that the moral connotations of *Cupido* cannot be taken to be entirely negative. To add to the terminological confusion, Charinus says at 648 that it is *Amor* who torments him: *quia enim me adflictat Amor*. If a more clear-cut distinction between *Amor* and *Cupido*, which is ultimately based on our ancient sources, were to be accepted, the usage here and at 648 would be rather puzzling. Indeed, the very fact that Roman authors from the time of Cato the Elder on felt the necessity of distinguishing the terms *amor* and *cupido* (and the names of the deities) indicates that the Romans themselves were not clear about that distinction.

856 eundem ex confidente actutum diffidentem denuo.
Cf. Charinus’ earlier statements, e.g. 345-350, 469-471, 588-594, all of which are in keeping with the character of the *adulescens amator*. Just as lines 851-854, the 855f. are an example for the *loquacitas* and the *multiloquium* of the *amator*, part of whose dramatic ‘job’ it is to be always full of self-pity, much to the edification of the spectators.

857-864 Charinus states his plan: he wants to go abroad and look for Pasicompsa, who he believes to have been sold overseas by his father. Eutychus had told him that Pasicompsa’s buyer was an Athenian citizen (cf. 635), but Charinus has either conveniently ‘forgotten’ this, or assumes that this man has sold Pasicompsa on to someone else. Be that as it may, in this scene the motif ‘search for beloved’ is coupled with another motif, *exilium amoris* (cf. 644-660). The tone is that of a tragic lamentation.
The motif of surmounting difficulties and long distances for one's beloved is frequent in classical Latin love-poetry, cf. e.g. Ov. Ars 2.235f., Am. 1.9.9-16, 2.16.17-20, Prop. 1.8.1ff., 2.5.19-26, 2.26b.35-44, Tib. 1.1.78, 1.2.29-32 (frigora, imber, labor), 1.10.53-66, 2.3.9 (sol); on the motif of militia amoris see Coleman on Verg. Ecl. 10.44f., Kistrup (1963) 109f. For comedy, cf. Cic. 578f., Ph. 510-554).

857 EU. cogito quonam ego illum curram quaeritatum. CH. certa res

Eutychus' remark affords the crowd with an opportunity to shout hilariously, 'Look, there he is! Can’t you see him?’ quaeritatum: ‘first supine’ (accusative case of a verbal substantive), expressing purpose with verbs of motion, see LHS II 381f., cf. e.g. 939, Cas. 162, Ht. 587. certa res: sc. est.

858 me usque quaerere illam, quoquo hinc abductast gentium;

quaerere: Charinus uses the same verb as Eutychus. The neat contrast of the former looking for his friend and the latter looking for his girl, while ignoring each other's presence, was not lost on the audience.

859 neque mihi ulla obsistet amnis nec mons neque adeo mare,

contains a well-defined but unexplained exception to Luchs' law in the lecythion (ne-qu(e)a-de-o set as dd a B c d+); the enumeration progresses from the small obstacle (amnis) to the bigger (mons) and concludes with the biggest (mare) in a hyperbolical climax.

860 nec calor nec frigus metuo neque ventum neque grandinem;

color: Philargyrius (on Verg. G. 2.344) quotes this line in the form neque frigus neque calor metuo as an example of calor as a neuter. However, Nonius (p. 294 L.) quotes the same line neque frigus neque calorem metuo explicitly as an example of calor as a masculine word. Bergk (1861) 42-44, unconvincingly suggests to read frigus neque calorem metuo (with brachylogy, dropping the first negative); for other suggestions see Ritschl/Goetz and Leo in app. It seems that calor has to be accepted as an irregular neuter (like the regular marmor, aequor), see Lindsay (1894) 356 and Enk ad loc.; one should refrain from reading calos (i.e. calus) with Gandino. Calor is lectio difficilior; the words quoted by Nonius look like an attempt at normalisation. The nominative ending -r (instead of -s) may have been imported by analogy from the oblique cases (e.g. robur - robustus, fulgur - fulgus), see Meiser (1998) 142, so that *calur (like iecur, robur) would be an arguable form. The form calor continues to remain a curious puzzle.
862 non concedam neque quiescam usquam noctu neque dius,
noctu: see 100n. dius: ‘by day’, < */dies/*-es ‘during daytime’, old adverbial genitive (cf. 
νυκτός) of a u-stem of dies, see Meiser (1998) 146, also attested in interdius, quamdius, 
perdius.

863 prius profecto quam aut amicam aut mortem investigavero.
bb c D A / B c D A B C D A B c D c, obscured and muted inner breaks after the first A/B 
juncture; a heavy word of six syllables at line-end (cf. 264 adolescetia). The high pathos 
is immediately deflated by the inappropriate zeugma aut amicam aut mortem.

864 EU. nesciocuia vox ad auris mihi advolavit. CH. invoco 
nescioxv... advolavit: a commonly used metaphor taken from fowling; the underlying 
idea is that of the spoken word as a bird: sounds are living things that can escape, be 
released and trapped, or land in the listener’s ear. The expression is absent from Terence 
and Attic comedy; probably originating in Greek (via Roman) tragedy as an extension of 
similar expressions in Greek epic poetry, see Haffier (1934) 47, Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 
245, Molsberger (1989) 60, Benz (1999) 70f. As to the question of Plautine originality, 
the present author agrees with Enk ad loc: “Marxius credit Plautum in Amphitruone et in 
Mercatore usum esse nonnullis locutionibus, quibus in Rudente usus esset. Sed quis 
demonstret Philoemenon hoc loco Ἐµµόρου non iimitatum esse tragicam dictionem?”

865 vos, Lares viales, ut me bene tutetis. EU. Iuppiter, 
Lares viales: see 834n. Iuppiter!: ‘by god!’ (also pro Iuppiter!), exclamation, see OLD 
s.v. 4; originally a vocative without an ending (< */dieu-pater/*), see Meiser (1998) 138. 
There is a thin line between an expletive and a prayer; when Jupiter’s name is used as an 
expletive (cf. Catul. 1.7 doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis) it is to point out that something is 
manifestly clear to all (referring to Jupiter as all-seeing).

866-872 Eutychus addresses the back of his friend, who refuses to turn round for fear of 
being dissuaded from his venture. The situation here, where a character about to proceed 
with his business is called back and turns, often not without some reluctance, to speak 
with his interlocutor, is found frequently, e.g. Cap. 833-836, Cis. 704-707, Ep. 1-5, Mo. 
885-887, Poen. 851-858, Ps. 243-264, Tri. 1059-1073, Tru. 115-123. A similar routine 
is found in Terence, e.g. An. 344, Ph. 739f., Ad. 320f. Fraenkel (1960) 212-221 thinks 
that the Terentian examples reflect their Greek originals more closely, whereas Plautus 
has expanded the routines. As Fraenkel points out, these routines occur always in 
recitative (chanted) or canticum metres and are part of a series of entrance/exit devices 
such as Plautus was particularly prone to develop, see also Bain (1977) ch. 10. Fraenkel 
(1960) 215f. thinks that between 866 ildo sta, Charine and the repetition of the
command at 872 *sta ilico* Plautus has inserted an interlude playing on the three deities *Spes, Salus, Victoria* (cf. *Ps. 709, Mo. 350f.*).

867 *sta, Charine. CH. qui me revocat? EU. Spes, Salus, Victoria.*

q**ui me revocat?:** cf. 474, *Cis. 705, Ep. 201, Poen. 1212, An. 344,* (cf. *P. Hibeh 5* fr. a.P. τις κακαληκε με; = Menander p. 338.9 Sandbach); for the indiscriminate use of *quis/qui* see 474n. *Spes, Salus, Victoria:* climactic enumeration with appropriately increasing word-length, beginning with hope, followed by safety/welfare, topped by victory/triumph. On the personification of deities in Roman religion see Feeney (1998) 87-91, Hanson (1959) 67f. The frequency of personified abstractions in Plautus is consistent with the general Roman literary and religious practice. The most important and common of these are at the same time gods with attested cults and deifications of important concepts in the religious thought of the Romans: *Fides, Fortuna, Pax, Pietas, Salus,* and *Spes.* Feeney suggests that whether an abstract was regarded as a deity was determined by social practice, namely by whether that abstraction had altars or not, as it is put somewhat crudely by Varro fr. 190 *Felicitas dea est. aedem accepit, aram meruit, sacra congrua persoluta sunt* and *As. 712f.*

Are these deities taken from the Greek original, or is Plautus referring to Roman gods? The personification of abstractions was familiar from Greek tragedy, cf. the examples given by Bond on *E. Herc. Fur.* 556. In comedy, it is used in contexts reminiscent of tragedy; see Gomme/Sandbach on *Men. Geo.* 77 (Πενια). For Plautine comedy, cf. *Cap. 863f., As. 716-719, Cis. 742 at vos Salus servassit,* for catalogues of abstract deities cf. *Am. 42, Ba. 115f.* (a ludicrous catalogue of *ad hoc* divinities), *Cap. 529, Ps. 45-47, 679, 709* *dic utrum Spemne an Salutem te salutem;* for another example of using the name of a deity with reference to a human being cf. *Ps. 736 non Charinus mihi hicquidem, sed Copiast.* This practice is continued later, e.g. *Sen. Oed.* 70 (a human being is referred to as ‘my help’). The idea that mortals can be referred to as deities is most clearly expressed in *Cas. 331-337* (on *Iuppiter* and *humani Ioves*), and *Per.* 99f. (where Saturio calls Toxilus his *Iuppiter terrestris*), see also 690n. (on *Iuno mea*). *Spes:* on Hope as a goddess see Hollis on *Ov. Ars 1.446,* Nisbet/Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.35.21. A temple of *Spes* was vowed in Rome in 258 BC, see Orlin (1997) 102; two temples were erected to *Spes* and *Fides* in the time of the First Punic War. *Salus:* the association of this deity with Eutychus is in keeping with his association with *medicus* and *medicari* (472, 489, 951). A temple of *Salus* was dedicated in 302 BC, see Orlin (1997) 142; cf. Livy 10.1.9, see also Marwood (1988) 12f. For the close collocation of *Spes* and *Salus* cf. *As. 713, Cap. 864, Ps. 709* *dic utrum Spemne an Salutem te salutem, Pseudole, Ru. 680 o Saluitis meae Spes* (cf. also *Mo. 350f.*), see Hanson (1959) 76; Terence, *Hec.* 338, *Ad.* 761 probably translated ‘Σαλος = Salus. The frequency of the religious use of *servo, Salus,* and *salus* in Plautine comedy should be seen in the light of the concern in other parts of the Greco-Roman world with the notions of rescue and salvation, expressed in Greek
through the development in the use of the words σωτήρ and σωτηρία, see Hanson (1959) 76f. Plautus provides important evidence for the existence of well-developed Roman raw material which is part of the total product of the Greco-Roman concept of σωτηρία. This use of the σωτηρία motif points towards later developments, cf. e.g. the theme of Verg. Ecl. 4 and the idea that Augustus was the Σωτήρ of the Roman people. For the connection of the use of Salus at As. 712 and the idea of the ruler-cult, see Marwood (1988) 12. According to Hanson, Salus in Plautus cannot be regarded as a simple translation from a Greek play, since she had already received a temple and cult in Rome at the end of the fourth century BC. Put in this way, Hanson’s argument is logically faulty. What he seems to mean is that Salus need not be regarded as a translation from a Greek play, for it is conceivable that despite of the cult already established at Rome, there may have been a Hygieia in the Greek original which was then translated into Salus by Plautus. With particular focus on Salus, Schmude (1988) 228 n.167 (discussing personifications at As. 712-719, Ba. 709, etc.) remarks on the frequency of enumerations of such σωματοποιήσεις (cf. Don. Ter. Ad. 760f., with As. 268) in Plautus, and notes the different facets of this deity, e.g. Ba. 115f. (Salus as goddess of enjoyment), Cap. 864 (good fortune and voluptuousness), Cu. 3 (love), Mer. 867 (‘salvation’), 870 (despair!, cf. 162). Victoria: this goddess is grouped together with Pudicitia, Libertas, Virtus, and Copia by Hanson (1959) 68 as deities with a contemporary or later cult who may also be regarded as “full-fledged divinities”. A temple of Victoria was dedicated 294 BC, see Orlin (1997) 99, 102, 127. Her mention at Am. 42 shows that Victoria, along with other deities like Virtus and Bellona, figures in patriotic prologues (or epilogues) to Roman tragedies during the years of the Second Punic War, see Sedgwick on Am. 41.

868 CH. quid me voltis? EU. ire tecum. CH. alium comitem quaerite,
B C D a / B c D A / bb C dd A / B c d+ (square verse type I). comitem: cf. 869; incorporeal abstracts are not infrequently personified as the comes of another object in emotionally charged passages, see ThLL III.1775f. s.v. c, and cf. Am. 635, 930, Caec. Com. 168; Rhet. Her. 4.36, Cic. Ver. 2.139, Att. 10.4.5; Molsberger (1989) 102 n.110 is wrong in calling such personifications ‘weak’ (or ‘faded’).

869 non amittunt hi me comites qui tent. EU. qui sunt ei?
amittunt = dimittunt, see Enk ad loc. and add to his examples Au. 656, Cap. 339; also frequent in Terence, see McGlynn s.v. I. me: ἀνό κοινοῦ with amittunt and tenent.

873 CH. male facis properantem qui me commorare. Sol abit.
Charinus is going to make a number of similar remarks, announcing that he is going to leave (921, 929, 930, 934, 935f.) without actually ever going. For the idea cf. Poen. 582 haud amice facis, qui cum onere offers moram, Ps. 246 quis est qui moram mi occupato molestam optulit? commorare: transitive use of commorari; restricted mainly to
Plautine comedy, cf. *Am.* 690, *Men.* 177, *Poen.* 924, *Ps.* 1131 (both reflexive). The passive is found at *Per.* 203, see Langen (1880) 174-180. *Sol abit:* ‘the Sun departeth’ (i.e. ‘time is getting on’), see 6n., for the elevated diction cf. e.g. Catul. 61.84-86.

875-884 Charinus’ situation is likened to that of a boat at sea (875-880). Eutychus gestures to Lysimachus’ house nearby, where the fair wind and clear Western breeze assure safety and happiness, and he warns against the rainy Southern wind that raises the billows in the direction of the harbour. At first, Charinus remains unmoved by his friend’s appeal. When Charinus finally turns towards him (881), the two friends begin slowly to move towards each other (882-884). The metaphor of the sea voyage (and of love as a sea, see 195-197n.), so far restricted to the verbal ‘scenery’ of the action, is now expanded into the on-stage world, as Charinus stretches out his hand (883) for Eutychus to help him out of a swaying boat on to the firm ground. The rapid sequence of short sentences mirroring the action conveys the intense concentration necessitated by this potentially dangerous business. The situational comedy - a man pretending to disembark from a boat with the help of his friend, while both are really standing on the firm ground of a stage representing a street in ‘Athens’, was probably not lost on the audience.


875 *huc secundus ventus nunc est; cape modo vorsoriam,*

*B c D A B C D A / bb c d+ A B c D; modo promoted to full metrical status at locus Jacobsohnianus. cape modo vorsoriam:* ‘stand by the *vorsoria*,’ i.e. ‘turn back’, ‘change course’, cf. *Tri.* 1026 (where *vorsoria* seems to mean ‘the sheet’ used in tacking). *OLD* s.v. *vorsoria* defines ‘the rope used to set sail at an angle (to catch a favourable wind)’, and provides the two Plautine occurrences; Casson (1971) 259 n.2: “The context makes clear that the command has to do with reversing - a maneuver that involves helm and sheets as well as braces, and, what is more, both braces and not just one.” Cf. a similar metaphor at *Ar. Lys.* 64.

878-880 There are a number of corruptions in this passage, not all of which can be remedied to full satisfaction. Perhaps the archetype was physically damaged or otherwise illegible. It seems unlikely that the lines can be restored; the suggestions made below are merely *faute de mieux.*

878 *recipe te ad terram, Charine, huc. nonne ex advorso vides*

*bb c D A B c D A / B C D A B c D.* The line may be corrupt. The position of *huc* is peculiar (*huc ad me*, *huc ad terram* would be usual), it seems displaced and disturbs the smooth flow of the line. Its isolation at sentence-end lends it undeserved emphasis. ex
advorso: ‘from the opposite quarter’ (ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου); adversus ‘blowing against one’ is used to describe unfavourable winds and weather conditions (OLD s.v. adversus' 7a-b).

879 nubis ater imberque instat. aspice ad sinisteram
nubis: nominative singular as cladis, see Lindsay on Cap. 911; for the black cloud as bringer of rain cf. Hom. Il. 4.275-279. sinistera: unsyncopated, cf. Eu. 835 (also at line-end), see Lindsay (1922) 217; on dext(e)ra seems to be used, e.g. Cu. 307, Mer. 149, as well as dextra, e.g. Mer. 965; alterinsecus instead of altrinsecus at Mer. 977.

880 caelum ut splendore plenumst? n nonne ex ad vorso vides†
The line is corrupt and probably mutilated by diplography (see 878). splendore plenum: the only instance of plemus taking the ablative (24 times with genitive; always in Terence), see Lindsay (1907) 17, Woodcock (1959) 55, Stockert (1983) 212; contra LHS II 77, interpreting the phrase as splendori’ [i.e. splendoris] plenum; see also Enk ad loc.

881 CH. religionem illic <mihi> obiecit: recipiam me illuc. EU. sapis.
religionem: Charinus considers the mention of black clouds and storm-troubled waves by Eutychus as an omen which it would be impious to disregard. To inhibit the power of the ominous words, he changes his plan and pursues a course that is favoured by wind, wave, and sky. The word religio is rare in Plautus (here and Cu. 350) and Terence (An. 730, 941, Ht. 228).

882 o Charine, contra pariter fer gradum et confer pedem,
‘O Charinus, match step and stride for stride and step!’ The situation is similar to that at Ps. 707f. confer gradum / contra pariter; porge audacter ad salutem bracchium; for parallels in tragedy see Haftler (1934) 63. pariter = similiter, a common usage, cf. Cap. 329, Cts. 481, Men. 1083, Mil. 670, St. 772, Tru. 124 pariter gradere, Ht. 132. confer pedem: an expression originally referring to the beginning of hand-to-hand fighting, see Baltáceanu (1966) 116, Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 193f., Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 584; cf. Tyrt. 831 καὶ πόδα πολύ θελές καὶ ἐπὶ ἀσπίδας ἀσπίδας ἔρεισας; E. Heracl. 836f., Troad. 333f. Don. Ter. An. 808 (numquam huc tetulissem pedem) remarks that ‘the critics note that the phrase is too lofty to be in keeping with comic style’.

B c D a B c D a a B c D aa B c D; a rare instance of a septenarius with nearly all the C’s and A’s pure; 883, 884, 888, and 889 are four-part lines in rapid repartee, see 181n. bracchium: Saint-Denis (1935) 69f. sees a play on bracchium ‘arm’ and, as a nautical term, ‘yard’. The play with nautical terms is carried through to line 891: tene (883) ‘keep
the course', restitutam (885) 'I will bring you to anchor', fluctuat (890), in tranquillo, quieto, tuto (891).


B C D A / B c D A / bb C dd A / B c d+ (square verse type I). 'Where were you going just now?' :: 'Into exile.' :: 'What would you do there?' :: 'What a wretch does.' ibas: inceptive imperfect; the action (going into exile) has begun but has not yet been brought to a conclusion; this is brought out even more clearly at 981. It would be absurd for Eutychus to ask Quo nunc tisti? faceres: 'you might have done', see 633n. quod miser: sc. faceret; Lindsay attempts to keep the paradosis - B has miserest (B² has miser), C has miser st, D has miser est (with a sublinear dot under the second e) by reading CH quod miser. EU. [extra versum] st!, followed by Enk, but not by Ernout. The explanation of such exclamations extra metrum (which are set in an extra line) given by Lindsay (1922) 266 sounds plausible enough. Wahl (1974) 36, applauding Lindsay, unconvincingly suggests that the majuscule text had MISERST, with the letter r being a remnant of the 'algebraic' notation of the speakers in the archetype (see 1014n.), in this case of the actor playing Eutychus. On balance, Lindsay's hypothesis about the origin and true nature of st in the present line may be accepted, cf. Mo. 894f., where Lindsay also reads st! ne pave. On the other hand, one has to bear in mind that B² has miser. If one wants to avoid st in a line extra metrum, one may read quod miser ist.

887 sta ilico, <nam> amicus advenio multum <tibi> benevolens.

B c D aa B c D aa B / C D aa bb c D. This line has worried scholars who found it deficient in metre and sense. The line was inserted after 872 by Ritschl, presumably because that line ends with sta ilico and he assumed a scribal error of displacement. Goetz/Schoell keep the line in its place but obelize it, similarly Ernout; Leo brackets the line. Lindsay prints it in its place and, after conjecturally curing the metre, does not mark it as corrupt or suspicious. As for the metre, the line in its above form, with two slight additions, results in a rhythmical movement that scans, but with a heavy drag in multum and containing a jarring break after advenio. Maybe read st(a) ilico, adveni(o) amicus multum benevolens <tibi>, with metrical hiatus after ilico? sta ilico: cf. 872. amicus ... benevolens: for this pairing cf. Tri. 45f., 1176f. multum: multum may be used adverbially (nine times in Plautus; not in Terence), cf. muy bien, molto bene, see Petersmann on St. 206. <tibi> benevolens: Dunsch (duce Ritschl tibi alibi inserente).

888 tuam amicam - CH. quid eam? EU. ubi sit ego scio. CH. tune, obsecro?

Wahl (1974) 35f. thinks that certain textual errors are indicative of the presence of an 'algebraic' notation (see 1014n.) of speakers in the text of the archetype in this line. D has scio CA tume atumne obsecro, and C has the same text without the indication of a change of speaker. Wahl wants to explain the textual corruption, especially the presence
338

894 EU. Non longe hinc abest a nobis. CH. quin [ergo] commostras si vides?
B C D a B C D A / B C D A B c D. The MSS have a line that contain two syllables too
many, ergo has to be bracketed with Guyet (accepted by Lindsay, Enk, Ernout).

898 qui illam habet, neque est quoi magis me melius velle aequom siet.

magis ... melius: ‘double comparative’; frequent in Plautus, e.g. Au. 422 amplius ...
plus, Ba. 500, Cap. 642 magis certius, Poen. 460. Gratwick on Men. 55 may be right in
pointing out that magis may just modify the verb as ‘rather’, ‘still more’ in all Plautine
examples.

900 sane hoc non in mentem venit dudum, ut ob<litus fui>.

Lefèvre (1995) 37f. describes the passage from 900-914 (and indeed the remainder of the
scene) as written with the intention of expanding the γελοιον beyond what is
dramatically relevant, and takes this as a sign of Plautine expansion. The general validity
of this criterion is rightly contested by Zagagi (1995) 79f.: “The apparent absence of this
practice from the plays of New Comedy and Terence, combined with an idealized picture
of Greek New Comedy, have made Classical scholars treat the presence of this
phenomenon in Plautus as evidence for regarding it as a Plautine improvisation. The
analogy between the opening scene of Act II of Menander’s Perikeirromene and Merc.
907-909, Asin. 649ff., however, would seem to cast doubt on the reliability of this
criterion. Features held in common include: a young lover exchanging jokes with another
person - a slave or a friend - under circumstances of some erotic urgency; deliberation
over the need to repay the interlocutor for promoting the lover’s amatory interests; the
repayment is conceived and expressed (especially where the Perikeriromene and the
Asinaria passages are concerned) in essentially impractical terms whereby a comic point
of delay is created in the lover’s attempted realization of his erotic plans.” dudum:
‘some time ago’; cf. 556; contrast dudum ‘a short while ago’, 753n. ut ob<litus fui>
Ribbeck : ut tibi B : ut ob CD : ub<i sit dicerem> Leo : ut tibi dicerem Camerarius. CD
should be followed, as ut tibi in B seems to be a misreading of a damaged text in P.
Therefore, Ribbeck’s emendation is better than those of Leo and Camerarius; cf. 481 ut
oblitus fui (also at line-end), Ps. 171 est quod ... dicere paene fui oblitus.

901 CH. dic igitur, ubi illa est? EU. in nostris aedibus. CH. aedis probas,
B cc d+ aa B C D A / B c d+ A B c D; IK: ub(f) illa est (aa B); loci Jacobsohniani after
the first cretic and in the second but last D-position. probas: ‘well-behaved’; a peculiar
attribute to be used of a house; the personification is carried through to the next line
(pulchre aedificatas).
902 si tu vera dicis, pulchre aedificatas arbitro.

BCD A BCD A / B cc D A / B c D; metrical hiatus -chre ae- (A / B) at inner A/B juncture. Charinus’ distrust and doubts are recurring motifs, cf. 905, 913, 936. Timidity is one of Charinus’ character traits, cf. e.g. his lack of confidence at 207-217, 345-355. pulchre: see 485n.; Gronovius (1760) 111 points out that it is adequate for Charinus to call the house in which he will meet his beloved pulchre (instead of bene) aedificatae. Plautus may allude to a formula used in the real estate business, cf. Cic. Off. 3.55.

904 EU. egomet vidi. CH. quis eam adduxit ad vos? EU. <ut> inique rogas!

Charinus’ suspicion seems to be that Eutychus has taken the girl for himself and betrayed him (cf. the conflict between Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus in Ba.). For that reason, he keeps asking who actually brought the girl into Lysimachus’ house - a fact that must come as a surprise to Charinus who actually thought that the girl had been sold overseas. Eutychus picks up on Charinus’ suspicion and reacts with dismay (<ut> inique rogas!).

<ut> inique rogas!: Buecheler, Leo : inque. EU. <tu> rogas? Lindsay duce Schoell : alii alia : inique rogas codd. Lindsay’s suggestion is not in accordance with Plautine usage. In Plautus (Ba. 883, Ps. 538; cf. also Am. 912) and Terence (Ht. 829, Ph. 919) inque is used after the sentence that should be said has been given in direct speech. The imperative is not used after indirect speech. Lindsay’s ‘Quis eam adduxit ad vos?’ inque would mean ‘Say (the words) Quis eam adduxit ad vos?’ and not what he intends it to mean (‘Tell me who brought the girl to your house!’). ut: ‘to what extent!, how!’; exclamatory interrogative adverb (OLD s.v. A. 2a), a common usage in comedy (e.g. As. 616, Au. 52, Ps. 245, Ru. 245, Ht. 1063, Ph. 945).

905 CH. vera dicas. EU. nihil, Charine, te quidem quicquam pudet.

Leo changes the sequence to 906-905, but the lines make good sense the way they are. vera dicas Dunsch : vera dicis codd. Charinus, reacting to Eutychus’ dismayed remark (904), says vera dicas (scil. velim) ‘Wish it was so!’ (cf. Cas. 234 vera dicas velim), i.e. I wish that my question (suspicion) was indeed unreasonable and unfounded. This sarcastic comment displeases Eutychus even more, and he reacts appropriately: ‘You’ve no sense of shame at all, Charinus.’

907 est profecto. CH. opta ergo ob istunc nuntium quid vis tibi.

Charinus’ offer of a reward comes παρά προσδοκίαν, and Eutychus’ expectations are deflated in the following line, see Schmidt (1959) 311. est profecto: (to Charinus, who is still suspicious) ‘she’s there, really.’ profecto: emphatic particle, used in Plautus for corrective comments on negative statements (or their equivalents) and in confirmation of the speaker’s own previous statement, especially when he declares that he recognizes someone/something, e.g. Cis. 666, Mil. 290, Per. 15. On the etymology of profecto
(*pro facto, as in *pro facto vidi, cf. pro certo scio) see Theslaff (1960) 21 n.2.; its use is parodied at Am. 370-372.

910-930 The equipment requested by Charinus for his long travels and exilium amoris consists of: chlamys (910), zona (925), machaera (926), ampulla (927). These props will probably have been brought on stage. If this scene is, among other things, the parody of an arming scene, it would be appropriate for Charinus to wear not only a chlamys (see 912n., 921n.), but also κρητιδες (or some other kind of military boots) and a πέπωσος (cf. Philemon fr. 34 K-A; Ps. 735) as part of his `uniform', even though no mention of them is made in the text.

The motif of sending a slave to fetch weapons as a piece of play-acting is used again at Cis. 283-288, but there the intention is to suggest that the lover has been sent out of his mind by his passion, see Kistrup (1963) 114f. and Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Sam. 659 who do not mention the present passage; cf. also Per. 155-157.

910 sed quin ornatum hunc reicio? heus, aliquis actutum huc foras
This shows that Charinus was dressed up as a soldier when he entered at 851 (apparatus sum ut videtis also refers to his appearance). For similar self-admonitions, cf. e.g. As. 291, Au. 816. ornatum: ‘dress’, ‘get-up’, cf. Am. 1007, Mil. 1282.

911 exite illinc, pallium mihi ecferte. EU. em, nunc tu mihi ut places!
B C D A B c D / A B C D A B c D; mihi ec- and mihi ut fill one metrical place each (A and B) by elision and synizesis. There is no need to bracket the exclamatory ut with Acidalius and Leo against the MSS. pallium: a cloak worn above the tunica, cf. 922, Au. 638, Ba. 72, 434, see 921n. The pallium was (a) the symbol of the comoedia palliata, and (b) it characterized its wearers as Greeks, see Middelmann (1938) 6f., Blank (1996) 74. By putting on the pallium, Charinus resumes his identity as actor in a comoedia palliata. em, nunc ... places: ‘that’s the boy’.

912 CH. optume advenis, puere, cape chamydem atque istic sta ilico,
B c D a B cc d+ / aa bb C D A B c D with locus Jacobsonianus in second D, unusual, as it precedes the usual midline break, see Soubiran on Mil. 226. A slave (a silent supernumery) has come out following Charinus’ order at 910f., remains on stage, is addressed at 922, and ordered off at 930; see Prescott (1936) 108 with n.14 for a discussion of passages where a puer is summoned for service, especially Mo. 418-426, 843-857. puere: older form of the usual vocative puer (like vir, faber), used for the address of servants in Plautus, see Meiser (1998) 134. The usual form of the vocative (vetus puer) is used in 976 to address Demipho. chamydem: ‘(travelling-)cloak’ (χλαμύς), widely worn by young men; on its specific military connotation see 921n. and Gomme/Sandbach on Men. Sam. 659. Χλαμύς (chlamys, 912) is a woolen mantle,
especially military cloak, fastened on the shoulder with a fibula on the right shoulder so that it left the right arm or, thrown back, both arms free, see Wilson (1938) 100-103, Blank (1996) 57f. In Greece, it had a military significance as uniform cloak of Thessalian or Macedonian origin, see Gow on Theoc. Id. 14.65f. and 15.6. It is traditionally the garb of a soldier (e.g. Cu. 632, Ep. 436, Mil. 1423, Per. 155, Ps. 1184), but it is also worn by civilians (Men. 658). 'To take the chlamys' can either mean, as in Antidot. fr. 2 K-A (ἐγγαρφῆναι καὶ λαβεῖν τὸ χλαμῦδιον, 'to be enrolled among the ἔφηβοι'), or 'to put on one's uniform', cf. Philemon fr. 34 K-A. istic sta ilico: 'stop right there'; cf. Ba. 1140, Mo. 885, 887, 1064, Ru. 836, Tri. 627, 1059, Ad. 156, Ph. 195, Caecil. Com. 118, see Stockert on Au. 56, Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 293. ilico < in stloco; in Plautus more common in its temporal than in its local sense, which is found only with verbs of resting, as Tri. 627 sta ilico 'stand on the spot' = 'stay where you are', cf. Tri. 1059, Mo. 1064. For the temporal meaning cf. e.g. 362, Ru. 266, Tri. 608, see Langen (1880) 155f.

913 ut, si haec non sint vera, inceptum hoc itiner perficere exsequar.
exsequar: 'proceed'; used with the infinitive, cf. As. 160, see Lindsay (1907) 73, see also 52n. itiner: cf. 929 itiner exsequi. The form itiner, derived by analogy from iitineris, occurs six times in tragedy against iter twice; comedy has iter fifteen times, itiner only thrice (not in Terence), see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 289.

915 sed quin intro ducis me ad eam, ut videam? EU. paulisper mane.
Note the analogy to Lysimachus’ behaviour towards Demipho, see 889n., cf. 564.

916 CH. quid manebo? EU. tempus non est intro eundi. CH. enicas.
intro eundi: perhaps a double entendre; see 567n. enicas: a mannerism of Charinus, see 157n.

917 EU. non opus est, inquam, nunc intro te mihi, CH. responde mihi,
This is parallel to (though phrased more politely than) 567, where it is Demipho’s friend Lysimachus who advises him not to enter. Here, it is Charinus, Demipho’s son, who wants to go in, and Eutychus, Lysimachus’ son, who keeps him from doing so.

918 qua causa? EU. operae non est. CH. cur? EU. quia non est illi commodum.
operae non est: Eutychus varies the phrase (non opus est, 917) but still refuses to give reasons. illi: Charinus understands illi = Pasicompsae (919); Eutychus means illi = Lysimachos (he tries to explain the situation, cf. 922-927, but to no avail).

920 omnibus hic ludificatur me modis. ego stultior,
ego stultior: 'I am so stupid ...'; affective verbal ellipsis of sum, cf. Am. 964, Mil. 370, St. 73, especially with stultus/stultior, cf. Am. 56, Mil. 370, Per. 261, Hec. 564, see
Forer (1979) 135-141. She notes a parallel in Men. Epit. 563-565 and observes correctly that such phrases are not intended as a real self-criticism but used to emphasize one’s momentary hesitation or doubts.

922 EU. mane parumper atque haec audi. CH. cape sis, puere, hoc pallium. Charinus’ order shows that he has put on the chlamys in the meantime. The change of clothing is a visualisation of his intention to become a mercenary soldier, see Loitold (1956) 45f.

923 EU. mater irata est patri vehementer, quia scortum sibi
irata ... vehementer: ‘boiling with rage’, cf. Tru. 545. scortum: Adams (1983) 348 notes rightly that the contrast with amica (925) and the difference between ‘taking a whore’ and ‘having a girl-friend’ (a more permanent relationship) is well brought out in this passage. This passage also implies that while Dorippa is angry about her husband’s behaviour, she is at the same time afraid to have lost more than his sexual attention (which would be lost to a scortum): she thinks that she might have lost his emotional attachment (which would go to an amica). Moreover, the main point that Dorippa has objected to is restated: the girl has been brought into her family home (cf. 786).

925-927 A nice piece of situational humour. Both characters talk, but Charinus does not react to the revelations made by his friend. He does not seem to listen, and yet at the same time he does. The grotesquely minute description he gives of his preparations for going abroad, probably coupled with corresponding on-stage action (in the tradition of a dressing-up scene), indicate that he cannot be touched by anything Eutychus says.

926 EU. eam rem nunc exquirit intus. CH. iam machaerast in manu.
machaerast: loanword (μέχαρα; not attested in Terence), frequent in comedy, only once in tragedy, see Jocelyn on Enn. Trag. 149. Cloak and sword are the two characteristic props of a man who intends to travel abroad selling his services as a soldier, cf. Men. Pk. 164f., Sam. 658; Cu. 632, Mil. 1423, or of a young man who is equipped to seem like a soldier, e.g. Ps. 735, 1184f., Ru. 315. The μέχαρα is a short sword with one curved cutting edge and a point, used for stabbing and hacking. It is distinguished from the two-edged long or short sword, ξιφός (gladius). Μέχαρα occurs once in Greek tragedy (E. Suppl. 1206) and often in comedy, but never as a military weapon, see Shipp (1955) 149f. The diminutive, however, seems to have been so used, cf. Men. fr. 793 ἀσπίδιον ... κατ’ μεχαραῖον (cf. Cu. 574f., Tru. 506). Tragic soldiers use the ξιφός, comic the σπάθη (Men. Pk. 165, Sam. 314, 315, Mis. B↓5, ↓25. The σπάθη has a long history, being borrowed into Latin and engendering épée, spada, etc. It had not yet entered Latin when Plautus was adapting Greek plays; he uses machaera in contexts like this, see Shipp (1955) 149.
The early *gladius* was a long sword, but in the 3rd or 2nd century BC the Romans adopted the Spanish short two-edged sword. This change was contemporary with the change from the long stabbing spear or *hasta* to the shorter throwing javelin or *pilum*, so that, when the legionary had hurled the several javelins which he carried, he would come into close combat with his short sword. Since the *machaera* is appropriate to the Greek mercenary captain, Plautus' use of the sword does not prove that the Romans were still distinguishing between a foreign short sword and a native long one, but it demonstrates their familiarity with Greek armament, see Hammond/Mack/Moskalew on *Mil. 5*.

927 EU. nam si eo te intro ducam - CH. tollo ampullam atque hinc eo.  

928 EU. mane, mane, Charine. CH. erras, me decipere hau potes.  
*mane, mane*: (*bb cD*) 'stop, stop!'; Eutychus is alarmed; the imperative appears in both metrically possible forms (heteroprosody), cf. *Ht.* 613, 736, and contrast the scansion *aa bb* at *Au.* 655; cf. *tene, tene* (*Au.* 415), *tace, tace* (*Per.* 591). Formally it would also be possible to set the beginning of the line as *B c D a*, see 749n.

930-949 This passage presents one of the most burlesque pieces of Plautine comedy, the fantastic chariot-ride of the *insanus amator* Charinus. The greater part of this scene is a good example of the depiction of madness on the Roman stage. Scenes involving the presentation of mad characters on stage ('mad-scenes') were particularly popular with Roman audiences, see Knapp (1919) 238f., O'Brien-Moore (1924) 53-66, Paschall (1939) 38-77, Goldberg (1986) 207f., who mentions scenes from tragedy and comedy (Pacuvius, Ennius' *Alexander* and *Alcmaeo*, Plautus' *Menaechmi* 831ff.), Wright (1974) 129, Stärk (1989) 105, and Arnott on Alexis fr. 4 K-A. Plautus parodies the madness of Orestes and Hercules elsewhere, cf. *Cas.* 621ff., *Men.* 830ff., see Hunter (1985) 128f.; cf. also *Cis.* 286-292/297, where the device of feigned madness is also used to heighten the lover's despair, *Ps.* 1272a-1280. Anaxandrides, Alexis, Diodorus, and Diphilus wrote comedies entitled 'The Mad One(s)', see Webster (1970) 69-73. In Menander's *Theophorumene* Kleinias and Lysias want to test whether the madness of the girl (an orgiastic-prophetic ecstasy) is genuine, see Webster (1974) 189-192; in the *Phasma* a young man is mad with love (*Phasm.* 31-56). Terence mentions that Luscius Lanuvinus wrote a play that contained the mad fantasies of a young lover, but Terence seems to reject the mad-scene as a stock routine (*Ph.* 6-8).

The passage should be staged with a considerable amount of movements and gesturing by Charinus, see Taladoire (1951) 27f., although his own suggestion is unconvincing: ‘[...] un voyage imaginaire [...] qui doit consister soit en un va-et-vient
rapide d’un bout à l’autre du plateau, soit en une promenade en ronde, ce qui serait à la fois plus significatif et plus comique, étant donné la vanité de cette agitation.” It should be added that, although ‘on paper’ Eutychus does not do a lot, the scene is best staged with him gesticulating and indicating his desperation over his friend’s madness. All in all, this passage will make for excellent choreography on the comic stage.

The motif of the chariot-ride is old. It is already found as a genre scene in the Near Eastern poetic tradition, see West (1997) 205-206. The usual Homeric chariot journey is made up of the following elements: mounting of the driver, taking of the reins, applying the goad, the horses flying along, an indication of the direction (which is reached instantly), stopping of the horses. Most of these elements are also present in this passage, apart from a mention of the horses. This is understandable: since there were probably no horses on stage, the playwright wanted to avoid drawing the audience’s attention to that fact, and therefore did not make the characters on stage talk about non-existent horses. The point where both the present narrative and those found in Greek and Near Eastern epic poetry converge most strikingly is the condensation of long journeys into a few lines of text; here the comic poet seems to follow the traditional form of the narrative as used by epic poets. The chariot motif is here combined with the escape-wish to sprout wings and fly away, which is common in tragedy, see Csapo (1986) 149 and 164 n.133. The result of this combination is not too artifically or forced as a motif in its own right, ‘flying away in a chariot’.

930 EU. non sino. CH. ego me moror. tu puere, abi hinc intro ocius.

ego: There is no need to read egomet with Priscian (GLK II.301, 1), introduced into the vulgate by Bothe (with reference to St. 445) and accepted by Ritschl, Leo, and Lindsay (but not by Goetz/Schoell and Ernout), especially since Priscian’s egomet memor seems to be a miswriting of ego me moror and the introduction of egomet would cause metrical difficulties involving the shortening of -ror in moror. ocius: see 671n.

931 iam in currum escendi, iam lora in manus cepi meas.

So far, the action has been quite ‘real’, and Charinus has (probably) been handling real stage props: a coat, sword, and flask. But now, as Eutychus has still not consented to lead the way to the girl, he goes mad - or rather pretends to do so, see Kistrup (1963) 113f. Enk ad loc. aptly compares Men. 865 (iam astiti in currum, iam lora teneo), uttered by Menaechmus pretending to be insane. Dramaturgically, this is the only way to reconcile two otherwise diametrically opposed objectives: Charinus cannot really be made to go into exile, for that would destroy the re-unification of the lovers, which, although taking place off-stage, brings to a conclusion a main strand of the plot. On the other hand, Charinus cannot simply stand there and do nothing, as he has indeed threatened to take action and leave the country. From this point of view, to make him pretend to go on a chariot journey, is a dramatic masterstroke. In contrast to the
preceding passage (874-884), where both friends participated in the metaphorical action, Charinus sets off alone on his imaginary journey, leaving his friend behind. Eutychus, on the other hand, tries frantically to talk some sense into him and gets more and more worried about his sanity.

Charinus first enacts climbing onto a chariot; then he takes the (imaginary) reins into his hands, and, perhaps with the flick of an imaginary whip, urges the horses to speed to Cyprus. Speaking to the audience while gesturing at Eutychus and accusing him of lying, he ignores the poor fellow’s protestations of innocence and pretends to have reached Cyprus. There he mimes a brief search for the girl and resumes the journey to Chalcis by climbing back onto his chariot. There his acting conveys an imaginary conversation with a hospes from Zacynthos. From Chalcis to Athens, he travels by boat; this can only be hinted at very briefly, as he is allowed no more than four words before he disembarks at home, in Athens. The actions need not be mimed entirely realistically, as the main objective is to express the raving and ranting of a madman. In a stage production, the enacting of the scene would probably contain a lot of swaying performed by Charinus - trying to keep the balance on the chariot which is wildly careering across the Mediterranean - and a gentler movement, representing the rolling of the boat, and at the same indicating Charinus’ gradual return to sanity.

currum: This could be (a) an imaginary chariot that Charinus pretends to mount, or, less likely, (b) a ‘real’ stage-prop, as they were used on the Greek stage, see Taplin (1977) 304, (c) a real or imaginary ship that he mounts on stage (metaphorical substitution of the verbum proprium as in Catul. 64.9 fecit volitantem flamine currum; like ὃχυμα or ὅχος for ναῷ, pace Lyne on Ciris 26). Considering that Charinus’ fantastic journey involves sea-travel, the last interpretation seems the most plausible, but then - if someone imagines to travel around the Mediterranean within a few minutes, he might as well imagine to do it in a flying chariot. On the metaphorical ‘flying’ of ships see Skutsch on Enn. Ann. 376; for the combination of the imagery of chariot-racing and nautical imagery with the motif of madness see Griffith on A. Pr. 883f. iam lora in manus cepi meas: this could be accompanied by an appropriate gesture. It would be funny if the actor performed a little pantomime, impersonating the gestures and posture of a charioteer.

932 EU. sanus non es. CH. quin, pedes, vos in curriculum conicitis

pedes: apostrophe directed at one’s feet, as if they were endowed with a life and will.

933 in Cyprum recta, quandoquidem pater mihi exilium parat?

recta: sc. via, ‘straight (on)’; it may imply ‘not along the coast-line’, as was the usual mode of travelling (at least by ship). It is notable that Charinus, after telling his feet to mount the chariot, does not use any verb to refer to his ‘ride’ to Cyprus, but simply says ‘straight on to Cyprus’, leaving the actual mode of transportation undetermined and thus
open to the spectator's imagination. Any verb expressing a concrete movement, e.g. ‘fly’, would interfere with that effect. pater mihi exilium parat: This is a strange complaint, for Charinus goes into ‘exile’ (at least this time) of his own free will, and even the last time he went abroad, it is not clear whether he was forced to or volunteered, as he is in two (or even more, cf. 345 decem animi) minds about it himself (82-84 he says to have volunteered, but 356-358 he bitterly complains about having been forced into exile by his father). However, his words should best not be forced: since Charinus thinks that his father sold the girl to a stranger, he must assume that it is his father who is ultimately responsible for the fact that he - Charinus - is now forced to go abroad.

934 EU. stultus es, noli istuc quaeso dicere. CH. certum exsequist, B c D / A B C D A B c d+ / A B c D; locus Jacobsohnianus in third D.

936 CH. nam hic quod dixit, id mentitust. EU. vera dixi equidem tibi. Charinus must be assumed to address himself and/or the audience. He is ‘cutting’ Eutychus (932-947). vera dixi: 902n.

937-950 A terse and vivid narrative of consecutive events, written in an appropriately jerky style in which conjunctions are scarcely used, which is a signal that Eutychus and Charinus are talking at cross purposes, cf. similar narratives e.g. at Cap. 502-513, Cu. 329-363, Mil. 200-216, Tru. 407-409.

938 CH. percontatus non inveni. EU. matris iam iram neglego. It would appear that Eutychus’ reason for not letting his friend see Pasicompsa straight away was matris iram (cf. 953f.). This is hard to understand, for Charinus’ appearance would be more likely to appease Dorippa than excite her, as he actually points out at the end of the scene (956).

939 CH. porro proficiscor quaesitum. nunc perveni Chalcidem; quaesitum: ‘first supine’, see 857n.

940 video ibi hospitem Zacyntho, dico quid eo advenerim, Charinus’ meeting of a hospes at Zacynthus is paralleled by the situation at the end of I.1, where he tells about his encounter with a hospes at Rhodes (97f.). The two scenes are connected by this motif, and probably were so in the Emporos. Zacyntho: ‘from Zacynthus’; adjectival use of the ablative of origin, see Lindsay (1907) 32. The mention of Zacynthus is unconvincingly used by Frank (1932) 243f. to date this play to the period after 191 BC, when Rome took over the island. It does not help either to point to lines 646f. as a proof that Plautus could assume “many of the soldiers and sailors who had served against Antiochus had returned and were present in the theater” were more
familiar with the topography of the Aegean. It is interesting that Rome attacked the island first in 211 BC, a date reasonably close to the supposed date of performance of the Mercator (in the last decade of the second century BC), but such evidence remains circumstantial.

941 rogito quis eam vexerit, quis habeat, si ibi indaudiverit. 

bb C dd A B c D / a bb C dd A B c D; IK of ib(i) ind-. indaudiverit: 'happen to hear', cf. 944; for the prefix ind- and its derivation from indu/endo (alternative forms of in) see Lindsay on Cap. 30, Enk ad loc. The verb occurs only in the perfect tenses, cf. e.g. Au. 264, Ph. 877, Afran. Com. fr. 68, Pacuv. Trag. fr. 32.

942 EU. quin tu istas omittis nugas ac mecum hue intro ambulas?

B C D / A B C D A / B C D / A B c D (mixed-type square verse). Enk ad loc. quotes Men. Sam. 658f., a close parallel: ἐφείς ἢ φλαμάρεις ταῦτα θάττων εἴσεθι εἴσω. The situation at Sam. 658-660 is similar to the present one, especially Moschion’s request to have a cloak and a sword brought outside for him from the house. In the present scene, the situation is reversed: Charinus is wearing a chlamys already, and sends for a pallium. intro ambulas: Here Eutychus’ tone is serious, and Plautus seems to avoid the use of the ambiguous introire (see 916n.), which would be more natural in this context, as this is the only instance of ambulas with intro in Plautus. Thus this line may serve as an indirect proof that the play on introire above is deliberate.

943 CH. hospes respondit Zacynthi ficos fieri non malas.

This rather odd piece of agricultural information is probably a double entendre. In 940, the Zacynthian hospes (the word may denote a kind of residential pimp, cf. 98-105) learns that Charinus is looking for a girl, and he answers by praising the local produce. In 944, sed marks a contrast, and if it does belong to the indirect speech (rather than introducing Charinus’ sentence), it indicates that the hospes has first spoken about other ‘figs’, but that he does not know anything about that specific one. The symbolism connected with figs can be divided conveniently into sexual and non-sexual, see Hunter on Eubul. fr. 74 and Arnott on Alexis fr. 122.1f. K-A; on σῶκον = ‘female pudenda’, see Taillardat (1962) 76, Henderson (1975) 135. On the sexual implications of ficus here see Frank (1932) 246f., Brinkhoff (1935) 53f., Schmidt (1959) 173; on fig symbolism in general see Buchheit (1960). André (1991) 185 mentions that σῶκον is used obscenely for the pudenda muliebria, but states cautiously (but mistakenly) that ficus is not used in the same way in Latin, although French figuattelle and Italian fica are. The same association occurs elsewhere, e.g. in the age of Shakespeare, see G. Williams A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature, vol. I (A-F), London - Atlantic Highlands/N.J 1994, s.v. ‘fig’ 1. non malas ‘not bad’; see 756n. (haud malast used of a woman).
945 hic Athenis esse. EU. Calchas iste quidem Zacynthiust.

hic Athenis: doubly incongruous, since Charinus has been pretending not to be in Athens. Now, however, he has no difficulty in switching back to ‘real’ topography. Secondly, as is pointed out by Leo in app. and Enk ad loc., who overlook the first incongruity, since the play is performed in Rome by actors who are merely pretending to be ‘in Athens’, this statement is actually doubly inverted. Calchas: direct mythological identification; for a list of such in Plautus (24 in total), see Hines (1973) 22f., cf. e.g. Ba. 122, 810, Cap. 274, Ps. 1063. Calchas is the soothsayer among the Greeks at Troy, who foretold the length of the war and advised the Greeks to build the wooden horse. Since one or more seers were regularly attached to every army, the jest fits the present situation (Charinus is still dressed as a soldier ‘mounted’ on his chariot) and is in keeping with Greek practice, cf. Men. Pk. 371f. (µάντιν ὁ στρατιώτης [περι(έγει / τοῦτον]) and see Gomme/Sandbach (1973) 495. As for the form of the nominative of this name, one would rather expect Calcha (gen. -ae) by the only other instance where Plautus uses it (Men. 748 novi cum Calcha simul). Instead, Plautus has Calchas (Κάλχας, Κάλχαντος), which one would expect to form a genitive Calchantis which is the usual form elsewhere, e.g. Calchanta, Verg. A. 2.122.

946 CH. navem conscendo, proficiscor ilico. iam sum domi,

navem: Charinus does not use the currus (cf. 931f.) that had brought him to Zacynthus in the first place. conscendo: ‘embark’, cf. Ba. 277, Ru. 63; not in Terence. The speed at which Charinus travels in his imagination (as a madman) is similar to that suggested at line 106 emi atque advexi heri. proficiscor: (cc DA) see 939n.

947 iam redii exilio. salve, mi sodalis Eutyches:

B cc D A bb C D A / B c D a / B c d+; hiatus after the first cletic (at D/A). The preposition ex (or a similar addition) inserted before exilio by Kampmann (accepted by Leo) is unnecessary metrically and grammatically, cf. 831 extollo mea domo patria pedem; Men. 277, 288 opsonatu redeo, Ov. Met. 1.698 redeuntem tolle Lycaeo.

The main comic telos of the mad-scene and the fantasy journey is this line of bathos, which in turn leads to Eutychus’ being invited to an imaginary dinner by Charinus. Zagagi (1995) 73f. has put forward convincing arguments that this passage (947-950) should be regarded as a Plautine expansion. Her observations on the way Plautus has managed to use the cena-motif ‘organically’ are interesting. “What is notable is that this insertion continues - indeed, brings to its logical conclusion - the previous scene. The imaginary, highly complex, part of the plot involving Charinus’ pretence of exile and madness is most probably taken from Philemon; but the invitation to dinner is, to the Roman audience, the most natural sequel to that scene. The analogy between Philemon and Plautus in exploiting the device of role-playing is quite striking, but
Plautus' addition of the Roman element of the dinner puts into its proper perspective his
highly improvisatory mode of expression in Mercator.” salve ... Eutyches: cf. 387; Cu.
16, Ep. 17, Tri. 50. The situation is not yet quite 'normal', for although Charinus
recognizes Eutychus, he pretends to have returned from a long journey, and his friend's
greetings are merely implied: parody of a formal greeting routine (Ba. 536, Ep. 7-9, Tri.
1127), also parodied at Cu. 561; similarly burlesqued greeting routines: Ba. 184-187,
Cu. 306f., Ep. 395. Greeting a friend upon return from a dangerous sea-journey is a
motif that derives from tragedy, see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 503, and is adopted by New
Comedy, see Blume (1998) 156 n.82. The reversal of the more natural sequence (the one
who stayed at home greets the one who returns) can be explained by the fact that it
would never occur to Eutychus to 'greet' someone who has actually never left his side.
Eutychus' pedestrian conclusion, 'the man is mad' (951), leaves the audience happily
laughing at the success of Charinus' play-acting. The scene ends when Eutychus leads
the way to his home, where the girl is waiting, and thus administers the only effective
'cure' for Charinus' 'madness' (951f.). mi: vocative of meus (against the MSS mihi) is
needed, as salve mihi, sodalis Eutycbos, which was suggested by Ritschel, is a Germanism,
see Brix (1857) 657.

949 bene vocas, benigne dicis: cras apud te, nunc domi.
bene vocas: 'kind of you to ask', cf. Tru. 127 bene dicis benigneque vocas; used for
declining invitations politely, see Gratwick on Men. 387; also used ironically, see Collart
on Cu. 563. cras apud te, nunc domi: hysteron proteron. The idea behind this is that of
an invitation to a cena adventicia (δεῖπνον ηὐποδεκτικὸν, 'reception dinner', described by
Plut. Quaest conviv. 727B as a particularly Roman institution) in honour of a friend's
safe return from abroad as is clear from the second half of the line; cf. Ba. 94, 186f.,
536f., Cu. 251-253, 384-388, 561f. salvos quom advenis/in Epidaurum, hic hodie apud
me - numquam delinges salem, 728, Ep. 7f., Mo. 1044ff., 1129, Per. 710, Poen. 1151,
St. 470f., 512f.; Cic. Att. 4.5.4; Verg. A. 1.637-642, 695-756, Hor. Carm. 1.36; Iuv.
emendation is pedantic in its attempt to reconstruct a complete symmetry of the
statement and deviates further from the paradosis than nunc. The confusion may have
arisen through a misreading of a common ligature for nunc (e.g. nf or nÊ) for n, a
common ligature for non.

950 sic decet, sic fieri oportet. EU. eloquenter somnias!
eloquenter somnias Niemeyer : eloqueni somnias codd. The text of the MSS is corrupt
and obelized by Leo. Niemeyer (see Enk in app.), and Brakman (1923) 133f. made the
attractive suggestion to read eloquenter somnias, assigning to Eutychus an oxymoron
mocking Charinus’ verbosity. Niemeyer’s conjecture yields a metrically intact lecythion.
The corruption that may have led to eloqueni can be explained palaeographically:
Eloquemi would be a misread abbreviation in the majuscule text ELOQUEf(N) (containing a ligature -NT for -NTER), which in turn was an abbreviation of ELOQUENTER. Lindström (1907) 110 suggested eloquein<s> somnia[s], taking the phrase as a continuation of oportet, which, according to him takes only the accusative and infinitive in early Roman drama. However, he has to assume that sic in this case points to what follows, but it is used by Charinus to refer back to the fictitious invitations made by him in the preceding line. To assume an ambiguous relationship to both preceding and following line in this case would mean to force text. somnias: ‘(day-)dream’ and, by extension, ‘talk nonsense’, see Langen (1882) 771, cf. e.g. Am. 697, Cu. 546, Mo. 954, 1013, Ru. 343, 1327. Terence uses the verb less frequently (three times), both literally and metaphorically. Daydreaming is a proverbial characteristic of lovers, cf. Verg. Ecl. 8.108, Pub. Syr. 16 amans quod suspicatur vigilans somniant.

Charinus’ elaborate and fantastic daydream towards the end of the play is the counterpart to Demipho’s dream narrative towards its beginning (225-251). Both passages are of similar length, and they are introduced with a similar complaint: miris modis di ludos faciunt hominibus (225) and omnibus me ludificatur hic modis (920). The gods are identified as the agents of Demipho’s ‘supernatural’ ludificatio, while Eutychus is accused of being the agent of Charinus’ ‘natural’ ludificatio.

951 hic homo non sanust. CH. medicari amicus quin properas <mihi>?

bb C D A B cc D a B C D aa B c D with shortening of line-initial hic hom-, similar to the shortening of the same fixed syntagma at 325. The shortening is analogous to that of hiequidem (--- instead of ——). hic homo non sanust: cf. 325 hic homo ex amore insanit; a jibe directed at Charinus. This type of ‘third-person address’, in which a scathing or reproachful comment about one’s opponent is made audibly in his presence, either as a parting shot or during the quarrel itself, is not uncommon in many literary genres, and it may well have a feature of everyday speech, cf. Am. 402, Men. 390, Mo. 38f., 571. For examples in Greek tragedy, see Bain (1977) 78, for Plato, see D. Tarrant CQ N.S. 8 (1958) 159, for Aristophanes, cf. Nub. 491, V. 168, Eccl. 811. Bain (1977) 129, 131, and Blundell (1980) 52 plausibly identify some Menandrian examples of third-person address. See also the excellent example at Theocr. Id. 15.89ff. This form of abusive comment is common enough in Plautus (see Lodge s.v. homo II C); expressions of the type hic homo insanus est do not occur in Terence or the comic fragments. hic homo: the usual word-order; inverse order (homo hic) only at Am. 574, Cic. Pro Rosc. 6.17, see Luchs (1872) 274, Frost on Am. 574. medicari amicus quin properas <mihi>?: for the friend-and-doctor theme cf. 489, 472; of the friend as doctor is very old, cf. e.g. Achilles and Patroclus in the Iliad, see Fantham (1972) 17, comparing Cu. 160, Men. 98f., Mo. 387 habe bonum animum: ego istum lepide medicabo metum; add Cis. 74 si medicus veniat qui huic morbo facere medicinam potest (the loved one is the
only effective physician); see further Mudry (1980). The *medicus*-motif may also be linked to Apollo, to whom Dorippa's prayer is addressed (cf. 675-680), although in the play Eutychus, by looking after his friend Charinus, takes over the role of Apollo the Healer, whereas in Dorippa's prayer Apollo is asked to look after Eutychus' welfare.

*medicari*: cf. *An*. 831 (with reference to *animum aegrotum*, *An*. 193); the absence of *sanare* from the works of Plautus and Terence (whereas the word *sanas* is widely used) is noteworthy; *OLD s.v. sano* 1a mentions Caecil. *Com.* 262 as its first occurrence.

952 EU. sequere sis. CH. sequor. EU. clementer quaeso, calces deteris.

One of Charinus' prominent character traits is his impatience; typical of the *adulescens amator*, cf. e.g. 137. *calces deteris*: cf. *Ba*. 929 *non pedibus termento fuit*; Tib. 1.9.16.

953-956 This brief delay at the end of the scene is probably Plautine (as in similar other cases), providing time for the actor playing Charinus to change dress and re-appear as Lysimachus or Demipho at 957, see Frank (1932) 243-248, Hough (1940a) 46 n.34. Thierfelder (1929) 45 and Jachmann (1931) 239 considered the passage to be a rather short monologue-turned-dialogue deriving from the Greek model; Zagagi (1995) 77 has spelled out this hypothetical 'monologue': *pacem componi volo / meo patri cum matre: nam nunc est irata / propter istanc. ergo cura*. On the analogy of *Tri*. 582-590 and *Poen*. 428-441, this is quite possible but hard to substantiate. Zagagi (1995) 77 states rightly: "This hypothesis of the substitution by Plautus of dialogue-scenes for monologues occurring in his Greek models has rendered unnecessary any of these 'either/or' approaches [my italics] to any of these scenes. Rather, it is Plautus' reliance on the original situation for dramatizing it in a new, more vivid manner that is in evidence in the dialogue pattern quoted above."

This is a clear refutation of the theory that that most of V.2 could not have been in the Emporos, see e.g. Lefèvre (1995) 37f. and 46. However, if this passage was indeed re-worked in the fashion Zagagi proposes, it should be investigated whether this sheds any light on the similar use of *i modo* in the *Trinummus* (582-590), where one character wants another one to go off alone and remains on stage after the other's exit to deliver a monologue, see Loitold (1956) 62.

Since the same motif is found in two plays that derive from Greek models by Philemon, one should allow for the possibility that it was Philemon who broke up what could - in another play - well have been a monologue into a lively dialogue. Jachmann (1931) 241, for example, attributes the passage to the Greek original: "Im Mercator 954-55 drängt Charinus den Eutychus mit dreimaligem *i modo* zum Abgang. Aber hier liegt kein Grund vor, dies Dialogstückchen dem Original abzusprechen: es bietet keinen Anstosz, lässt sich auch nicht ohne weiteres streichen, denn was Eutychus sagt - *pacem componi volo meo patri cum matre egs* - gehört wirklich in die Handlung." For a similar technique cf. *Men. D.E.* 59f. ...

*άκολοουθεὶ καὶ λαβέ / ... ἀκολοθεὶ καὶ λαβέ.*
954 meo patri cum matre: nam nunc est irata - CH. i modo.

i modo: ‘just go!'; the repetitions underline the urgency, cf. Tri. 582-590 and Poen. 426-431, 731-740, 1351-1353, Men. 941-944. They are probably accompanied by some gesturing (e.g. movements of the arms), see Taladoire (1951) 22. On repetition jokes in dialogue, see also Gratwick on Men. 621-625.

956 tam propitiam reddam quam quom propitiast Iuno Iovi.

propitiam: commonly used in religious language, see 678n.; here used of a human being, and then, in a surprising comparison, of a deity. This throws light on the use of iratus at 954, which is of course referring to Dorippa, but also currently used to refer to the unfavourable attitude of a deity in Plautus, see Hanson (1959) 71. quam quom propitiast Iuno - Iovi: not exactly a promising perspective, if one is to judge by the ancients’ beliefs about Juno’s temperament: the last word is παρὰ προοδόκων. It is just possible that this is also an allusion to the fact that Juno, the patron goddess of Carthage, was indeed reconciled with Jupiter, the state god of Rome, towards and after the end of the Second Punic War (cf. Serv. A. 1.281, 12.841)? For the background of Juno’s reconciliation, especially as related in the epics of Ennius and Vergil, see Feeney (1990) passim. From both an historical and a literary point of view, the most significant supplication to Juno was that of 207 BC (cf. Liv. 27.37.7) when a carmen by Livius Andronicus was sung, see Feeney (1990) 361.

III. Discussion

This scene elaborates on the theme of exilium amoris, but unlike examples of this type in Greek New Comedy, sight is lost of the theme of the son leaving his father’s house to serve as a mercenary because he could (or would) not face his father’s wrath because of some peccatum. Instead, the main part of the scene focuses on Charinus’ imaginary chariot-ride in search of his beloved Pasicompsa. In Terence, several young men consider (albeit not seriously) the possibility of exsilia, cf. Ht. 111f., Ph. 243f., Ad. 385.

Lefèvre (1995) 37f., following Ritschl (1854) ix, Langen (1886) 159f., and Fraenkel (1922) 70 and 225, takes this scene as a prime example of Plautine discontinuity and, following his neo-analytic approach, comes to the verdict that “almost nothing” in this scene could have been in the Emporos. It is quite telling that Lefèvre’s description of what constituted the oikovouξα of the fifth act in Philemon, Lefèvre (1995) 40, is rather thin. If one eliminates all of V.2 from the last act, what remains is dull, and if one removes almost all of V.4 as well, nothing much remains at all, and one would have to compose a new play for Philemon, since there would be no remains from the Mercator to go by.
I. Introduction

Demipho and Lysimachus enter in mid-dialogue. In their very brief dialogue Lysimachus reveals that his wife is very angry because of the girl in her house. At 961 Lysimachus announces that his son is coming from the house and, overhearing the one-line entrance monologue (962), is delighted to learn that his wife’s anger has been allayed (placet principium, 963).

It is possible that there was an act-break after 956 in the Greek original. Without an interlude four actors would be required in 956f., where the simultaneous exit of Charinus and Eutychus is followed by the entrance of Demipho and Lysimachus. Despite difficulties, on which see most recently Blume (1998) 64-69, the preponderance of evidence points to the general application of a ‘soft’ three-actor rule in New Comedy, see e.g. Frost (1988) 2f.

Moreover, an act-break at this point would cover for off-stage action at the harbour, where Lysimachus needs to search for Demipho (802-957) and discuss the state of affairs with him. Yet this does not necessarily imply that the Emporos contained more action towards end than the Mercator. If there was an act-break after 956 in Philemon’s play, Plautus may just as well have telescoped the dialogue between Lysimachus and Demipho at this point. It is peculiar how Lysimachus turns against Demipho in V.4, especially since Demipho has promised him to clear his good name and talk to his wife (960). Lysimachus’ behaviour could be explained much better by assuming that a longer quarrel between them preceded the action of V.4.

The entry of two characters in mid-conversation, which although rare in tragedy and in Old Comedy outside the first scene (though cf. e.g. Eur. Hipp. 601; Ar. Ran. 830) had become more common by the time of Menander, as playwrights began to appreciate the benefits of this technique for the creation of a ‘back-stage world’, see Handley on Dysc. 233. These include: (a) the more naturalistic treatment of the entry of characters; (b) the ability to achieve continuity in the action without repeating the details of previous scenes: the characters arrive midway through their discussion and, by an oblique reference to the facts or events previously heard or seen by the audience, enable the spectators to comprehend the new situation before them.

The technique is common in Plautus, e.g. Cas. 437, Per. 329, St. 579, Tri. 729, 1125, Tru. 775, and Terence, e.g. Eu. 818, An. 820, Hec. 577. For further details, see Leo (1908) 42f., Frost (1988) 10f., Loitold (1956) 76.
II. Commentary

957 DE. quasi tu numquam quicquam adsimile huius facti feceris.

bb C D A B C dd a / B C D A B c d+; metrical hiatus at A/B juncture (-le / hui-);
disyllabic hui(i)us. Lysimachus has fetched Demipho from the forum, and this line introduces them in mid-conversation, obviously after Lysimachus has reprimanded Demipho. This parallels what the simia is predicted to do in Demipho's dream, cf. 234f., 242-244. quasi: opening a sentence with omission of the main clause, cf. e.g. Caes. B.G. 7.38. adsimile: also found at Tru. 563, cf. Ba. 951 adsimiliter; not in Terence; perhaps a calque of παράμοιος, see Ernout on Ba. 951; like similis, consimilis (Cap. 116), persimilis (Per. 698), regularly used with the genitive.

958 LY. edepol numquam; cavi ne quid facerem. via vivo miser.

facerem: picks up facti feceris of the previous line; perhaps a double entendre: for facio 'to do it' instead of an indelicate verb see Adams (1982) 204. In 714f., pudicius / factunt quam illi qui non fiunt rustici, a similar undertone may be intended.

959 nam mea uxor propter illam tota in fermento iacet.

in fermento iacet: cf. Cas. 325 nunc in fermento totast, for the idea also Mo. 699 tota turget mihi uxor, scio, domi, Petr. Sat. 76, Iuv. Sat. 3.187f., Pers. 1.24; see MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 325, Otto (1890) 133, Sutphen (1902) 130, Fantham (1972) 13; cf. also the use of peracescere at Au. 468, Ba. 1099, on which see Reis (1962) 217f., and Cis. 240 ei me <tot tam> acerba facere in corde!.

960 DE. at ego expurigationem habebo, ut ne suscenseat.

expurigationem habebo: 'I'll have a clearing up' = 'I'll clear you', which is slightly odd, as Am. 965 habui expurigationem; facta pax est refers to the speaker ('I've cleared myself'), not a third party (cf. the expression orationem habeo); for the use of purgo in similar contexts cf. Cas. 944, Mil. 497, 517.

961 LY. sequere me. sed exeuntem filium video meum.

The announcement of another character leaving the house (by using a 'stage-directional phrase') is conventional in Greek and Roman drama. sequere me: Cf. 816.
962-963 There are four empty lines in B after 961. The scribe of the archetype ended here. At 962 a new scribe began with 963 instead of 962, leading to an inversion of the lines in the MSS. It was restored by Pylades, see Lindsay (1896) 47, Zwierlein (1990) 42.

962 EU. ad patrem ibo, ut matris iram sibi esse sedatam sciat.
B c D A / B c D A / bb c D A B c D (mixed-type square verse); sib(i) ess- (bb): IK. Eutychus talks back into the house, probably to Charinus (or Syra) and Pasicompsa. Some time has elapsed during V.3. In this interval Eutychus and Charinus have persuaded Dorippa of Lysimachus' innocence. It is peculiar that Eutychus says he is going ad patrem, for (a) this would usually be taken to mean his father's house, which is the building he is supposed to leave (he and Charinus entered at 956), and (b) how is he supposed to know his father's whereabouts (cf. 797, where Lysimachus says to himself ibo ad forum)? It is clear from these considerations that this line is a theatrical ploy, and its only raison d'être is to motivate Eutychus' appearance on stage. He is actually never meant to search for Lysimachus, but to meet him right there on stage.

963 iam redeo. LY. placet principium. quid agis? quid fit, Eutycbe?
iam redeo: 'I'll be back soon', 385n. placet principium: 'capital start!' alliterative and formulaic, cf. Am. 801, St. 358, 672.

964 EU. optima opportunitate ambo advenistis. LY. quid Rei est?
Comically inflated language, cf. e.g. Ep. 203, Mo. 573f.; Hec. 626f., Ad. 322, see Schmidt (1959) 35, Haffter (1934) 41. optima opportunitate: ablative of attendant circumstances, see 811n.; Plautus and Terence use opportune more frequently (Ep. 203 is the only parallel). réfıt occurs as an iamb in c D/, not a B/ positions (cf. Ep. 203, Ru. 487), much more frequently undergoing synizesis, see Gratwick on Men. 323. Here it also undergoes aphaeresis.

965 EU. uxor tibi placida et placatast. cette dextras nunciam.
uxor: Talking to his father, Eutychus does not say 'mother' but 'your wife'; at 810 and 923, talking to Syra and Charinus respectively, he refers to her as mater. placida et placatast: alliterative and formulaic, cf. Lucr. 5.1154. dextras = dexteras; see 149n. nunciam: always trisyllabic in Plautus; used mainly with imperatives referring to the immediate future, see Langen (1880) 285-288; disyllabic munc iam (e.g. Ep. 135) refers to a contrast with past action, see Stockert on Au. 81.
966 LY. di me servant. EU. tibi amicam esse nullam nuntio.

B C D A / bb c D A / B c D A B c D; tibi a- (bb c): ‘prosodic’ hiatus; metrical hiatus at A/B juncture (-cam es-), amicam thus being doubly emphasized. For the rare ‘prosodic’ hiatus after the latter element of bb (also dd) cf. 286, see in general Lindsay (1922) 248-250, Soubiran (1988) 252f., Gratwick (1993) 254.

Eutychus turns to Demipho, telling him that he will no longer be able to keep his amica, or rather, that he never had one in the first place. Eutychus’ knowledge about the fact that Demipho had acquired Pasicompsa as his amica is not motivated anywhere in the play. This has been taken as an inconsistency and ascribed to Plautine intervention, see Wehrli (1936) 61f., Braun (1980) 63f., Lefèvre (1995) 39. Wehrli (1934) 61 is particularly unhappy with the fact that Eutychus keeps Charinus from entering the house because he seems to think that his father is the owner (and lover) of Pasicompsa (897-899, 905f., 923ff.) and that the short period of time covered by V.3 cannot have been sufficient to inform Eutychus of the true state of affairs. However, Harsh (1937) 291f. has shown that one has to exercise caution and discretion when taking the unexplained knowledge of a detail of which a character is supposedly ignorant as an indication of Roman originality. He concludes that “small matters do not mar the effectiveness of a play and doubtless were often entirely overlooked by the audience” due to the special optique du théâtre.

In the present case, two points may be mentioned to invalidate the objections: (a) Upon leaving Lysimachus’ house, Eutychus says that his mother’s (i.e. Dorippa’s) ira is sedata, that Dorippa has been placated (962). This presupposes, in turn, that Dorippa now knows that Lysimachus is not the owner (nor the amator) of Pasicompsa. The audience will, if they think about the problem at all while watching the play, come to the conclusion that the misunderstandings were somehow (and ‘somehow’ is just exact enough) resolved in the backstage world. It should not be forgotten that by now quite a few people are assembled in Lysimachus’ house: Pasicompsa entered for good at 543, Dorippa at 792, Syra at 829, Charinus and Eutychus at 956. For the duration of the short dialogue 957-961, they are together in the house, and when Eutychus leaves, he is the messenger (966 nuntio) of their joint considerations and decisions, and to reach these may have taken longer than the time that was needed to speak the few lines of V.3. Again, the playwright shows decorum by not confronting a matrona with a meretrix on stage. (b) Upon interrogation, Pasicompsa will have reported Lysimachus’ words tuo ero redempta es rursum (529) and that she knows this erus to be an old man (cf. 524, 541). Given these pieces of information, Charinus and Eutychus can put two and two together.

There is nothing unnatural in all this; it is no “schwerer Verstoß gegen die Sorgfaltspflicht des Dramatikers”, as Braun (1980) 63 judges. There is nothing that would justify Braun’s interesting but speculative ‘reconstruction’ of a scene, to be imagined after 956, where Eutychus eavesdrops on a heated debate between Lysimachus...
and Demipho over what is going to be done with the girl. Braun would see such a scene as the necessary counterpart of the announcement of a quarrel between the simia and Demipho in the dream (234-246). The dream narrative, however, should not be taken as an infallible guide to the minuta of the following action. Rather, it will have left the audience with the impression (and not more) that Demipho will not succeed in whatever he has planned to do with the capra. In ancient drama, dream narratives indeed have an expository function, but more importantly they are used for the characterization of the dreamers, to motivate changes in the behaviour and attitudes of the dreamers, and - in comedy - exploited for their immediate humorous content. Their value as a means of prediction of future dramatic action is limited.

di me servant: ‘thank Heavens!’; used by Characters who have just escaped from a real or imagined danger to their life, love, or money, e.g. Ps. 613 (similarly di me servatum volunt / cupiunt, e.g. Ru. 1164), see Hanson (1959) 74. Terence does not use this phrase, but cf. instances of servat + name of a deity, see Mc Glynn s.v. servo; twice it is Jupiter (Ph. 807, Eu. 1049f.), twice Iuno Lucina (An. 473, Ad. 487), once Salus (Ad. 762).

967 DE. di te perdant! quid negotist nam, quaeso, istuc? EU. eloquar.
B C D A / B c D A / B C D A / B c d+ (square verse type I). di te perdant!: ‘go to hell!’; see 710n. The phrase echoes di me servant, the addressee being Eutychus; Demipho is reluctant to yield the girl to anyone else. quid negotist nam, quaeso, istuc?: ‘Would you be kind enough to explain what all this is about, now?’

968 animum advortite igitur ambo. DE. quin tibi ambo operam damus.
Lindsay in app. suggests that the second half of the line may be spoken by Lysimachus and Demipho. This would certainly be an effective way of producing this line, and the technique of synchronous delivery of words may have been used in Roman comedy, see Loitold (1956) 67, cf. Cas. 800, Men. 1084, Ru. 1048f., 1423. Yet, there are many examples of statements in the first person plural that do not need to be assigned to two actors, and the present line belongs to that class.

969 EU. qui bono sunt genere nati, <si> sunt ingenio malo,
bono genere nati: ‘from a good family’; denoting membership of a higher social class (bonus a social term like αὐχενικός), see Stockert on Au. 212, Hellegouarc’h (1972) 488, cf. Am. 365, 614, Cis. 24, Ep. 107, 169, Per. 645, Poen. 1201, Ph. 115, Cato Or. fr. 42 Cugusi bonis, bono genere gnatis. The good-bad-dualism, one of the leitmotifs of the Mercator, is invoked again, cf. 145-149, 510-513. Here it is underlined by an effective play on genus and ingenium, rather like the well-known adage that ‘nobility’ should reflect the status of ‘noble’ people instead of being a privilege gained by birth. Genus is
by definition not subject to change, whereas *ingenium* is (cf. *Ba.* 613, *Tri.* 303f). A similar word-play on the root *γεν-* is 오χ η πολις σου το γενος εγγενες ποιει/σει δ' εγγενεις ην πολιν προσων κολος (quoted by Ribbeck on *Com. inc.* 94 as ‘Philemon fr. 189’, not in K-A). *ingenio malo*: ‘of evil disposition’.

970 suapte culpa degenerascunt, genus ingenio improbant.  
*B c D A / B cc D A / bb C dd A / B c D*; synizesis of suapte, metrical hiatus before final cretic. *suapte*: emphatic suffix -pte, used with personal and possessive pronouns, especially in the ablative case, see *LHS* I 466, Gratwick on *Men.* 1059, and cf. e.g. *Mo.* 156, *Ps.* 803, *Tru.* 471, *Pho.* 766, *Cic.* *Tusc.* 1.40, *De orat.* 2.98, 3.10. *degenerascunt* Dunsch: *genere captunt* codd.: *degeneres fiunt* Colvius, Lindsay dub. *For a discussion of the attempts at healing the corrupt line see Lindström (1907) 113f. What is needed to fill the gap is a word or word-group of the metrical structure *B c D A*. The verb *degenerasco* is not attested in any classical author, but in *Gloss.* V 188.28 (see *ThLL* V.1 381.68), it is glossed with *degenerare*, which in turn is glossed *degenerat a genere suo dissimilat, ... parentes degenerare εξεγενεσθαι, έποκαμψθαι*. The form *generascunt* ‘they come into being’ is found at *Lucil.* 3.745; cf. also *Cic.* *Prov.* 18 *utinam filii ne degeneravissent a gravitate patria*! In view of this, one might try *degenerascunt* (*B cc D A*). *genus ingenio improbant*: cf. *Tri.* 1049 *eorum ex ingenio ingenium ... probant* for the phrasing.

971 DE. verum hic dicit. LY. tibi ergo dicit. EU. eo illud est verum magis.  
*B C D A / bb C D aa B c D / A B c d*; *IK of fib|i) er- (bb), -it. :: e(o) illud est: a curious sequence a/a BcD (split resolution).

972 nam te istac aetate haud aequom filio fuerat tuo  

973 adulescenti amanti amicam eripere emptam argento suo.  
*adulescenti amanti*: ‘young lover’; in the lists of dramatis personae and the metrical *argumenta*, both of which were not composed in Plautus’ time, see Gratwick (1987) 228, the ‘young lover’ is not referred to in this way, but merely as *adulescens*. In the plays themselves, the ‘young lover’ is regularly called *adulescens* or *adulescens amans* rather than *amator* (first at *Apul. Fl.* 16). The present participle *amans* used as an attributive complement denotes that someone is ‘in love’, whereas the *nomen agentis* ending in -tor carries an overtone of habitual behaviour or posturing, a person whose essence it is ‘to do the job of loving the girl’, see Brown on *Lucr.* 4.1177, cf. *Cic.* *Tusc.* 4.27 and Don. *Ter. An.* 49. *eripere*: see 341n. *argento suo*: ‘with his own money’; Charinus has made a lot of money through trading, actually more than his father had
anticipated (cf. 94f.), and that, as a consequence, he was able to put on one side a peculium (95f.); on peculium see 96n. The reference to Charinus' 'own money' can only very loosely be taken to be legally correct; it is, however, correct in Greek legal terms, under which the son did have some control over his finances. Yet, the use of yet another possessive pronoun at line-end (tu - suo) emphasizes that Demipho had no 'natural' right or claim to interfere with his son's 'business'.

975 DE. ille quidem illam sese ancillam matri emisse dixerat.
dixerat: pluperfect for perfect, as in 972; see 760n. The first person to tell Demipho about this was Acanthio (cf. 211f.) who had spun that yarn in order to save Charinus' neck (cf. 200-202).

976-1004 A flagitatio scene full of delightful abuse, in the style of improvised drama. Flagitatio was a widely used form of rough justice sanctioned by popular custom, by means of which a complainant can seek redress by exposing an offender to public ridicule, e.g. a man whose property had been stolen could attempt to regain it by subjecting the offender to a barrage of insults and demands for the return of the property, see Scafreo (1997) 185f., cf. Mo. 568-654, Ps. 357-380, Catul. 25 and 42.

976 EU. propterea igitur tu mercatu's, novos amator, vetus puer?
novos amator, vetus puer: oxymoron and parallelism; vetus is depreciatory, see 291n.; on the vetus-puer motif see 292n. and 296n. mercatu's: sc. illam; a reference to the title of the play (cf. 10); Demipho is just as much a mercator as Charinus is. amor: 'lover'; the term is not abusive in itself, but can be used abusively, cf. As. 921-925, see Lilja (1965) 68. In the present case, it seems to be strongly contrasted as a description of Demipho as 'habitual' lover, whereas Charinus has been called amans above (973).

977 LY. optume <me>hercle, perge, ego adsistam hinc altrinsecus.
B c D a B c D a / bb C D A B c dv; with IK (eg(o) ad- set as bb) at the head of the lecythion. <me>hercle Dunsch. The MSS have optume hercle perge ego adsistam alterinsecus; Guyet suggested perge <perge>, Ritschl perge <porro>, Leo perge <tu>, Lindsay followed the MSS. Guyet's conjecture is attractive, but there is no need for a strongly emphasized imperative. The personal pronoun suggested by Leo is unnecessary; for the omission of the pronoun in similar contexts cf. e.g. Au. 363 curate, ego intervisam, Cis. 773 i prae, iam ego te sequar. Ritschl's perle porro occurs at As. 472, Mil. 386 (at line-end), St. 544 (mid-line); it is solely used to ask another interlocutor to continue to speak to the person who asks perge porro, but not to someone else. It seems easier to assume the loss of me- by haplography and read <me>hercle. Meherc(u)le, the longer form of hercle, derived from ita me Hercules iuget, see Barsby on Eu. 67, is much rarer than hercle (twice in Terence, three times in Plautus). Yet, it is found specifically
linked with terms of evaluation (cf. Ru. 1365 bene mehercle, Eu. 416 pulchre, Cic. Att. 1.8.1 vir mehercle optimus). Usually, mehercle is disyllabic (me(her)cule), yet trisyllabic forms are found (cf. Ps. 1175, Ru. 1365, Eu. 67, 416, Phaedr. 5.5.22). adsistam ... altrinsecus: cf. Ps. 357 adsiste altrim secus atque onera hunc maledictis.

978 quibus est dictis dignus usque oneremus ambo. DE. nullus sum.
dictis = maledictis. usque: ‘utterly’, used absolutely, cf. Ba. 1095, 1125, Cap. 269, Cu. 447, Ep. 311, Mil. 768, Poen. 701, Ps. 545, Ht. 138, Ad. 213, 559, 715. oneremus: metaphorical, cf. Mil. 903, Per. 182, Ps. 357, 764, An. 827. ambo: Lysimachus joins Eutychus in abusing Demipho. Nadjo (1971) 105f. is right in pointing out that Lysimachus’ malicious behaviour in this scene, turning against his friend and co-schemer Demipho, may be explained by the fact that he had developed an interest in the girl himself and is jealous of Demipho. Demipho’s remark at 997 seems to point in the same direction. nullus sum: cf. 164, 217, 468; for the weakening of final -s to secure B c D/ see 232n. and cf. 217. Verb + enclitic monosyllable is the main pattern in which -s may be weakened or dropped, see Gratwick on Men. 999.

979 EU. filio suo qui innocenti fecit tantam iniuriam.
inconsenti: perhaps the wrong attribute for a young man under patria potestas who bought a prostitute and tried to smuggle her into his father’s household under the pretence of her being a present for his mother. However, this is Plautopolis; regarding Charinus as the ‘good’ party in this affair makes the altercation more fun for the abusers.

981 nam ibat exulatum. DE. an abiit? LY. etiam loquere, larua?
ibat exulatum: ‘he was about to go into exile’. an abiit?: ‘Well, is he gone now?’; Demipho uses the perfect to ask for more precise information. The question may be taken as an expression of his hope that Charinus has in fact left the country (which would solve the problem in a different way). This is why Demipho’s apparently innocent question provokes such a strong reaction from Lysimachus, see Blänsdorf (1967) 64 n.1. larua: ‘old spook’; see Lindsay on Cap. 598, Stockert on Au. 642. Originally, larvae ‘ghosts’ (cf. Am. 777, Au. 642, Men. 890) were believed to be demons of the Underworld (cf. Sen. Apoc. 9.3; Plin. Nat. praef. 31), but came to be identified with the spirits of the dead, especially those of bad men (as opposed to the Manes). They were represented as skeletons (cf. Petr. 34.8) or as marked by the pallor characteristic of ghosts (cf. Apul. Met. 9.29-31); both may be alluded to here, meaning that Demipho is addressed as a pale-faced ‘bag of bones’, an Acherunticus (cf. 290). This seems more likely than the explanation given by Enk ad loc. and MacCary/Willcock on Cas. 592 (‘madman’). It is not Demipho’s ‘madness’ that is objected to, but his age. Larua is, as always in Plautus, trisyllabic with a vocalic v, see Meiser (1998) 93, Soubiran (1995) 108 n.1.
temperare istac aetate istis decet te artibus

istac aetate: cf. 972. te artibus: A B c d+ with metrical hiatus at A/B before the last cretic.

vacuum esse istac ted aetate his decebat noxiis

Ritschl (followed by Goetz and LHS II 107) regarded this line as a dittography and conflated it with 982 (temperare istac ted aetate his decebat noxiis). Abraham (1884) 184f., followed by Leo and Zwierlein (1992) 61 n.132, bracketed the line for philological reasons, finding the form vacuum, used with the ablative, the plural form noxiae un-Plautine, and the use of the imperfect decebat faulty, as the line refers to the present and not the past. The paradosis is defended by Thierfelder (1929) 85f., Enk ad loc., and Blänsdorf (1967) 61 as being aimed at the rhetorical effect of the responsion between Lysimachus' and Eutychus' flyting. It has to be conceded to Abraham that it is possible that instead of vacuum Plautus wrote indeed vocivom, but this form of the word could undergo IK, thus leaving the metre of the line unchanged. The plural noxiis corresponds to the plural artibus in 982; it is also attested at Hec. 310 and in Cicero (Plautus uses the singular elsewhere).

itidem ut tempus anni, aetatem aliquam alium factum condecet;

Another jibe at Demipho's old age (cf. 972, 982); senectus is paralleled with hiems, as youth is with spring, see Dehon (1993) 28 n.66., cf. Tri. 398, Tru. 353.

nam si istuc ius est, senecta aetate scortari senes

istuc: pointing forward to the appositional explanatory clause, cf. e.g. Am. 590, Mil. 878, Mo. 208f., Ru. 717, Ht. 910, see Keller (1946) 307f. ius est: `it is right'; cf. Au. 747, Ru. 978, Ad. 686, Cic. Off. 3.42, see OLD s. v. ius 7. This phrase leads to two others taken from the sphere of law and politics, and prepare for more (e.g. 991, 996, 1006 - an indirect invitation to the audience to 'judge this case for themselves'), leading up to the law-giving spoof at 1015-1025. senecta: rare and mostly ante-classical adjective used with or without aetas; cf. Am. 1032, Au. 253, Cas. 240, 244, 259, Cist. 48, Mil. 623, Mo. 217, Tri. 43, Ad. 954, Lucr. 3.772 (membra), 5.886, 896. The noun senectus refers to Old Age in personifications, cf. As. 18, Men. 756f., St. 568, Tri. 381, 398, An. 887, Ph. 434, 575, 1023, Hec. 119, Ad. 833. scortari: 'pick up tarts', a rude expression.

ubi locist res summa nostra publica? DE. ei, perii miser!

The pater familias is here seen as the representative of the res publica in the sphere of his own family, see Bettini (1986) 25. ubi locist (bb c D by IK) = ubi loci est, cf. ποιδ γῆς; also e.g. Cap. 958, Ru. 1161. res summa nostra publica: formulaic expression of
high emotional appeal; parodied at Cap. 901 *illic hinc abitit, mihi rem summam credidit cibarim. ei, perii miser!*: ‘oh no! I’m done for!’, cf. Am. 668, St. 388.

987 LY. adulescentes rei agendae isti magis solent operam dare.

*b*b *C*D*A / *b*b *C*D*A / *b*b *C*D*aA *B*b *C*d+; IK of *magis*, shortening of monosyllabic *rei* in ‘prosodic’ hiatus. *rei agendae isti*: maybe ambiguous, playing on the meanings of *res publica* ‘public affairs’ and *res* ‘private affaire’ (see 535n.). For the legal technical term *rem agere* ‘to proceed with, conduct’ (*OLD* s.v. *res* 11b) cf. 1010, *Cap.* 489, *Cis.* 703, *Ep.* 422, *Ps.* 261, *St.* 129; *Cic.* *Arch.* 3. In Terence, only the passive is used (*res agitetur*), see McGlynn s.v. *ago* XIII, s.v. *res* VI.5.

988 DE. *iam opsecro hercle habete vobis cum porcis, cum fiscina.*

*B*c *D/ *a*B*c *D*A / *B*C*D / *A*B*c *D* (mixed-type square verse). The paradox (vobis *habete*), though accepted by Leo, is metrically difficult, as it would only scan with monosyllabic *vobis* (vis), on the difficulty of which see 699n., or alternatively with monosyllabic *hercl*’ (by apocope of final -e), on which see Gratwick on *Men.* 57. Therefore, the present author has adopted Acidalius’ transposition.

Demipho is intentionally offensive, as he implies that his interlocutors are *rustici* who may have the girl along with the possessions of a lowly farmer, pork chops and a basket. Moreover, by using the pronoun *vobis* and the plural imperative, Demipho rather rudely implies that *both* Charinus and Eutychus are going to have their ‘fun’ with Pasicompsa. As a consequence, Eutychus commands more specifically *redde illi* (= *Charino*) in the following line (989), insisting to have Demipho say that he gives her back to Charinus alone, and Demipho answers, now more politely, *ut volt per me sibi habeat licet* ‘may he keep her for himself, I’ve nothing against that’. Starting with a strategy of aggression-as-defence, Demipho is rapidly descending to a business-like kindness (989), and this is soon reduced to beggary (995f.). Plautus frequently deflates characters in such a way; in Terence, cf. for example Sannio’s deflation at *Ad.* 247-253.


Since the sixteenth century, there have been various attempts at providing an adequate explanation of this phrase. Turnebus, quoted by Taubmann (1605) 800,
suggested rather fancifully that the phrase refers to pigs and a dung basket: "Videtur mihi lusisse ut in scropha, quam vel abalienamus saepenumero, vel cedimus cum suo foetu, et fiscina qua sordes et stercora harae efferimus: ac proinde perinde esse, ac si nihil quicquam ille sibi reliqui faceret, sed omnia cederet sine exceptione." Salmasius, quoted by Gronovius (1760) 114f., explained the phrase as an expression taken from the language of fishery, taking fiscina as a fisherman's basket: "Ergo haec sententia est proverbialis: habete hoc cum porcis et fiscina, id est, praedam cum ipsis armis; omnia quae vultis concedo." Salmasius' suggestion is attractive, as it implies a certain facetiousness on the part of Demipho and would also convey the idea that Pasicompsa is a kind of praedia (cf. 498). It involves the interpretation of porcus as an (otherwise unattested) transcription of πόρκος 'fish-trap', 'weel' (LSJ s. v. I), which is here less likely to mean some kind of fish (OLD s. v. gives 'shark' and 'sheatfish'). Taking Salmasius' idea further, one could read cum porcis, cum fuscina, fuscina being a 'three-pronged spear' used in fishing (OLD s.v.; Vid. fr. 7; Petr. 109.6), or as a weapon of the sea-gods (Acc. Trag. 400).

A less likely explanation would be to take the phrase as a mistranslation by Plautus, putting porcus for χοιρίνη and fiscina for κάδισκος. The χοιρίνη was the shell of a sea-mussel that was used in voting by the Athenian jurors as an alternative to the voting-pebble (ψήφος), see MacDowell on Ar. V. 94. In that case, the phrase (unattested in Greek) could have run το γ' ἕμον χοιρίνας ἔχετε' αὐτῷ καδίσκῳ ('as far as I am concerned, have the shells along with the voting-urn'), conveying the same idea of totality. Equally unlikely is an obscene interpretation, taking porcus as equivalent of the Gk. word for 'piglet' (χοιρός, χοιρίδιον), a slang-word for the genitals of girls or the smoothly-shaven pudenda of hetairai, see Adams (1982) 82, Davidson (1997) 116. The obscene connotation of porcus may be complemented by a similarly obscene one of fiscina, 'little scrotum', see Adams (1982) 75 on fiscus. Yet, although an erotic atmosphere has been established in some scenes of Mercator and the erotic has been associated with the senex libidinosus Demipho, it does not seem to prevail in this scene, see Svendsen (1971) 93. If the phrase is in any way proverbial, a drastically obscene interpretation seems unlikely. Although the general sense of the present expression is quite clear, its exact meaning remains a puzzle; the way it is delivered suggests that it is formulaic. porcis: elsewhere only at Men. 289, Ru. 1208 (both mention porci sacres, pork used for expiation). On the appreciation of pork in Roman (as opposed to Gk.) cuisine see André (1961) 140f., Williams (1968) 286f., Gratwick on Men. 211. The mention of pork was not necessarily added by Plautus, as there is evidence that pork was cheap meat for everybody in Greece as well, see Tierney (1945) 49-51 for references to passages from Gk. comedy (e.g. Men. Pk. 996). fiscina: = fiscella, fiscellus (diminutives of fiscus), 'basket', omitted in the list of vasa compiled by Pocină (1988), a flexible container, not infrequently used in a non-technical way for a more rigid one, see White (1975) 90.
Like a proper amator, Demipho intended to free Pasicompsa and set her up in rented accommodation, see 531n. The audience is not told what Charinus may do with Pasicompsa now that he has free rein, a fact that is criticized by Rosivach (1998) 87: "It should be noted [...] that unlike other lovers in this world of New Comedy, Charinus did not give his mistress her freedom when he purchased her from her owner, and his original intention seems to have been nothing more than to sneak her into the country without his father’s knowledge (cf. especially 189f.), and so continue his relationship with her in secret. In either case, whether Charinus sets Pasicompsa free or she remains a slave, given the social distance between the two, marriage is inconceivable, and the issue is never raised.” For a similarly critical view of the apparent dramaturgical untidiness of the last scene, see Lefèvre (1995) 18f. That Charinus did not set Pasicompsa free is a conclusion that Rosivach reaches e silentio; the play leaves the question open; 531f. is ambiguous, since Pasicompsa does not contradict. per me sibi habeat licet: ‘he can have her, for all I care’, rhetorical permissio (ironical permission) implying indifference, cf. Cu. 178, 554, An. 889 immo habeat, valeat, vivat cum illa, Cic. Att. 7.11.1 sibi habeas suam fortunam.

temperi: ‘in good time’, an adverb derived from the locative of the old e-stem of the word, see Stockert on Au. 454, Meiser (1998) 139; for its ironical use in laconic statements, cf. Au. 454, Cas. 412. non est copiae: ‘there isn’t the opportunity’, with partitive genitive; Plautus uses copia est and copiae est, see Lindsay (1907) 16.

supplici sibi sumat quid volt ipse ob hanc iniuriam, quid = quidquid, see Lindsay (1907) 44. supplicii: ‘reparation’, see OLD s.v. 1a.

The contrast between Demipho’s statements here and the picture drawn of him by Charinus in the prologue (cf. 50-60) is strong, see Wallochny (1992) 138f.

se illam amare, numquam facerem ut illam amanti abductor. amanti: see 973n. facerem ut ... abducerem: imperfect subjunctive used for the pluperfect subjunctive, as usually in early Latin, cf. e.g. As. 397, 678, Au. 439, 741, Ba. 434, 1208f., Cap. 871, Cu. 700, Mil. 28, 720f., Per. 173, Ru. 1260, St. 742.
Eutyche, te oro, sodalis eius es, serva et subveni:
B c d+ / A B c D a B C D A B c D; locus Jacobsohnianus after the first cretic;
monosyllabic eius (by synizesis). oro: used to moderate the imperatival force, cf. Eu. 912
move te, oro, ocius.

hunc senem para [me] clientem; memorem dices benefci.
B c D / a B c D A / bb C D A / bb c D (mixed-type square verse). Smith (1940) 54 and
Dieterle (1980) 303 note the parallel function of the second adulescens in the
Mostellaria, cf. esp. Mo. 1125-1127, 1156-1161; for the second adulescens acting as a
deus ex machina, see Harsh (1948) 362 with n.62. hunc senem = me. Despite of the
objections raised by Zwierlein (1992) 124 n.268, hic homo can be equivalent to ego (cf.
öbe ö ävijp), sometimes with a tone of jesting or boasting, e.g. Ba. 56, 138, 340, 640,
Cap. 43, Cu. 248, Poen. 647, Ps. 942, Ru. 937, St. 231, Tri. 172, 507, 787, 1090, 1115.
clientem: ‘client’, an allusion to the specifically Roman institution, of the client-system,
see Fantham (1972) 77. The relationship between the cliens and the patronus varied in
different periods of history. In the early Republic it appears to have been mainly about
help and representation in legal matters: a cliens could not plead in person, but was
represented by his patronus in legal proceedings, cf. Hor. Ep. 2.1.104. For an overview
over the system of clientship in the Republic see Brunt (1971) 47-50. Gratwick on Men.
574 suggests that Plautus seems to have thought cliens (cf. öπγης, ‘under-listener’)
to be the participle of clu(e)o ‘hear’, ‘be spoken of (well or ill)’, ‘be known as’.
Although the allusion to the client-system is Plautine, it is also a motif of Gk. comedy
that someone else asks at the end of the action pardon (au yvwµ11) on behalf of the
guilty party (= ναι reiv), cf. Men. fr. 693 K-Th (cf also Pk. 509f); for Roman comedy
cf. Cas. 1004, Mo. 1156-1161, Ht. 1001f.

ora ut ignoscat delictis tuis atque adulescentiae.
ignoscat: cf. 319. delictis tuis atque adulescentiae: ‘the follies of your youth’,
HENDIADYS; Stockert (1990) 5 compares Mo. 1157, cf. also Eu. 383; see 274n.

DE. pergin tu autem? heia, superbe invehere. spero ego mihi quoque
heia: ‘come on, then’ (probably the same as εις, see LSJ s.v.); conversational particle of
encouragement (e.g. Ba. 630), often found in comedy and satire. Not unnaturally in an
exclamation, the quantity of the second syllable varies. It is long here and in two late
authors, see Soubiran on Mil. 1141. Mostly poets avoid a decision by putting it in a
neutral position or by eliding -a (e.g. Verg. A. 4.569, 9.39), see Skutsch on Enn. Ann.
603. Here, it is used sarcastically, expressing reprimand and the wish that the other
person should say something less hurtful, see Stockert on Au. 220. invehere: (passive)
‘attack with words, inveigh (against)’, OLD s.v. 6.
999 tempus tale eventurum, ut tibi gratiam referam parem.

ut tibi gratiam referam parem: (ironically) 'so that I can return your favour', cf. Per. 853, Eu. 385, 719, 911; on par pari referre see 629n.

1000 LY. missas iam ego istas artis feci. DE. et quidem ego dehinc iam. EU. nihil <agis>:

B C dd A B C D / A bb C D A B c d+; dehinc monosyllabic by synizesis, as always in Plautus and Terence, see Lindsay (1922) 194, Laidlaw (1938) 123. There are several metrical problems. The IK eg(o) is- (dd) is anomalous (perhaps illegitimate). The split anapaest quid(em) ego (b / b C) may be admissible, since equidem ego may be regarded as a fixed syntagma ('one word'). These problems, together with the fact that the paradosis is two syllables short, justify scepticism as to present form of the line. The text as presented is faute de mieux. missas ... feci: cf. 84, 657; Am. 1145, Mo. 1177, Poen. 1405, Tri. 1168, Ad. 906, 991, Eu. 90, An. 833, Hec. 780. artis: 'behaviour', 'demeanour'; for the moral use of the word (like ἀρσω) cf. e.g. Sall. Iug. 85.9.

1001 consuetudine animus rursus te hoc inducet. DE. opsecro,

animus ... te ... inducet: a comic reversal of the common phrase animum inducere, for which see Lodge s.v. induco II.3. The inversion of subject and object emphasizes Demipho's passivity: it is not he who governs his animus, but his animus that governs him.

1002 satis iam ut habeatis. quin loris caedite etiam, si lubet.

satis iam ut: (bb C; IK), cf. satis ut at Ba. 130, Hec. 257; for more examples of postponed ut with adverbs of degree see Booth (1923) 32 n.17. satis ... habeatis: 'be content with', 'consider sufficient', OLD s.v. satis 4., originally a comparative form like magis and nimir, see Meiser (1998) 154f. caedite: also used with pugnis (Am. 377, Cas. 407, Cur. 199, Tru. 768), calcibus (Poen. 684), restibus (Per. 282), virgis (Ps. 513). Terence uses it similarly, but only once (An. 199). loris: 'throngs, straps', ἱμάντες; White (1975) 34f. supplies a collection of literary references to lorum. The ἱμάς is commonly referred to in comedy as an instrument for slave punishment (Men. Dynsc. 502, Sam. 321; Antiph. fr. 74 K.). Elsewhere in Plautus lora are used as fetters (Cap. 658f., 667, Ep. 683).

1003 LY. recte dicis. sed istuc uxor faciet, quom hoc resciverit.

B C D A / bb c D A bb C D A B c d+; sed is- (bb): IK. recte dicis: 412n.; cf. 1007.
1004 DE. nihil opust resciscat. EU. quid istic? non resciscet, ne time.

nihil opust resciscat: paratactic subjunctive after opus est, see Sedgwick on Am. 11, LHS II 531; also after other impersonal expressions like licet, necesse est, oportet, certum est, optimum est, potin. resciscat: 107n. quid istic?: dd A (IK of fixed syntagma), (lit.) ‘What there?’; like the American expression ‘What’s the big deal?’; formula of unwilling assent (see Don. Ter. Eu. 388, Ad. 350) used to respond to an objection containing a negative (e.g. nihil), see Ernout on Ba. 1049, Shipp on An. 572, Lindsay (1907) 45, for lists see Lodge s.v. iste III.G.1.c, McGlynn s.v. iste X.2.b; istic is adverb (‘in that matter of yours’) with e.g. dicendum est to be understood, see Barsby on Eu. 171. ne time: see 173n., cf. 891 (also at line-end).

1005-1009 Zwierlein (1992) 318 with n.704, and 333, unconvincingly attempts to reconstruct this passage as the original Plautine epilogue.

1005 eamus intro, non utibilest hic locus, factis tuis,
B c D A / B C dd A / B c D / A B c D (mixed type square verse); eamus disyllabic.

The idea that Demipho’s wife might find out about the affair (see 107n.) makes Eutychus realise that ‘this place’, i.e. the street in front of the houses, is not a proper locale for the discussion of sensitive family business. He suggests they should better go inside. This is the beginning of the preparation of the end of the play. In the following, the spectators are indeed led to believe that the play is going to be over within moments, while at 1015 Eutychus will take them by surprise when he begins to announce his mock edict and the ‘final curtain’ is postponed for a couple of lines.

Conventionally, with few debated exceptions (some scenes in Seneca), all ancient drama is set ‘outdoors’, i.e. in front of the stage-building, ‘on the street’. Plautus can (and does) manipulate this convention both ways. For example, at Tri. 1137f. oblitus intus dudum tibi sum dicere: / modo mi advenienti nugator quidam ocessit obviam, an excuse is used to explain why certain things are actually uttered outside. Another case is Au. 133f. eo nunc secreto ted huc foras seduxi, / ut tuam rem ego tecum hic loquerer familiaris. Here, he operates the convention exactly in the opposite way: a character takes another outside for the outrageous reason that there is more privacy in front of the house (i.e. in the street!). The very self-conscious handling of this convention is an important feature of Plautine dramaturgy and an effective source of humour. The general humour derives from the reference to the tension that lies in the fact that the stage is a place where the talk of characters is, in fact, always overheard by others - the audience.

utibilest = utibilis est, a contraction like -ust for -us est, Leo (1912) 285-287, Gratwick on Men. 36; utibilis = utilis, regarded as un-Plautine by Zwierlein (1992) 334; found in Plautus (Ba. 7, Men. 983, Mil. 613, Mo. 859, Tri. 748) and Terence (Ph. 690). factis tuis: dative, with arbitri sunt (1006), not with memoramus; slightly zeugmatic.
arbitori: ‘(eye-)witnesses, observers’, in keeping with the (original) legal dimension of arbiter, ‘a neighbour called to be witness’ (*ad-biter ~ spectator), see Broggini (1957) 40-43. In a more specifically legal sense, the word can mean ‘arbitrator’, cf. Ru. 1004, Ht. 500-502, Ad. 123. The term is also used once of the audience as ‘judges in matters of dramatic art’ in a captatio benevolentiae (Am. 16, Cap. 67f., cf. Ad. 4); the line could be effectively produced with a gesture towards the audience, jokingly taking them to be the arbitri and playing on the ambiguity of the word. On the audience as judges, see Moore (1998) 13, 16, 103f. per vias: the ‘street’ in front of the stage-house, see Enk ad loc.

DE. hercle qui tu recte dicis: eadem breviar fabula

B c D A / B C D a / B C dA / B c d+ (square verse type I); disyllabic eadem. hercle qui tu recte dicis: 412n. breviar fabula: This is a good example of Plautus’ special handling of what purports to be autoschediastic entertainment involving the ‘breaking of the dramatic illusion’. The character playing Demipho pretends not to have understood what the character playing Eutychus, already playing with the convention (but still being within it, i.e. not taking a complete leave from the dramatic world) meant (‘let’s go inside, so that we may have some privacy’) and answers, stepping out of his role: ‘Oh, yes, let’s go inside, and the play will be much shorter.’ Doubtless such a joke needs to be carefully rehearsed, but while performed, it will seem more like improvised banter than like carefully planned dialogue. For similar remarks cf. Cas. 1005f., Ps. 388, 720, TRI. 1101f. The question is whether such remarks are always signs of Plautine intervention. Dietze (1901) 63 attributes it to Philemon and compares Mer. 160 and Mo. 510 for examples of similar ‘meta-thetricality’ of a kind that is also found in Aristophanes, e.g. Eccl. 582 ύς το ταχύνειν χαρίτων μετέχει πλείστον παρά τοίσι θεατάίς; see also Jachmann (1931) 43. eadem: sc. opera, 802n.

ERIT. eamus. EU. hic est intus filius apud nos tuos.

bb c D A / B C D a / B c d+/ aa B c d+ (mixed-type square verse); locus Jacobsohnianus before the last measure; apud scanning regularly (with right-leaning cliticization) as a pyrrhic.

Why does Eutychus say this? Demipho does not seem to have been looking for his son in this play. In the Emporos, Charinus may have threatened Demipho with going abroad as a mercenary (cf. 659f., and the exilium amoris motif), as happens in Menander (Samia) and Terence. Plautus dropped the threat, leaving only the farewell to the door (830-841) and parts of the ‘dressing scene’ (in V.2). In Philemon’s play, Demipho has been worried about his son, and consequently Eutychus’ remark would have a stronger point. Plautus left it in the text because it reminded the audience of the existence of the absent character Charinus (thereby fulfilling a dramaturgical purpose, albeit very different
from its original one). Eutychus seems to have prevented him from going (980f.), and Demipho seems to be worried to be reconciled with him (991-994, 995f.). *apud nos*: epexegetic apposition accompanying the adverb *hic*, as often in Roman drama, see Otto (1912) 29.

1009 DE. optumest. illac per hortum nos domum transibimus.

*B c D / A B c D A / B c D / A B c d+* (mixed-type square verse). *optumest*: 'that's phenomenal'; superlative of *bene est* (*καλῶς ἔχει*), expressing a subjective judgement, e.g. *Am. 965*, *Ba. 502, 783*, *Cap. 10, 706*, *Cas. 738*, *St. 537*, *Ad. 884*. By contrast, *optumum est* (*τὸ ἄφιστον ἐστὶ*) expresses an objective judgement ('it is the best plan'), e.g. *As. 786*, *Au. 237, Tru. 626, 700*, see Lindsay on *Cap. 10*. *illac*: deictic; probably accompanied by a gesture, cf. e.g. *As. 742*, *Mo. 931*, *Per. 444, 679*. **per hortum**: 'through the garden' by which a lane (*angiportum*) imagined to be running behind the houses can be reached (*As. 741f., Cas. 613, Ep. 660, Mil. 341, Mo. 1043f., Per. 444-446, 678f., Ps. 1234f., St. 437, 614*). It is used to get characters from house to house without bringing them across the front stage, see Duckworth (1952) 85-88, Beare (1964) 256-263, Beacham (1991) 61.

1010 LY. Eutyche, hanc volo prius rem agi, quarr meum intro refero pedem.

*B c D a B cc dd A / B C D aa B c D*. A metrically difficult line with synizesis and total elision of *m(eum) intro* (set as *CD*), prosodic hiatus of *rem ag-* (*dd*), on which see Enk ad loc., and IK of *prius* (*cc*) securing resolution in *C*-position. There seem to be traces of old *prās* (*prī* equivalent to *praē*), see Lindsay (1922) 211, but the word is usually measured as a pyrrhic, despite *prī-mus, prīs-cus, prīs-tinus*, see Kieckers (1931) II 94, Meiser (1998) 174. *rem agi*: 987n. *refero pedem*: a grand way of saying 'return, go back' (*OLD s.v. refero 2b*), cf. e.g. *Ep. 439*, *Verg. Aen. 10.794*; cf. 882. Terence has only *pedem ferre* (*An. 808; Ad. 227* by implication).

1011 EU. quid istuc est? LY. suam quisque homo rem meminit. responde mihi:

*suam quisque homo rem meminit*: 'each man for himself'; proverbial, see Otto (1890) 218, cf. 71f., Cic. *Sen. 7.21*. *meminit*: + genitive, 'remember persons (or personifications)' (e.g. *Cap. 800*, *Per. 494, 658*), + accusative, 'remember things' (e.g. *Cas. 260*, *Cis. 148*, *Men. 45*, *Mil. 354*, *Per. 186*, *Poen. 1062*, *St. 42, 46, Tri. 697*), see Gratwick on *Men. 45*.

1012 certon scis non suscensere mihi tuam matrem? EU. scio.

*certon scis*: 'know for a certainty', 'know for sure'; *certo* is only used by the comic poets (and Cicero), see Lodge s.v. *certus* II.C.1.f, McGlynn s.v. *certus* III.1. *tuam matrem*: Lysimachus does not say *meam uxorem* or *Dorippam* but *tuam matrem*, as if
talking of a stranger; cf. 965, where Eutychus, talking to his father, referred to his mother as ‘your wife’. *scio*: Eutychus is laconic as usual, cf. 476, 477, 642 (ironized).

1013 **LY. vide. EU. mea fide. LY. satis habeo. sed quaeso hercle, etiam vide.**


1014 **EU. non mihi credis? LY. immo credo, sed tamen metuo miser.**

At this point a new scribe begins in *B* (f. 133r), taking over the function of rubricator himself in the first portion of his assignment. A curious fact about the assignation of speakers in the following lines is that the scribe seems to use an ‘algebraic’ notation of speaking parts, consisting of the Greek letters Α Β Γ representing Lysimachus, Demipho, and Eutychus. Such a notation, whereby each character is assigned a Greek letter in the scene headings which is then used to denote the character in the following scene, is found consistently in the Bembinus and a few later Terentian MSS and in some other places in the MSS of Plautus, see Jory (1963) and Wahl (1974) passim. Such a form of notation is likely to have been unknown in Republican times. The earliest papyri of Greek dramatic texts have marginal dashes (*paragraphoi*) and mid-line double points (*dikola*) to indicate change of speaker, and name the characters only occasionally, see Gomme/Sandbach (1973) 40-42, Lowe (1962), Stoessl (1960) 9-16, Andrieu (1954) 209-272. At any rate, no far-reaching theories about the notation of speakers in the archetype or even earlier MSS can be formed on the thin basis of the present evidence.

It can be seen from the use of the letters here that they were not assigned according to the order of appearance of the characters in the play, unless we assume that the actor called Α played part of Charinus’ and part of Lysimachus’ role, that is unless we accept part-splitting. Then, however, unless we suppose Acanthio’s role to have been played by a hypothetical actor Δ, the system would still be inconsistent. The *raison d’être* of this form of notation is as yet unknown, and it may be no more than a scribal affectation, perhaps in an effort to imitate the practice of some Terentian MSS. It is well-known that the Middle Ages had a peculiarly playful relationship to ciphers, see Bischoff (1990) 177f.

In the present case, it seems that the copyist has simply ‘numbered through’ the speaking parts in line 1014 with Α Β Γ, probably thinking that his predecessor had used the same convention, and that he inserted the suprascript glosses on the Greek letters after realizing that this was not the case. He does not take this practice into the first
scene of the *Pseudolus*, where he assigns the Latin letter *P* to *Pseudolus*, and the letter *C* to *Calidorus*. However, Wahl (1974) 35 states that "es ist ganz unwahrscheinlich, daß die genannten jemals die einzigen Siglen im Stück bildeten - für die paar Schlußverse wäre das ohne Sinn." Wahl does not consider that the change of scribes may have led to the erroneous assignment practice. In fact, if the scribe had wanted to produce a system of algebraic notation as he found it in the master copy, it remains enigmatic why he ceased to use it after a couple of lines. Wahl (1974) 35f. thinks to have found evidence for the use of the 'algebraic' notation in earlier parts of *Mercator*, indicated by certain corruptions, none of his arguments being cogent. The passages are discussed by the present author ad loc. (431n., 884n., 888n.; see also 487n.).

Like the scene headings themselves, for the late origin of which see Bader (1970) and Andrieu (1954) 87-206, the system of 'algebraic' notation is unlikely to go back to classical antiquity, to near-contemporary theatre scripts, or to Plautus and Terence themselves. It may seem paradoxical, but it would appear that the careful assignation of speakers and the introduction of lists of *dramatis personae* and scene headings are actually a sign of the transformation of a dramatic script into a more 'literary' text to be read rather than produced. An actor or producer has no need for anything that goes beyond the text itself, as the very fact that such people are in the process of producing the play (probably collaborating with the playwright) means that they can settle any question concerning the assignation of speakers, the use of props, questions of entrance and exit, or modes of delivery by immediate communication. Stage directions, *notae personarum*, lists of *dramatis personae*, etc. are superfluous. This is also true for the texts of Shakespeare, see Wells (1991) 40. Wahl (1974) 148f. argues unconvincingly for the exact opposite. *immo credo*: see 172n.

1015-1026

Zwierlein (1992) 329, 333f. thinks that the play originally found its conclusion at 989-994, 1005-1009, and he regards 995-1004 and 1010-1026 as later interpolations. His main argument is that after the exit of the characters has already been announced (1009), the *exeunt* should not be delayed further by Lysimachus' restating his worries (1010-1014) and Eutychus' mock edict (1015-1024). The present author feels much less confident about the demand for oikonomia here and agrees with what Hoban (1988) 4f., giving reasons for cutting out and for keeping certain scenes for her stage-production of *Mercator*, rightly observes about the dramaturgical value of this part of the scene: "More importantly, without this speech, the timing of the scene is ruined. Suddenly - too suddenly - the play is over, and everyone has left the stage. The speech was a transition between Demipho's apology for his actions (the last loose end of the plot) and the end of the play, and it was thus an essential part of the scene." Moreover, it is the counterpart of the extra-dramatic speech delivered by the *prologus* Charinus at the beginning of the *Mercator.*
DE. eamus intro. EU. immo dicamus senibus legem censeo, prius quam abeamus, qua se lege teneant contentique sint.

legem ..., qua ... lege: antecedent recurring in the relative clause, cf. *Au. 574, Ep. 41, Ru. 997*; suitable to legal precision, see Lindsay (1907) 6, Enk on *Tru. 736*. *legem*: *lex* is the saying or words which accompanied any formal act, cf. *Cic. De orat. 1.178 in mancipii lege 'in the formula appropriate to mancipatio', 1.256 Manilianas venalium vendundorum leges*. So it comes to mean 'term, condition', see also 817n. Again, *lex* should not be taken to mean 'law' or 'Act of Parliament', but rather 'a rule made by any authority, ordinance, regulation' (see *OLD* s. v. 5a), especially in conjunction with the verb *dicere*, cf. *St. 503f. certumst amicos convocare, ut consulam/qua lege nunc med - essurire oporteat*, where the non-technical sense of *lex* is obvious, *Sen. Dial. 8.3.1 non quia mihi legem dixerim nihil contra dictum Zenonis ... committere*, *Priap. 5.1f. quam puero legem furtur dixisse Priapus, / versibus haec infra scripta duobus erit*. In addition, the terms of the victorious party after a reconciliation in comedy are seen as clauses of a treaty, cf. *Ht. 998, 1046, 1054*; also in love-elegy, cf. *Prop. 4.8.71-81*. Perhaps the Greek original contained an allusion to the *nomos sussitikos* 'rules of the house', on which see Davidson (1997) 104: "The same woman [Gnathaena] provided a more direct record of her establishment by adding a footnote to the tiny corpus of classical literature written by women, a 'Rules of the House' (*nomos sussitikos*) in three hundred and twenty-three lines, telling guests how to behave when visiting her and her daughter, a parody of the similar *nomoi* written by the philosophers, just as Machon’s *Chreiai* was a parody of their wise sayings." Scafuro (1997) 432 (on *Cap. 492-495*): "The parasite bluffingly threatens to sue the young men who are no longer inviting him to dine; the remedy is represented as a *barbarica lex* (= Roman) at 492. Cf. (a) Alexis *Lebes* frs. 130 and 131 K-A; (b) Diphilos *Emporos* fr. 31 K-A; (c) Diphilos *Enagizontes* fr. 37 K-A; (d) Timokles *Philodikastes* fr. 34. 5-6 K-A; (e) Plautus *Merc. 1015-24*; (f) Plautus *Persa* 65-74: all these references (a) to laws attributed to lawgivers or (b) to a foreign polis or (c-f) to laws created by the speaker; there is no direct threat made against any specific individual."

One thinks of the opposite regulation formulated as a law in Aristophanes’ *Ecclesiazusae*, where it is the old women who are privileged to have the first 'use' of any young desirable men, to the detriment of the young women.

DE. eamus intro. EU. immo dicamus senibus legem censeo

**eamus intro**: 'let's go inside'; formulaic request concerned with movements in the 'real' world, while *abeamus* in the following line is the term used for leaving the stage-world ('before we go off'). Thus, by using the two terms in close vicinity, the worlds of
reality' and 'stage' are subtly blended. dicamus: 'decree'. censeo: 'give one's opinion, think, recommend' (OLD s.v. 3a), here used with paratactic subjunctive; see also 536n.

1016 prius quam abeamus, qua se lege teneant contentique sint.

bb cc DA /B C D a /bb C D A B c D; IK of prius (bb); regular synaloepha qu(am) a(-
)set as cc) resulting in a 'falling' proceleusmatic in the first cretic. qua ... lege: 'under which terms', see 817n., 1015n. se teneant: cf. 1024 lex teneat senes; for se tenere 'contain oneself' cf. As. 600 leges ... quibus se populus teneat, Ps. 1110.

1017-1025 The language is notably that of legal procedure (enumerated conditional clauses siquem ... si ... sive, the formal prohibitive imperative neu ... prohibeto, the pleonastic posthac prohibeto, the formulaic provisional clause quod modo fiat bono, the verbal echoes and parallelisms prohibuerit - praehibuerit, clam - palam, and the chronological formula at the end of the law, 1025).

1017 annos gnatus sexaginta qui erit, si quem scibimus

B C D A /B C D A /bb C D A B c d+; 'prosodic' hiatus qui e- (bb). annos ... sexaginta:
cf. 524 ovem ... natam annos sexaginta (Lysimachus about Demipho); cf. Ht. 62.

1018 si maritum sive hercule adeo caelibem scortarier,

B c D A /B C dd A /B c D /A B c d+ (mixed type square verse). si: Brix' emendation for seu is necessary, as the classical seu .. seu contravenes Plautine usage, see Gratwick on Men. 295. It remains unclear why Zwierlein (1992) 334 calls this emendation 'inadmissable'.

1019 cum eo nos hac lege agamus: inscitum arbitrabimur,

cum eo: bb C, 'prosodic' hiatus. hac lege: is Bothe's conjecture for the MSS hic lege (mistakenly accepted by Enk ad loc.). Sense requires Eutychus to say 'we shall deal with that man on these terms (hac lege)', not 'we shall take that man to law here', as that is not what he goes on to propose in this and the following line. One might read agamus to emphasize the adhortatory character of the line. inscitum arbitrabimur: 'we'll look upon him as an idiot'; the sanction attached to the lex is, of course, not a serious one: the old man will simply lose his 'credit'.

1020 et per nos quidem hercle egebit qui suom prodegerit.

per nos quidem: 'at least as far as we are concerned', cf. e.g. Cu. 554, Ru. 1165. egebit qui suom prodegerit: a neat inversion of Demipho's initial outrage (cf. 46-60, esp. 57f.). Now it is not Charinus who is threatened with poverty, but the senex amator Demipho. For the typically close relation between amare and egere in other contexts in Plautine comedy, see Crampon (1985) 60-63, cf. Au. 380f., Tri. 336. suom = 'his

1021 neu quisquam posthac prohibeto adulescentem filium
B C D A B cc D A / bb C D A B c D; metrical hiatus (-to / a-). quisquam: emphatic, instead of enclitic quis, see Lindsay (1907) 44, cf. e.g. Au. 609, Cap. 753, Cis. 495, Cu. 704.

1022 quin amet et scortum ducat, quod bono fiat modo;
B c D / A B C D A / B c D / A B c D (mixed-type square verse). quin: with prohibere (elsewhere ne), see Woodcock (1959) 142. After negatives and expressions denying objection, hindrance, prevention, *quin* or *quominus* may be used; Liv. 26.40.4 *nee quin erumperet contineri poterat* ‘nor could he be prevented from breaking out’; *quin* is not used with prohibere by Cicero or Caesar, nor by Terence. *quod*: ‘as long as’, ‘if’, see LHS II 572f. on the legal background of the phrase *quod* ... *fiat*, cf. e.g. *lex Corn. de XX quaest*. [CIL I2 587] 1.4 *idque ei ... facere liceto, quod sine malo pequlatuu fiat*. bono ... *modo*: ‘with due moderation’; cf. Am. 996 *dum id modo fiat bono*. As a rule, Plautus uses the singular *modo* with pronominal adjectives and the plural *modis* (cf. 225 *miris modis*) with other adjectives (*indignis, malis, miris, miseris, omnibus, suavibus*), but we find occasionally *modis* used with a pronomial adjective (*Mo. 1146 quibus*) and *modo* with other adjectives (*Mil. 624, Ps. 659, Ru. 912*).

1023 si quis prohibuerit, plus perdet clam <qua>si praehibuerit palam.
‘If someone has prohibited it, he shall lose more by stealth than would be the case if he had provided funds openly.’ The text is based on a conjecture by Camerarius (*praehibuerit* for the MSS *prohibuerit*), <qua> being Seyffert’s addition (for quasi ‘than would be the case if’ after comparatives, cf. e.g. Au. 231, Mil. 482, Ps. 641, Tru. 341). *perdet*: ‘squander’, see 188n., 710n. *plus*: ‘more money’; an echo of the *amor-versus-res* motif (e.g. 42, 52).

1024 haec adeo ut ex hac nocte primum lex teneat senes.
*B cc D / a B C D a / B C D / aa B c D* (mixed-type square verse); unexceptionable metrical hiatus after *adeo*, dragged and weighty line-cadence. *ex hac nocte*: ‘as from tonight’; for the legalistic tone cf. e.g. *CIL I 198 ex ea die qua tributus erit*. With a perfect tense, *haec nox* means ‘last night’ (227, *Am. 731*), otherwise, as here, ‘tonight’ (Cap. 127).

1025-1026 A variation of the standard ending (*clausula*, Suet. Aug. 99.1) of a *palliata* with its appeal for applause, which in a curtainless theatre signals the end of the play to
the audience, see Beare (1964) 267-274. The use of a standard ending is probably derived from New Comedy (cf. e.g. Men. Dysc. 965-969, Mis. 463-466, Sam. 733-737, Sic. 420-423), where the appeal to the spectators is followed by a formulaic prayer to Victory. As in Old Comedy, the play may be ended by setting the events within the ambit of the stage revel (Men. Dysc. 963f., Mis. 459f., Sam. 731, Sic. 418; cf. Ar. Eccl. 1149f., Plu. 1194f., Ra. 1524-1527, Nu. 1490); this is no longer done in Roman comedy. The length of the appeal varies, ranging from a short plaudite (Cu., Poen., Tri., An., Hec., Ad.) to a speech of several lines commenting on the play (As., Cap., Cis., Mer.; Cas. is a curious variation) or inviting the audience to join the festivities (Ps., Ru.). Roman plays usually concluded, as here, with a recitative (trochaic septenarii), except for Ps. (cretics) and St. (iambic septenarii). New Comedy plays seem to have closed with spoken iambic trimeters, see Gratwick on Men. 1162, although there are exceptions (Men. Sam. 736f.). The clausula was either spoken by all on-stage actors (As., Ba. [probably], Cap., Cis., Ep., Per., Poen., Tri.; grex or caterva in the MSS) or by one of the characters, here presumably Eutychus, as there is no indication to the contrary in the MSS and as it makes sense that an adulescens should specifically address the adulescentes in the audience while referring to the ‘pains’ of the senes. The same may well have applied in Terence, leaving aside the problematic discussion about the cantor (cf. Hor. Ars 154f.), who is believed by some scholars to have been a separate person on stage, see Monaco (1970) passim. It appears that much depends on the ambiguous status of cantor as ‘singer’, ‘musician’, or ‘actor’.

1025 bene valete; atque, adulescentes, haec si vobis lex placet,

\[ bb \text{cDA} / bb \text{CD A} / B \text{CDA} / B \text{cD} \] (square verse type I). adulescentes: = μειράκια, who are also addressed as part of the audience at Men. Dysc. 967, Sam. 734, Sic. 420; there is no specific address of the young men elsewhere in Roman comedy.

1026 ob senum herecl industriam vos aequom est clare plaudere.

ob senum ... industriam: ‘to reward the old men’s diligence’; cf. Men. 123, 791. The tranfigurative use of ob is commoner than its local one, see 924n. In Terence, industria is used twice to refer to the playwright’s dedication to his art (Hec. 32, Ad. 25), and here it may refer to the actors’ efforts. For reasons that remain obscure Zwierlein (1992) 335 insists that ob industriam can only mean ‘by design’ (OLD s.v. industria 2) in Plautus and regards this line, Men. 123 and 791 as un-Plautine. plaudere: invokes the usual plaudite = ἐπικροτήσατε (e.g. Men. Dysc. 967).
II. Discussion

Mercator and Trinummus, both based on Philemonian originals, along with the Mostellaria, exhibit a great amount of detail in the discovery of the intrigue, but after the trickery is discovered, all three omit the details of the exitus and draw rapidly to a close, see Smith (1940) 133f. The finale of Mercator has been analysed by a number of scholars, most notably E. Lefèvre, V. Rosivach, A. Scafuro, and O. Zwierlein. As far as the question of originality is concerned, they are all in agreement that the way Mercator is brought to its conclusion is demonstrably different from what one might expect from a New Comedy play. Their theories shall be discussed briefly.

1. The 'Saturnalian Inversion and Deleted Anagnorisis' Theory

Following the emphasis that was put on the importance of the concept of Saturnalian inversion for the understanding of Roman comedy by Segal (1987) passim, Lefèvre (1994) 170 states that the final scene reminds us of the role-reversal ascribed to the Saturnalia, where slaves acted as iudices and patroni of their masters. In Mercator, the old men are subjected to what Lefèvre equates with a trial, see also Lefèvre (1988) 41, (1990) 39, (1995) 39f., 57f. Due to the Roman nature of this reversal, the last scene of Mercator should be taken as a reflexion of Italiote orality and not of Greek literary comedy. Moreover, the senes were not ridiculed in Philemon and were able to keep up appearances. This theory is flawed in two respects:

First, in the previous scenes the senes do not act as the iudices of the young men, so that at the end of the play there can be no 'reversal of roles'. Lefèvre (1995) 57 n.203 refers to an earlier study by himself (1988), where he claims to have shown that the fact that it is not slaves but a young citizen who sits in judgment on an old citizen can be paralleled with the Saturnalian motif of slaves sitting in judgment on their masters. He admits that the connexion is vague. The present author would deny that there is a connexion at all.

The phrase dicamus... legem (1015), the following verbs in the first person plural and other references to nos (1016 abeamus, 1017 scibimus, 1019 arbitramur, 1020 per nos) include the senes on stage, but not the absent Charinus. It is impossible to argue that the plural forms refer to an imaginary 'plurality' of iuvenes, since the senex Demipho opens the series of these forms himself at 1015 (eamus intro), and the following forms refer back to that. Rightly, Loitold (1956) 96f. understands the nos to mean the actors. Strictly speaking, this is true only for the last two lines (1025f.), as the preceding lines are not spoken with a complete abandonment of dramatic illusion, for the actors still refer to a situation in which they themselves have just been involved. Further, Lefèvre makes much of the fact that one of the sons sits in judgment on the fathers, but that is exactly what Eutychus is not doing. There is a vast difference between legem dicere and iudicium facere. The fact that the senes on stage are included leads to two conclusions:
(a) that the characters are no longer speaking as Eutychus, Lysimachus, and Demipho, or in other words, that they 'take their masks off' (or so one could stage this) and that therefore there is no 'Saturnalian' reversal, as the characters—the masks—to whom such a reversal could be attributed have already vanished into thin air, and that their statements are not 'Saturnalian' but parabatic; (b) that, even if the *senes* were still speaking as comic characters in a play, that very fact would imply that they inevitably share in the 'Saturnalian' power that stems from announcing such a 'subversive' edict. Therefore, the theory of 'Saturnalian inversion' is ill-founded. This does not mean that the present author does not appreciate the various elements of role-reversal, comic inversion, and general festive abandon that are doubtless present in Roman comedy (and in New Comedy). For an early criticism of the celebrated concept of 'Saturnalian inversion' see further Dingel (1981).

Second, the finale of the Mercator is not the acting-out of a courtroom scene but an exchange of abuse (*par pari respondere*), followed by a scene of comic law-giving. Eutychus does not act as *iudex* but as *praetor urbanus* issuing an edict, see Scafuro (1997) 185f., and Demipho has his come-uppance: Eutychus exacts repentance and is aided by Lysimachus in a *flagitatio* (977-1006). In the course of this *flagitatio*, Demipho concedes: he will relinquish Pasicompsa to his son (989); he asks Eutychus to act as peace-maker between them (992); he will become Eutychus' *clientes* and predicts that 'you'll say I am mindful of your kindness' (996, cf. Ad. 251). Like Lefèvre, Scafuro thinks the *flagitatio* has replaced the mechanism of reconciliation that belonged to the Greek original. Yet the *flagitatio* need not be a Plautine addition: the last scene of Menander's *Dyskolos* is replete with the same kind of raucous inflicting of shame and exacting of repentance that Scafuro claims to be Plautine.

2. The 'Faulty Plot' Theory

Rosivach (1998) 87 has pointed out that it remains unclear what is going to happen to Pasicompsa and Charinus after the play. They have sworn to remain faithful to each other (536f.), and Pasicompsa expects that he will never marry and leave her (cf. 538f.): "In a truly happy ending, such as we have seen in other plays, the young man would marry his beloved, but while a fairy-tale marriage between a rich young man and a poor young girl is, if improbable, at least possible, a marriage between a rich young man and a slave or former slave clearly is not. For us this makes for an unhappy ending, but it obviously was not one for Plautus and his audience." Furthermore, Rosivach thinks that Pasicompsa's love and devotion for Charinus is emphasized by Plautus throughout the play because her devotion makes her much more attractive as his mistress and lover, and so increases the reward for Charinus, "who is, after all, the focus of the plot."

Rosivach's approach may be criticised for two reasons. First, to ask what happens after the end of a play is an illegitimate question to which the answer can only be—'nothing'. The audience want to be entertained and neither be lectured on the
implications of relationships between people of unequal social status nor be told about the psychological strain such a relationship may put on a *meretrix*. Second, the fate of prostitutes in New Comedy may differ anyway, depending on their own moral status. Their love-affairs may be cut short by some punishment or by repentance on the part of the young man; if they return a man's love, a father may be discovered for them who is a citizen or some extra time is allowed for their affair, which brings a humane relationship of respect (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 712C). Pasicompsa has returned Charinus’ love (cf. III.1), and she will, although this is not made explicit at the end of the play, enjoy a longer, if not perpetual, relationship with him.

Like Rosivach, Lefèvre (1995) 18 is dissatisfied with the absence of the lovers Charinus and Pasicompsa in the final scene and the focusing of the action on the *senes* and Eutychus. He assumes that Plautus simply cut off the ‘real’ ending of the play, which would have culminated in some form of re-union of the lovers, a re-union that now merely takes place backstage. However, it is unnecessary to assume with Rambelli (1957) 55, 86, and (without reference to Rambelli) Lefèvre (1995) 19 that she will, after an *anagnorisis*, be married to Charinus, and that this is what usually happens in such a kind of plot. Plutarch shows that this is not the only possible outcome; there are several variations on the theme of ‘happy-ending for the prostitute’ available to the New Comedy playwright. He should be trusted to be able to use them at his discretion. Further, Marti (1959) 110 speculates about a possible inclusion of the promises of manumission given to Pasicompsa (531f.) and Acanthio (152f.) at the end of the Greek model. There is no need to tidy up the plot in such a way. Furthermore, it is hard to agree with Rosivach that Charinus is the focus of the plot. Of all the characters, Demipho has most claim to that title, for even when he is not present on stage (as in the first two scenes), his presence is made felt by what other characters have to say about him. The main theme is friendship, and thus the focus of the play is not on the young lover, nor the courtesan, nor the old fool. In general terms, it is not on people but on their characters as revealed by their relationships and interactions, namely on the relationship of Charinus and Eutychus on the one hand, and of Demipho and Lysimachus on the other, see Wehrli (1936) 60.

### 3. The ‘Interpolation’ Theory

In the view of Zwierlein an interpolator has introduced changes (additions) to endings of a number of Plautine comedies, stated for *Mercator* in particular by Zwierlein (1992) 313-319 (esp. 318) and 333-335 deserve some comment. Zwierlein regards lines 995-1004, parts of 1005-1009, and 1010-1026 (including the epilogue *ad spectatores*) as un-Plautine. He thinks that upon the words *per hortum nos domum transibimus* the play has found its proper end (p. 333): “[...] die ganze Gruppe tritt ins Haus des Lysimachus, um dem drinnen besorgt wartenden Charinus das Ende der Rivalität mit dem Vater zu verkünden. Danach will der Vater mit dem Sohn über den Garten ins eigene Haus.
zurück. Daß dieser auf diese Weise nachdrücklich angekündigte Abgang durch erneute Bedenken des Lysimachus, ob denn seine Frau ihm wirklich wieder wohlgesinnt sei (1010ff.), verzögert würde, ist ganz unglaublich.” Zwierlein takes offence because the actors’ exit is delayed twice (1010, 1015f., both times using prior quam), not properly appreciating the comic effect of this retardation.

4. Conclusion

The compression of the action in the finale of Mercator is not essentially different from that in e.g. Amphitruo, Casina and Cistellaria. The audience can infer that father and son in the Mercator will come to an agreement after Demipho’s confession of guilt. Eadem brevior fabula erit (1007): this reason given for representing the completion of the resolving scene as taking place off stage, perhaps influenced the dramatist much less in bringing his play to a final close than the realization that he had nothing more truly dramatic to give the spectator. The real reason for the brevity of the scene is the fact that the audience needs no explanation of the solution: (1) a long scene (962-1026) presenting Eutychus as disentangler of the plot has just been presented, and a second scene containing similar revelations in the presence of yet other characters, e.g. Dorippa, would be boring; (2) it is bad dramaturgy to present on the stage what the audience already knows unless some additional dramatic value accrues from such presentation; (3) the play has already reached 1026 lines. Furthermore, it may be a characteristic of Philemon to compress the action toward the end of his plays anyway, cf. Tri. 1101f., see Smith (1940) 123, Marti (1959) 108.

Lefèvre, Scafiuro, and Rosivach are unhappy about what they deem an undue compression of the dramatic action at the end of the play. Yet, instead of asking what the playwright may have wanted to achieve by this brevitas, they either propose different endings for the Greek original (Lefèvre, Scafiuro) or speculate in moral terms about the impression the Roman audience may have had of Pasicompsa’s fate (Rosivach). Zwierlein showed that brevity may not be a reason to take offence, but by claiming that there was much less in Plautus than there is in the vulgate, he also went too far. However, the purpose of this compression may simply have been to focus the spectators’ attention on character, not on plot.

The first three scenes of Mercator constitute an elaborate exposition. Yet after this extended exposition of character as well as of situation the persons introduced to us in these scenes practically disappear for most of the action; the lover and his sweetheart, whose characters have been fully delineated, are removed from the stage and, where they appear, remain impotent and do not themselves advance the action. The removal of the hero and the heroine, as we suppose them to be from the exposition, is cleverly devised. The present author would like to claim the Greek poets were so interested in character, in ηόν, that they sometimes allowed themselves to disregard the close interrelation of
exposition and main action in order to indulge in the portrayal of persons essential to the situation but irrelevant to the subsequent action.

The form of Eutychus’ mock decree harks back to announcements of the *praetor urbanus*, of which this comic edict is an amusing parody. Eutychus is outrageously presenting himself in a didactic role. Plautus is well aware of the topos that comedy is a didactic medium, that ‘comedy mirrors life’, that it presents the audience with people who are acting foolishly or in a morally objectionable way, and thereby improves the *mores* of the audience. Plautus turns this claim on its head by putting on stage a young man who - under the pretence of being didactic - reveals himself as an extremely biased comic law-giver and pompous *erotodidaskalos*. The terminology is that of legal discourse, but just as in the case of Syra’s speech (817-829), the substance is anything but legal. Plautus uses diction, metre and themes familiar to the audience from non-*palliata* contexts to create certain expectations of pathos and deflates them immediately.
Indexes

References are to lemmata in the commentary where further examples and parallels may be found.

1. Topics, Themes, Motifs (Greek and Roman)
adultery, 817-829.
‘agnosticism’, of Charinus, 4-7, 18-36, 145f., 626f., 854.
Apollo Agyieus, 678
auction(s), 424-443, 616.
auspicium, 274.
Bacchants, Bacchanalia, and the Pentheus-myth, 469-470.
calator, 852.
castration; (gelding of goats) 272; (of adulterers) 275.
cena adventicia, 949.
chariots, 931.
city-country-dichotomy (urbanus-rusticus), 65, country (rus) as anti-erotic space, 65, 656-657, 667-668.
clapping one’s hands, 981.
cliens, 996.
conquistor, 665.
cooks, thieving, 746.
crucifixion, 184.
death, better than miserable life, common topos, 471.
dext(e)ra, taking someone by the right hand, 149, 965.
double standard, sexual, 817-829.
dreams, 225-271.
ego-iam-a-principio motif, 61-72.
elege(i)a, as graffiti, 409.
ephebate, 40, 61, see also Index 2 s.v. aequalis et sodalis.
exile (exilium), as a leitmotif, 43, see also ecfugio (2).
exilium amoris, 644-660, historical background to ~, 857-864.
fermentum, 959.
‘figs’ (obscenity?), 943.
fiscina, 988.
flagitatio, 976-1004.
flies, 361.
Fortuna, alluded to but not named, 197 (fluctus), 842-843 (speratrix; Εὐελπις), 875 (ventus).
gait, as means of characterisation, 406.
goats, have bad breath, 575, capra as expletive, as nickname, voluptuous, 575.
gods; attitude towards gods, 6-7, 626-627; gods making sport of men, 225-226; lover comparing himself to gods, 603-604; mortals referred to as, 867; prayer to Apollo, 678-680; see also 'Fortuna'.
hircus, connected with obscenities, 575.
homosexuality, 204.
hortus, and the θόρα κηραία, 1009.
ignorance (necessary to maintain plot), of Demipho, 335-468n. (esp. 364-365), of Eutychus, 466-468.
incessus, as index of character, 406.
iudex, 736.
κληδών, 274.
Juppiter, 865, 956.
Juno, 690, 956.
Lares; Lar familiaris, 834; Lares viales, 865.
larvae, 981.
law-giving, comic, 817-829, 1015-1024.
lenocinium, 411.
lorarius, 272-334 (scene-headings).
lorum, 1002.
love, as a disease, 263, 489; as insanity, 262-263; 'love-at-first-sight' motif, 101-105, 262; 'stages of love', 571, 745.
lover; immortal (when happy), 603; 408; senex amator, 575; untimely, see 'vetus-puer motif'.
madness, mad-scenes, 842-956, madness of lover, 262, see also 'schizophrenia of lover'.
medicine, in Rome, 139-140, 472, 489.
misogynism, 513, 555-557.
monkeys, 233.
mutuum, 52.
navigatio amoris, 193-195.
ummus, 491.
old age, as a burden (literary topos), 672-673.
omen, 274.
one-and-only theme, 536-537, 824-825.
ottium, as cause of idle love (commonplace), 62, 552; 'counter-world' of businessman and negotium.
pallor, as sign of fear and love-sickness, 368, 373.
Panathenaea, 67.
paraklausithyron, 408.
peculium, 96, 525 (double entendre?).
penates, 834.
praetor, 664.
ramites, 138.
raster, 277.
reading skills, 303.
redhibitio, 419.
religio, 881.
Rhodes; Rhodians famous for wit, 514.
salt, 205.
schizophrenia of lover, 345, 589.
seats, in Plautus’ theatre, 160.
seasickness, 371, 389.
sequestration, 738.
sheep, 524.
ships, tonnage of merchant ~, 75.
Snakes, 761.
sodalis opitulator, 475.
soul, ‘displacement’ of, as literary motifs, 589.
suicide, 472-473, 660, 830-841 (perhaps).
symposiastic themes, 547-554.
symposium, auctions at, 424.
tossing one’s head, a sign of anger or dejection, 600.
ususfructus, 832.
uxor, theatrical ‘job’ of, 1003-1004; uxor dotata, 703, uxor univira, 817-829.
vetus-puer motif, 290-292, 303, 540, 976.
vilicus, 277.
woolwork, 518.

2. Semantic and Syntactic Observations
Acherunticus, orthography and prosody, 290.
addictus, legal technical term, 616.
aegritudo, always in connection with Charinus (and his love-sickness), 19, 140, 359, 870.
aequalis et sodalis = συνέφησος, 612.
ah, 156, 323 (?), 431.
aunt, 469.
amabo, 503.
amens amansque, 81.
amicus amico, ὁς φίλος φίλω, and similar phrases, 499.
amo, used in Roman declension tables, 304.
amores, 2.
aneo, 755.
animi, 166.
antiquus, 546, 885.
arbitro, 902.
ast, 246.
at, introducing curse, 793.
atque, adversative, 532, 742; = καὶ μήν, 256; atque eccum/-am, 561, 671.
auctarium, 490.
auctor sum (ut), 312.
augaeo, ritual term of sacrifice, 676.
animi causa, ‘for fun’, 341.
barbarus, not always as reference to Romans, 424-444.
bellus; bellissumus, ironically, 688, 812.
bene ambula(to), formula of leave-taking, 327.
bonus, ‘sexually obliging’, 512.
capital, 610.
caput, for the person (pars pro toto), 153.
certa res est, 857.
certo scio, 1012.
civitas, prosody of –, 846.
conceptis verbis, in oath-taking, 790.
concubina, 757.
contabesco, 205.
copiae est, and copia est, 990
cras, and heri, in a theatrical sense, ‘not in this play’, 106, 438, 481, 542, 770.
curo, of food-preparation, 583.
damunt, 226.
decem, of an unspecified high number (‘a thousand’), 345, 694.
decreptus, etymology uncertain, 291.
deus, divus; genitive plural divum (deum), 842.
dext(e)ra, 149, 965.
dico, ‘to announce (an edict, a bill of law)’, 1015; dicam, pleonastic (in periphrasis) 128.
dierectus, 184.
disciplina, 116, 133.
disperii, 599 (see also perii).
dius, adverbial genitive, 862.
do, in prayer-language, 688.
doctus, of someone good at scheming, 522 (?), 631-632.
domi, and foris, 131, 489.
domo doctus, 354.
drach(u)ma, 777.
dum ... dum, ‘now ... now again’, 348-349.
eadem, adverbial, 1007.
ecastor, 503.
ece autem, 748; eccum, 271, 330, 561, 747.
eccillum, 434-435.
ecflictim, 444.
ecfugio, usage influenced by γενειανεια, 660.
edepol, 393.
eiulare, 683.
em, or eme, particle, 313.
enicare, 114, 157, 312, 493, 557, 612, 893, 916; enicas, Charinus’ mannerism, 157.
equidem, 161.
ergo, with imperative, 907, usually follows verb, 955.
et, explanatory, 282.
etiam, in incredulous questions, 202, affirmative etiam, 816.
exemplum, 226.
face, for fac, 498.
facio, used for an indelicate verb, 957-958.
factum, exclamatory, 298; ellipsis of esse, 242, 389.
faxint, 285.
fides, ‘promise’, 531.
filum, used like forma, of a woman, 755.
flagitium, 237, 406, 417, 422, 784; flagitium facio, mainly said of senes amatores, 237.
foris, and domi, 131, 489.
formosus, 229 (hapax in Plautus).
fortasse + infinitive, 782.
fueram, for eram, 231.
grates ago, 843.
gratus, 105, 527.
guttatim, and other adverbs in -atim, 205.
habeo + perfect participle, 360, 398.
hau(d) vidi magis, ironically, 723.
heia, 998.
hercle, 539; hercle qui, 'heavens how ...', 412.
heu, 624, 701, 770.
heus, 800.
hodie, heri, and cras, in a theatrical sense, see cras.
humanus, in a narrowly defined sense.
ignavus, 'lax', 133.
immo, 164, 708.
incedo (cedo), of slow walking, 600, 671.
infit, 249.
ingratiis, 479.
inopia, 30, 162, 650, 848.
ingerum, 431, 448, 457, 776, 917.
insanus, in connection with love-sickness, 263.
introire, 'to enter', in an obscene sense, 567, 570.
intus, in tautological expressions denoting 'inside', (187), 684.
inventum rather than inventus, 847.
ipsus, 56, 481, 598, 759.
ita vero, 567.
Iudicare, legal t.t., 'to pass a verdict', 281.
Iuppiter, in exclamations, 865.
lapis, of a stupid person, 632.
lis, 281.
luci, 255.
malis bene esse solitumst, and similar expressions, 511.
mando, 'request', 835.
maxeume, end position, 840.
mecastor, 689.
mercimonium, referring to a slave, 500.
miser, frequently said of the unhappy lover, 588; high frequency of ~ in Mercator (29 times).
mons ... mali, 617, see also thesaurus ... mali.
moratus, 392.
mulier, `Madame', 522; mulier - femina 684, mulier - meretrix 685.
multum, modifying adjectives, 887.
musso, 49.
navem, orthography, 75.
ne time, 173, 891, 1004.
nempe, probably ironic, 760, 776.
nescioquis, `some sort of', 365; nescioqui, prosody,

ni = nisi, 243; `but for the fact that', 591.
nihil agis, 459.
nihil est quod, 317.
nimium, 479, 686; nimio (abl. of measure), 549.
nimis, 125, 166, (501), 597.
nocte hac, `last night', 227.
noctu, 862.
nullus sum, 164, 217, 468, 978.
num, 132.
numero, `too quickly', 739.
numquam, `under no circumstances', 438.
numquid vis?, formula of leave-taking, 325.
occo, 71.
ocius, for positive, 930; comparative, 671.
odisse, 761, 764; odiosus esse alicui, 608.
oppido, 239, 245, 709.
opsecro, 166.
opume, `in the nick of time', 329, 912.
os sublino, 485, 631.
paelex, 690, 757.
palpo percutere, `to pat', 153.
par pari, 629.
parce, in ritual language, 680.
perendie, 375, 606.
perii, 124.
perpetuus, 378, 387 (perpetuo).
persentiscere, 687.
propitius, in religious language, 678, 680, 956.
proprius, as a religious term, 338.
puer, as a criticism of behaviour, 292 (cf. 296).
pulchre, 485; pulchre sum, 583, pulchre aedificatus, 902.
quamvis, = quam vis 687, 726
quandoquidem, causal, 171.
quantum potest, 691.
quake, 19, 111, 226, 411, 793, 794, 818, 840 (?), 878 (dub.), 879, 902, 1016; in
formulae/‘high’ diction: 111 (?), 226 (?), 793, 830; in enumerations: 19, 26, 162.
quire (queo), 55.
qui, play on ambiguity, 183, (487?), 627.
qui, ablative singular, 676.
qui for quis, 474, 867.
qui amat, = amator, 20, 744.
quid verbis opus est?, 106.
quin?, ‘why not?’, 190, 725; with subjunctive, 582-583; in orders, 183, 185, 937, 955,
1002.
quoa (cuia), = cuius, 200 (morphology), 529, 720-722 (a central motif).
recte, in evasive answers, 367.
reignum, 841.
recipere, used instead of se recipere, 498.
resciscere, frequency and meanings, 107.
rus-words, frequency of in Mercator, 273.
sane, with imperative, 500, 677.
sanus, and insanus, a major motif, 679.
satin, 337, 481, 682.
sapientia, and sapere, 295, 506; si sapias, 373, 801; si sapis: 584.
socio, laconic and dismissive, 476.
satus, of women, 755, 757.
sententia, legal terminology, (mea) ex sententia, 94, 370, adversum mei animi
sententiam, (377), 441, 597.
sicine, 158.
siem, morphology, 125.
simitu, 118, 847.
sinistra, 879.
sil, 749.
sultior, 920.
subniger, 640.
supplicum, 991.
traceo; non taces?, 211, 484, 754; quin taces?, 494.
tam = tamen, 33.
tamendem, 595.
tantumst, 283-284.
thensaurus ... mali, 163, 641, see also mons ... mali.
unde = a quo, 418.
vae tibi, 161, vae misero mihi, 181, 681, 708.
vapulare, 397.
verbero, 189.
verbis meis, 'in my name', 787.
verbum, 'saying', 771.
veron serio ?, 685.
vicus, 665.
vir, 667, 688.
video; ego (istuc) videro, 448.
viduus, vidua, 829.
volo, + infinitive, expressing futurity, 156.
vorto, intransitive, 433.

3. Composition, Grammar, Dramatic Technique, and Style
accusative of direction, with names of islands, 11, 92, 937.
alliteration, 176, 192, 508-509, 598b, 843, 964.
antonomasia, 690.
apposition, epexegetic, after local hic, 1008.
argumentum, 2.
asyndeton, 360; 832.
comparative, double, 898.
constructio ad sensum, 131, 910f.
co-ordinate for subordinate construction, 546.
deictic pronouns, hic homo etc. = ego, 123, 996.
depONENT, deponent and active co-exsistent in Plautus, 902.
‘dispatch style’, 277, 498.
doors, dramatic use of, knocking at, 130.
double entendre, sexual innuendo, 504-506, 518, 522, 769 (?), 781 (?).

expectation, defeated para prosdokian (πορά προσδοκίαν) jokes, 612, 621-622; raised, 586, 592, 595-597.

exits, of actors, consecutive, delayed; exits in order to plan/execute action, 466-468, 498, 587, 663-666, 689-691, [797], 815-816, 952-956.

extras (‘supernumeraries’), 272-334 (lorarius), 741-802, 842-956 (puer).

figura etymologica, 191, 843, 844.

future, difference between simple future and future perfect in Plautus, 139, 372, 389, 497.

future imperative, 115, 139, 140, i + future imperative, 787.

future perfect, 139, 448.

gemination, emphatic, 474, 928.

genitive in -om/-um, 842.


greeting routine, absence of, 365-370, pompous, 713.

habere, with perfect participle, 360, 398.

hendiadys, rare in Plautus, 174, 274, 997.

‘historic’ present, in ut-clause, 100.

‘historic’ infinitive, 46.

iconism (effictio), 639-640.

imagery; grotesque, 590; sustained, marine and nautical, 173-174, 195-197, 875-880, 890-891; violent, 308-312, 613.

infinitive, complementary, representing an object in dative case, 288, used as verbal noun, 805.

introduction of characters’ names by question and answer, 474, 516.

laconic expression, 883; scio, 476.

loanwords, Greek: terminology of commerce and seafaring: cercurus 87, drach(u)ma 777, lembus 193, 259, metreta 75, mina, 429, 430, 432, 435, 437, nausea 389, talentum 89, 703, thensaurus 163, 641; cult: Acherunticus 290, Apollo 678, baccha 469; dining: opsono(r) 695, 754, opsonium 582; techniques/trades: ampulla 927, balineae 127, chlamys 912, 921, comoedia 3, machaera 926, paedagogus 91, peplus 67, philosophor 147, porcus = πόρκος ‘fish trap’ (?) 988, resina 139, toxicus 472, zona 925; interjections: apage 144, attatae 365, (h)ea 950, 998, eu 601, eug(a)e 283, eugepae 626; speaking names: Acanthio 112, Eutychus 601, Pasicompsa 515, Pentheus (?) 469, Pistus (?) 278; others: bracchium 883, ephebus 40, 61, hilare 99, musso (μύσσο) 49, paelex (?) 691, podagrosus 595.

oxymoron, 574.
"metatheatre", 225.

"mirror-scenes", III.3 intro.

modal verbs, indicative of modal verbs used in unreal conditions, 724, 983*,
monologues; entrance monologues, 1, 111, 225, 335, 544, 588, [667], 700, 830, 842;
link monologues, 469-473, 692 (also entrance monologue), exit monologues, 662-666, 792-802, 817-829, [1015].

*optique du théâtre*, 966.

‘padded’ expressions, 964.

‘paratragedy’, 195-197, 830-841, 841ff. (V 1, V 2).

parody, of Greek dramatic conventions, 1007.

passage of time, unobtrusive references, 255, 873.

passive, impersonal, expressing reservation/distance, 465, 776.

*permissio*, 989.

Plautus *imitator sui*, 225f. (Ru. 593f.), 744 (Cas. 802).

plot (Acanthio’s role), play with expectation horizon/audience frustration.

perfect, contraction (omission of -is(s)-), 53, 826.

perfect, periphrastic (*habeo* + perf. partic.), 360, 398.

perfect subjunctive, r-forms much rarer in Plautus, 323.

prayer, 678-680.

priamel, 225-228.

pronoun, indefinite, *qui* for *quis*, 474, 867.

protatic characters, I.2 intro.

props, portable; stage fixtures (Apollo statue)

puns, 161, 486, 601, 643.

*quam* - *tam*, archaic construction, 122.

questions, echoed (of surprise and indignation), 727 (probably), 749.

rapid repartee, four-part lines, 181, 324, 883, 884, 888, 889

rapport, between actors and audience, 8.

‘rhyme’, 218, 361.

*scaenae suppositiciae*, 816.

*servus currens*, 111.

slowness, comic complaints about, 595-597, 670-671.

stage conventions, Plautus manipulating stage conventions, 481, 1004.

stichomythia, interruption in ~, 480.

style, jerky, 937-950.

subjunctive; deliberative, used to express surprise after command, 749; jussive, *ne* +

imperfect subjunctive, 60, *ne* + perfect subjunctive, 401-402; present subjunctive instead

of imperfect subjunctive for unfulfilled conditions in present time, 298-299, 430 (?), 445, 841 (cf. also 405-406).
supine, 352.
tenses, use of; perfect, greater vividness of perfect in apodosis (instead of future/future perfect), 909; pluperfect in main clause/present tense in subordinate clause, 616.
vocative, *puere* instead of *puer*, 912.

4. Metre and Prosody
aphaeresis, see ‘prodelision’.
apocope of final -e, 446.
*brevis brevians*, see ‘iambic shortening’.
es, (ess), 629.
enjambment, 3(?), 31 (?), 42, 56, 57, 62, 63, 74, 90, 95, 100, 145, 150, 199/200, 201, 208, 210, 216, 220, 252 (?), 262, 269, 277, 278, 279, 314 (?), 331 (?), 382, 405, 410, 413, 421 (?), 446 (?), 467, 469 (?), 486, 490, 505 (?), 531, 547, 552, 571, 578, 582, 620, 623, 659, 689, 695, 716, 741, 751, 760 (?), 773, 779, 812, 864, 867, 869, 910, 920, 923, 998, 1007.
final -s, dropped before a consonant, 131, 217, 232, 245, 324, 978, possibly dropped, 805.
heteroprosody, 928.
hiatus, metrical, 6; legitimate at A/B junctures, 709, at D/A junctures, 706, at C/D 859; ‘prosodic’, see ‘semi-elision’.
iambic shortening (*brevis brevians*), 217, 232, 240, 244 (?), 245, 260, 324, 377, 567, 620-621, 726, 751, 812, 828, 941, 978
*iilius*, disyllabic (*illi(u)s*), 48, 657.
lengthening before ‘final dipody’, 901.
line-end, passive infinitives in -ier securing c D at line-end, 48, 58.
*loci Jacobsohniani*, in ia^6^, 693, 706, in tr^7^, 412 (?), 611, 619 (?), 1008
Luchs’ Law, infringed 202 (definite license); a standing exception to *(dd a B)*, 394, 859.
Meyer’s Law, 6; infringed, in ia^6^, 6, 10 (?), 48, 328, 95 (?), 312 (?doubtful), 317, 708, 728, 730 (?doubtful), 774, 780, 801 (?doubtful).
neu/neve, 332 (see also seu/sive).
*nemquid*, pyrrhic, 282.
‘one word’ (*Wortbild*), 325 *hic homo*, 967.
prodelision (= aphaeresis), 1; (forms of *esse*), 169, 614, 672, 726, 752, 756 (?doubtful), 816, 833, 945, 1005.
‘proceleusmatics’, at line-end, 237.
‘prosodic’ hiatus, see ‘semi-elision’.
quadrisyllabic words, at line-end, 490.
semi-elision = 'prosodic' hiatus, 257 (heri), 286, 666, 845.
seu/sive, 306 (see also neu/neve).
'split anapaest', 282, 683.
synaloepha; e.g. 330, 333, 567, 655; of monosyllabic interjection at line-end, 156.
synizesis, 1; of personal pronouns, 711.
wortbild, see 'one word'.

5. Names (personifications, geographical, divine, and mythical names)
Achilles, 488.
Amor, 590.
Apollo, 678.
Boeotia, 647.
Calchas, 945.
Chalcis, 646, 939.
Cnidus, 647.
Corinthus, 646.
Creta, 646.
Cupido, 854.
Cyprus, 646, 933, 937.
Dies, 6.
Eretria, 646.
Hector, 488.
Juno, 690, 956.
Juppiter, 865, 956.
Lesbia, 647.
Luna, 5.
Megares, 646.
Nox, 6.
Pentheus, 469.
Philemo, 9.
Salus, 592-594, 867.
Sicyon, 647.
Sol, 5, 873.
Spes, 592, 867.
Rhodus, 11, 93, 257.
Venus, 38.
Victoria, 867.
Zacynthus, 647, 940.
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