From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff.For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information onthe Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.
https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us

---

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026 Classics

2016

Persa: Introduction and Commentary

Conlon, Joseph Matthew

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01q524jr177

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf

PERSA: INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY

Joseph Matthew Conlon

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY

OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE

BY THE DEPARTMENT OF

CLASSICS

Advisor: Joshua Katz

January 2016

© Copyright by Joseph Matthew Conlon, 2016. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ii
1. Preface 1
2. Introduction 3
I. Why a new commentary on the *Persa*? 3
1. The *Persa* before Woytek. 3
2. From Wilamowitz to Woytek: Background, Method, Conclusions 4
3. Critque of Woytek 9
4. Modern Plautine scholarship 12
5. Conclusion 20
II. The *Persa* and the interests of the commentary 21
1. Language and Register 21
a. Colloquial, literary, archaic, classical, comedic, and Plautine Latin 21
b. Choice and frequency of words and expressions 24
c. Alliteration 27
d. Proverbs, folk wisdom, and modern European languages 28
2. Staging 31
3. Music and Meter 34
4. The Characters: Slavery, Gender Race 39
a. A cast of slaves: Toxilus, Sagaristio, and Paegnium 39
b. Slavery and gender: Saturio and the *virgo* 41
c. Race in the *Persa* 44
III. The text, commentary, manuscripts, and editions 45
3. Commentary 48
4. Bibliography 343

ABSTRACT

The *Persa* of Plautus has received little scholarly attention. Aside from a handful of articles and a few passing remarks in monographs about other plays or aspects of Plautus or Roman comedy, the only commentaries on the play are: Woytek (1982, German), Ammendola (1922, Italian), Ussing (1886, Latin), Jacobus Operarius (1679, Latin) and Lambinus (1577, Latin). This dissertation, taking the form of an introduction and commentary on the *Persa*, is the first commentary and, more generally, the first full-length treatment of the play in English. The introduction has three goals: (1) to show why all previous commentaries in other languages, but especially Woytek's, fail to meet the needs and address the interests of modern readers and scholars of Plautus; (2) to demonstrate that the *Persa* has been neglected unjustly and that it merits attentive reading just as much as the more popular comedies of Plautus; and (3), to introduce the main issues of the play and the main interests of commentary which follows. The commentary itself performs all of the basic work that one would expect: collecting comparanda, explaining difficult and corrupt passages, providing necessary cultural and historical context, etc. In addition, it places particular emphasis on explaining Plautus' language (especially alliteration, proverbs, etymology, the relationship between the colloquial and literary registers of Latin, word choice, and parallels with modern European languages), the staging of the drama, the development of the characters and their relationships, music, and the issues of slavery and gender. The goal throughout is to render the play more accesible to a wider audience of readers.

PREFACE

Even experienced classicists are often surprised to learn how little scholarly attention (in the form of either commentaries, monographs, or journal articles) the plays of Plautus have received in any language. Of the more commonly read and/or popular plays, some commentaries have aged gracefully, such as Lindsay's 1900 commentary on the *Captivi*, which, while dated in certain respects, is still serviceable and is the best commentary available on the play in English; a few have received excellent treatment in English in more recent times, such as Christenson's 2003 commentary on the *Amphitruo* and Gratwick's 1993 commentary on the *Menaechmi*; still other plays have only basic student editions available, such as the *Rudens,* a masterpiece which deserves a much more thorough commentary than Fay's 1969 edition offers, and the *Curculio* and the *Mostellaria* as well; finally, there are a number of plays (including the *Stichus, Trinummus,* and the *Persa*) which have no commentary in English at all.

This situation is less than ideal for many reasons, but especially since the existence and accessibility of commentaries often plays a large role in what gets read by students and what is ignored by scholars. This is compounded by the fact that the plays of Plautus themselves are often less accessible already because of their distance, due to linguistic differences and the general unfamiliarity with the colloquial register of Latin, from the Classical Latin of Cicero, Vergil, and others. Some of Plautus' 20 surviving plays are admittedly more or less interesting than others, but each play is certainly worthy to be studied and, at the very least, to be made accessible to a broader audience of readers.

This commentary hopes to do just that for the *Persa*, a play, as I hope to demonstrate, which, although often neglected, rewards attentive reading. There are three issues which immediately draw the modern reader of Plautus to the *Persa*: the cast composed almost entirely of slaves; the uniqueness of the character of the *virgo*; and the issues of race and cultural identity which the title of the play seems to announce. The lack of modern scholarly attention to the *Persa* is perhaps an accidental result of earlier distaste for the first of these aspects, the cast composed of slaves and social degenerates. But it is precisely this aspect of the *Persa* that makes it so interesting for modern readers. The unique presentation of slaves in the play will be one of the main focuses of this commentary and is outlined in more detail in the introduction. The sympathetic portrayal of the eloquent and intelligent *virgo*, which is largely without parallel in other Roman comedies, will also strike modern readers and will be handled in more detail in the introduction and the body of the commentary itself. Conversely, the issue of race and cultural identity, which at first would seem central to the *Persa*, will not receive the same attention, because, as will be seen, the play never delves deeply into these questions and deals mostly in clichés and stereotypes.

The first section of the introduction will provide a brief overview of modern work on the *Persa* and will outline the reasons that the *Persa* stands in need a commentary in English. The second section will introduce in detail the interests and the scope of the commentary which follows.

INTRODUCTION

I. WHY A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE *PERSA*?

1. THE *PERSA* BEFORE WOYTEK

Modern commentary on the *Persa* might be said to start with Camerarius. In 1558 he wrote in the introduction to his commentary on the *Persa:* "argumenta fabulae est exile, amationis servilis, et iocosum ac plausible in lenonis circumventione."[1] The mild praise and lukewarm judgement of the plot is considered by some to be responsible for the general lack of interest in the Persa to this day.[2] Ritschl, who edited much of Plautus and ushered in a new standard of philological accuracy in Plautine studies, offered in 1851 an equally lukewarm opinion: while some parts of the play are "nur für das gröbste Publikum berechnet," Ritschl admits that it has a "sehr natürlichen, gleichmäßigen Fluß" and that it is composed "einfach und gewandt."[3] But it is Wilamowitz' 1893 treatment of the *Persa* in his *de tribus carminibus latinis commentatio* that most influenced the course of subsequent scholarship. This piece sets out what was to become the central problem of scholarly interest in the *Persa* (the date of the Greek original) and simultaneously condemns the value of the play as a work of art. Although he was later able to see the play in a more positive light,[4] his original judgement exerted much force on later appraisals. Many scholars blindly mimicked his disapproval, while others, such as Gurlitt, responded to Wilamowitz violently in the opposite direction, singing high the praises of the

---

[1] Camerarius 720.

[2] E.g., Woytek 9.

[3] Ritschl 2, 748f, quoted by Woytek 9.

[4] Wilamowitz 1925.

Persa.[5] The judgement of the *Persa* ultimately stabilized over the course of the 20th century, but Wilamowitz' concern for Greek originals behind the *Persa* and especially the dating of these originals has persisted much longer than his judgement of the quality of the play. In many respects, establishing the date of the lost Greek original has become the only point of discussion of any scholarly attention paid to the *Persa*.

2. From Wilamowitz to Woytek: Background, Method, Conclusions

At the beginning of his treatment of the *Persa,* Wilamowitz writes of his approach to Plautus that "Plautum multo plura exemplis suis debere quam plerique crediderant," and that scholars who think otherwise are simply "eximia ac vere Latina sermonis et argutiarum arte decepti."[6] Setting aside all other potential interest in the play by claiming it to be "vitiis suis iam magis memorabilem quam virtutibus futuram" and along the way criticizing the "infantiam artis in conectendis scaenis,"[7] Wilamowitz devotes all of his energies to establishing the date of the Greek original of the *Persa.* He concludes: "argumentum nobis unum est....cetera omnia eo consilio disputata sunto, ut Demosthenicae aetati graecam comoediam a Plauto expressam convenire appareat."[8]

---

[5] Gurlitt 1921. See also Woytek 10-11.

[6] Wilamowitz 13.

[7] Wilamowitz 15, 22.

[8] Wilamowitz 26. Cf. also his famous formulation: "scripta enim est superstite Persarum regno fabula, in qua Timarchides Atheniensis expeditioni interest a rege Persarum susceptai, et Persa puellam ex Arabia raptam Athenis vendit. quae quod non re vera facta sunt, sed a Toxilo servo finguntur, ad hanc rem omnino non pertinet. finguntur enim quia fieri tunc poterant."

The advances made in scholarship on the *Persa* between *de tribus carminibus latinis commentatio* and Woytek's commentary are few.[9] In 1894 Friedrich Hüffner proposed a date of 312 against Wilamowitz' 338, but Friedrich Leo's approval for Wilamowitz' thesis in 1895 sealed the deal. The early 20th century saw sporadic continuation of this debate with little innovation or advancement.[10] Ammendola's commentary appeared in 1922, but it aspires to be little more than a school edition. In 1957 Müller wrote his dissertation *Das Original des plautinischen Persa* and argued that the original was written in Athens in the 3rd century by an emulator of Menander.

Although Woytek's commentary appeared in 1982, in many respects it may as well have been published almost a century earlier, perhaps a few years after Wilamowitz' *de tribus carminibus latinis commentatio* in 1893, or at least in the first quarter of the 20th century. The reason for this is that Woytek is centrally and primarily concerned with the question of the Greek original and presents his entire commentary as a solution to this and only this problem. He announces this intention right away: "Als das zentrale Problem, das der Persa der Plautusphilogie aufgibt, muß seit nunmehr bald neunzig Jahren die Datierung des grieschischen Originals angesprochen werden. Seitdem Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff im Jahre 1893 das Stück kategorisch der griechischen Mittleren Komödie zuwies, blieb die Diskussion über diese Frage stets im Flusse, und das Problem kann auch heute noch nicht als endgültig geklärt angesehen werden. So setzte auch meine Beschäftigung mit diesem Punkte an, wobei ich davon ausging,

[9] See Woytek 13-15 for a more detailed survey of the contributions from 1893 to 1980.

[10] Including minor contributions from M. Meyer (1907), W. Suess (1910), P. Legrand (1910), H. Prescott (1916), Gurlitt (1921), G. Jachmann (1931).

daß eine genaue Untersuchung des Stückes selbst zu einer verlässlicheren Datierung führen sollte als sie aufgrund historischer Spekulation möglich war."[11]

So Woytek believes that a detailed commentary on the play and a close comparison with other works of Plautus will yield an answer to this century-old question. His plan of action is straightforward: Woytek produces a new text of the play and provides a commentary and apparatus to explain his decisions and to investigate the question of the Greek original, and then in his introduction to the commentary he offers his conclusions and answers. The new text which he produces rather liberally reattributes speaking roles, questions and reverses textual decisions of Lindsay and Ritschl, and even restores an old lacuna and posits a new one. Goldberg is unhappy with many of these textual changes, and attributes them to the fact that Woytek "forgets that the Persa is a play and obstructs our view of the dramatic forest with disproportionate attention to the the philological trees."[12] I largely agree with Goldberg's claim. The changes that Woytek proposes will be dealt with in detail in the commentary. Some of them are thought-provoking, but unfortunately few if any contribute to his overall argument about the dating of the Greek original.

After discussing Wilamowitz' dating scheme and the critical response to it, much of the remaining part of Woytek's introduction is devoted to outlining the plot, structure, and characters of the *Persa.* Building off of these outlines, Woytek then presents the backbone of his critical stance in a section entitled "Persa und Asinaria: Die Zeit des Persaoriginals."[13] Woytek rightly

---

[11] Woytek 5.

[12] Goldberg 249.

[13] Woytek 65-79.

sees many parallels and almost identical aspects in the specifics of the plots of the two plays, e.g., the fact that in both plays the girl is purchased with stolen or misappropriated money, in the *Persa* with money from a sale of cattle, in the *Asinaria* with that of asses,[14] or that the money in both plays is referred to by metonymy with the names of the animals themselves,[15] or that both plays end in similar "Foppszenen."[16] But besides these definite and specific instances of similarity, Woytek spends much more energy speaking about similarities which are much harder to pin down. For example he speaks rather impressionistically of "der ganz ähnliche Geist" of the two plays and says that "die aus den beiden Stücken zu abstrahierende Weltsicht der Autoren auf das engste verwandt ist."[17] This impression of similarly leads him to posit that the Greek originals of both plays must have been written by the same author. He emphatically denies that the similarities could be attributed to the preference, style, or artistic choices of Plautus,[18] claiming that in those plays of Plautus of which the author of the Greek original is known, the "mark of the original poet's personality" is clearly felt.[19] Making once again a somewhat fuzzy appeal to the "Übereinstimmung des Weltbildes, das im Persa und in der Asinaria deutlich wird,"

---

[14] Woytek 67.

[15] Woytek 67-8.

[16] Woytek 72.

[17] Woytek 69.

[18] He claims "daß diese Tatsache nicht auf die Wirksamkeit des römischen Bearbeiters zurückgeführt werden darf," (69).

[19] "Trotz der mit der Umformung durch eine so starke und ausgeprägte Persönlichkeit naturgemäß verbundenen nivellierenden Effekte wird die spezifische Eigenart jedes einzelnen Autors, sei sie auch nur an gelegentlich hervorblitzenden Einzelzügen zu erkenne, nicht völlig verschüttet, tragen beispielsweise nach Menander gearbeitet Stücke in freilich unterschiedlichem Grade an Deutlichkeit immer noch den Stempel seiner Persönlichkeit, der eine Verwechslung etwa mit den auf Philemon zurückgehenden Komödien ausschließt," (69).

he claims that this must go back to the originals of both plays.[20] Woytek suggests that the original Greek author of the *Persa* must then be the Demophilus mentioned in the prologue of the *Asinaria* (11: *Demophilus scripsit, Maccus vortit barbare*) Following Gurlitt, he claims that "Die Dominanz des Materiellen über das Emotionelle" is a "Kennzeichen" for the comedies of Demophilus, and proceeds to find evidence of this in the actions of the main characters of the two plays.[21] He says, for example, that neither the Persa nor the Asinaria presents as ideal "eine sentimentale Liebesbeziehung."[22] The world of both plays is "grundsätzlich völlig unsentimental" and displays absolutely no "Selbstlosigkeit des Menschen in seinen Handlungen."[23] The presentation of authority is also similar: parental authority is "ungebrochen und wird mit allem Nachdruck ausgeübt," while the authority of masters over slaves is always undermined.[24] A few other examples of similarity are brought forth, but in sum Woytek claims that the Weltsicht of the author of the two plays displays "keine wesentlichen Unterschiede," and adds: "Das Weltverständnis beider Autoren ist durchaus materialistisch, der Gefühlswelt gegenüber bewusst skeptisch, ja feindlich; das Verhalten der Menschen zueinander sehen beide Dichter, dem Tenor der Stücke nach zu schließen, vom brutal und kompromisslos ausgeübten Recht des jeweils Stärkeren bestimmt."[25] He is ready to admit that the Gewichtigkeit and the

---

[20] Woytek 69.

[21] Gurlitt 324 claims that Demophilus is "der zynischte von des Plautus Meistern." See Woytek 69-70.

[22] Woytek 70.

[23] Woytek 71.

[24] Woytek 71.

[25] Woytek 72.

Beweiskraft of the similarities between the two plays might seem unconvincing when the parallels are isolated, but remains convinced that taken together they point to the common origin of the two Greek originals.[26] All that remains is to briefly analyze the a few surviving fragments of Greek comedy for style and content,[27] make a few additional comments on Wilamowitz' thesis, and draw his conclusions: "Wir sehen also den Persa als ein Produkt der späten Nea geschrieben schon unter dem Einfluß niederer dramatischer Formen wie des Mimus, demgemäß auch durchaus *proche ancêtre de ce que sera plus tard la comédie italienne, avec ses Arlequin, ses Scapin, ses Pantalon*."[28]

3. Critique of Woytek

While in the proceeding review of the methods, conceits, and conclusions of Woytek's commentary many of the inadequacies and anachronisms are immediately apparent, it will prove helpful to outline them directly. We will treat first the problems with his argument about the dating of the Greek original before addressing larger methodological issues, although the two are very much interrelated. As noted above, the heart of Woytek's critical work on the *Persa* comes in a 13-page section entitled "Persa und Asinaria: Die Zeit des Persaoriginals." His discussion of the two plays is interesting and he carefully outlines all the parallels in plot, structure, and characterization, and even gives a few examples of similar jokes or diction. Nevertheless one gets the feeling that too much weight in his argument is put on somewhat slippery similarities in things like the "Geist," "Weltsicht," "Weltverständnis," or "Gefühlswelt" of the plays or authors.

---

[26] Woytek 73-4. He does however lightly quality his assertion: "[das Nahverhältnis] kann auf Identität des Verfassers zurückgehen kann, aber nicht unbedingt muß."

[27] This Woytek does in little more than two pages, 75-77.

[28] Woytek 79, quoting Ernout's edition of the Persa.

And even if one were to rightly identify these similarities, the assertion that they must go back to a common Greek author is tenuous at best and assumes somewhat unbelievably that Plautus, even if one is to accept that he faithfully and purely preserved certain elements of his Greek models, could not have modified the "Geist" of his plays as he translated them in Latin and adapted them for Italian audiences. Goldberg addresses this problem succinctly: "It is axiomatic for the Plautine *Quellenforscher* that similarities perceived between, say, *Mercator* and *Trinummus* occur not because Plautus wrote them both, but because Philemon wrote their Greek originals."[29]

The identification of the author of the Greek originals as Demophilus is also not without its problems. In his commentary on the *Asinaria*, Bertini writes: "[de Demophilo] nihil aliunde comperire possumus."[30] Not only do no fragments of his comedies survive, but his only testimony is the prologue to the *Asinaria*.[31] We know absolutely nothing about him, and Golberg notes that Ritschl "actually banished Demophilus from literary history by emending [the reference in the *Asinaria*] to 'Diphilus.'"[32] This is incredibly convenient for Woytek, and Goldberg rightly criticizes: "at best W. has brought the discussion of *Persa*'s original around to a faceless, dateless Greek poet."[33] Woytek doesn't pull his argument out of thin air, as show above,

---

[29] Goldberg 250.

[30] Bertini 11.

[31] Bertini 11-13; Goldberg 250.

[32] Goldberg 250. But see also Bertini 12: "Ritschl ille, cum prius Demophilum in Diphilum corrigere voluisset, posta suam mutavit sententiam." Cf. also Marigo 534 (quoted Bertini 12): "è certo che il tentativo di correzione fatto dal Ritschl del v. 11 dell'*Asinaria* è errato e l'errore fu francamente confessato dal critico stesso che lo commise."

[33] Goldberg 250.

and he is following closely Gurlitt's and ultimately Leo's assertions about Demophilus.[34] Goldberg's criticism nevertheless stands: although Woytek presents himself as a commentator whose methodology actively tries to avoid historical speculation in the dating of the Greek original,[35] he seems to have embraced a more radical form of literary speculation.

But perhaps the biggest methodological concern confronting a modern reader of Plautus who comes to this commentary is the rather strong resistance to giving Plautus credit for innovation as a poet and dramatic artist. This manifests itself in the commentary most obviously in the far greater interest of the commentator in the lost Greek originals than the extant plays of Plautus. This leads Woytek to three critical mistakes:

(1) Placing so much emphasis on the Greek originals and paying so much less attention to Plautus' own personality, style, and innovations leads Woytek to the false assumption that similarities in two or more plays of Plautus must go back to similarities in the Greek originals. This false assumption is present in much of Woytek's ideas about the *Persa* and ultimately leads him to posit a date and author for the *Persa* that given our evidence can not be objectively corroborated, as seen above.

(2) His interest in the philological comparison of discrete aspects of Plautus' plays with one another and with rather artificial generalizations about Greek comedy means that Woytek

---

[34] See above on Demophilus and Gurlitt. See also Bertini 12 on Leo's *Plautinische Forschungen*: "Fridericus autem Leo sectatorem quendam Menandri Demophilum fuissi iudicavit."

[35] Woytek 5, quoted above in §2: "So setzte auch meine Beschäftigung mit diesem Punkte an, wobei ich davon ausging, daß eine genaue Untersuchung des Stückes selbst zu einer verlässlicheren Datierung führen sollte als sie aufgrund historischer Spekulation möglich war."

rarely pauses to look at the bigger picture and imagine what is happening on stage.[36] Indeed the blessing of the commentary is also its curse: Woytek's philological rigor is commendable but interferes with reading the *Persa* as a piece of dramatic art.

(3) Woytek's singular focus means that other potential influences on Plautus, such as native traditions of farcical comedy in the Umbrian and Oscan speaking parts of southern Italy, or even Etruscan or Carthaginian influences, are overlooked or ignored. It also means that he spends very little time addressing other issues that are not only of interest to the general reader of Plautus but which also make us much better readers of his plays, like slavery, race, and gender in the ancient world, the role of music, staging, and the audience in performance and scriptwriting, Plautus' presentation of himself as a creator and translator, and the metatheatrical and poetically self-conscious games he likes to play in his productions. These concerns will also be addressed more thoroughly through this commentary.

4. Modern Plautine scholarship

One of the most if not the most important moment in scholarship on Plautus in the 20th century is the appearance of Erich Segal's *Roman Laughter* in 1968, a surprisingly late date for the first book-length exclusive treatment of Plautus in English.[37] This book approaches Plautus from an entirely different prospective than the big names of German scholarship on Plautus that most influence Woytek's commentary.[38] Segal is quick to point out that while these heavyweights

---

[36] Cf. Goldberg 249: "He forgets that *Persa* is a play and obstructs our view of the dramatic forest with dispropotionate attention to the philological trees."

[37] Segal's book, although published fourteen years earlier, is not given even a passing reference in Woytek's commentary.

[38] i.e., Wilamowitz, Ritschl, Leo, and even Winkelmann,

of continental philology have made invaluable contributions in preparing the texts of Plautus, they have focused almost exclusively on his relationship to Greek New Comedy. But "no one has studied Plautus," he says, "in relation to contemporary Roman culture or to the comic tradition."[39] And so, focusing on laughter and comedy, Segal sets out to do exactly this. His premises are simple: (1) as the most successful dramatic poet of antiquity, as a "theatrical phenomenon," Plautus himself deserves careful study, and not just his relationship to Greek New Comedy;[40] (2) one cannot separate the comedies of Plautus from their performances and their relationship to the audience: "it is impossible to understand Plautine comedy without appreciating the context in which it was presented;"[41] and (3), this context is primarily the holiday or festival, which Plautus took advantage of in order to invert the (to use Segal's word) "melancholic" norms of everyday Roman life and provide a venue for comedic form of Aristotelian catharsis. In each of his five chapters, Segal focuses on one form of this festive inversion, each of which is described as the disregard of traditional Roman virtues such as pietas, hard work, or the obedience of slaves to their masters. The generalizations that Segal makes about the typical Roman audience might seem a bit theoretically outmoded,[42] and he may well both rely too much upon and misunderstand Freudian ideas,[43] but it is a step in the right direction

---

[39] Segal viii.

[40] Segal 1-5.

[41] Segal 7. See also vii: "Laughter is an affirmation of shared values....Comedy always needs a context, a community, or at least a communal spirit."

[42] E. O'Neil's review begins to address this point: He says that one should read the book and "everywhere...replace the word 'Roman' with 'aristocratic.'" The point being that it is dangerous to assume that the audience of popular comedy would have shared the same values and ideals of behavior as the aristocratic authors who attest these virtues.

[43] See Wiles.

in Plautine studies: throughout, Segal pays Plautus his fair due, analyzing his plots, jokes, and dramatic techniques on their own terms, without reference to Greek originals, and is always interested in uncovering how the plays functioned not only in their performative but also their social context of Republican Rome and how Plautus artfully played with and inverted aspects of this social context through his dramatic technique and humor.[44]

Another big moment in Plautine studies came just three years after Woytek's commentary with the publication of Niall Slater's *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind* (1985). The book's approach and methodology are similar to Segal's (i.e., informed by the need to reappraise Plautus' artistry), but with a different topic and focus. The goal of the work is "to demonstrate the value of reading some representative Plautine comedies as performances."[45] Slater grounds his readings on the assertion that "a play is not a text but rather a total artistic event which exists only in a theatre during a performance."[46] Slater puts to the side the standard problems of Plautine scholarship, i.e., textual editing and identifying the Greek originals behind the plays, and chooses instead to read Plautus on his own terms, as an artist and innovator. Of the innovations that Plautus brings to the stage, Slater focuses on his extensive use of metatheater, which he defines as "theatre that demonstrates an awareness of its own theatricality," and argues that in particular the character of the clever slave, long considered main seat of Plautine originality, transcends the other stock characters and "demonstrates a self-awareness of the play as play and through this awareness demonstrate their own ability to control

[44] See Segal vii: "Moreover, the fact that ancient comedy was presented to an audience which constituted an entire citizenry suggests that laughter might at times even be a national gesture."

[45] Slater 4.

[46] Slater 4.

other characters in the play."[47] Slater then offers a close reading of six plays of Plautus—including the Persa[48]—and shows, as Peter Smith puts it, "the emotional and intellectual impact of [Plautus'] theatre."[49] He suggests that Plautus' use of metatheater is actually closer to Old Comedy than New Comedy. New Comedy, Slater argues, had the more typical goal of theater: mimesis, or pure illusion. Old Comedy and the comedies of Plautus, on the other hand, contain non-illusory elements which breaks the fourth wall and draws the audience into the play.[50] These elements include the prologue, epilogue, monologue, the aside, eavesdropping, role-playing, and the play-within-the play, and improvisation.[51] Once again, Plautus and his artistry are at the center of the argument: Greek comedy makes a minor appearance, but only to underscore Plautus' innovations and independence from his Greek models. This, like Segal's book, is much sounder methodological approach. Although neither Segal nor Slater make this statement explicitly, it is obvious that before we try to reconstruct a lost genre, before even we can understand what Plautus can tell us about this lost genre (if anything), we first must read and understand what it is that Plautus is actually doing. With a solid understanding of Plautus, his work, motivations, goals, audience, and dramatic techniques, the philologist can then proceed to speculate on much firmer ground about Greek New Comedy.

---

[47] Slater 14.

[48] On Slater's reading of the *Persa* see below, §5.

[49] Smith 218.

[50] Slater passim, sed vide praecipue 9-12.

[51] For the list and explanation, see 12-14.

Timothy Moore's book *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* (1998) follows in the footsteps of both Segal and Slater. Once again, the approach is similar (an attempt to understand Plautus in his own terms and in his own context), but with a different focus (this time, the audience). Through a close reading of six plays of Plautus, Moore wants to analysis the relationship between the performers and the audience. This, he claims, is "at the core of any theatrical performance."[52] Moore is aware that evidence for the original performance context of Plautus is difficult to interpret, that even big questions, like whether or not the actors wore masks, remain controversial, and that "texts are woefully inadequate substitutes for performance."[53] Nevertheless, by focusing on "theatrical reminders and direct communication from stage to audience" (i.e., what Slater would call metatheater or nonillusory theater), elements which obviously shape the interactions between audience and the actors, he attempts to reconstruct this relationship.[54] In other words, while Slater points out where and when Plautine metatheater occurs, Moore wants to explore how it happens, how it affects the experience of both performers and audience, and, perhaps most interestingly, "how [it] helps Plautus' plays to succeed with his audience."[55] One very interesting way in which he advances the conversation about Plautus is his analysis of the instances in Plautus where the actors refer to the setting of the play.[56] He comes to the conclusion that Plautus' plays constantly remind the viewers that "the

---

[52] Moore 1.

[53] Moore 1.

[54] See Moore 2-4. Moore focuses his analyses on the elements which Slater identified, such as eavesdropping, monologues, etc.

[55] Moore 4.

[56] This is his third chapter, entitled "Greece or Rome?" 50-66.

Greek setting is a product of theatrical pretense." The implications of such an argument contradict many of the Plautine Quellenforscher who want to see Plautus as perserving more or less intact the purity of the Greek originals. Moore, in contrast, argues that the plays have been so thoroughly adapted to Roman taste and social reality that any references to Greece in Plautus' plays are satirical. While Moore focuses only on geographical references to Greece, it is a reminder of the care that one must have before one can call an element in Plautus unequivocally Greek.

It is in this tradition that David Christenson published his commentary on the *Amphitruo* two years later in 2000. This commentary presents a thoroughly modern reading of Plautus, one that takes careful consideration of all of Plautus' techniques and innovations. The introduction to the commentary does all the standard work: an outline of Plautus' life and social context, a tour through what we know about Roman comedy, information about meter, music, sources for the play, and the manuscript tradition. But where Christenson really shines is in his section entitled "The play's the thing," a thirty-page reading of how the *Amphitruo* achieves its dramatic and comic effect. Christenson's reading testifies to obvious influence from Segal, Slater, and Moore. From Segal comes his sensitivity to the festival context in which the plays were performed,[57] and from Slater and Moore he derives his analysis of the metatheatrics of the "play within the play" in the *Amphitruo*.[58] The commentary itself sacrifices no philological rigor and offers extensive comparanda from Plautus and Latin and Greek literature. But Christenson never lets the technical

---

[57] See, e.g., Christenson 33ff: "Plautus warmly embraced the festival licence temporarily granting freer reign to the Roman populace's social fantasies, and his plays are rife with social inversions, the slave's outwitting of his master being one of the most common of these." He then goes on to talk more about the dynamics of the festivals, the visibility of the nobility in the theater, and touches on the material aspects of the performance setting.

[58] passim, sed vide praesertim 25.

details, such as scansion, textual variants, or difficult phraseology, obscure his view of the bigger questions and interests of modern Plautine scholarship outline above, such slavery, metatheater, social roles and context, dramatic technique, and Plautine innovation.

Since the turn of the millennium and the appearance of Christenson's commentary there have been many fresh contributions to many aspects of Plautine scholarship. Alison Sharrock's *Reading Roman Comedy* (2009), for example, takes a sophisticated literary approach to Plautus and Terence, uncovering in Roman Comedy the poetic principles more familiar to students of Augustan poetry: programmatic statements of poetics, programmatic language or catchphrases which announce a certain poetics, and intertextual readings (which she does both backward and forward in time). Sharrock's readings accomplish exactly what she sets out to do: to explore "how the *poetics* of Augustan poetry might find resonances in the artistry of republican comedy," to approach the comedies in the same way she would approach Ovid or Vergil, i.e., as sophisticated and learned creators or literature, and to "help in bringing Plautus and Terence into the mainstream of Latin literary studies."[59]

Roberta Stewart's 2012 book *Plautus and Roman Slavery* focuses on a different aspect of Plautus and investigates what his plays tell us about how slavery functioned both economically and psychologically in Republican Rome. Using Hegelian theories about slavery, she isolates a handful of elements which exist in most systems of slavery (such as the act of buying and selling, violence and hazing, and gaining freedom) and uses scenes from Plautus to further our understanding of the dynamic which existed between masters and slaves in this period of Roman history. Michael Fontaine's *Funny Words in Plautus* (2010) gives a philologically rigorous

[59] Sharrock ix-x.

analysis of traditionally misunderstood words and jokes in Plautus and in so doing puts our understanding of Plautine language in humor on a much firmer grounding. Timothy Moore's new *Music in Roman Comedy* (2012) offers us a thorough treatment of some of the most elusive elements of the art of Plautus: song, dance, rhythm, meter, and music. Since the cantica are generally understood to be a Plautine innovation,[60] and since a play like the *Persa* is over thirty percent cantica, Moore's book, as well as Caesar Questa's recent critical edition of all of the cantica of Plautus (1995), his book about the topic, *La metrica di Plauto e Terenzio* (2007), and Benjamin Fortson's *Language and Rhythm in Plautus* (2008), all provide the student of any play of Plautus all the necessary material to begin an analysis of one of the most difficult aspects of working with Plautus. And when it comes to understanding Plautus' difficult and archaic language, one cannot underestimate the many contributions of Wolfgang de Melo. In addition to many articles about specific morphological phenomena in Plautus, his 2007 book *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*, while not without faults,[61] casts new light on old problems and misunderstandings in basic morphological and syntactical difficulties in Plautus and Old Latin generally, such as sigmatic futures and infinitives, irregular subjunctives like *duim*, and the workings of the sequence of tenses. But perhaps his most impressive contribution is his 2011 five volume Loeb edition of Plautus, which replaces the

---

[60] vide, e.g., Christenson 24: "In the absence of any firm evidence as to the nature of Plautine music and singing techniques, and how these coloured individual scenes, we can only conceive of broad analogies with modern musical comedy or opera. We suspect but cannot prove that dance was also a regular feature of Plautine performance. At any rate, in their musical virtuosity alone Plautus' performances immediately distinguish themselves from the relatively quiet drama of a Menander or Terence."

[61] Especially troublesome is the small sample size of the data that he uses to make some of his claims. In his discussion of the sematic range of the simple future and the future perfect in archaic Latin, for example, the sample size is limited to only three plays: two from Plautus and one from Terence.

rather outmoded edition of Nixon. de Melo has an impressive command not only of the philological niceties of Old Latin morphology, but also of Plautine idiom and phraseology, producing translations that are much more respectful to the Latin than Nixon's. He not only provides the reader with a new, clean text and many helpful tools, such as a complete commentary on the Punic passages in the *Poenulus*, but also remains sensitive to modern directions in Plautine scholarship and he generally does a good job of reading the plays as theatrical works.

5. Conclusion

I hope that the need for a new commentary on the *Persa* in English has become apparent from the preceding. Woytek's commentary has in many ways laid the foundation for work on the *Persa*, and the present commentary is throughout indebted to his work, especially in matters that he has treated thoroughly, such as the collection of parallel passages, analyses of the peculiarities of meter, and the history of emendations (especially by German philologists) for specific words and lines in the play. Much of this ground I have chosen not to repeat except where absolutely necessary, as Woytek's account of these matters is still entirely serviceable. But in many other aspects, although only slightly more than thirty years have passed since the appearance of Woytek's work, the traditional focus on Quellenforschung has prematurely dated much of the commentary. The present commentary takes into account all of the literature mentioned above and offers a fresh reading of the play. The following sections of the introduction will provide an overview of some of the concerns and interests of this commentary which distinguish it from previous work.

II. THE *PERSA* AND INTERESTS OF THE COMMENTARY

In addition to performing all of the basic work of a commentary (collecting comparanda, explaining difficult and corrupt passages, providing necessary cultural and historical context, etc.), the reader will notice that a handful of ideas and interests come up again and again throughout. Within the broad category of Plautus' language fall: word choice, alliteration, proverbial expressions, etymology, and parallels with modern European languages. Among the aspects of Plautus' artistry as playwright, three elements stand out: the handling of the staging, music and meter, and the development of the characters and their relationships. Under this last category are found also the issues of slavery, gender, and race in the *Persa.*

1. LANGUAGE AND REGISTER

A. COLLOQUIAL, LITERARY, ARCHAIC, CLASSICAL, COMEDIC, AND PLAUTINE LATIN

The purpose of this section is offer some preliminary thoughts about a number of problematic terms which are employed throughout the commentary. In particular, the categories of colloquial, archaic, comedic, and Plautine Latin are very difficult to define individually because all of these categories can at times overlap.[62] It may help to start by stating the obvious: that *colloquial* and *literary* refer to registers of speech; *archaic* can refer to the corpus Old Latin itself, to frozen forms and expressions, and to the deliberate use of language to evoke an earlier time; *classical*, like archaic, can refer to a temporally defined corpus or to later attempts to imitate the Latin produced during this period; *comedic* refers, of course, to a (literary) genre; and finally, *Plautine* refers to a specific author.

---

[62] For a good introduction to the problems of these terms, the reader is directed to the first part of the edited volume *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (2010) entitled "Theoretical Framework." This section of the introduction is heavily indebted to this book.

On the distinction between the *colloquial* and *literary* registers, we can say that it is: (1) fluid; (2) always interacting with genre[63]; and (3) related but not entirely dictated by the distinction between written and spoken language. By fluid, we mean that many words and phrases are at home both in literary and colloquial Latin.[64] The distinction interacts with genre insofar as certain genres will admit more or less of one register or the other, although all genres are flexible enough to include elements of all registers of speech. Finally, one must take care to not equate the colloquial with the spoken and literary with the written, since certain authors will want to write texts that attempt to sound as if they are spoken (especially playwrights), and the speech patterns of certain people in certain contexts are often influenced by literary registers.

The terms *archaic* and *classical* are much less problematic when dealing with Plautus. Archaic, for our purposes, will refer to features of Latin which are present (whether frequently or not) in Old Latin, i.e., Latin produced before ca. 75 BC, but which are not present or particularly common in later Latin. The corpus of Old Latin has been expanding over the course of the last two centuries, as more inscriptions and fragments are found and published; the corpus, however, is still dominated (in terms of quantity of material) by the plays of Plautus and Terence and other fragments of tragedy and comedy. Classical will refer to the style and usage of Latin produced during the late Republic and Empire. The most important classical author is Cicero, not only because of the size of his corpus, but because his influence can be felt in all subsequent Latin,

---

[63] Eleanor Dickey uses the term "genre-dependent," Colloquial and Literary Latin, 2010: 3.

[64] Eleanor Dickey gives some examples: "it would be as silly to ask whether English 'and' is an element of literary or of colloquial language as it would be to ask to which register the English present tense belongs."

even in poetry and in authors who are frequently seen as anti-Ciceronian, such as Sallust and Tacitus.

Comedic refers to a genre. The genre as we have it now is almost entirely a literary (i.e., written) genre, but the origins of the genre lie in improvised and unscripted exchanges. Despite the fact that the genre is literary, it is, by its nature, the genre which calls for the most use of the colloquial (i.e., the spoken) forms of the language. When talking about the relationship between the genre of comedy and colloquial language, we must remember that it is not a mark of a successful playwright or actor if, during the performance, the audience has the impression that the situations are scripted or if, for some reason, the language feels unnatural or otherwise far from the context of the situation or characters depicted on stage. Therefore it is fair to assume that the language of Plautus' characters was, for the original audience, a fairly convincing imitation of the language used in the everyday situations and exchanges which Plautus puts on stage. The language departs from the colloquial in obviously marked places where other genres (e.g., tragedy, epic) or registers (e.g., legal, religious) enter into Plautus' comedies. In fact, these departures, because of the very contrast with the expected register of the genre, often add comedy to a given situation. As such, departures from the colloquial register are intended to be fairly easy to spot. Other genres and corpora which tend (or purport) to reflect colloquial language are: dialogue in tragedy, letters (personal letters to a greater, philosophical or argumentative letters to a slightly lesser extent), philosophical dialogues, satire, and certain passages in Apuleius and Petronius.

Finally, *Plautine* refers to expressions, vocabulary, usages, forms, style, and any other aspects of language which are found primarily in Plautus, as opposed to other authors (including other comedic playwrights).

This commentary does not pretend to solve the problems inherent in these words, but I ask the reader to keep these considerations in mind throughout. Many of these words and categories overlap and interact, and each occurrence of one of them must be treated with caution, both in this commentary and in scholarship generally. Additionally, we must always keep in mind that some things which seem colloquial may seem so only by an accident of transmission. But because we have much more literary Latin than colloquial Latin, the opposite is much more frequently true (within limits, of course): that elements which we consider to be literary or otherwise high in register were actually normal features of everyday language.

B. Choice and frequency of words and expressions

Over a century separates the plays of Plautus from the most widely-studied Republic literature (Cicero, Catullus, Lucretius, Caesar, etc.). In many cases, the language of Plautus is also distant from Classical Latin because of genre, context, and register. Understanding how Plautus' language both differs from and resembles Classical Latin is the first step in tackling one of the most interesting aspects of Plautus' plays: the insight they offer into what colloquial, quotidian Latin may have sounded like as spoken by an average Roman (whether slave, pimp, prostitute, landowner, soldier, etc.). A few examples will clarify what this process looks like:

(1) The expression *ex sententia esse alicui* 'to be as one would wish' (cf. ad 10) is common in both Plautus, used 6 times in Terence, and quite frequently in Cicero's letters (in his other works it just occurs once in the *De Oratore* and once in the *Lucullus*).

Although Livy and Sallust each use it a few times, the data seem to indicate that the expression was fairly colloquial and of a more relaxed register. Variations include *ex (mea, tua, alicuius) sententia,* or just *ex sententia* ('to one's liking').

(2) The adverb *sedulo* (cf. ad 46) is very common in comedy, occuring 34 times in Plautus and 22 times in Terence. It is absent from Caesar, Sallust, Tacitus, and almost all poetry; it occurs a handful of times in Livy; five times in Pliny's letters; and in Cicero it occurs only once in an oration (*Pro Cluentio* 58.9), but five times in letters and twice in dialogues. All this suggests that in general it was more suited to colloquial registers.

(3) Genitive of indefinite value *nihili,* 'worthless, of no value' (cf. ad 94), is a favorite usage of Plautus (more than 50 occurrences) which is not as common in other authors. Cicero is among the few who actually use it, but even so there are only seven occurrences in his corpus (twice in orations, twice in letters, thrice in dialogues). In this case it is difficult to say whether this is a feature of the colloquial register of Latin generally, or if is just a favorite expression of Plautus which does not get used much later. One may hypothesize, however, that the genre of Plautus' works allowed this everyday expression to be used with a much greater frequency than in other surviving Latin works.

(4) The word *propediem* ('soon,' from *prope* and *dies,* lit., '[on a day] near to today'; cf. ad 295) is present in comedy and is used a few times in Cicero's dialogues, but it is extremely common in Cicero's letters and is a favorite word of Livy. Otherwise it is not found elsewhere, suggesting that the word was a part of the colloquial register which Livy just happened to enjoy using. History, in general, has more flexibility than other genres in incorporating vocabulary from many registers.

(5) The phrase *abi in malam rem* ‘go to hell!’ (cf. ad 288) occurs four other times in Plautus, once in Terence, and nowhere else in Latin. This is no surprise; the distribution of this phrase is explained entirely by register and generic expectations of comedy. One can imagine that this expression, despite having no attestation after Terence, was commonly heard on the streets of Rome.

In addition to the differences and similarities between Plautus and Classical Latin, one may also use word frequency to come to a deeper understanding of the preferences and peculiarities of Plautus’ language in its own right:

(1) The adverb *continuo* (cf. ad 163) is used 48 times in Plautus, making it second only to *extemplo* (67 times) as his favorite adverb for expressing ‘immediately, right away.’ Other expressions occur with much less frequency (*subito,* 14 times; *repente,* 8 times; and *statim* only twice).

(2) The adverb *interibi* (cf. ad 165) is found about 9 times in Plautus, once in Apuleius, once in Aulus Gellius, and nowhere else. The more standard Classical words are *interim* and *interea*, both of which are more common in Plautus as well (31 and 24 times respectively).

(3) The verb *occipere* (cf. 114) is Plautus’ favorite way to express “to begin,” which he uses more than 70 times, far more often than the classical verbs *incipere* or *coepisse/ coepere,* each of which are found in Plautus fewer than 30 times.

The many notes of this sort which are found in this commentary are by no means intended to be a comprehensive study of colloquial Latin; indeed, they hardly even scratch the surface of the question. But as of yet there is no exhaustive study of the frequency of words, expressions, and

forms in Plautus as compared to Classical authors.[65] The notes found in this commentary are an attempt to alert the reader of certain words of importance or interest, either because they are uniquely Plautine or colloquial, or because they are particularly rare in the colloquial register of Latin, or even because what may seem like a colloquial expression is actually a common usage of Cicero or Caesar. These notes begin, at least, to highlight what is unique to comedy and the colloquial register of Latin and offer the beginnings of a hypothesis of what Latin sounded like in the mouths of ordinary Romans.

C. ALLITERATION

Not much can be offered as far as a theory of alliteration in Plautus is concerned. It is, however, one of the defining organizational principles of Plautine expression (and of Old Latin generally), a feature which often is actively avoided in Classical Latin. It occurs everywhere in Plautus, from the most mundane exchanges to the most rhetorically charged speeches, in the mouths of prostitutes and soldiers, old landowners and young lovers, slaves, freedmen, and parasites. Sometimes, indeed, the alliteration is purposeful (i.e., to highlight a particularly important point or to make a joke more vivid):

> In *qui ero suo servire volt bene servos servitutem* (7), note how the alliteration and consonance adds to the ridiculousness of the excessive etymological wordplay; the alliteration of *s* continues three lines later (10: *ego nec lubenter servio neque satis sum ero ex sententia*), giving ultimately a rhetorically polished introduction to Sagaristio and

---

[65] Adam's *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (2013) begins to address some of these issues, but his focus is more on phonology and morphology rather than word frequency, colloquialisms, and usage of constructions and expressions.

placing emphasis on the root *serv-*, which is particularly fitting for a play whose characters are almost all slaves.

Other times, however, the alliteration seems to have no rhetorical purpose or deeper explanation other than the fact that it is a natural organizational principle that influences word order:

> The line *si tu tibi bene esse / pote pati, veni: vives mecum* (30 - 30[a]) is organized as such: first the repetition of consonants separated by one vowel each (tu tibi bene...); then the repetition of the same short vowel sound (bene esse); then alternating repeating consonants separated each by a unique vowel (pote pati); and finally the same consonant repeated thrice with a chiasmus of vowels (**v**en**i** **v**i**v**es). This is an extreme example of how alliteration (and assonance, consonance, and other sonic effects as well) organizes the progression of thought and the order and choice of words.

I have not hesitated to make note of all of the most interesting uses of alliteration in the *Persa*. Indeed, they are so common that one can sometimes forget that they are there.

D. PROVERBS, FOLK WISDOM, AND MODERN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Plautus is rich with proverbs and seemingly proverbial expressions. Some of these proverbs are found elsewhere in Latin literature (seemingly confirming their status as proverbs), while others are unattested elsewhere but, because of tone, content, or rhetorical features, can be said have a proverbial ring or, further, to be proverbs which only accidentally are not attested elsewhere. In establishing whether an expression is common enough to be considered a proverb, often comparisons with modern European languages can helpful, and very often one can find many similar proverbs and pearls of folk wisdom in these languages. It would be a stretch in most cases to assume that a Plautine expression or proverb made its way directly into a modern

language (although the renewed interest in Plautine Latin during the Renaissance and the influence of Plautus on Renaissance theater may make this more plausible than it seems at first glance). It is perhaps more likely that the content which becomes frozen and popularized in proverbial expressions is similar across similar cultures. Even if all of these parallels are due to mere coincidence, they are nevertheless illustrative of the fact that the comedies of Plautus are more modern (or, perhaps, that we are more Plautine) than immediately apparent.

The prevalence of these types of proverbs and expressions in Plautus is largely due to the register of language demanded by the genre. Of all ancient genres, comedy claims to be the most lifelike in both its language and its presentation of human morals (cf. Aristophanes of Byzantium's famous judgement of Menander: ὦ Μένανδρε, ὦ βίε, πότερος ἄρ' ὑμῶν πότερον ἀπεμιμήσατο;). This type of folk wisdom and the usage of proverbial expressions is far more common in colloquial speech and far more common among the uneducated than the educated.

Some examples of these phenomena:

(1) In line 166, we meet the words *ut habeat animum bonum.* The phrase *habere animum bonum* 'have confidence, be confident, be of good courage' is used 20 times in Plautus, being more common than *bono animo esse*, which is found about 15 times in Plautus. Both expressions elsewhere are almost always found in the imperative (*habe animum bonum, bono animo es*, etc.). One might compare It. *Animo!* and Sp. *¡Animo!,* which are used in similar contexts with similar meanings. It may be suggested that the word *animus* was used commonly enough in expressions with meanings like 'cheer up' or 'have faith, confidence' to survive with this meaning in the Romance languages.

(2) In line 233, we have the words *quia peritae praedico,* which mean, "because I'm talking to you who are experienced [in love]." Although there is no other attestation of this expression, the alliteration (especially when compared with Poen. 880: *quia doctum doces*) suggests that the phrase was somewhat proverbial or axiomatic. One may compare the modern expressions: Eng. preach to the choir; It. *sfondare una porta aperta*; Ger. *offene Türen einrennen*; Ru. ломиться в открытую дверь. The fact that there is another alliterating expression with similar meaning in Plautus coupled with the fact the this seems to be the type of content or knowledge which is made into a proverb in many languages allows one to suggest that the phrase *peritae/perito praedicere* was likely common enough and is attested only once by an accident of transmission.

(3) In lines 114-115 we have *mane quod tu occeperis negotium agere, id totum procedit diem* . This exact phrase is found nowhere else in Latin, but it is an example of folk wisdom which is common in many languages in various forms: En. the early bird gets the worm; Sp. *a quien madruga Dios le ayuda*; Por. *deus ajuda quem cedo madruga*; Fr. *l'avenir appartient à ceux qui se lèvent tôt*; It. *chi dorme non piglia pesci, chi primo arriva meglio alloggia*; Ger. *Morgenstund hat Gold im Mund*; Ru. кто рано встает, тому бог подает. One can also compare Hesiod's ἠώς τοι προφέρει μὲν ὁδοῦ, προφέρει δὲ καὶ ἔργου (Erg. 579:) and even Homer's οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα (Il. 2.24). Aristotle agrees with the advice: τό τε διανίστασθαι νύκτωρ: τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ πρὸς ὑγίειαν καὶ οἰκονομίαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν χρήσιμον (Econ. 1.6). Here, the abundance of examples from other languages, especially the examples from Greek epic and Aristotle's endorsement of the idea, allow one to postulate that this pearl of wisdom about early-

risers was directly transmitted from Greek into Latin and from there into modern European languages.

(4) At 212 we have the words *tuo ex ingenio mores alienos probas.* Plautus expresses a similar idea at. Trin. 1049 : *quippe eorum ex ingenio ingenium horum probant*; Capt. 582: *omnes inveniri similis tui vis.* The sentiment is also found the modern expressions: Eng. takes one to know one; It. *ci vuole un ladro per riconoscerne un altro*; Es. *cree el ladrón que todos son de su condición*; Ru. рыбак рыбака (дурак дурака) видет издалека. While it is unlikely that there is a genetic relationship between these exact expressions, they all may arise from a similar logical system of argumentation.

2. STAGING

One of the main problems with Woytek's commentary, as stated above, is neatly summed up by Goldberg: "he forgets that the *Persa* is a play and obstructs our view of the dramatic forest with disproportionate attention to the the philological trees."[66] Indeed, throughout the commentary, there is little sense that Woytek ever attempts to imagine what the actors would be doing onstage.

In some cases, this results rather innocuously in merely misunderstanding the tone in which an actor would pronounce a line, or in failing to fully understand the dynamics of an interaction onstage. In other cases, however, the result of Woytek's strict philological reading is much more severe. Indeed, his failure to read the play dramatically often leads him to emend the text, reattribute speaking roles, and revive older readings which have long since been improved by other editors. There are a handful of instances where Woytek's judgement is to be accepted,

[66] Goldberg 249.

but in many cases his suggestions seem inferior in comparison to the text of Lindsay's OCT. Many of Woytek's emendations and reattributions have unfortunately made their way into de Melo's Loeb edition, which is likely to be the sole text that will be read by those who are not scholars of Plautus or seasoned Latinists or linguists. I have made note of these instances throughout the commentary and have offered, where relevant, explanations and interpretations of why Woytek's readings are not to be preferred.

Throughout this commentary I have suggested stage directions and have imagined (to the best of my ability) the instructions which would have been given to the actors as to how to deliver their lines. In making these suggestions, I always have two criteria in mind: (1) increasing the comedic effect of jokes and scenes; and (2), rendering the Latin of the exchanges in the play more comprehensible through dramatic context. Obviously, these directions can never be more than educated guesses, and one must always remember that the play would be preformed differently by different troupes of actors at different times and different places. Nevertheless, it is my firm belief that this type of analysis is necessary when one approaches Plautus (or any dramatic text). Some of my suggestions may well be wrong (in the sense that they do not reflect what Plautus or the original stage director intended), but it is my hope not only that they will be helpful to those who may be interested in producing the play, but also that they will open fruitful discussion about the characters, plot, and language of the *Persa.*

For now, one example of this type of approach will suffice to give a sense of what one can expect:

At line 47, Toxilus, after having convinced his friend Sagaristio to look for some money for him, says: *quaere tamen, ego item sedulo*! This is the version found in the manuscripts and

printed by Lindsay. Woytek, however, prefers and prints Ritschl's suggested emendation *quaero*. He argues that the imperative *quaere* was written by mistake because of all the other imperative forms in the neighborhood and that, if we keep *quaere*, we cannot find a parallel example where *item* is used with the ellipsis of a verb. This is a clear example of an instance where Woytek's blind commitment to philological principles interferes with his ability to read the text. Not only would the present tense verb *quaero* (instead of the future, *quaeram*) be slightly awkward here, but the resulting word order, in my opinion, is unlikely (I have not found in all of Latin literature the sequence first person present verb + *tamen ego*). In addition, and more importantly, the ellipsis of the verb is likely not a syntactic phenomenon but a dramatic one. The exchange could be imagined to run something like this:

(1) Sagaristio promises his anxious friend Toxilus twice that he will search for the money (44: *quaeram*; 46: *hoc meum est ut faciam sedulo*).

(2) Toxilus then tells Sagaristio to let him know whatever happens (46: *recipe te ad me*).

(3) At this point, the exchange is more or less complete, and Sagrisitio has likely already begun to turn around and rush off to help his friend and make his exit.

(4) Toxilus then bursts out another command as his friend starts to leave, saying *quaere tamen!*

(5) Sagaristio makes a sign of exasperation (perhaps by waving his hand or shaking his head) and continues on his way, as Toxilus, who wants to assure his friend that he will also be doing his best to find the money, shouts after him *ego item sedulo* [*quaeram*]!

(6) Sagaristio now turns around, interrupts Toxilus (perhaps even as Toxilus is beginning to say something like *quaeram*), and with an annoyed tone shouts *si quid erit, te faciam ut scias!,* as if to say, "Calm down and get off my case! I promise I'll let you know if I find anything!"

Thus the imperative fits nicely with this scene, which derives much of its comedic value from the fact that the lovesick Toxilus is bossing around his friend Sagaristio and not realizing that he is rather forcefully making seemingly impossible demands of his fellow slave. The height of Sagaristio's annoyance with his whimsical friend is reached one line later, with *ah! odio me enicas!* (48). In my hypothetical staging of this small exchange, one could punctuate with an ellipsis after *ego item sedulo* instead of a period.

This is a small example of how imagining the action onstage and the dynamics of the exchanges between the actors can improve our understanding of the text. This example involves only one word, but others are much more serious, involving entire clauses, lines, or exchanges. Each instance is considered in depth in the commentary itself.

3. Music and Meter

Music was an integral part of ancient drama, yet we have no sure way to reconstruct this aspect of our surviving plays. One of the only clues we have is the rhythm of the various meters, some of which we understand to have been spoken, while others, presumably, sung. Woytek's commentary has admirably treated all of the metrical problems and points of interest in the *Persa* (indeed, the first comment on any individual line is invariably about the meter), and Questa, while disagreeing with Woytek in a small number of places, offers the student of Plautus a convenient and annotated edition of all of the *cantica.* The reader is directed to these two sources for metrical questions, which are dealt with in the present commentary only when especially important or relevant to a larger argument about the play.

One of the only things that one can affirm about music is its presence or absence in certain scenes, and perhaps a few assumptions about the pace or tempo of the music. Timothy

Moore has fully and productively exhausted this type of analysis for the *Persa* in his article "Music in *Persa*," (2001). In this article, Moore seeks to answer the question: "What did music contribute to the original performance of the *Persa*?"[67] While the music of course cannot be recovered, Moore first focuses on emotion and pace, two aspects of the meter and composition of the play which can hint at the original music. He is careful to note that "Attempts to assign a distinct ethos to each individual Plautine meter have been notoriously unsuccessful," but nevertheless a few trends can be observed.[68] Cretics, for example are playful and so are used in the teasing of the pimp Dordalus. Trochees sound very fast and occur in scenes with a lot of movement. Moore also provides very helpful charts which outline how often each character in the play is accompanied by music, whether their first entrance is accompanied, and whether their entrance ever stops the music.

A look at the opening 18 lines of the *Persa* will provide an excellent example of how Moore's analyses of the music can contribute to our understanding of the play. The *Persa* is one of the few surviving Roman comedies that opens with *cantica* (the others being *Cistellaria, Epidicus,* and *Stichus*) instead of the more standard iambic senarii. According to Moore (2001, 2012), it is always important to note at what juncture in a play the music begins. He calls attention to a tendency for Plautus' plays to begin their music at the entrance of the main *adulescens amans* (Moore 2012, 245-6). *As., Mos., Ad., Hau.,* and *Ph.* all start the music with the appearance of the main lover, while *Eu.* with his second entrance. Moore says that "the other three plays that begin in meters other than iambic senarii are conspicuously non-iambic, making

---

67 Moore 2001, 256.

68 Moore 2001, 257.

an emphatic break with the tradition of unaccompanied openings....*Persa*, however, begins with long iambic lines, as if Plautus is teasing the audience, reminding them that the meter really should be unaccompanied iambic senarii," (Moore 2001, 264). Following Questa's (1995) scansion of the line as four iambs joined with four trochees (in opposition to Woytek's scansion as a syncopated iambic octonarius), Moore notes that Plautus is playing with the audience's expectations: the beginning sounds as if the play is opening with the expected iambic senarius, but the trochees disrupt this expectation mid-line. The switch to trochees with the word *princeps*, Moore suggests, probably was accompanied by the *tibicen*.

The play opens with a 6-line speech of the main character Toxilus followed by the 6-line speech of his friend Sagaristio which closely (but not exactly) mirrors the meter of Toxilus' lines. This is closest that Plautus comes to the responsion typical of Greek tragedy.[69] Moore uses music and meter to shed light on the complex issues of characterization in the *Persa*: "The clever slave Toxilus begins the play with a soliloquy in which he pines for his unattainable love. His fellow slave Sagaristio soon joins him, entering with an ironic variation of the 'good slave' soliloquy. Again, there are competing conventions, and at the same time a comment on the play's plot. 'Good slave' soliloquies are inevitably accompanied, and lover's laments almost almost demand accompaniment. These accompanied soliloquies at the beginning of the play help prepare the audience for the unusual character of Toxilus, the only slave in Roman comedy who is also the lover for whom the play's deceptions will be produced" (Moore 2012, 244). Moore also notes

[69] Cf. Fraenkel 219, quoting Leo: "Dato che per la struttura dei canti plautini la responsione non entra in causa come principio primario d'articolazione, se ne deve concludere che in questo passo del *Persa*, che è 'l'unico caso di responsione finora accertato con sicurezza."

that when Toxilus appears on stage in the costume of a slave and begins speaking of someone *qui amans egens,* audience probably would expect that he is complaining about his master's love affair (in the form of an unaccompanied prologue in iambic senarii). But *ita fio miser* (5) casts away all doubt: "Toxilus himself is the lover. He is delivering not a prologue, but a lover's soliloquy" (Moore 2012, 273).

Toxilus and Sagaristio share the opening equally, each singing 6 lines. In the exchange that follows (13-18) they also divide up the lines almost evenly: in lines 13, 14, 16, and 18 each gets half of a trochaic octonarius, and in 15 each gets one quarter, and in 17 they each sing cretics of equal length. Moore explains that this metrical symmetry is made all the stronger by the echoes like *qui* (1)...*qui* (6), *quis...quis* (13), and *ut...ut* (17) (Moore 2012, 273-4). One could expand Moore's list of symmetries to include features like: (i) the consonance and alliteration in 1, 2 and 6 (1: *amans...amoris;* 2: *superavit aerumnis suis aerumnis;* 6:*suo servire volt servos servitutem*) and in 5 and 10, 11 (5: *ita fio miser quaerendo argento mutuo;* 10: *ego neque lubenter servio neque satis sum ero ex sententia*; 11:*me erus meus manum*); (ii) the near complete repetition in line 13 with the substitution of the demonstrative pronoun *illic* for *hic...sic*; (iii) the near chiasmus of 14: *similis...Sagaristionis / Toxilus...amicust*; (iv) *is...eum* and *congrediar...adgredibor* (15); (v) *O Sagaristio, di... O Toxile, dabunt di* (16); (vi) *agitur...vivitur* (17); and (vii) the mirrored alliteration in 18: Sag. *Satin ergo ex sententia?* Tox. *Si eveniut quae exopto, satis.* Fraenkel believed that such intense symmetry was a Plautine or a least an Italian development: "È evidente che a forme come *quis illic est qui contra me astat? -- quis hic est qui sic contra me astat?* Plauto non poteva giungere partendo dal dialogo dei suoi originali attici... Una decisione sicura è impossible, ma sembra però lecito dire che la seconda alternativa [that he

took these from a Greek original] è poco probabile, in questo caso noi saremmo quasi inevitabilmente costretti a supporre che questa maniera di trattare il testo del duetto sia penetrata nel dramma romano antico dalla tragedia greca, per il tramite della tragedia latina." And we cannot do this, he says, because these structures are not found anywhere in Greek tragedy (Fraenkel 220).

All of these symmetries would probably have been reinforced on the stage as well, with the two characters standing on opposite ends of the stage and approaching each other evenly (see Moore 2001, 265). One of the few asymmetries in the opening passage is the fact that Toxilus' first line (1: half iambic, half trochaic) does not find responsion in Sagaristio's first line (7: all iambic). The asymmetry in these two lines serves to highlight the large difference between the two characters. Toxilus' first line is about love, mentioning love twice (*amans, amoris*), while Sagaristio's is about servitude, using the word *erus* once and words related to *servus* thrice. Moore hits the nail on the head: "for all their similarities, Sagaristio and Toxilus are creatures of different worlds; for Sagaristio is a comic slave of the usual variety, but Toxilus, as a lover, breaks the mold of the comic slave," (Moore 2012, 274).

The playfulness of the opening lines was already demonstrated by Slater (1985). He believes that the audience must have been shocked by the dissonance between the actor's slave costume (and slave mask as well, probably): "Could he be quoting his master? Could the actor in his haste lest he miss his entrance have grabbed the wrong mask?" I.e., the audience would have been wondering whether the generalizations being made about love in the first four lines be a criticism of the slave's master. But by the time he pronounces *ita fio miser* (5) everything is clear:

"we realize that the slave, normally the witty critic of love, has himself fallen under its spell" (Slater, 37).

4. Characters: Slavery, Gender, Race

a. A cast of slaves: Toxilus, Sagaristio, and Paegnium

One of the most interesting and unique aspects of the *Persa* is the cast of characters. In almost all other plays, the main characters are freeborn, while in the *Persa,* five of the eight speaking characters are slaves (Toxlius, Sagaristio, Sophoclidisca, Lemniselenis, Paegnium) and an additional character pretends to be a slave (the *virgo*).[70] Because of this, many of the traditional roles in comedy are reversed or inverted, giving the entire play a Saturnalian atmosphere. Much of the comedy and appeal of the play derive from the upset expectations of the audience.

Toxilus, the main character of the play, is a hybrid between a clever slave and young lover, roles which elsewhere are distinct. The tension between these two roles is felt in the first line, as a character appears on stage in a costume which obviously would have marked him as slave and begins speaking about love. The opening exchange between Toxilus and his friend Sagaristio makes it very clear that this inversion of roles will be a running theme in the play, summed up neatly in Sagarisitio's surprised question *iam serui hic amant?* (25). Toxilus hardly responds directly to the question, but says: *quid ego faciam? disne advorser? quasi Titani cum eis belligerem quibus sat esse non queam?* (26-7). The rhetorical polish of these words and the

---

[70] Cf. van Ijsendikj 1884, 47, 50: "In ceteris Plauti fabulis res aguntur aut ab hominibus liberis aut ab hominibus liberis una cum servis: hac in fabula soli servi telam texunt et usque ad finem deducunt….Nusquam ergo servi locum primum explent: sunt sane plerumque dolorum auctores, verum herorum et filiorum herilium causa: servi quidem sunt qui agant, verum res eorum non agitur. In Persa autem servi agunt et servorum res agitur," (quoted by Auhagen 2001, 95).

mythologizing of Toxilus' situation confirm Sagaristio's suspicion: not only do slaves have love affairs in this play, but they do so with the style that befits educated free men. A few lines later we learn that Toxilus has decided to take action and seize his beloved prostitute at this point in time because his master is currently out of town (29: *quia erus peregri est*).Thus the entire play is presented as a window into what slaves get up to when they are left unsupervised.[71] The situation can be fruitfully compared to the very common iterations of this theme in modern movies, television, and animation, in which children, pets, toys, servants, or employees are left to their own devices while their parents, owners, or bosses are away or missing. The hijinks of the characters and the resulting comedic situations are often the result of attempts to imitate (either successfully or unsuccessfully) the world from which they are normally barred (be it the world of adults, masters, employers, or humans).

A nice example of the comedy that can result from this type of imitation is in the first exchange between Toxilus and Paegnium at 183ff. Toxilus and Paegnium enter on stage and do not notice Sophoclidisca, who has just delivered a monologue and who remains on stage during their comical conversation about Toxilus' plans and the charges he has laid upon Paegnium. Part of the comedy of the scene rests in the dynamic between the two characters, the nature of whose relationship is not immediately apparent. The audience's expectations have already been overturned as they learned that the main lover of the play is a slave, and then again when they found out that this slave has a parasite (Saturio). As Paegnium appears on stage for the first time accompanying Toxilus, the audience must immediately ask itself what kind of relationship these

---

[71] Stewart (2012, 37) places a different emphasis: "*Persa* stages the fantasy - or nightmare - of slaves taking vengeance on the slave owners for whom they are fungible chattel."

two characters have. It seems from their initial exchange that the dynamic resembles that between a master and a quick-witted slave, which seems to be confirmed in line 193 when Paegnium speaks of *fides erilis* in relation to Toxilus. The audience would be asking itself whether our slave-hero has a slave of his own, whether Toxilus could simply be playing the role of master with one of the other slaves from his house, and why, in this case, Paegnium is so obedient. From his role, perhaps we can imagine that Paegnium indeed is a younger slave from the same house as Toxilus, who looks up Toxilus with brotherly admiration and who is ready to serve him as if he were his master. At any rate, the comedic success of the scene results from Toxilus trying to take on a role which otherwise would be barred to him. The audience watches as he comically attempts to convince both himself and Paegnium of his authority and does his best to imitate the manner and language of a master.

B. SLAVERY AND GENDER: SATURIO AND THE *VIRGO*

That the *virgo* (as Saturio's unnamed daughter is called) is a special character will be made clear by a brief discussion of women in Plautus generally. The three most common female roles in Plautus are the *meretrices* (prostitutes), *ancillae* (slave girls), and *matronae* (married women).[72] We have examples of fairly typical *meretrices* and *ancillae* in the *Persa* in the characters of Lemniselenis and Sophoclidisca. *Ancillae,* while they can have fairly extensive speaking roles, like Sophoclidisca, are very rarely integral to the plot. They are almost always loyal to their female masters, and they can be slightly clever (but not as clever as the *servi callidi*). *Meretrices* are always portrayed as beautiful and young and are often little more than

[72] For an overview of the female stock characters in Plautus and the general attitude towards women in Plautus, See de Melo's introduction to the first volume of his Loeb edition, xxxviii-xliii.

sexual objects. *Matronae* are not as common as *ancillae* and *meretrices*. When they do appear, they are almost portrayed as nagging, annoying, or otherwise unpleasant characters who oppose the will of their husbands and meddle in their affairs. By far the least common character type is the *virgo* (the young, freeborn, bachelorette). *Virgines* very rarely appear on stage. Since willingly engaging in love affairs made *virgines* unfit for marriage, many of the *virgines* involved in Plautine plots have been raped and impregnated by one of the main *adulescentes* who will then marry her. Generally speaking, throughout Roman comedy the attitude towards women is negative and objectifying. This makes the positive, noble, and deeply personal portrayal of the *virgo* all the more remarkable and interesting.

The *virgo*, as noted above, is one of the only freeborn characters in the play (the other two being her father Saturio and the pimp Dordalus). She takes part in the deception of Dordalus by playing the part of a captured slave and so becoming, at least for the climax of the play, a part of the cast of slaves. The *virgo*, then, in some sense, can be seen as a bridge between the world of slaves and the the world of the free. Her character is presented in a comical and safe way (after all, she only pretends to be a slave and is rescued according to plan) as a reminder to the audience that enslavement is always a very real possibility.

Saturio is in many respects a typical Plautine parasite: he is concerned only with his belly and will go to extreme lengths for free food. But in one important respect he differs from other parasites: he is the only one to have a daughter. The *virgo* is herself noteworthy in being one of the most well-spoken, intelligent, and sympathetic female characters in the Plautine corpus. Indeed, Stewart locates one of the main points of the play as allowing the audience “to hear the

private thoughts of a recently enslaved freeborn female."[73] The *Persa,* then, is one of the few places in Latin literature where we find "evidence of the personal effects of slavery on the individual."[74]

We first meet the *virgo* at the beginning of the third act in the exchange between her and her father Saturio. In this conversation, Saturio announces his plan to stage the selling of his daughter, and the *virgo* quite eloquently and sympathetically resists. She offers philosophically prudent opposition while simultaneously realizing that she has no power to command her father (344-348). She appeals to the reputation and shame which will result for both of them, but is unable to dissuade Saturio from his intentions. Stewart says that in this scene "Plautus uses the mechanism of the staged fraudulent sale to allow the Roman audience to witness the corporal vulnerability of a freeborn female unprotected by family."[75] Indeed, the audience pities the plight of the *virgo* and at the same time admires the stoic submission to the power and right of her father.

In the scene of the sale, Stewart argues that the *virgo* takes on the role of the *servus callidus* in the way that she dodges Dordalus' questions about her origin. The *virgo* "avows that her past life has been made dead by slavery" and that slavery has made her old homeland irrelevant and Athens her new home, indicating that she has accepted her "social death."[76] Once again, the audience admires the mature wisdom of the *virgo* and the excellent job she does in

---

[73] Stewart 2012, 38.

[74] Stewart 2012, 44n.

[75] Stewart 2012, 42.

[76] Stewart 2012, 45, looking at Persa 635-641 and using Orlando Patterson's terminology.

playing the role of a captured freeborn woman. Stewart suggests that the intelligence of the *virgo* as well as the constant emphasis (especially by Toxilus) on freeborn nature and appearance serve to convince Dordalus of the value of the *virgo* as prostitute, whose high birth and level of learning make her a more desirable sexual object.

C. RACE IN THE *PERSA*

The title *Persa* refers of course to Toxilus' friend Sagaristio, who dresses up like a Persian merchant to trick the pimp Dordalus into buying Saturio's daughter, who herself is dressed as a well-born Arabian girl. With such a plot and a title like *Persa,* one might expect that the issues of race and cultural identity would be important for the play. But in point of fact, in comparison with the other main issues and themes of the play (slavery, gender, friendship, justice, etc.), there is very little that one can say on this subject. In "Persisches im *Persa*," practically the only treatment of the issue of race in this play, Stefan Faller rightly concludes that "der plautinische *Persa* ist sicherlich kein Stück, in dem profunde Kenntnis eines nichtrömischen Volkes vorhanden ist."[77]

While other plays of Plautus show serious interest in foreign cultures (such as the *Poenulus,* which famously has dialogue written in Punic), and in certain instances one may suggest that the Persians (and other foreigners) on the Roman stage are used as a safe way to talk about the Carthaginians, there is no substantial cultural discourse in the *Persa* other than the most mundane and superficial stereotypes. Many of these stereotypes can be dated back to Aeschylus and Herodotus, and they are further watered down in Plautus. But despite the lack of any deep or specific cultural jokes or references in the text, the fact that the name *Persa* has

[77] Faller 2012, 203.

stuck with the play indicates that there was something particularly memorable about this aspect of the performance; one can imagine that elaborate costumes and simulated foreign accents particularly delighted the audience.

One may also suggest that there is something almost metatheatrical about the superficiality of the cultural stereotypes in the *Persa.* We suggested above that much of the comedy of the play is derived from Toxilus trying and only partially succeeding in imitating the traits usually associated with freeborn and slaveholding lovers, much like a boy in his father's clothing and shoes. Here we see a similar trial and partial success of Toxilus to take on the role of a stage director or playwright. We should remember that there are many comic ways to trick a pimp out of his money or property, and we must ask why Toxilus decides specifically on this ornate plot involving a Persian merchant and an Arabian princess. In producing his play-within-the-play, we can imagine that Toxilus naively thinks to himself: "I've seen foreigners in elaborate costumes in other dramas, I should put some of them in my play too." Of course neither Toxilus nor Sagaristio knows anything specific about Arabia or Persia; the comedy of the situation is derived from the clichés which result from this ignorance and the subsequent success of Toxilus' plan despite the lack of credibility which must have been obvious to everyone in the theater besides Dordalus. Taken further, one might see here a comment on the types of plots and theatrical decisions which are effective in captivating and delighting the audience.

III. The text, commentary, manuscripts, and editions

All of the lemmata in the commentary refer to Lindsay's OCT, including spelling, punctuation, and assignment of speaking parts. Places where Lindsay's text significantly differs from the manuscripts are noted in the commentary. The most important manuscripts for Plautus

are A, a text which dates to the third or fourth century which was effaced and written over with the Old Testament, and B, C, and D, all of which derive from the lost (P), a manuscript dating to the tenth or eleventh century. Generally speaking, Lindsay's text is much more conservative than Woytek's, which is the only other modern critical edition of importance. Woytek's apparatus, however, is much more detailed than Lindsay's and goes to great lengths to record all of the most important emendations and suggestions. The reader is referred to Woytek's apparatus for many textual issues. The Latin text of de Melo's Loeb edition is somewhat of a compromise between Lindsay and Woytek, although he has followed Woytek in many places where Lindsay's text is better. The merits and issues of de Melo's text will be handled in detail in the commentary since this is the newest text of the *Persa* and one of the ones most likely to be consulted by readers of Plautus in the Anglophone world. Questa's edition of all of the Plautine cantica (1995) is mentioned where relevant. Other commentaries on the *Persa* (as well as their texts) often mentioned in this commentary are Ammendola (1922, Italian), Ussing (1886, Latin), and Lambinus (1577, Latin). Jacobus Operarius' complete Latin paraphrase of Plautus (with text and commentary, 1679) often provides useful interpretations of difficult passages.

This commentary is indebted throughout to all of these previous editions of the *Persa* and indeed would have been nearly impossible without them. I have endeavored to make it as clear as possible where my ideas differ or are independent from previous work, but I have also made free use of the philological contributions of these editions, especially in (but not limited to) citing parallel passages. Woytek and Ammendola make free use of all of the editions and commentaries before them (sometimes with citations, but much more often without any hint of borrowing). In

these cases, I have tried where possible to indicate the earliest occurrence of a given interpretation.

COMMENTARY

1-52 : The opening exchange between Toxilus and Sagaristio characterizes the two protagonists and offers an introduction to some of the main themes of the play. Sagaristio, a down-to-earth, typical Plautine slave serves as a balance to the amorous slave Toxilus. Toxilus' speech is full of references to Greek mythology (Hercules in 1-6, the Titans in 26f), Greek topoi (the εὔρημα in the first line), and Grecisms (e.g., 29: *basilice agito eleutheria*; 49: *morologus fio*), and poetic platitudes on the power of Amor, Cupid, and Venus. Sagaristio's speech, on the other hand, is pragmatic and realistic throughout. Toxilus will make impossible requests of his friend, but Sagaristio keeps a rational view of the situation. All this serves to highlight the novel position in which the character Toxilus finds himself: he is slave playing the role of freeborn man.

1-18 : The *Persa* is one of the few surviving Roman comedies that opens with *cantica* (the others being *Cistellaria, Epidicus,* and *Stichus*) instead of the more standard iambic senarii. According to Moore (2001, 2012), it is always important to note at what juncture in a play the music begins. He calls attention to a tendency for Plautus' plays to begin their music at the entrance of the main *adulescens amans* (Moore 2012, 245-6). *As., Mos., Ad., Hau.,* and *Ph.* all start the music with the appearance of the main lover, while *Eu.* with his second entrance. Moore says that "the other three plays that begin in meters other than iambic senarii are conspicuously non-iambic, making an emphatic break with the tradition of unaccompanied openings....*Persa*, however, begins with long iambic lines, as if Plautus is teasing the audience, reminding them that the meter really should be unaccompanied iambic senarii," (Moore 2001, 264). Following Questa's (1995) scansion of the line as four iambs joined with four trochees (in opposition to Woytek's scansion

as a syncopated iambic octonarius), Moore notes that Plautus is playing with the audience's expectations: the beginning sounds like the play is opening with the expected iambic senarius, but the trochees disrupt this expectation mid-line. The switch to trochees with the word *princeps*, Moore suggests, probably was accompanied by the *tibicen*.

The play opens with a 6 line speech of the main character Toxilus followed by the 6 line speech of his friend Sagaristio which closely (but not exactly) mirrors the meter of Toxilus' lines. This is closest that Plautus comes to the responsion typical of Greek tragedy. Cf. Fraenkel 219, quoting Leo: "Dato che per la struttura dei canti plautini la responsione non entra in causa come principio primario d'articolazione, se ne deve concludere che in questo passo del *Persa*, che è 'l'unico caso di responsione finora accertato con sicurezza.'"

Moore uses music and meter to shed light on the complex issues of characterization in the *Persa*: "The clever slave Toxilus begins the play with a soliloquy in which he pines for his unattainable love. His fellow slaves Sagaristio soon joins him, entering with an ironic variation of the 'good slave' soliloquy. Again, there are competing conventions, and at the same time a comment on the play's plot. 'Good slave' soliloquies are inevitably accompanied, and lover's laments almost almost demand accompaniment. These accompanied soliloquies at the beginning of the play help prepare the audience for the unusual character of Toxilus, the only slave in Roman comedy who is also the lover for whom the play's deceptions will be produced," (Moore 2012, 244). Moore also notes that when Toxilus appears on stage in the costume of a slave and begins speaking of someone *qui amans egens,* audience probably would expect that he is complaining about his master's love affair (in the form of an unaccompanied prologue in iambic

senarii). But *ita fio miser* (5) casts away all doubt: “Toxilus himself is the lover. He is delivering not a prologue, but a lover's soliloquy,” (Moore 2012, 273).

Toxilus and Sagaristio share the opening equally, each singing 6 lines. In the exchange that follows (13-18) they also divide up the lines almost evenly: in lines 13, 14, 16, and 18 each gets half of a trochaic octonarius, and in 15 each gets one quarter, and in 17 they each sing cretics of equal length. Moore explains that this metrical symmetry is made all the stronger by the echoes like *qui* (1)...*qui* (6), *quis...quis* (13), and *ut...ut* (17) (Moore 2012, 273-4). One could expand Moore's list of symmetries to include features like: (i) the consonance and alliteration in 1, 2 and 6 (1: *amans...amoris;* 2: *superavit aerumnis suis aerumnis;* 6:*suo servire volt servos servitutem*) and in 5 and 10, 11 (5: *ita fio miser quaerendo argento mutuo;* 10: *ego neque lubenter servio neque satis sum ero ex sententia*; 11:*me erus meus manum*); (ii) the near complete repetition in line 13 with the substitution of the demonstrative pronoun *illic* for *hic...sic*; (iii) the near chiasmus of 14: *similis...Sagaristionis / Toxilus...amicust*; (iv) *is...eum* and *congrediar...adgredibor* (15); (v) *O Sagaristio, di... O Toxile, dabunt di* (16); (vi) *agitur...vivitur* (17); and (vii) the mirrored alliteration in 18: Sag. *Satin ergo ex sententia?* Tox. *Si eveniut quae exopto, satis.* Fraenkel believed that such intense symmetry was a Plautine or a least an Italian development: “È evidente che a forme come *quis illic est qui contra me astat? -- quis hic est qui sic contra me astat?* Plauto non poteva giungere partendo dal dialogo dei suoi originali attici... Una decisione sicura è impossible, ma sembra però lecito dire che la seconda alternativa [that he took these from a Greek original] è poco probabile, in questo caso noi saremmo quasi inevitabilmente costretti a supporre che questa maniera di trattare il testo del duetto sia penetrata nel dramma romano antico dalla tragedia greca, per il tramite della tragedia latina.” And we

cannot do this, he says, because these structures are not found anywhere in Greek tragedy (Fraenkel 220).

All of these symmetries would probably have been reinforced on the stage as well, with the two characters standing on opposite ends of the stage and approaching each other evenly (See Moore 2001, 265). One of the few asymmetries in the opening passage is the fact that Toxilus' first line (1: half iambic, half trochaic) does not find responsion in Sagaristio's first line (7: all iambic). The asymmetry in these two lines serves to highlight the large difference between the two characters. Toxilus' first line is about love, mentioning love twice (*amans, amoris*), while Sagaristio's is about servitude, using the word *erus* once and words related to *servus* thrice. Moore hits the nail on the head: "for all their similarities, Sagaristio and Toxilus are creatures of different worlds; for Sagaristio is a comic slave of the usual variety, but Toxilus, as a lover, breaks the mold of the comic slave," (Moore 2012, 274).

The playfulness of the opening lines was already demonstrated by Slater (1985). He believes that the audience must have been shocked by the dissonance between the actor's slave costume (and slave mask as well, probably): "Could he be quoting his master? Could the actor in his haste lest he miss his entrance have grabbed the wrong mask?" I.e., the audience would have been wondering whether the generalizations being made about love in the first four lines be a criticism of the slave's master. But by the time he pronounces *ita fio miser* (5) everything is clear: "we realize that the slave, normally the witty critic of love, has himself fallen under its spell," (Slater, 37).

1 : qui amans : Reading this line as Questa does (as four iambs followed by trochees), the elision between *qui* and *amans* is paralleled in line 6 by *qui ero*. The parallel in scansion makes the contrast between *erus* and *amans* all the stronger: Sagaristio is the familiar slave of comedy, while Toxilus is a new, surprising hybrid slave-lover. — **qui amans egens :** The antecedent (*amans egens*) is incorporated into the relative clause. *qui amans egens* stands for *amator pauper qui*. The substantive use of the participle is more common in Plautus than in Classical Latin. Lindsay 1907, 79 gives examples such as *benevolens, insciens, indigens*. Classical Latin would use a noun, an adverb, or an adjective agreeing with the subject (e.g., *benevolus*, *inscius, indigus*). *amare* and *egere* are paired together in *Curc.* 142: *qui amat, si eget, misera adficitur aerumna; As.* 684: *vides me amentem egere;* and in a different context at *As.* 591: *quia tui amans abeuntis egeo*. — **princeps :** *princeps* for *primus* is good Latin, and both words are later used used for discussing poetic primacy cf. Lucr. 5.9-10: *qui princeps vitae rationem invenit eam quae / nunc appellatur sapientia;* Lucr. 1.66-7: *primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra / est oculos ausus primusque obsistere caelum.* — **ingressus in :** Plautus prefers the repetition of the preposition with this verb. Of the 10 occurrences, only two occur with the bare accusative. Classical usage alternates freely between the plain accusative, the accusative with *in*, and the infinitive with the meaning 'to begin' — **in Amoris vias :** cf. *Trin.* 667: *atque ipse Amoris teneo omnis vias*. *via* often has the meaning “path (of life),” cf. Cic. *Fl.* 42: *via vivendi*; Cic. *Off.* 1.32.118: *rectam viam vitae sequi.* The *viae Amoris*, then, is a lifestyle choice that one makes in opposition to other possible lifestyles (military, political, etc.), a common conceit of later Roman love elegy. Woytek compares Gk. μέθοδοι, which does not seem quite right, and the German expression “die Pfade der Liebe beschreiten,” which is more fitting; Similarly Ammendola

compares It. “metersi sulla via di.” Woytek compares also Prop. 3.14.32 *caecum versat amator iter*, but perhaps for the sentiment it would be better to compare one of Propertius’ many recusationes (3.3, 3.5), or even Prop. 4.14.4: *data libertas noscere amoris iter*, which Ammendola offers.

2 : superavit aerumnis suis aerumnas Herculei : This is Lindsay's and de Melo's reading. Schoell reads *aerumnas Herculi sex,* which Ammendola likes: “la qual lezione farebbe meglio risaltare l'ignoranza del servo in materia di conoscenze mitologiche,” (*ad loc.*). He however prints *aerumnis is suis aerumnas Herculi*, a transformation of Servius' reading *aerumnis in suis.* — **aerumnas :** this word does not appear frequently in classical Latin except in Cicero and it was totally obsolete by Quintillian's time, but it is a favorite of Plautus. The word *aerumna* is paired with *amare* and *egere* also at *Curc.* 142: *qui amat, si eget, misera adficitur aerumna.* — **Herculei :** The comparison of love with mythology and war will become one of the defining characteristics of Propertius' love elegy. Here as elsewhere in Plautus we can in hindsight see the beginnings of many aspects of later Latin literature.

3 : nam : Both Ammendola and Woytek feel the need to explain the logical connection between the two verses implied by *nam* with elaborate periphrases: “è tanto vero che gli affanni di chi per la prima volta cade nei lacci d'amire superano quelli di Ercole, che io difatti preferirei lottare col leone..."; "das gilt auch für mich, das verspüre ich am eigenen Leibe.,” (*ad loc.*). But the logical progression is clear and obvious, and we find *nam* in its expected meaning. — **cum leone, cum excetra, cum cervo, cum apro Aetolico :** the anaphora adds to the power of the heightened

poetic register of the comparison, as does the alliteration and consonance: *cum excetra, cum cervo, cum apro Aetolico*. — **leone :** The first labor of Hercules was to slay the Nemean lion. — **excetra :** The word is used elsewhere in Plautus as an insult. cf. *Cas*. 644: *excetra tu!*; *Pseud.* 218: *ain, tu excetra?*. Woytek explains: "excetra... ist κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν [sic] die lateinische Entsprechung für ὕδρα Λερναία," (ad loc.). Hercules' second labor was the slay the Lernaean Hydra. — **cervo :** The capture of the Ceryneian Hind (ἡ Κερυνῖτις ἔλαφος) was the third labor. — **cum apro Aetolico :** Hiatus between *cum* and *apro*. The capture of the Erymanthian Boar was the fourth labour.

4 : cum avibus Stymphalicis : The slaying of the Stymphalian birds is traditionally the sixth labour. — **cum Antaeo deluctari :** This is not considered one of the traditional twelve labours, but perhaps something Hercules did between the tenth and eleventh. — **deluctari** : This verb appears only here as a deponent, but also at *Trin*. 839 in the active with the dative: *quibus aerumnis deluctavi*. Nonius Marcellus, a third century AD grammarian, writes: *deluctavi pro deluctatus sum, Plautus in Trinummo, 'cum hisce erumnis deluctavit.'* The classical verb is deponent and without prefix (*luctari*). — **mavelim :** Woytek calls this a "Zwischenstufe in der Entwicklung von magis velim zu malim." In point of fact, mālim and māvelim and the corresponding mālō and mālim are equally common in Plautus (Weiss 2009, 431). Woytek suggestions additionally that "[der] Versschluß [ist der] bevorzugte Platz für Archaismen" in Plautus.

5 : quam cum amore : Woytek wishes to distinguish this sentiment from depictions in later Roman poetry of the lover battling against or wrestling with Amor: “Dort [in Ovid, e.g.] liegt Versinnbildlichung des vergeblichen Winderstandes des Menschen gegen die allbezwingende Macht des Eros vor: Toxilus hingegen sträubt sich nicht gegen die Liebe, er ringt nicht mit Amor, sondern in Wahrheit mit den aerumnae, die einem armen Mann wie ihm daraus erwachsen; cum Amore deluctari somit für: (cum) aerumnis deluctari, quas Amor amanti egenti adfert.” This seems overly pedantic. Cf. Ovid, *Am.* 2.2, especially 2.2.8 *et possessa ferus pectora versat Amor*. As far as I can see, Woytek’s distinction seems to arise from the extent to which Amor is anthropomorphized and personified in Ovid. But *deluctari cum Amore* is already sufficient personification. Are Toxilus’ words and Ovid's poem or even Vergil's famous *omnia vincit Amor* (*Ec.* 10.69) really that far apart? — **ita :** As above with *nam*, both Ammendola and Woytek seem to think that the logical progression of the passage is unclear and that the logical progression expressed by *ita* needs paraphrastic explanation. Woytek, following Ammendola, calls it "quasi kausales *ita*" and compares *Per.* 472, *Amph.* 1067, 1077, *Aul.* 609, and *Stich*. 210. But in all of these loci the meaning of *ita* departs little if at all from its classical use as demonstrative adverb ("in this way") or as an intensifying demonstrative adverb ("so, to such an extent"). — **fio miser :** The first person verb is the first time the audience can be sure that Toxilus is indeed talking about his own love and not simply generalizing or complaining about his master's love. — **miser quaerendo argento mutuo :** The instrumental or causal use of gerundive phrases with an adjective is common throughout the history of Latin letters and a favorite of Plautus. cf. *Poen.* 224: *aggerundāque aquā sunt viri duo defessi.* Note the sonic effect *fio miser quaerendo argento mutuo*.

6 : nec quicquam nisi 'non est' : *non est* is technically a second object of *respondere*, parallel with *quicquam*. The grammaticalization of direct quotations (which can occur in any case, but mostly in the accusative or nominative) is feature of lively, colloquial Latin, as well as of most languages which distinguish between direct and reported speech. Cf. Ger. *Er hat mir gesagt, 'ich habe nichts!'*; *Er hat mir gesagt, dass er nichts habe*; Ru. Он ничего говорит, кроме: "я самый лучший"; Он ничего не говорит, кроме того, что он лучший; — **sciunt mihi respondere :** The verb *scire* is often used with the infinitive to refer to mental ability, in distinction to *posse*. cf. *Per.* 645: *nil scit nisi verum loqui*; *Trin.* 766: q*uid is scit facere postea?* cf. It. *potere ~ sapere*; Ru. мочь ~ уметь; Eng. *can* (cognate with Lat. *gnosco,* Gk., γιγνώσκω, Ru. знать) -- **quos rogo :** sc. *argentum mutuum.* The double accusative of the person and thing asked for remains the standard construction with *rogare* in Classical Latin.

7: qui ero suo servire volt bene servos servitutem -- Note the excessive etymological wordplay, and the alliteration and consonance: *qui ero suo servire volt bene servos servitutem*. One can compare *Per.* 761: *facilia factu facta* and especially the famous *Epid.* 331-2: *aliquid aliqua aliquo modo alicunde ab aliqui aliqua tibi spes est fore mecum fortunam*. The line is parallel to Toxilus' first line *qui amans...* and the parallel elisions (*qui amans, qui ero*) serves to highlight the main difference between the two characters: Sagaristio is the typical comic slave, focused on (complaining about) his master, while Toxilus is a new invention of Plautus, the hybrid *servus callidus* and *amator adulescens*. — **ero suo :** The word *erus* (cognate with Grk. χείρ?) is much more common in Plautus than *dominus* or *domina* (which occur only 41 times).

The word is present throughout the history of Latin, but *dominus* becomes the standard term. — **volt, servos :** The raising of *o* to *u* is a common in Latin before *lC, m, rC,* and in final syllables before *-s, -d, -m, -nt* (where C = consonant), e.g., *volt* > *vult (< *uelti*); **solkos* > *sulcus* 'furrow' (cf. Gk. ὁλκός). The sound shift *o* > *u* in final syllables (e.g., *servos* > *servus, consentiont* > *consentiut*) seems to have occurred by the middle of the third century BC, since the Scipionic elogia (*ILS* 1 and 3) already have *u* before *-s*. See Weiss 2009, 140 for more examples. The *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* (186 BC) also has throughout *-us* and *-um*. A preceding *v* seems to have prevented the *o* > *u* development until the end of the Republic (ibid.). So *equos* and *seruos* are not anachronistic archaisms. To what extent this spelling reflected pronunciation is difficult to say. It is possible that the spelling *-uus* was just too awkward, and so the conservative spelling *-uos* outlived the sound change. — **servire servitutem :** Internal (cognate) accusative. The expression is common in Plautus, occurring at least 25 times. As Lindsay (comically) says: "Early Lat. did not recognize the restriction that the Acc. should always contain some additional notion besides that contained in the Verb," (Lindsay 1907, 24).

8 : ne . . . edepol : *edepol* is formed perhaps from *e-* (particle found in *ecastor, equidem, enim* (e + nam)) + *de* (< *dee,* voc. of *deus*) + *pol* (shortened form of *Pollux*). *ne* (Grk. *νή* or *ναί*) with the name of diety in an affirmative oath is common in Greek. It occurs also at *Amph.* 182 *ne illi edepol* and elsewhere. There are instances where ne in Plautus almost certainly goes back to Grk. ναί and not νή, such as *Amph.* 325: *ne ego homo infelix fui*, providing evidence for the early reduction of Greek vowels and diphthongs. Indeed, the sound changes that took place and

resulted in the pronunciation of Greek used to this day were largely complete by the Hellenistic age. — **illum :** Antecedent of *qui* (7), subject of *conlocare*. — **in pectore suo conlocare oportet :** For a similar sentiment about what constitutes a good slave, see *Bacch.* 651-3: *nequius nil est quam egens consili seruos, nisi habet / multipotens pectus: / ubiquomque usus siet, pectore expromat suo*. Woytek also compares *Bacch.* 660: *hominem pectus quoi sapit.*

9 : Quae ero placere censeat praesenti atque apsenti suo : This line responds to Toxilus' *nam cum leone, cum excetra, cum cervo, cum apro Aetolico*. The lover and the good slave have different crosses to bear. — **Quae ero placere censeat :** Subjunctive in a relative clause of characteristic.

10 : Ego neque lubenter servio neque satis sum ero ex sententia : Note the alliteration: *servio neque satis sum ero ex sententia.* — **Ego neque lubenter servio :** It is in the fourth line both of Toxilus' and Sagaristio's speeches that we get the first person verb: *mavelim* is answered quite nicely by *lubenter servio*. The *ego* emphatically moves the conversation from generalizations about the life of a slave to what pertains specifically to Sagaristio. — **lubenter :** For *libenter*. The change of *u* to *i* between *l* and a labial is a standard phonological development in Latin. cf. OE *lufu* 'love', Ru. любить 'to love.' As Weiss notes (2009, 141), the modern English spelling *love* is a later orthographic development. — **neque satis sum ero ex sententia :** The expression *ex sententia esse alicui* ('to be as one would wish') is common in both Plautus, used 6 times in Terence, and quite frequently in Cicero's letters (in his other works it just occurs once in the *De Oratore* and once in the *Lucullus*). Although Livy and Sallust each use it a few times, the data

seem to indicate that the expression was fairly colloquial and of a more relaxed register. Variations include *ex (mea, tua, alicuius) sententia,* or just *ex sententia* ('to one's liking').

11 : sed quasi lippo oculo me erus meus manum apstinere hau quit tamen : This line responds to line 5 of Toxilus' speech. Both lines give the reason for the speaker's misery. — **sed . . . tamen :** *Sed* and *tamen* together is good, classical Latin. But more normally *tamen* follows *sed* directly or comes after the first word (e.g., Liv. 40.56.9: *sed animo tamen aegrum magis quam corpore). tamen* ends a clause only when the clause is one or two words long (e.g, Cic. *Rep.* 1.43.66: *difficile factu est, sed conabor tamen*). The hyperbaton used here is exceptional for classical Latin, but there are other examples in Plautus of *sed* and *tamen* encircling a verse or longer clause as here. Cf. *Per.* 602: *sed ego te malo tamen / eumpse adire*; *Rud.* 685: *sed muliebri animo sum tamen*. — **quasi :** The comparison *quam cum Amore* is balanced nicely by *sed quasi lippo oculo.* —- **hau :** Used before consonants in Plautus for *haud*. *haud* possibly < *ho* (demonstrative, cf. Grk. ȯ) + au (~ab) + de (as in *unde*). — **quit :** *potest* is preferred to *quit* by Plautus about 27:1, *possum* to *queo* about 4 :1, *possunt* to *queunt* 5:1. In the present subjunctive forms of *posse* are 3 to 4 times more common.

12 : quin mi imperet, quin me suis negotiis praefulciat : The construction changes from ablative of separation (*me*) with *apstinere* to subjunctives (*imperet, praefulciat*) introduced by *quin* following a negated verb of prevention, resisting, etc. -- **quin :** from the old instrumental stem *quī* + *ne.* — **praefulciat :** The verb occurs twice in Plautus, once in Cicero's letters, and once in Gellius. Possibly a colloquial form? Classical Latin, at any rate, prefers the unprefixed

verb. Ammendola compares expressions like *columen familiae* for the sentiment (Ter. *Phorm*. 287). — **suis negotiis :** Woytek reads this as an ablative and compares *Pseud.* 771-2: *ubi ego omnibus / paruis magnisque miseriis praefulcior.* However there is no reason that both *negotiis* and *miseriis* cannot be taken as datives which follow the compound verb (in fact, this reading seems to me to be easier): "He uses me as a prop for (lit. before, in front of) his business," and "I am used as a prop for all miseries, great and small."

13 : quis illic est qui contra me astat? quis hic est qui sic contra me astat? : Toxilus and Sagaristio evenly share the trochaic octonarius, *illic* being exchanged for *hic…sic*. As noted above, this phenomenon is rare in Plautus. — **illic … hic :** *illic* is the demonstrative pronoun *ille* plus the deictic particle *ce* (found also in *cedo* and *nunc*). The *e* is then weakened to *i*. The etymology of *hic* is similar: a demonstrative pronoun **ho* (cf. Gk. ὁ) plus *ce.* Both *ille* and *illic* are attested in Plautus and elsewhere, but the demonstrative pronounce *hic* without the *ce* is not found anywhere in Latin. This verse, therefore, with its exact responsion and the substitution of *illic* with *hic*, perhaps provides evidence that the etymology of *hic* was still felt by Plautus and his audience. — **astat :** In consonant clusters of the type -LsT-, -nst-, and -TsT- (where L is any liquid and T is any stop), the first consonant is always lost. So, **tertis* > *testis;* **monstrolom* > *Mostellaria; ad-sto* > *asto;* see Weiss 2009, 180-181.

15 : congrediar…contra adgredibor : In Plautus the *-bi-* infix is productive in forming the future tense in the third and fourth conjugations as well. In the *Persa* we also find *amicibor* (307)

and *servibit* (682). *Scibo* is common for *sciam* (v.i. ad 219: scibo). In Classical Latin the only such example is Prop. 3.21.32 *lenibunt*. See Weiss 2009, 415.

16 : di ament te : A common wish in Plautus and Terence, either as a greeting or a form of encouragement or promise, which can be addressed either to oneself (*di ament me*) or to someone else. It is not frequent in other genres. — **dabunt di quae exoptes :** The future may be stronger than the usual subjunctive (as in *As.* 46: *di tibi dent quaecumque optes*). Lindsay theorizes that the subjunctive *ament* and the future *dabunt* may have the same force and reflect the fact that in Indo-European languages the future and the subjunctive are often confused or not distinct (Lindsay 1907, 65). This is much clearer in Homer, where the sigmatic future is often indistinguishable from the short-vowel aorist subjunctive.

17 : ut vales? # ut queo. # quid agitur? # vivitur : The responsion continues in this brief cretic interruption of the largely trochaic rhythms of 13-18, perhaps to mark the moment that our two characters have finally finished their entrances and have come together in the center of the stage. — **ut vales? :** One of the many colloquial expressions in comedy for asking "how are you?". Others include *quid agis?, quid agitur?, quomodo te habes? quomodo vales?* v.i. ad 204: quid agis? ut uales? — **quid agitur? # vivitur :** The impersonal and passive use of *agere* in this construction is common throughout Plautus. The meaning here and elsewhere is "going on, happening."

18 : satin ergo ex sententia? # si eueniunt quae exopto, satis : On the responsion, alliteration, and chiasmus, see above on 1-18. On *ex sententia,* see 10. — **satin :** *satin* for *satisne* is very common in Plautus and reflects the tendency for final *-s* to be lightly if at all pronounced. Often in Plautus and Terence and even later occasionally in Lucretius final *-s* fails to make position or is elided entirely.

19 - 52 : The exchange between Toxilus and Sagaristio continues to be sung and accompanied by music. It is only with the appearance of Saturio in 53 that we find the spoken iambic senarius.

19 : nimis stulte amicis utere. # quid iam? # imperare oportet : Slater claims that the word *imperare* (19) "is a call to arms, a command [for Toxilus] to drop the *adulescens amans* persona and take up that of the *seruus calidus*," (Slater 1985, 39). The basis of this claim, according to Slater, is "the background of scheming slaves as military commanders." The exchange in this line, then, would be one of the first instances of metatheatricality in the play, wherein the characters call attention to their own roles. The military imagery continues then in 23 (*uetus iam istaec militia est tua*) and 24 (*saucius factus sum in Veneris proelio*). Thereafter Toxilus begins to do exactly what Sagaristio recommends, and we find many imperatives in his lines. — **nimis stulte :** The final syllable in *nimis* scans as short in this iambic septenarius, the final *-s* not making poistion.

25 : iam serui hic amant? : One of the key lines of the play which succinctly establishes one of the main aspects of the plot and one of the recurring themes of the work: the reversal of expected roles.

26 : quid ego faciam? disne advorser? quasi Titani cum eis belligerem quibus sat esse non queam? : Toxillus does not offer a direct reply to Sagaristio's question, but instead, with the rhetorical mythologizing of his situation, even more emphatically confirms Sagaristio's assumption in *iam serui hic amant*: not only do slaves have love affairs in this play, but they do so with the style that befits educated poets.

28: uide modo ulmeae catapultae tuom ne transfigant latus : Sagaristio continues the war imagery by referring to *ulmeae catapultae* "missiles of elm wood," but in so doing he calls attention to the reality of his friend Toxilus' position: he is slave who lives under the constant threat of having his sides and back beaten by rods. Woytek aptly calls this a "memento te servum esse."

29 : basilice agito eleutheria : Once again, Toxilus does not respond directly to Sagaristio, but switches the topic to the fact that his master is out of town. The line is almost entirely Greek (one would say βασιλικῶς ἄγω (τὰ) ἐλευθέρια) and might have sounded to the audience almost as a Latinized Greek pidgin. The adverb *basilice* "like a βασιλεύς, like a boss" is comical in the mouth of a slave. The word conjures of images of Greek and otherwise eastern monarchs, and probably did provoke the same visceral agitation among the king-fearing Romans as *rex* and its

derivatives. *Agitare* and *agere* are standard verbs for celebrating festivals in Latin and correspond exactly to Greek ἄγειν ἑορτήν (ποιεῖσθαι is also commonly used). The ἐλευθέρια was the festival of Liberty celebrated in many cities in Greece. de Melo calls Toxilus' reference to this festival hyperbole, saying that "such a feast would celebrated if Toxilus were manumitted, but his freedom now is only temporary," (*ad loc.*). Of course this is hyperbolic, but it is unlikely that Toxilus has in mind any literal feast, but is instead mentions the ἐλευθέρια as a way of boasting to his friend about his current freedom.

29ª : peregri : Traditionally interpreted as the adverb from *pereger* (**per-aeger,* 'through the fields'). *Peregre* is the classical adverb. If *peregri* is the correct reading here (and where it is found in Naevius), it is not an adverb at all, but rather a relic form of the PIE locative ending **-i*, to be compared with forms like *domi, ruri, humi, duelli, heri, tempori,* and *luci,* all of which can be found in Plautus (and many of which can also be found in Terence and as frozen forms in in later Latin), and also with Greek οἴκοι. — **ain tu :** For *aisne tu*, as *satin* for *satisne* above in 18.

30 - 31 : si tu tibi … victu : Once again, Toxilus seems to avoid directly answering Sagaristio's question, preferring instead to fantasize about his newly-won freedom and all the things that are now permitted to him because of it.

30 - 30ª : si tu tibi bene esse / pote pati, veni: vives mecum : Toxilus' entire utterance is made up of disyllabic units (including the initial *si tu*), which adds speed and urgency to his words. Alliteration, assonance, and consonance are much more present as organizational principles in

versification in Old Latin. Later Latin poets in all but the fewest incidences sought actively to avoid them. The most famous example of this is of course from Ennius' *Annales*: *O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti.* The present line is organized as such: first the repetition of consonants separated by one vowel each (tu tibi bene...); then the repetition of the same short vowel sound (bene esse); then alternating repeating consonants separated each by a unique vowel (pote pati); and finally the same consonant repeated thrice with a chiasmus of vowels (veni vives). The sentiment is exactly echoed in Catullus 13 (*cenabis bene, mi Fabulle, apud me*), where the joke is also the same: a man who is either poor or has no property of his own invites someone else to dine with him.

31 : basilico : A favorite word of Toxilus, which comes up again later as well. A common conceit in Roman literature (found most obviously in the *Satyricon*) is that freedmen live much more luxuriously than freeborn citizens. They almost resemble eastern monarchs in their excess and whims. Plautus is humorously using this stereotype by giving this word to Toxilus so often.

32 : vah! iam scapulae pruriunt, quia / te istaec audivi loqui : *Prurire* in other passages in Plautus sort out all passages in Plautus`

33 : sed hoc me unum excruciat : Another joke made possible by the Toxilus' role reversal. *Cruciare* and *excruciare are* vivid verbs used often of physical torture and pain (often inflicted on slaves by their masters). Plautus uses the word also of mental afflictions, including love. Such a use paved the way for later conceits in Latin literature of the lover as tortured slave of the

beloved (*passim* in Propertius and most famously and succinctly in Catullus 85: *Odi et amo. quare id faciam, fortasse requiris? / nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior*).

34 - 34ª : haec dies summa hodie est, mea amica sitne libera / an sempiternam servitutem serviat : The indirect question depends on and expands upon the idea contained in the word *summa.* cite Woytek here on this. The hyperbaton which results from the fronting of *mea amica* outside of its clause places emphasis on the central element of the sentence, in this case, the subject. It also allows for a loose chiasmus in *sitne libera / an sempiternam servitutem serviat,* where the verbs *sit* and *serviat* surround the contrasting inner members: *libera an sempiternam servitutem.*

34ª : sempiternam servitutem serviat : The sonic effect recalls Sagaristio's first line (7: *qui ero suo servire volt bene servos servitutem*). Sagaristio thus far has been portrayed, in contrast with Toxilus, as a typical slave. Perhaps the sonic echo underscores one of the main issues of the play: will Toxilus' girlfriend remain a slave forever (like Sagaristio), or will she break out of her character's mould, like Toxilus already has?

35 : emere amicum tibi me potis es sempiternum : The joke in having a slave tell another slave that he could be purchased continues the *Persa's* constant occupation with role reversal. The repetition of *sempiternum* highlights the seriousness and epic scale that Toxilus sees in his situation, much like any other lover. On a metatheatrical level, the conversation is about character types and their malleability. Is it possible that the references here to eternity are a

metatheatrical comment on the permanence or lasting power of dramatic characters? Cf. Pentheus becoming a literal πρόσωπον in the *Bacchae*. — **quem ad modum :** *ad modum* and *modo* (with adjectives and in the forms *quem ad modum* and *quo modo*) are synonymous.

36 : ut mihi des… : The fact that this responds to the question *quem ad modum* and that we therefore expect some sort of adverbial answer leads Bennett (1, 266) to classify this as a "stipulative clause with the force of 'by' with a verbal noun." Woytek agrees and de Melo follows in his translation ("by giving me…"). The "Stipulative Subjunctive" is Bennett's own moniker for a category of uses of the subjunctive in early Latin which he explains as "a subordinate subjunctive clause designating primarily some agreement, compact, or understanding under which the main act takes place," (263). He believes that the origin of this use is found in the paratactic uses of the jussive and prohibitive. Possible translations of this category which he offers are: "on the understanding that"; with the agreement that"; "under the restriction that"; "with the reservation that"; and "on the condition that." This overly pedantic classification seems to be a symptom of a larger problem, found especially in the anglophone world, of thinking that our categories of Latin syntax should be dictated by and keyed to the way we must translate them to create elegant sounding English. Of course, it makes perfect sense, sounds great, and for the most part respects the syntax to translate this phrase with "by giving me," but this offers little insight into what the clause is actually doing and what it must have sounded like to the audience. In point of fact, given that we have already seen multiple times that Toxilus does not respond directly to Sagaristio and rather seems to talk past him, concerned only with his own love affair, it might be less important for the modern reader to try to find a response

which directly mirrors the syntax of Sagaristio's question. It may be better to ask what subjunctives with *ut* usually do in Latin using broader categories come to an understanding of how the audience might have understood Toxilus' response. The easiest answer, given the context, is that is a polite request, typically expressed in its fullest form by *quaeso ut facias*, but both *quaeso* (or another word of requesting) and *ut* can be left out. Depending on the intonation which the actor gave the line, it could have also been heard as more of a wish than a polite command (the optative uses of the subjunctive is possible with or without *ut* and *utinam*). Nothing is gained in this and in other instances by the creation of the category of "stipulative subjunctive" other than needlessly obfuscating and complicating our interpretation of modes of expression which are, on the whole, very clear.

36 : nummos sescentos : The comedy lies therein, that this is likely an impossible request to make of a slave, however great the sum. Nevertheless much ink has been spilled to try to define what Greek *nummi* are being referenced and figure out how much this Greek slave girl actually cost. Woytek reviews the literature and ultimately concludes that all such an attempt "muss wohl an der Tatsache scheitern" and that comedians cannot be expected to provide an "exakte Reproduktion der Realität" and instead want to produce comedy with the "Verzerrung von Preisen." It is puzzling that this entire discussion, including Woytek's good instincts, fails to mention the fact that *sescenti* often has no specific referent at all, but rather is the standard number in Latin for expressing impossibly large sums. In fact, in all of Old and Classical Latin, *sescenti* has this use much more frequently than it actually refers exactly to 600 discreet things. Especially since the line is made up entirely of heavy syllables, one can imagine that the line

would be pronounced very slowly, loudly, and solemnly, with a large dramatic pause between *nummos* and *sescentos* ("I ask that you give me some money…ten million dollars!").

36ª - 38 : quos pro capite … quadriduo : After the slow and heavy line in 36, the speed and rhythm increases in the remainder of Toxilus' lines, with pairs of short syllables substituting often for the heavy syllables in the trochaic rhythm. One might imagine that Sagaristio was visibly shaken by the amount requested in line 36, and that Toxilus speeds up his rate of speech to try to quickly convince Sagaristio of the purpose of the request and to promise their swift return.

36ª : quos pro capite illius pendam : There are three options open to us for our interpretation of *pendam* and *reponam*: (1) future; (2) subjunctive by attraction; (3) final subjunctive in a relative clause. (1) and (3) make the best sense, but a case could be made for attractive (see Lindsay 1907, 66-68 and Bennett 1910, 305-312). Perhaps the best solution is take *pendam* as final and *reponam* as future. — **pro :** The preposition *pro* is used of monetary and commercial transactions in the the sense "in exchange for," and, depending on the verb, either piece of the exchange (i.e., the money or the merchandise) can strand after *pro.* — **pro capite :** *Caput* has a wide semantic range in Latin, and it can refer to, much like κεφαλή and κάρα in Greek and in English expressions like "head of cattle" or "10 dollars a head," an animal or a human being as a commodity in an economic transaction.

37 - 37ª : continuo… in hoc / triduo aut quandriduo : There is some comedy to be found in this development: "right away…(I mean) in three or four days!" The *-duum* element in these compounds comes from **diuom,* the same root as *deus*, *divus*, and, later, *dies* (which developed from the PIE noun **diéus* 'Sky-god').

38 : age fi : *Age* strengths the following imperative, much like Greek ἄγε. *Fi* is a very rare imperative, found just one other time in Plautus (*Curc.* 87) and once in Horace (*Ser.* 2.5.38).

39 - 42 : qua confidentia … aret : Sagaristio's response calls Toxilus back to the reality of the situation, reminding him that they are both slaves and that such a request or proposition is absolutely impossible. This is marked by the switch back from the Trochaic rhythm of Toxilus' statement to a more natural iambic rhythm.

39 : qua confidentia rogare tu a med argenti tantum audes : This line is very nicely balanced: the words introducing the question (*qua confidentia*) are balanced by the verb at the end (*audes*); the complement to *audes* (*rogare*) and its object (*argenti tantum*) then encircle the pronouns in the middle (*tu a med*). — **qua confidentia :** *Confidentia* often has a negative connotation in Plautus. The sense is "audacity" or "impudence" (OLD 2). — **a med :** Classical Latin would have *a me*. The final *-d* in the ablative was originally only present in pronouns (cf. Vedic *mat, tvat;* OL. *med, ted*) and in the thematic declension (i.e., nouns whose stem ends in **-o-* or **-e-*). In all other declensions, singular and plural, including the so-called first declension, there was no distinct form for the ablative. The ablative instead shared its form with the genitive in the

singular and the dative in the plural. It was an Italic innovation to create unique ablative singular forms for all declensions, which was done originally with the help of this final *-d*. It seems like the loss of the final *-d* in the ablative endings of nouns and pronouns was occurring rapidly during Plautus' own lifetime (254-184), to judge from the frequency with which they are found in Plautus compared to Terence (195-159), where they are largely absent. The earliest epigraphical evidence for the loss of the this final *-d* is ca. 241 (Weiss 222). — **argenti tantum :** So print both Lindsay and de Melo. Woytek, however, says that *argenti* "ist weniger gut überliefert" in the medieval manuscripts, and so decides to print *argentum*. That Plautus wrote or that an ancient actor pronounced *argentum tantum* seems almost impossible. It is standard idiom in colloquial Latin to use the genitive with neuters (*tantum, quantum, id,* etc.), especially when the noun in question is singular and uncountable. This phenomenon is not limited to Latin, but can be found in many Indo-European languages (e.g., Ru. сколько молока, and not *сколькое молоко; or It., where *tanto di latte* sounds much more natural than *tanto latte*).

40 : impudens : *Impudens* in either the vocative or the nominative is found almost exclusively either at the end or the beginning of the verse (*Rud*. 653 is the only exception). When found at the beginning, it can be either enjambed (as here) or it can begin the clause. This is also the case with many other insulting vocatives, showing the tendency for insults to either introduce or punctuate exclamations. — **quin :** The semantic range of *quin* (as a particle, not a subordinating conjuction) is notoriously difficult to get understand. It comes from the old ablative of the interrogative/relative pronoun *quī* plus the negative particle *ne*, and as such its original meaning is interrogative ("how not, why not?"), although in Latin it is almost always used in rhetorical

questions or explanations. Then it developed the ability to introduce sentences both that verify or confirm the preceding thought and that oppose another interlocutor's words (cf. OLD A2a, A2b). But in both of these the uses the original negative can still be felt ("not even if I sold myself…").The semantic range of *quin* often overlaps with German *doch*. — **egomet :** The empahatic pronomial suffix *-met* is of doubtful etymology. It can be attached to all forms of the first and second person pronouns, both singular and plural (except for the genitive, obviously), although Plautus only has *egomet, mihimet, memet, tibimet, nosmet,* and *vosmet*. — **veneam :** The verb *vēnīre* is a compound of *vēnum* ("for sale," cognate with Gk. ὤνος and Skt. वस्नः) and *īre,* just as *vendere* is from *vēnum* and *dare* ("to give for sale"). The initial *e* in *vendere* is then shortened before *-nd.* — **potis est :** Classical Latin *possum, potes, potest,* etc., is a contraction of *potis* (or *pote*) and the personal forms of *esse*. In Plautus we find a nearly full paradigm, including *potis sum, potis es, pote est, pote esse, potis siem,* etc. The contracted forms of the type *potest,* however, are much more common, suggesting that the large part of the transition was complete by Plautus' day. The word *potis* itself is cognate with Gk. πόσις and δεσπότης and Skt. पतिस्, from the root **potis* ('lord'). — **vix recipi potis est :** The use of a passive infinitive with forms of *posse* is a very common idiom in all registers of Latin, but it is especially common in comedy. The ellipsed antecedent of *quod* in 41 (sc. *id*) is the subject of the sentence, *recipi* the complementary infinitive.

41 : nam tu aquam a pumici nunc postulas : This is the only time this exact idom comes up in Latin literature, but making impossible requests of inanimate objects (especially various liquids from rocks and other earthy things) is common in many languages, cf. Eng. draw blood from a

stone; Sp. *sacar agua de las pietras*; It. *cavare il sangue da una rapa*; Port. *tirar leite de pedra*; Rus. заставить камни рыдать; but uniquely Fr. *on ne peut peigner un diable qui n'a pas de cheveux*.

42 : qui ipsus siti aret : The form *ipsus* occurs 79 times in Plautus and 10 in Terence, while *ipse* occus 91 times in Plautus and 30 in Terence. The form *ipsus* is largely absent from any other literary sources. It seems to be a late analogical creation. — **sicin te mi hoc facere :** Infinitive of exclamation, for which see Lindsay 1907, 75. — **sicin :** For *sicine.* The demostrative adverb *sic* comes from *si* ("if") plus the deitic particle *-ce.* With the interrogative particle *-ne* the vowel of the particle *-ce* was still pronounced but it is weakened to *i.* cf. *haecine* in 545 and Weiss 2009, 343. — **mi :** This form could be a contraction of *mihi* or cognate with dative enclitic pronouns of the type Gk. μοι, Ved. मे. The later is not impossible, but Weiss prefers the former interpretation, which helps to explain why there is no form **tī* attested: *tibi* could not contract, but *mihi* could much more easily, (Weiss 2009, 327).

43 - 47 : Toxilus and Sagaristio share each of these iambic lines almost evenly. Toxilus begins lines 43, 44, and 45. Sagaristio's half of line 45 runs over into the first half of line 46. Toxilus counters with the same strategy and is again the first speaker in 47.

43 : alicunde : Indefinite words in Latin are formed by attaching the prefix *ali-* (from *alius*) to the interrogative stem (*ali-quis*). Word-initial **k*^{w} was lost in Latin only before a *u,* thus we have *quis* (**k*^{w}*ís*) but *ubi* (**k*^{w}*ud*^{h}*ei*). When not word-initial, the sound did not disappear, and so we

have *alicubi* and *alicundi*. — **mutuom :** *Mutuum* used substantively is a loan (sc. *aes*); *aes alienum* is a debt.

44 : quaeram equidem, si quis credat : de Melo takes *quaeram* as a future and the *si quis credat* as an "if haply, on the chance that" clause, familiar to Greek (Smyth 2354). Bennett, on the other hand, classifies this as a contrafactual conditional statement (Bennett 1, 273f). It is true that rigid formulae for conditional sentences that one traditionally memorizes from grammar books does not hold good for Plautus and Old Latin, and it is true that one will often find a present subjunctive in a conditional sentence where Classical Latin would regularly use the imperfect subjunctive, but given Toxilus' response (*nempe habeo in* mundo), the first interpretation seems to fit better. But perhaps the audience is meant to hear some real ambiguity here, ambiguity which does not register with Toxilus, who blindly assumes that his friend is making him a promise. — **equidem :** All of the *ca.* 180 occurrences of *equidem* in Plautus are with the first person singular. Other questionable instances tend to be able to be easily emended to *quidem*. — **si quis credat :** It seems that the original meaning of *credere* was confined to business transactions and meant "to give a loan." The substantive *creditum* is found in later Latin meaning "a loan," and this is whence modern languages have derived *credit, credito, crédit, crédito, Kredit,* кредит, and even the modern Greek gloss πίστωση. The meaning of *credere* in Latin, however, quickly expanded to include any form of trust, belief, confidence, or commission.

45 : nempe habeo in mundo : Woytek alone punctuates this as a question. de Melo punctuates with a period but translates, "Then I have it in sight, haven't I?" The particle *nempe* can be used to introduce both statements (OLD *nempe* 1: "Of course…") and questions (OLD *nempe* 2: "So it may be assumed that…") in both Plautus and Latin generally. In Woytek's words, *nempe* poses questions "deren Inhalt als ganz selbstverständlich betrachtet wird." There are other instances of *nempe* in questions in Plautus where the particle might have a similar force as this one here, such as *Mil.* 922 (not cited by Woytek): *nemp' tu novisti militem meum erum?* The meaning here would something like "So, I gather, you know….?" For other examples of this sort, see OLD *nempe* 2. One immediate problem with this interpretation is that Sagaristio's *si id domi esset mihi, iam pollicerer* is not exactly the most adequate answer to a question. Woytek cites a handful of examples where similar conditional sentences occur immediately after a change of speakers in Plautus, but fails to mention that none of them come after a question. Ultimately there is very little at stake here; it seems to me that there is little semantic difference between statements that begin with "Clearly…" and questions that begin with "So it may be assumed…" The correct punctuation can not be discovered by means of philological tools and comparisons, as Woytek would have it, but rather, since the semantic range of *nempe* allows for both interpretations, it is more a question of the intonation which the director would have instructed the actor to use in this line. But, if we think about the characterizations of the two characters that have been set forth so far, it does seem slightly more fitting for Toxilus' intonation here to utter a blithe statement of absolute confidence in his friend's vague promise (*si quis credat*) than to question him further.

46 : hoc meum est ut faciam sedulo : The *ut* clause is in apposition to *hoc*. — **meum est :** sc. *officium*. Along with *tuum est*, this is a standard idiom for talking about obligations. It is found most commonly in Plautus, Terence, Cicero's letters, and in Tacitus as well. Normally, we expect the construction to be used with an infinitive. The construction with a substantive *ut* clause is rarer, but is made to sound more natural with the addition of *hoc*. — **sedulo :** This adverb is very common in comedy, occuring 34 times in Plautus and 22 times in Terence. It is absent from Caesar, Sallust, Tacitus, and almost all poetry; it occurs a handful of times in Livy; five times in Pliny's letters; and in Cicero it occurs only once in an oration (*Pro Cluentio* 58.9), but five times in letters and twice in dialogues. All this suggests that in general it was more suited to colloquial registers. There are a handful of adjectives in Latin that use the neuter ablative singular adverbially instead of using the much more common ending *-ē* (OL *-ēd*), such as *sedulo, merito, continuo,* and *crebro*. See Weiss 2009 361-2 for more on the formation of adverbs in Latin. — **quidquid erit :** "Come what may, whatever happens." The phrase might have had an almost proverbial ring to it, judging from *quidquid erit, superanda omnis fortuna ferendo est* (Verg. *Aen.* 5.710); *quidquid erit, patiar* (Ov. *Ep.* 18.51); *ut melius, quidquid erit, pati* (Hor. *Car.* 1.11.3). — **recipe te :** The verb *recipere* is used both reflexively (with the meaning "return") and transitively in Plautus, although the reflexive use outnumbers the transitive.

47 : quaere tamen, ego item sedulo : This is version that Lindsay and de Melo print, which is obviously better than Ritschl's suggested emendation *quaero*, although Woytek prefers and prints the latter reading. He argues that the imperative *quaere* was written by mistake because of all the other imperative forms in the neighborhood and that, if we keep *quaere*, we cannot find a parallel

example where *item* is used with the ellipsis of a verb. This is yet another example where Woytek's blind commitment to philological principles interferes with his ability to read the text. Not only would the present tense verb *quaero* (instead of the future, *quaeram*) be very awkward here, but the resulting word order, in my opinion, is unlikely (I have not found in all of Latin literature of sequence first person present verb + *tamen ego*). In addition and more importantly, the ellipsis of the verb might be not a syntactic phenomenon but a dramatic one. The exchange could be imagined to run something like this:

(1) Sagaristio promises his anxious friend Toxilus twice that he will search for the money (44: *quaeram*; 46: *hoc meum est ut faciam sedulo*).

(2) Toxilus then tells Sagaristio to let him know whatever happens (46).

(3) At this point, the exchange is more or less complete, and maybe Sagrisitio has already begun turning around to rush off to help his friend and make his exit.

(4) Toxilus then bursts out another command as his friend starts to leave, saying *quaere tamen!*

(5) Sagaristio makes a sign of exasperation and continues on his way, as Toxilus shouts after him *ego item sedulo* [*quaeram*]!

(6) At this point, Sagaristio turns around, interrupts Toxilus (perhaps even as Toxilus is beginning to say something like *quaeram*), and with an annoyed tone shouts *si quid erit, te faciam ut scias!,* as if to say, "Calm down and get off my case! I promise I'll let you know if I find anything!"

Thus the imperative fits nicely with this scene, which derives much of its comedic value from the lovesick Toxilus bossing around Sagaristio and not realizing that he is rather forcefully making seemingly impossible demands of his fellow slave. The hight of Sagaristio's annoyance with his

whimsical friend is reached one line later, with *ah! osio me enicas!*. In my hypothetical staging of this small exchange, one could punctuate with an ellipsis after *ego item sedulo* instead of a period. — **si quid erit, <te fac>iam ut scias :** So de Melo prints Abraham's conjecture for the *si quid erit, iam ut scias* of the manuscripts, which Lindsay prints with an asterisk. Woytek prints and defends instead Sudhaus' emendation (<*iam fac*>*iam ut scias*), offering one decent and one questionable justification. First, he rightly claims that homoioteleuton often influences the loss of a word or two in manuscripts. Second, he argues that the "proleptisches Objekt ist in unserem Kontext sinnleer," saying that an example like *Asin.* 28 (*ut ipse scibo, te faciam ut scias*) differs fundamentally from the present line in that the proleptic pronoun is stressed. I however cannot see a semantic distinction between these two examples (or an example like Asin. 140: *te ut quae sis nunc et quae fueris scias*) large enough to justify one reading or the other. Both types of construction (i.e., *te faciam ut* and *faciam ut tu*) are common enough in Plautus and elsewhere and it would be foolish to argue too strongly for one or the other conjecture.

Facere often takes a predicate accusative to mark a change in state. The construction in *te faciam ut scias* seems to have developed from common expressions with predicate accusatives like *fac me certiorem* ("Let me know") or *te faciam certiorem* ("I'll let you know"). At risk of pedantry, the full thought expressed here would be *te faciam talem ut/qui scias*.

48 : opsecro te resecroque operam da hanc mihi : By all accounts this line should be, like 47, an iambic octonarius, and therefore the beginning of the line is missing five syllables (x. — x — x). The text of the rest of the line is also problematic. The manuscripts have both *resecroque* and *resecro, and* the presence or absence of *que* cannot be determined metrically because of the

following word begins with a vowel. There is also manuscript evidence for a change of speaker both before and after *resecro.* The options and interpretations are as follows (the em dashes indicate that Sagaristio interrupts Toxilus):

(1) Lindsay : TOX. *opsecro te*—SAG. *resecroque.* TOX. *operam da hanc mihi.*

(2) de Melo and Questa : TOX. *opsecro te resecroque, operam da hanc mihi*.

(3) Woytek : TOX. *opsecro te*—SAG. *resecra*! TOX. *operam da hanc mihi.*

Each of the options has its own advantages and disadvantages. Lindsay's is the most conservative and respectful of the manuscripts, keeping both of the indicated changes of speaker before and after *resecro*(*que*), but perhaps Sagaristio's interruption is slightly awkward. de Melo and Questa create a line with much better sense that Lindsay's without any change to the text, but must get rid of the attested changes of speaker. Woytek's line perhaps has the best sense and comedic force (TOX. I beg you… SAG. Keep on begging!) and respects the indicated changes of speaker, but he is the only editor to completely change the text, and his reading leaves a hiatus between *resecra*! and *operam* (which is admittedly made more possible by the change of speaker).

Despite the great sense which Woytek makes of the line, I think we must reject his reading, since passable sense can be made of the line without any textual emendation. In textual criticism of dramatic texts, indications of speakers in manuscripts is almost always much more fluid and open for debate than the text itself. It is for this reason that de Melo's and Questa's reading, which ignores these indications, is nevertheless the superior reading. I wonder if the indications of the changes of speaker before and after *resecro*(*que*) which Lindsay and Woytek keep could be explained by the fact that *resecrare* is a rare and unusual word, attested only here

and in one other passage in Plautus (*Aul.* 683-4: *nunc te obsecro / resecroque, mater*). Perhaps the word was interpreted as meaning "I ask you back" rather than "I ask you again/repeatedly," and so was given to Sagaristio. That the second meaning is the correct one is secured by the *Aul.* passage quoted above.

48 - 48ª : operam da hanc mihi / fidelem : *operam dare* is a favorite idiom not only of Plautus but also of Cicero (not only in his letters but also in his orations and philosophical dialogues). It can be used absolutely with the dative (as here) and also very commonly takes clauses introduced by either *ut* or *ne* with the subjunctive.

48ª : ah, odio me enicas : Sagaristio finally reaches the height of his exasperation with his friend. Plautus and Terence both use *enicare*, whereas *enecare* is found everywhere else. This is perhaps evidence for the retention of the original word-initial stress of Old Latin in Plautus. Plautus uses the same turn of phrase elsewhere: *Asin.* 920-921: *Pol me quidem / miseram odio enicavit*; *Rud.* 944: *enicas iam me odio, quisquis es.* For a similar sentiment cf. also *Asin.* 446: *Perii hercle, iam hic me abegerit suo odio*.

49 : Amoris vitio, non meo : Blaming love is common enough in comedy (as is the specific pairing of *Amor* and *vitia*): *Aul.* 754: *Quia vini vitio atque Amoris feci*; *Mer.* 18: *nam amorem haec cuncta vitia sectari solent*; Ter. *Eun.* 59: *in amore haec omnia insunt vitia.* It is also a common in classical poetry, e.g., Ov. *Ars Amatoria* 2.552-3 : *barbaria noster abundat amor. / Non semel hoc vitium nocuit mihi.* — **nunc tibi morologus fio :** The adjective *morologus* is

attested only here and at *Pseud.* 1264: *nec sermonibus morologis uti*. But Plautus also at times prefers the Latin calques *stultiloquus* (*Pers.* 514, said by Toxilus!)*, stultiloquentia* (*Trin.* 222)*,* and *stultiloquium* (*Mil.* 296).The Greek word and its derivatives (μορόλογος, μορολογία, μορολογεῖν) are found only rarely in Attic, but become hugely popular in koine Greek, with many occurrences in Plutarch, Origen, Athenaeus, John Chrysostom, and other early Church Fathers.

50 : at pol ego aps te concessero : The usage of the future and the future perfect in Plautus is the subject of much scholarly debate, and in individual instances it often difficult to see a clear distinction between the two. Often the difference is purely aspectual, and the "anteriority" of the future perfect (i.e., "I will have done something before something else") is not felt at all, as here. — **aps te :** The preposition known in classical Latin as *ab* or *ā* has many other attested forms in Old Latin, both in inscriptions and in literature, including *ap, af,* and *aps,* and in compounds *au-* and *as-*. The form *aps* seems to come from *ab* + *s,* perhaps on the analogy of *ex* (< **ek-s*), and was used originally only before *c, q,* and *t*. The form *abs* is also present in our manuscripts of Plautus. — **bene ambulato :** The future imperative is more common in comedy than in Classical Latin. Although it is commonly considered an archaism, the future imperative remained in use in all periods of Latin both as a colloquialism and as way of conferring gravity to command (often in legal contexts, but common elsewhere as well).

51 : quam primum potes : The phrase *quam primum* can be used absolutely without a verb to mean "as soon as possible." When the verb is expressed, Classical Latin prefers the subjunctive,

but Plautus and Terence use both the indicative and subjunctive freely.— **cave fuas :** The verb *cavere,* when used with a subordinate clause, is almost always followed by *ne* ("Watch out that…"), except in the imperative, where the *ne* is often missing. This is the result of the grammaticalization of the word *cave*(*te*), which becomes in its function almost a particle. This happens often with words of similar meaning across languages, cf. Russ. сморти. Another example of this kind of grammaticalization would be the colloquial use of the verb *velle*: e.g., *Mil.*157: *quid vis faciam?;* cf. Gk. ἐθέλεις, βούλει; Russ. хочешь. — **fuas :** In PIE the root of the verb "to be" was **h$_1$es-,* which forms the present tense in Latin. The perfect forms (*fui,* etc.) come from the root **b^{h}uh$_x$-* ('become' cf. Gk. ἔφυ and Ved. अभूत्). See Weiss 2009, 426 for more a more detailed account of the forms of the verb in Latin and in other Indo-European languages. The form *fuas,* then, would be a subjunctive formed from the perfect stem on the model of present subjunctives in *-a.* One cannot say whether this should be interpreted as an original present or perfect subjunctive, but it is likely that the perfective aspect was felt in Plautus' day, whose audience was familiar with the more traditional forms *fuerim,* etc.

52 : excoxero : Unlike *concessero* (50) above, *excoxero* is unambiguously anterior to to the idea (not to the verb itself) of the main clause ("I'll be at home until I…." = "I will leave home only after I will have…"). The form *coxi* is classical, but in general perfect stems in *-x* and *-s* are more common in Plautus and Old Latin than in Classical Latin e.g., OL *parsi* (which continues the PIE *s*-aorist familiar from Greek) for CL *peperci* (which continues the PIE reduplicated perfect, also familiar from Greek). — **malam rem aliquam :** Plautus uses the phrase *res mala*

very often, and it has a variety of different meanings depending on the context. Very often, it means “a beating,” but also “difficult situation,” or “trouble, misfortune.”

53 - 80 : Sagaristio exits offstage, Toxilus exits into his house, the music stops, and Saturio, the parasite, enters and delivers a very dramatic monologue in iambic senarii. A monologue delivered by a parasite during the opening scenes of the play is common in Plautus (cf. Cap. 69ff., Men. 77ff., Stich. 155ff.,). Many of the elements in Saturio’s monologue are typical: he talks about his genealogy (as in Stich. 155-6), gives himself a funny nickname (as in Cap. 69-70, Men. 77-8), and generally talks about his hunger and engages in some moralizing. It is in this vein that Slater 1985 offers some insight into the function of this scene. He argues that the monologue is a “reassertion of the comic world the audience knows and expects,” (41). That is to say, Toxilus has, in the first scene, upset some common assumptions about the types of characters one normally finds in comedy. Saturio, in contrast, by conforming so closely to his stock type, anchors the action of the play firmly in the comedic world. But does Saturio really conform so closely to the stock type of the parasite in this monologue? One distinguishing feature is his criticism of professional informers and of the laws which govern court cases. Another would be his concern for the common good (e.g., 65: *publicae rei causa*). Putting these concerns into the mouth of a parasite, who normally ought to be concerned with only his own belly, is indeed very funny and may challenge at least slightly the audience’s preconceived notions of the stock type. While it is true that Saturio then dismisses these concerns and turns to concerns typical of the parasite (75: *sed sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam / ubi sint magistratus quos curare oporteat*?), the characterization is nevertheless not as unequivocal as

Slater suggest. In fact, Saturio is somewhat atypical throughout the play insofar as he takes, as will be seen, a much more active role in main execution of the plot than is normally expected for a parasite.

53 - 61 : Saturio traces his genealogy back six generations and offers something of an aition for his current "profession" as a parasite. This section is rather self-contained.

53 : veterem atque antiquom : "Redundancy of expression, so marked a feature of Plautus' style, may be classed with these colloquialisms, for undoubtedly it reflects every-day speech," (Lindsay 9). Woytek needlessly tries to explain that since this pair is not strictly tautological (*vetus* referring just to age and *anitquus* being in addition, in his reading, a judgement of quality), this pairing of adjectives cannot rightly be classified as "redundancy of expression." Yet this analysis seems excessively pedantic and philological when one considers the tone and mode of expression in the entire opening of the monologue. The opening of Saturio's speech is marked throughout by redundancy (or "fullness"): in the next line we have *servo, optineo,* and *colo*; in 57 we have an absurdly long list of ancestors; in 61 the pair *hunc quaestum et locum.* That these features are all marks of colloquial speech is unquestionable. One could also say, however, that they tread the fine line between colloquial redundancy and dramatic fullness. — **quaestum :** A common word in Plautus and in Classical Latin. The meaning ranges from "profession, occupation" (as here) to "income, profit, earnings; a living." — **maiorum meum :** The ending *-um* (**-ōm*) in the genitive plural in the paradigm of the second declension (both nouns and adjectives) is the older form (a form parallel to Gk. -ων). The familiar ending -

orum was an analogical form based on the the first declension ending *-arum* (*-*asom*). Plautus does indeed use forms ending in *-um* more frequently than Classical poets, but is this due to the fact that the forms were still somewhat current in his day or that Plautus took more liberties *metri causa*? Perhaps both factors play a role.

54 : servo atque optineo et magna cum cura colo : Ascending tricolon with alliteration in the third member. For the redundancy of the line, see above on *veterem atque antiquom* (53). The resolution of the heavy syllable in the second iambic into two shorts as well as the ellisions of the coordinating conjunctions (all of the vowels of *atque* and *et* are involved in ellisions) speeds up the pronunciation of the beginning of line and contrasts with the second half of the line, which has no ellisions and is made up entirely of heavy syllables, except for the first *o* in *colo*. These features ease the redundancy of the line and put the emphasis on the stately and dignified expression *magna cum cura colo*.

55 - 56 : These two lines are held together by a long series of short units of alliteration, assonance, and consonance: (1) *nam num-*: nearly identical syllables save the vowel; (2) *-quam quisquam* : an alliteration of three members which is strengthened by the repetition of the syllable *quam*; (3) *meorum maiorum*; alliteration plus homoioteleuton (4) parasitando pa-verint ve-ntris suos: repetition of the sounds *-s* and *-nt* and of the syllables *pa* and *ve.*

55 : numquam quisquam : For Classical *nemo umquam*. It is astonishing that Woytek claims that *nemo umquam* "bei unserem Autor nicht vorkommt." In point of fact, Plautus uses *nemo*

umquam twice, one of which is in the *Persa* itself (Per. 211 and Amph. 566)! Woytek has no note on 211 at all. Terence also uses *nemo umquam* once (Hec. 281). Both authors, however, use *numquam quisquam* numerous times to express this idea. Cicero, on the other hand, has *numquam quisquam* only a handful of times (e.g., Pro Sestio 52.3 : *deinde numquam iam, ut spero, quisquam…;* De finibus 1.25: *numquam hoc ita defendit Epicurus neque Metrodorus aut quisquam eorum…*), while *nemo umquam* is much more frequently met. — **meorum maiorum :** If Gruterus conjecture above is correct (53: *quaestum maio<rum meum>*), as it probably is, then we see here the variation of the genitive plural endings in *meorum* and *meum* in very close proximity. This, then, would be good evidence for a *metri causa* interpretation.

56 : quin parasitando paverint ventris suos : It is possible that the audience immediately recognizes Saturio as a parasite at his entrance, either because his costume was in some fashion marked or because they recognized some of the tropes in his opening words from other similar parasite monologues. But it is also possible, and perhaps preferable given the theme of role reversal which is developed throughout the play, that he is in someway disguised and it is not until this line when the actor pronounces *parasitando paverint ventris suos* that the audience realizes that the actor on stage delivering this lofty monologue is actually a lowly parasite. Perhaps the actor made a light pause after *quin* for dramatic effect, and another one at the end of the line to give the audience time to laugh. The downbeat of the the first iamb is resolved into two shorts (*para-*) so that the line speeds to the punch line. — **parasitando :** *parasitari, subparasitari,* and their derivatives are favorite words of Plautus. The verbs are denominal, formed by attaching Latin first conjugation ends to the stem of the Greek noun παράσιτος. Such

hybrid forms are less common among the classical poets and prose writers. The use of the ablative of the gerund in this fashion is common in all registers of Latin but particularly suited to everyday speech. — **paverint ventris :** The same idiom is found elsewhere in Latin literature only at Pet.,*Sat.* 57.6. (*viginti ventres pasco et canem*) and Sen., *Epis.* 17.4 (*facile est pascere paucos ventres et bene institutos et nihil aliud desiderantes quam impleri*).

58 : quasi mures semper edere alienum cibum : We find Ergasilus, the parasite of the *Captivi*, say nearly the same line in his monologue at Cap. 77: *quasi mures semper edimus alienum cibum.* The words (*edere*) *alienum cibum* are perhaps a calque on the Greek word *παράσιτος* (lit., "food from (another)"). They are also undoubtedly, as Woytek mentions (following Leo), a translation of the phrase common to Greek comedy τἀλλότρια δειπνεῖν.

59 : edacitate : This word is attested only here and twice in Cicero, both times in his letters. It is an abstract noun formed from the adjective *edax* (*edere*). The more usual way to form these abstract nouns is through the suffix *-cia* (e.g., *fallacia, audacia, pertinacia > fallax, audax, pertinax*).

60 : is cognomentum erat viris Capitonibus : Using a predicated dative in expressions of naming is common in Plautus. One can both *nomen mihi est Marcus* and *nomen mihi est Marco*. — **cognomentum :** Plautus uses this strange form thrice times and *cognomen,* the noun more common in Classical Latin, twice. Cicero avoids this form altogether in prose, but it is attested twice in Sallust, three times in Apuleius, and is everywhere in Aulus Gellius and Tacitus. —

cognomentum erat : The long *o* in the second syllable of *cognōmentum* bears the ictus of the second iamb in this line. Because of the ellision which follows (*-um erat*) we can assume that the natural accent of *cognoméntum* was disregarded and was pronounced instead *cognóment*(*um*). This happens somewhat often in the Plautine corpus and is called by Fraenkel "die 'Zurückziehung' des Iktus vor der Synaloephe," (Fraenkel 1928, 268ff.). The same phenomenon is likely to be found in 58 with *édēre alienum* (Woytek *ad* 60). — **viris Capitonibus :** This is Woytek's own reading (for the manuscript reading *duris Capitonibus*), which de Melo adopts and Fontaine (2010, 171) praises. The idea behind the emendation is that there is little reason for these *Capitones* (which Fountaine renders "mullet men") to be described as *duri,* but rather the whole phrase is probably a calque on the Greek expression ἄνδρες κεστρεῖς, which is found in an Aristophanes fragment. The fish *κεστρεύς* was apparently also called κεφαλών (derived from κεφαλή, "head"), and thence comes the connection with *Capito* (from *caput*). For a complete analysis of the calque, see Fontaine 2010, 171.

61 : unde ego hunc quaestum optineo et maiorum locum : This line nicely closes the beginning part of the monologue with ring composition (Woytek *ad loc.*). In the first line we also had the forms *quaestim* and *maiorum* (the latter in the same metrical position), and *optineo* in the second. — **unde :** In colloquial Latin pronominal adverbs like *quo, unde, inde, huc,* etc. often are used to replace pronouns, whether relative or demonstrative. Here, *unde* = *e quibus*. Lindsay 1907, 48, 80. Whatever the interpretation of *unde*, it seems to me that one would be better off punctuating with a comma at the end of 60 instead of a period. — **hunc quaestum obtineo et maiorum locum :** For the fullness of expression, see above note on *veterem atque*

antiquom (53). Woytek argues that *maiorum* cannot be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both *quaestum* and *locum,* thinking that the demonstrative adjective *hunc* then becomes awkward. But *hunc quaestum maiorum* would be fine Latin. Indeed the difference in meaning between *quaestus* and *locus* here is small and it is only natural to understand not only *maiorum* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ but *hunc* as well.

62 - 74 : The transition from the first part of the monologue (53-61), in which Saturio establishes his pedigree, to this section, in which Saturio criticizes professional informers, is surprising and abrupt. The logic of the development of the argument is: "I have a noble lineage of parasites [and while some might criticize this choice of lifestyle], at least I am not accumulating wealth by dishonorable means like professional informers and people who concern themselves with matters of the court."

62 : quadrupulari : This word *quadrupulari*, and also *quadrupulator* below (70), is attested only here. The *quadrupulator* was a professional informer who profited by taking people to court. The name is derived from the fact that the accused, if convicted, had to pay four times as much as whatever he was charged for. Half of this amount went to the court, half to the *quadrupulator* (de Melo 2011, *ad loc*). Fontaine suggests that this word might also be a lewd pun with the word *quadrupedari* ("to be a quadruped," a word common in the participial form *quadrupedans*), which "alludes to the pathic's role in the sexual position that Romans called *coitus quadrupedum ritu,*" (Fontaine 2010, 245). The basis he provides for his assumption is the presence of doublets which suggest that the pronunciation of *l* and *d* in Latin were not very far

apart: *lingua* and its pre-Classical form *dingua*; *lacrima* and *dacrima*, the latter of which is attested several times in Livius Andronicus; and perhaps even variations like *sella* and *sedes.* Fontaine goes on to show that the end of this line (*neque enim decet*) and all of line 64 (*neque illi qui faciunt mihi placent. planen loquor?*) become much more comedic if this pun was felt by the audience. — **quadrupulari me volo :** According to Bennett, there are 30 instances in Plautus of the verb *velle* with an infinitive which has an accusative subject which is the same as the main verb (Bennett 1910, 1, 381). Woytek claims that *me* here helps to underscore the contrast between Saturio and other parasites. Fontaine claims that the redundant pronoun "looks like a means of facilitating an equivocation on *quadrupulari*" and so helps to emphasize the pun with *quadrupedari* discussed above. While it is unlikely that anyone in the audience would hear a substantial difference in meaning between generic statements like *volo facere* and *volo me facere,* in this instance, given proper and appropriate intonation, both Woytek's and Fontaine's readings are perfectly possible. — **neque enim decet :** As discussed above, this remark becomes much funnier assuming the presence of Fontaine's pun.

63 : sine meo periclo ire aliena ereptum bona : Fontaine does not go so far, but given the proper intonations and gesticulations on stage, this line could become pretty racy and continue the joke of 62. — **sine meo periclo :** Plautus has *periculum* 11 times, *periclum* 38 times. By way of comparison Vergil has *periculum* 10 times, and *periclum* 15 times. The variation is entirely *metri causa.* This is can be seen most clearly in Vergil, where *periclum* appears only at the verse end and *periculum* only immediately after a feminine caesura in the fourth foot. — **ire ereptum :** The supine in *-um* to express purpose is common in Plautus and very colloquial.

Cicero and Caesar do not use the accusative of the supine very frequently, instead preferring final clauses or *ad* with the gerund or gerundive. It is most commonly found with the verb *ire* and is Latin's answer to the Greek infinitive of purpose after verbs of going. We do find the infinitive of purpose after *ire* in Plautus and elsewhere, but much more rarely.

64 : On the probable joke in this line, see above on 62 : *quadrupulari.* — **illi mihi placent :** In all periods of Latin literature the singular of *placere* is much more common than the plural. This is true of Plautus as well, but he is not exactly shy about using it not only in the plural, but in the other persons as well. The following forms are attested: present indicative: *placeo* (3), places (9), *placet* (78), *placent* (11); present subjunctive: placeam (3), placeas (2), placeat (10), placeant (2); imperfect indicative: *placebant* (1); imperfect subjunctive: *placeret* (2); perfect: *placuit* (2), *placuimus* (1); future perfect: *placuero* (1); perfect subjunctive: *placuerit* (1). Cicero, by way of contrast, almost entirely avoids the personal construction (he has *placeamus* once in a letter and *placui* once in a dialogue) and perfects the singular to the plural in the present indicative 12 to 1, in the present subjunctive 49:1, in the imperfect subjunctive 34 to 1, and the perfect indicative 67 to 1.

65 : publicae rei caussa : This is the only instance in Plautus of the inversion of the normal word oder *res publica*. This order is incredibly rare throughout the history of Latin literature. Here, one can say that the choice is motivated by two concerns: (1) the use of the postposition *causa,* which may have allowed the noun to be attracted closer to the postposition than the adjective (Aulius Gelius also has the order *publicae rei causa* at 11.9.1.1); (2) the contrast

between public and private, which places more stress on the word *publica* than on the word *res* (e.g., Cic. *De Amicitia* 15.7: *quocum mihi coniuncta cura de publica re et de privata fuit*; Cic. *Epistulae ad Atticum* 1.18.1.7: *qui mihi et in publica re socius et in privatis omnibus conscius*…). — **rei :** Monosyllabic. Plautus has *rēī, reī,* and rei. The last is the most common (Weiss 254). — **caussa :** Both Woytek and de Melo have decided to print *causa.* Lindsay's decision to print *caussa* may have manuscript evidence or may be an artificial orthographic archaism, but it is almost certain that the word was pronounced with a double consonant in Old Latin, because a single intervocalic *s* would have been rhotacized. — **quiquomque :** The spelling *quom* for Classical *cum* is common in editions of Plautus, but is probably an artificial archaism. The change *-om* to *-um* already happened by Plautus' day, and so did the dissimulation of the labiovelar **k*^{w} to **k* before rounded vowels. — **ocius :** v.s. ad 85.

66 : magis quam : The -s in *magis* is not pronounced. — **quaesti sui :** This form of the genitive (for Classical *quaestūs*) is found three other times in Plautus (*Aul.* 83, Mos. 1107, *Poen*. 95; *Cist.* 757 is a modern restoration of a lacuna) and twice in Terence (*Hec.* 735, 836). Plautus almost always uses this form of the genitive for fourth declension nouns (the one or two instances of genitives in *-ūs* are questionable), which is formed by analogy with the genitive singular of the second declension. Perhaps one can hypothesize that knowing when to use the genitive in *-ūs* was a mark of higher register, and that the *-ī* genitive was associated with more colloquial registers. — **animus induci potest :** Lindasay paraphrases *credi potest*, to which Woytek objects and suggests instead *credere possum* (assuming that *meus animus* was understood in the original remark). The main point that Woytek seems to want to make with this is that Saturio is

presenting a subjective rather than an objective argument. But is there really a big difference between *credi potest* and *credere possum*? And if there is indeed a difference, would it not be better to have Saturio, who here rather uniquely for parasites in comedy is voicing concern for the common good, speak with a more objective and generalizing tone?

68 : legerupam : This word is found only in Plautus and never in Classical Latin. The the roots of the members of the compound are obviously *lex* and *rumpere,* but the member *-rupa* ('breaker') is not attested in any other compounds in Latin. Lindsay and de Melo (following the OLD) print *legerupam,* while Woytek (along with Lewis and Short) prints *legirupam.* The reason behind Lindsay's decision is presumably the rules of accentuation in Classical Latin, where the word would be pronounced *legérupam*. This would thus prevent the second *e* from being weakened to *i.* But given the metrical placement in the line, with downbeat of the iamb falling on the first syllable, it is almost certain that this word bore stress fixed on the initial syllable (as did all words in early Latin and Sabellic). Therefore the latter reading (of Woytek and Lewis and Short) is obviously better, since the weakening of short vowels to *i* in non-initial open syllables is the rule in Latin. The word here was almost certainly pronounced *légirupám,* with word initial stress and secondary stress on the ultima, and not **legérupam.* — **qui :** The paradigms *quis, quid* and *qui, quae, quod* are often confused not only in Plautus but in other authors as well. It might be better to print *quis* here. cf. Weiss 350. — **dēt** : Jussive subjunctive. The rule in Classical Latin that long vowels are shortened before *t, r,* and *l* usually does not apply in Plautus. This must have been a rather late innovation in the development of the language. — **in publicum :** As a substantive, *publicum* can mean "public property," "public land," "public funds," or "public

interest." Here the meaning is probably "public funds," cf. *As.* 321: *rapere cupio publicum; St.* 717: *hoc non impendet publicum?* But elsewhere *in publicum* means "for the common good," cf. Quin. 10.7.1.: *auxilium in publicum polliceri*.

69 : atque etiam in ea lege ascribier : *Ascribier* is the archaic passive infinitive for Classical *ascribi*. It is difficult to say what exactly it depends on. If there actually is a line missing between 67 and 68, perhaps that would have provided some more context. But even as the text stands, it is possible to understand it as very loosely depending on the construction set up by *animus induci potest* in 66, or as if Saturio is quoting some common legal language, especially since *in lege ascribere* is a relative common expression (e.g., Cic. *Caecin* 33, 95).

70 : quadrupulator : See above on *quadrupulari* 62. — **quempiam iniexit manum :** This type of double accusative construction is called "Accusative in 'Construtio ad sensum'" by Bennett (2, 260). A clearer explanation would be that *manum* is an internal accusative and *quempiam* the direct object. Often verbs joined with internal accusatives become so grammaticalized that the combined idea contained in the verb and the accusative can then take its own object. An extreme example of this phenomenon is *animadvertere* < *animum advortere,* which takes a direct object in both Old and Classical Latin. Plautus also has direct objects with collocations like *curam dare* and *operam dare* (Bennett 2, 260). In the present example, *inicere manum* contains one verbal idea ('to lay hands on someone so as to summon them to court") which can govern its own direct object. This expression is found also at *Truc.* 762 (*postid ego te manum iniciam quadrupli*). A

similar expression is famously found on the first of the Twelve Tables: *Si calvitur pedemve struit, manum endo iacito.*

71 : tantidem : This word comes from *tantus* and the suffix *dem* (as in *idem*) and means "just as much." The genitive here is a genitive of the charge or punishment with the phrase *manum inicere,* which acts as verb of accusing. It is akin to expressions like *damnare pecuniae* or *dupli/ quadruupli condemnare* 'condemn to pay two/fourfold' (Woodcock §73.5). — **ille illi rursus iniciat manum :** The *illi* here has been emended to *illum* to make it match the accusative in the preceeding line. The *quempiam* of 70 has also been emended to *quoipiam* for the corresponding reason. Woytek may be right in suggestion that is merely *variationis causa*. Whatever the reason may be, the readings of the manuscripts do not create impossible problems in either line and so should be left as found.

72 : aequa parti : Gronovius suggests "pari utrinque periculo proposito;" de Melo translates "in an equal position"; Woytek wants *pars* to mean "Rolle, Aufgabe, Funktion." It is difficult to find comparanda for either interpretation, but the meaning in context is clear enough. — **ad trisviros :** "The *tresviri capitales* were responsible for administering justice, imprisoning suspects, and executing criminals," (de Melo *ad loc.*).

73 : si id fiat, ne isti faxim nusquam appareant : The line between the future less vivid and the present contrafactual condition is not distinct in Old Latin, and often we find present subjunctives were in Classical Latin one would more reasonably expect imperfects. See Bennet

1, 273f. — **ne :** ναί, particle for emphasis. — **faxim :** In PIE the infix *-*h₁s*- was added between the root of the verb and the personal endings to create a desiderative verb ('I want to…'). The most direct evidence of this form can be found in the Greek *s*-future and the short-vowel aorist subjunctives in Homer. In Latin, however, the future in most cases continues the PIE subjunctive (not desiderative), while the Latin subjunctive continues the PIE optative. There are a handful of future verb forms, however, than continue the *s*-desiderative, like *faxo* (<**fac-sō*). The form *faxim*, then, is actually an original optative (which in Latin is interpreted as a subjunctive) created from the desiderative stem. This type of subjunctive is already very rare in Old Latin: according to de Melo, there are 106 uses of it in Plautus, 12 in Terence, and about 20 in other Archaic Latin authors such as Ennius, Pacuvius, Cato, etc., (de Melo 2007, 191). The subjunctives can almost always be regarded as the equivalent of the more standard subjunctive forms (*faciam, fecerim*), i.e., they are not semantically distinct formations. de Melo, however, having surveyed all of the surviving evidence, concludes that they tend to be closer in meaning to non-past perfect subjunctives than present subjunctives (de Melo 2007, 191-215). — **ne isti faxim nusquam appareant :** What exactly does *facere* mean here, and what type of construction is it setting up? It is likely that *appareant* is not dependent on *faxim* at all, as Woytek explains: *faxim* is "als parenthetischer Zusatz mit der Bedeutung 'ich garantiere, stehe dafür ein' zu verstehen." de Melo follows, translating, "I bet those people would disappear who…" There are indeed many parallels for *faxim* with this meaning in contrafactual conditionals (see above on *si id fiat* for present subjunctives in contrafactual conditionals), e.g., *edepol ne illa si istis rebus te sciat operam dare | ego faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis quam Iouem* (Amph. 510-511);

ecastor faxim, si itidem plectantur uiri…plures uiri sint uidui quam nunc mulieres (Mer. 826-829).

74 : albo rete : Why are the informers said to use a white net? This passage has been very problematic and there have been many emendations and suggestions to try to solve the issues (for which, see Woytek *ad loc*.). Woytek rejects almost all attempts to make sense of the line. His suggestion, which de Melo follows, is that the net is specifically white "because in Athens accusations were made public on white noticeboards," (de Melo *ad loc.*). But this is no more sound an interpretation than those which we find in Lewis and Short, where *albo rete aliquid oppugnare* is interpreted as hapax legomenon proverb with the meaning "attack or seize upon in a delicate, skillful manner" (*albus,* I3c), or in the OLD, which suggests that the phrase *albo rete* means "by legal documents" (*rete,* 1e).

75 : sed sumne ego stultus… : Now Saturio asks the question that the audience has probably been wanting to ask for quite some time: "Why is this parasite talking about these serious issues?" After Saturio's rhetorical question in 75-6, he drops this serious discourse altogether and transforms back into the parasite that we want and expect him to be. — **sumne :** "*Sumne* is especially common in soliloquy, where it always has the force of *nonne sum?*" (Bennett 1, 460, which Woytek also quotes in full). A curious remark, since the particle *-ne* has the force of *nonne* whenever it is added directly to *any* verb (AG 332c), both in Plautus and in Classical Latin. — **qui rem curo publicam :** This is classified as a causal relative clause by Bennett (1, 137) and Woytek follows. Bennett provides a long list of other examples of causal relative clauses with the

indicative, where Classical Latin would generally prefer the subjunctive. But it is not clear that this is a helpful or productive category. Often, like here, these clauses can be understood as plain old relatives.

76 : ubi sint magistratus : Woytek argues that the subjunctive here is "zwischen kausaler und konzessiver Bedeuting, die von den Grammatiken wohl nicht geführt wird" and cites Ger. "wo (doch)," which can have a similar meaning, as a comparison. The reason for such an argument is that one naturally wants to translate *ubi* as either 'when' or 'since,' which is what de Melo and previous translators offer. This, however, is not the most convincing explanation. It is much better to leave *ubi* with its expected meaning "where" and understand the subjunctive as in a clause of characteristic: "[the sort of republic] where there are magistrates…" The understandable desire to make the clause causal is probably the reason why translators and commentators have missed the fact that Bennett already suggested this interpretation in 1910 by citing *Pers.* 76 under the category which he called descriptive clauses of fact introduced by *ubi* with the subjunctive, (Bennet 1, 289ff). — **magistratus :** The word is uncommon in comedy. — **oporteat :** Either subjunctive by attraction or another clause of characteristic as *ubi sint* above, but the meaning is hardly affected by either interpretation.

77 - 80 : This lines have an excited sing-song effect. Each of them are broken up into two short units by a strong sense pause in the middle of the line, and there is a fair amount of homoioteleuton, alliteration, and the repetition of sounds. Thus 77 opens with two words which share the same vowel and strong final consonant and which sound very similar when pronounced quickly (*nu̲nc̲ huc̲*) and two words which have both the first and final vowel in common (*i̲ntro̲*

ibo) and ends with a delicate homoioteleuton (*visam hesternas reliquias*). The first half of 78 is held together by the triple repetition of the final sound and the repetition of the sound *n* (*quierintne recte necne*), while the second half opens by adding to the accumulation of *n* sounds and closes with a light consonance (*num infuerit febris*). The two hals of 79 are joined by the perfect subjunctive endings *-erint* and *-erit* which close each clause and which echo the verbal endings of 78 as well. Because of these features and the strong staccato rhythm of the clauses, we can imagine that Saturio has begun to prance about the stage after having turned from thoughts about the state to thoughts about leftovers. The actor pronounces these words whimsically, as if singing to himself. Line 80 opens continuing the pattern of alliteration (*aperiuntur aedes*), but the second half does not (*remorandust gradus*), as if the opening of the door has called Saturio back from his fantasies. So with the final words of the soliloquy (*remorandust gradus*) Saturio simultaneously stops his prancing and metatheatrically announces his stage direction to the audience.

77 : nunc huc intro ibo : The *huc* has diectic force. Now Saturio starts dancing towards Toxilus' house. The remark is vaguely metatheatrical, in that it can be seen as stage direction, as can *remorandust gradus* below (80). — **visam :** The verb *visere* is more vivid than *videre.* Whereas the latter normally only refers to the physical act of seeing, the former has more force: "go and see, go and find out, go and have a look." The joke is that *visere* is normally used of persons, and so the *hesternae reliquiae* are personified. So Ussing: "Eas se visurum dicit faceta usus comparatione, ut homo visitur, apud quem clientes … adsunt"; and Ammendola: "Saturione parla come un cliente." — **hesternas :** Both Plautus and Terence tend to avoid the adjectives

hersternus, hodiernus, and *crastinum* and prefer modes of expression which allow instead for the adverbial forms *heri, hodie,* and *cras* to be used. — **reliquias :** A favorite word of Plautus, where it almost always means "leftovers (of food)." This meaning is not very common outside of comedy, where is usually denotes the remainders of other things.

78 : quierintne … febris : The comical personification continues. These would be common questions that a client would pose to his patron during his morning visit. — **quierint :** Syncopated for *quieverint,* from *quiesco*. Asking how the patron rested is typical, as we see at Mil. 710: *priusquam lucet, adsunt, rogitant noctu ut somnum ceperint.* — **recte :** A favorite adverb of Plautus and colloquial Latin generally. — **num †infuerit† febris :** The reading is uncertain, but the sense is clear. The readings *afuerit* (cf. Curc. 17: *caruitne febris te?*) and *is* (=*iis, i.e., reliquiis*) *fuerit* have been suggested as emendations for the manuscript reading. Woytek, however, is content with the manuscript reading. But what exactly does it mean for the leftovers to have a fever? There are no parallels for this expression. If it means that they have been burnt (so as to dispose of them) or have already been reheated (so as to finish eating them), then perhaps the positive meaning of the verb in the manuscript (*infuerit*) or Linday's *is fuerit* would make the most sense. But if we are not meant to take the metaphor so far, and the joke is funny merely at a more superficial level, i.e., because the parasite is talking to food as if to a human being and is asking about the health the leftovers (i.e., whether they spoiled or not), then perhaps the negative verb *afuerit* would be more suitable.

79 : opertaen fuerint : The verb *operire* has a wide range of meaning, including "close (eyes, doors, boxes, etc.)," "cover (with a cloth, with earth, with a blanket, with a lid)," "clothe,"

"protect," and "conceal." It is obvious that Saturio is asking whether the leftovers have been covered and so protected, but, continuing the personification, one can also imagine him asking his patron whether he was covered well while he slept or whether he is dressed yet. — **ne quis obreptaverit :** A clause of fearing dependent either on the initial *visam* or just on the immediately preceding *opertaen fuerint.* The latter is more likely, thus creating four clauses of almost equal length in 78 and 79 all of which are dependent on *visam*.

80 : aperiuntur aedes, remorandust gradus : See above on 77-80.

81 - 167 : This exchange between Toxilus and Saturio, all in iambic senarii, sets into the motion the main action of the play. Toxilus exits his house claiming that he has figured everything out (81-2: *omnem rem inveni, ut*...) and proceeds to trick Saturio by tempting him with the promise of a lavish banquet (83-109). He then reveals his plan: he wants to dress up the daughter of Saturio as a foreigner and stage a mock sale. He will sell her, collect the money, and then have Saturio claim her as a free-born woman, thus negating the purchase. After a little hesitation Saturio accepts the plan (147), and Toxilus proceeds to instruct him on all the details: how the girl should look, what she should say about herself, and whence Saturio should get the supplies.

81 - 98 : Slater refers to the opening of this scene as an inversion of the power dynamic typical of scenes of eavesdropping. Toxilus is aware of Saturio's presence and so stages a fake conversation with slaves who are in charge of the cooking to further tempt Saturio. "Usually the

eavesdropper and the audience share the position of superior knowledge. Here Toxilus is in control of the dramatic communication, and the audience shares in his position of knowledge."

81 : omnem rem inveni : Plautus uses the unit *omnis res* much more frequently than other authors and often in places where Classical Latin would just say *omnia*. — **inveni :** A present-perfect which sets up primary sequence (*ut faciat*).

81 - 82 : ut … faciat : An indirect question depending on *inveni*, in apposition to the proleptic object *omnem rem*. — **sua sibi pecunia :** Woytek agrees with Lindsay's analysis: "The pleonastic strengthening of *suus* by the addition of *sibi* is a feature of colloquial Latin," (Lindsay 41). It seems to me, however, that *sibi* is doing more work in this instance than merely strengthening the possessive adjective. It is more likely that *sibi* is the so-called dative of disadvantage in all of its power: "the pimp will do this, with his own money, to his own downfall!" The placement of *sibi* between the possessive adjective and the noun with which it agrees is not coincidental, but reflects the general structural tendency in Old Latin verse to place similar items (similar either in sound, meaning, or, as in this case, both) in close proximity or in strong or otherwise marked positions (as *leno libertam*). The repetition of *suus* again at the end of 82 (*suam*) is somewhat pleonastic and speaks to Toxilus' state of excitement. We can imagine that these two lines were pronounced dramatically and at a slightly slower pace than usual, so as to build suspense for the revelation of Toxilus' plan. Thus *suam,* already distant from *sua sibi*, is artificially further removed and was likely to not be immediately noticed as an unnecessary repetition.

83 : eccum : Forms like this are usually interpreted as *ecce* plus a form of *is, ea, id*. Weiss, however, suggests that *eccum* and *eccam* actually are from **ekke-hom* and **ekke-ham*, i.e., from *ecce* plus the accusative of the *hic, haec, hoc* demonstrative without the particle *-ce.* We find other combinations of *ecce* with demonstrative adjectives in Plautus, such as *eccistam* and *eccillum,* which later produced the Italian demonstratives *questo* and *quello*. — **quoius mihi auxilio est opus :** The phrase *opus est* can be used with the nominative, genitive, or ablative of the thing needed or wanted. In Plautus the phrase is used overwhelmingly with the ablative.

84 : simulabo quasi : Classical Latin tends to use *simulare* with either a direct object or an accusative infinitive object clause. This construction is found also in Plautus, but *quasi* with the subjunctive is just as common. The *quasi* clause is also used with *adsimulare* and *dissimulare*. Bennett calls these "clauses of conditional comparision." See Bennett 1, 285-286 for all examples with these and other verbs. — **alliciam :** The only instance in Plautus of this verb; *elicere* is found twice. — **virum :** The use of the word *vir* instead of a pronoun is to be compared with the word *homo,* which, according to Lindsay, is to be considered a pronoun which "in the colloquial Latin of Plautus and Terence often has the function of *is* or *ille,*" (Lindsay 45, with examples). The same usage of *vir* is found below at 481: *aggrediar virum*. Both ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος can do the same thing in Greek poetry (LSJ ἀνήρ VI 2: "ὁ ἀνήρ is frequently used emphatically for αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος"; ἄνθρωπος, I 5)

85 : Toxilus begins his fake conversation with some imagined slaves inside. — **istic :** This adverbial form and also *hic* and *illic* are originally locatives of the demonstrative pronouns

ending in *-ei* with the addition of the particle *-ce* (Weiss 354). Comparing line 405 (*curate isti intus*), Woytek writes that here *istic* = *intus*. The meaning of the two words is indeed close. Cf. Lindsay 45: "The distinction between *hic* 'the person beside me or us,' *iste* 'the person beside you,' *ille* ' the person at a distance from me or us' is carefully observed in the Comedies and often reveals to us the position occupied at the moment by the several actors on the stage." — **adproperate :** The simple verb *properare* is much more common in Plautus and differs little if at all in meaning. — **ocius :** The positive degree of this word (which is cognate with Gk. ὠκύς) is not attested, but *ocius* as an adverb can have both positive (as here) and comparative meaning. It seems that using the comparative for the positive, as Woytek notes, is a feature of colloquial Latin, but can find *ocius* not implying comparison in other registers of poetry as well (See OLD 2 b, e.g., Verg. *A.* 10.786-8: *ocius ensem* | *Aeneas viso Tyrrheni sanguine laetus* | *eripit*). Cf. Ru. скорее/скорей, which also often loses its comparative force.

86 : ne mihi morae sit quicquam : Bennett classes this use of *morae* under the heading of predicate dative of purpose (Bennett 2, 175). There are indeed other instances of *morae* being used in this way (e.g., inter alia, *M.G.* 1190: *ne sit matri morae*), but none of the other examples have a word like *quicquam* in the sentence. Given the overwhelming use in Plautus of the partitive genitive, especially with adverbs and neuter nouns, adjectives, and pronouns (for copious examples of which see Bennett 2, 16-34), it is much more natural in this instance to take *morae* as a partitive genitive. Cf. Lindsay 16: "The Partitive Gen. is as greatly affected by Plautus as by Cicero. He even prefers *hoc negoti* to *hoc negotium*." — **ubi ego intro advenero :**

The construction is equivalent in form to the protasis of the so-called future more vivid conditional sentence with an emphatic protasis.

87 : commisce mulsum, struthea coluteaque appara : So prints Lindsay. Woytek has *commisce mulsum, Struthea, †coluthequam† appara.* Understanding *Struthea* as a proper name rather than referring to a type of apple (a suggestion of many different critics) seems sound and helps explain the switch from plural imperatives in 85 to the singular here. The reading behind *coluteaque* (some sort of fruit) or *coluthequam* (meaning unknown) is much more difficult to uncover. Ritschl suggested *colyphia*, picking up on 92 below. Others have posited a lacuna after *struthea*. de Melo prints Woytek's suggestion *calidam* (sc. *aquam*), which gives nice sense (especially considering the following clause in 88: *bene ut in scutris concaleat*) but is farther from the manuscripts. For a complete account of the reasons (at times convincing) behind the suggestion *calidam*, see Woytek *ad loc.* — **mulsum :** i.e., mulsum vinum.

88 : bene ut in scutris concaleat : If there is any truth behind Woytek's suggestion of *calidam* above in 87, then this would be a final clause after *commisce mulsum, calidam appara.* If not, then we have a switch from the imperative (*appara*) to a jussive subjunctive clause. We can understand the construction to be something like *fac ut* or *velim ut*. —**calamum :** i.e., *acorus calamus,* which apparently has and has had many uses, including adding flavor to wine, bitters, and absinthe.

89 : credo : The parenthetical use of *credere* is common in all registrars and in all periods of Latin literature, especially in the first person. See TLL *credo* B 1 a β δδ. — **congerro :** Attested four times in Plautus and nowhere else. Varro quotes this line at L. L. 7.55, where he says that is related to the Greek word γέρρον**,** which can refer to anything made of twigs or wicker-work. The word was adopted into Latin (*gerrae*) and the meaning was then transferred to "nugae; nonsense, trifles." For a full account of the etymology of these words, see Samuel Brandt's entry on *gerrae gerro congerro* in the 117th volume of the Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik (1878: 365-389). See Corpus Glossariorum latinorum.

90 : me dicit : The verb dicere often takes the accusative of the thing or person said or mentioned, such as *dicere verum, nugas, iocum,* etc. The use of a personal pronoun is not so surprising. We find the same use at Merc. 563 (*me dicit*) and a similar one at Amph. 618 (*Sosia ille quam iam dudum dico*). — **eugae :** Gk. εὖγε. The final syllable is often lengthened in arsis and thesis in Plautus and Terence, and some editors, including Richter and Lindsay, prefer to print *eugae* in other places as well. — **e balineis :** The plural of *balneum* is *balneae.* In theory the singular refers to a private bathroom, the plural to public baths, but this distinction is not rigid. In Plautus, unsurprisingly given the social status of most of the characters, only the plural is found. The form *balineae* is used in Old Latin. This is evidence that words containing four syllables in which the first three syllables are light were accented on the first syllable: if the Romans had said **balíneae* and not *bálineae*, the stress on the *i* would have prevented syncopation. See Weiss 111.

91 : ut ordine omnem rem tenet : Woytek prints instead *ut in ordine omnem rem tenet,* a reading from a 17th century codex which Ussing also prints. But in reality there is little if any different between *ordine* and *in ordine.* — **omnem rem :** See above on 81 : omnem rem inveni. — **tenet :** By analogy with Grk. ἔχειν, the verb *tenere* often means 'understand, know.'

92 : collyrae : Probably some sort of pasta made from bread (Grk. κολλῦραι). — **madeant :** The verb *madere* properly means 'to be wet, moist,' and is exactly cognate with Grk. μαδᾶν. In Plautus the word can also mean 'to be soft because of boiling, a coquendo percoctum esse' and seems to be the opposite of *incocta* (81: 'raw') below. — **colyphia :** Little pieces of meat. Grk. τὰ κωλύφια, which itself is a diminutive of κωλήν, 'thigh, leg.'

93 : ne mihi incocta detis : The use of *ne* plus the present subjunctive to express a prohibition is mostly limited to Old Latin, poetry, and colloquial conversation. The construction of the *ne* with any subjunctive (and in Greek, μή) to express a prohibition is inherited from PIE (Bennett 1, 348; cf. Ved. *me* + injunctive). Classical Latin limited this use to only the perfect subjunctive and replaced *ne* + present subjunctive with *noli* + infinitive and *cave* + present subjunctive. Plautus also uses *ne* + present imperative in short phrases like *ne fle, ne time, ne parce*, *ne clama* etc. This usage survives in colloquial Latin and poetry. — **rem loquitur meram :** "He speaks of nothing but the affair at hand, he speaks the truth."

94 - 98 : Saturio's lines here have a singsong quality, and we can imagine that he comes close to singing as he get himself more and more excited about the food. In line 94 we have

homoioteleuton in *quas madidas gluttias*, the repetition of dental sounds *crudae.. madidas gluttias,* and the near-identical sounds *crud-* and *glutt-*. The next three lines (95-7) all end in similar-sounding four syllable words (*collyricum, pellucidum, collyricum*). Line 95 contains alliteration (*cremore crasso…collyricum*), the sounds of which continue to repeat in 96 (*macrum…epicrocum*). Line 98 is ringed nicely by *nolo* and *volo* (forming a chiasmus) and alliterates with *v* (*in vesicam…in ventrem volo*). The repetitions of *nihili* at the beginning of 94 and 96 and of *ius collyricum* in 95 and 97 tie all of the lines together.

94 : nihili : Genitive of indefinite value, "worthless, of no value." A favorite usage of Plautus which is not as common in other authors. Cicero is among the few who actually use it, but even so there are only seven occurrences in his corpus (twice in orations, twice in letters, thrice in dialogues). — **crudae :** = *incoctae.* — **madidas :** See above on 92 : *madeant*. The adjective in this meaning is more common than the verb. — **gluttias :** A rare verb, absent from republican and Augustan Latin and attested only here in Plautus. It is cognate with Ru. глотать 'gulp down.'

95 : cremore crasso : The same phrase is found in Cato, *de Agricultura* 86: *donec cremor crassus erit factus*. The noun *cremor* is of uncertain etymology and is found otherwise only in Ovid's *Medicamina Faciei Femineae,* Celsus' *de Medicina,* and in Scribonius Largus. — **ius :** This word can be used of any liquid prepared by boiling, but mostly refers to meat- or fish-based broths. It is cognate with Ru. уха, a type of fish soup. It is not to be confused with the identical *ius* ('law, etc.'), which probably shares its root with the negative particle Gk. οὐ. — **collyricum :**

An adjective derived from *collyrae* above (92). It is, of course, created using Greek derivational morphology (-ικος) but is not itself attested anywhere in Greek.

96 : nihili est macrum illud epicrocum pellucidum : "that thin, transparent, women's garment is worthless." In this line and the next, Saturio compares thin and hearty soups to light and heavy garments. — **macrum :** Most frequently used of animate beings, but it can be metaphorically applied to various inanimate things. Woytek is correct in pointing out that although *macer* is never used elsewhere to describe clothing, the words *crassus* and *pinguis* can be used of various garments. The use of *macer*, then, is not much of a stretch. — **epicrocum :** The word is attested only here, once in Naevius, and in Varro's comments on Naevius. In Naevius it seems to describe a thin women's garment. — **pellucidam :** Adjective derived from *perluceo*.

97 : †iuream† : 'soupy, juicy.' The manuscripts give variously *iuream* (from *ius*)*, viream* (from *viriae,* 'bracelets')*,* and *iureseam,* none of which are attested elsewhere and none of which can be correct. Ritschl proposed the Greek word *sisuram,* a type of cloak. This emendation fittingly continues the comparison between garments and food, but the word is not attested elsewhere in Latin. Woytek suggests the adjective *birreum* (from *birrus,* a type of raincoat), arguing rightly that it is "paläographisch näher an der Korruptel als alle bisherigen Emendationen (phonetisch bedingte b/v-Verschreibungen sind überall häufig, zwischen a und u ist in Minuskelhss. oft nicht zu unterscheiden)." Woytek's emendation is ultimately not impossible and arguably sticks closer paleographically to what is written in at least one of the manuscripts. de Melo actually prints *birreum* in his Loeb. The problems remain, however, that the adjective *birreus* is nowhere else

attested, that the noun *birrus* is entirely absent from Latin before the middle to late imperial period, and that the comparison would ultimately be stronger with a noun (like *sisuram*) than with a noun-derived adjective. The original reading is undoubtedly lost, but the sense needed is clear enough.

98 : quod eat : The object of both *nolo* and *volo*, forming a perfectly balanced chiasmus: *nolo*^{A} i*n vesicam*^{B} (*quod eat*) *in ventrem*^{B} *volo*^{A}. *eat* is subjunctive of characteristic ("the sort if thing which goes…") or consecutive ("with the result that it goes…").

99 : prope me hic nescioquis loquitur : The same line is used at Ru. 97 and nearly the same at Amph. 331 (*certe enim hic nescioquis loquitur*). — **nescioquis :** Joining interrogative pronouns and adverbs (*quis, quae, quod, ubi, quo modo, etc.*) with *nescio* is a favorite expression of Plautus, Terence, and Cicero. It is common enough in poetry as well, but very rare in other prose authors. — **o mi Iuppiter :** According to de Melo, this is a "jocular reference to the feast where Jupiter, together with his divine table companions Juno and Minerva, was presented with a meal." The *o mi Iuppiter* would then be an apostrophe to Jupiter and the *terrestris coepulonus* of the next verse would have to refer to Toxilus. This seems to miss the mark, however. It is much better for the *o mi Iuppiter* to be interpreted as an excessively flattering address to Toxilus from Saturio and the *terrestri coepulonus* of the next verse to be Saturio himself. Woytek suggests an interpretation along these lines, and points out that it is common enough in Plautus for characters to jokingly address one another as gods or heroes, e.g., Mil. 1054 (*mi Achilles*), or Merc. 690 (*Iuno mea*).

100 : terrestris te coepulonus compellat tuos : Saturio's singsong continues (v.s. ad 94-98): not only do we have alliteration (*terrestris te coepulonus compellat tuos*) but *coepulonus* (scanned as four syllables) and *compellat* share the same initial consonants in the first three syllables (*coepulonus, compellat*). — **coepulonus :** The only attestation of this word in Latin.

101 - 103 : O Saturio …. nam Essurio venio, non advenio Saturio : Fontaine 2010 (70-72) argues against the common interpretation that the hungry parasite's name is ironically derived from the Latin word *satur* 'full.' Cf. Woytek: "Der Name ist im Griechischen (Σατυρίων) gut belegt….Lateinisch etymologisiert passt der Name κατ᾽ ἀντίφρασιν ideal auf einen Parasiten." Fontaine however claims that the *u* in *Saturio* of 101 is actually a Greek upsilon which Plautus transliterated (archaically) as *u* and which was not modernized in the MSS to *y*. Thus the audience would have first heard the Greek name Σατυρίων (the name and the similar Σάτυρος are elsewhere associated with comic figures or parasites). Line 103 (with the *u* of *Saturio* now being pronounced as a Latin *u*) can then be interpreted as a "surprising bilingual pun." Fontaine convincingly concludes: "The Greek interpretation of the parasite's name does more than simply improve the joke in vv. 101-103. It also restores balance and restraint to the parasite's character overall. The name *Saturio* makes the character into a permanently buffoonish starveling, a surreal and cartoonish Roman roaming the streets of "Athens" in search of food, and yet bearing the fantastical and ironical Latin name "Fatso." The Greek name, by contrast, privileges a superficial realism that firmly grounds the character in his natural milieu and places Plautus' play

more firmly along the continuum with Greek comedy; it foregrounds the parasite's wit, not is appetite" (72).

101 : opportune : A favorite adverb of Plautus when talking about arrivals, used no less than 9 times (e.g., *As.* 753: *ut tempori opportuneque attulistis; Poen.* 576: *opportune egrediuntur Milphio una et vilicus*).— **aduenisti mihi :** This dative could be construed as simple dative of reference/advantage (with *opportune*), or as the equivalent of *ad me*. Withs verbs of motion (*venire, advenire, ire*), however, Plautus usually prefers *ad* with the accusative to the dative. The use of the dative here could be by analogy with the common equivalence in Plautus of the dative of indirect object with *ad* plus the accusative. Thus Lindsay (1907, 20, 83): "The equivalence of the Dat. to the combination of a Prep. (*ad, in*) with the Acc., which led to the 'Auxiliary' formation of the Dat. in the Romance languages, is prominent even in Plautus' time"; "The Vulgar Latin use of *ad* with Acc. as the equivalent of the Dat. is…already exemplified here and there in Plautus." This chronology, that the use of *ad* with the accusative is a feature of colloquial Latin which shows up in Plautus and remains a feature of the language into Romance but disappears from the record during the Classical period, has been refuted conclusively by Adams 2013 (278-294). Adams finds examples of this construction in every period of Latin literature and ultimately concludes that "There is no direct connection between the uses of *ad* discussed by Lindsay in Plautus and the Romance languages" (292).

102 : mencadium dicis : The use of *mendacium* as the direct object of a verb of speech is a turn of phrase not especially common in other authors (although it is found once in Cornelius

Nepos and a few times in Quintillian). In Plautus it is found here and at *Amph.* 198 (*dixero*), *Bacch.* 525 (*dixit*) and 957 (*dixeram*), *Merc.* 209 (*proloqui*), and *Truc.* 484 (*memoravisse*). There was a semantic difference between *mendacium dicere* and *mentiri*, according to the Republican grammarian P. Nigidius Figulus: *inter mendacium dicere et mentiri distat. qui mentitur, ipse non fallitur, altern fallere conatur; qui mendacium dicit, ipse fallitur. qui mentitur fallit, quantum in se est, at qui mendacium dicit ipse non fallit, quantum in se est. vir bonus praestare debet ne mentiatur, prudens ne mendacium dicat; alterum incidit in hominem, alterum non* (Gel. *N.A.* 11.11). — **hau te decet :** The final *-d* of *haud* is often omitted before a consonant. Cf. Caper gramm. VII 96.4 : *'hau dolo' per 'd' recte scribitur. etenim 'd' inter duas vocales esse debet. quod si consonans sequitur, 'd' addi non debet, ut hauscio.*

103 : nam essurio venio, non advenio saturio : On the joke, see above on 101 - 103. — **essurio :** Found only here, derived from the verb *essurire* 'be hungry.' The verb is variously written *essurire* and *ēsurire*, and so some editors prefer to write *Essurio* here, others *Ēsurio*.

104 : nam iam intus uentris fumant focula : Note the balance and sonic effects : *nam iam* (two similar sounding monosyllabic words), *intus uentris* (two disyllabic words), *fumant focula*. — **ventri fumant focula :** Only here as *focula,* more usually *foculus*. The word is derived from the verb *fovere* and as such refers to a pot, pan, or instrument used for heating things. Here it is used metaphorically to refer to food, cf. Nonius 9-10: *focula dicta sunt nutrimenta,* and Ussing: *nutrimenta…quasi quae ventrem foveant.*

105 : perna : This word is cognate with with Grk. πτέρνη ‘heel.’ The word *perna* refers to the haunch, usually of animals, but Ennius uses it once of soldiers. Here it refers to a ham, and it was with this meaning that the word was re-borrowed back into Greek (πέρνα). — **quidem :** The meaning here is close to Grk. γε.

106 : ius est : “It is right, lawfully sanctioned, just.” A solemn but fitting utterance from Saturio, who above displayed his interest in legal affairs (62-74). But given the immediately preceding discussion of the proper consistency of *ius* ‘soup, broth’ (95, 97), is the audience tricked for a moment into thinking that Saturio is continuing this discourse? —**apponi :** The verb *adponere* is used of food, tables, and dishes in the same way as Grk. παρατιθέναι to mean “serve, set.” Cf. *Il.* 23.810: σφιν δαῖτ᾽ ἀγαθὴν παραθήσομεν; *Merc* . 779-780: *apponite obsonium; Mil* 753: *quando accubuere, ubi cena appositast.* In situations where two or more languages share synonymous compound words built from the same (analogically, not always etymologically) roots, which happens with great frequency in Indo-European languages, it is often impossible to tell whether the languages came to the same logical conclusion about how to refer to something or whether one word is merely a calque on the other. Given the fact that the use of παρατιθέναι in Greek poetic texts to refer specifically to dining dates back at least to the Iliad, however, it would be a reasonable hypothesis to think that *adponere* in this sense is a calque on the Greek. — **postridie :** Another frozen locative that made its way into Classical Latin, from *post(e)rī* (masc. sing. loc. of *posterus*) + *die.* See above on 29[a] : peregri.

107 : ita fieri iussi : Toxilus offers a response similiar in construction to 105 (*calefieri iussi reliquias*). Perhaps it is not too large of a stretch to imagine that Toxilus in line 105 really exaggerated the first syllable of *iussi* to egg on the hungry Saturio, who just finished his discourse on the proper consistency of the *ius* 'broth' (see above on 106 : ius est). Toxilus, who has remained in total control of situation since 81 and has been elegantly manipulating Saturio (on the power dynamic in the scene, see above on 81 - 98), continues to enchant the parasite and says something like: *calefieri iiuussss-si reliquias.* Saturio, mouth watering, falls for it and answers with the similar sounding: *iiuusss esst.* And just in case that was not enough, Toxilus repeats once more: *fieri iussi.* This time the comic effect would be greater without exaggerating the first syllable of *iussi*, as if to mock Saturio for how easily he was enticed by Toxilus' stupid joke. — **ecquid hallecis? :** The use of *ecquid* (*ecce* + *quid*) with the partitive genitive is attested elsewhere in Plautus (e.g., Asin. 648: *ecquid est salutis?*; Poen. 257: *ecquid gratiae*). In these cases it differs little in meaning from the more regular *quid* + partitive genitive. However *ecquid* often does not = *quid,* but is rather an interrogative particle used to introduce both direct and indirect questions. — **hallecis :** Some sort of fish sauce which is described by Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* 31.93-95). First a "choice liquid" (*liquor exquisitum*) called *garum* is made from otherwise unusable fish parts which are salted and allowed to rot and ferment. The non-liquid parts which remain after the preparation of the *garum* are collectively called *hallex.* The word has many attested spellings: with and without the aspirate, with single and geminate *l*, and with the final consonant of the nominative singular in both *c* and *x*. — **vah :** This interjection is confined almost entirely to Plautus and Terence, although it is found in Petronius once. It can be

used to express a wide variety of emotions, including surprise or astonishment, contempt or disregard, joy or anger.

108 : sapis multum ad genium : Woytek: "Du verstehst dich sehr aufs Wohlleben;" which is better than de Melo: "You know very well what's good for you." Both of which translations seem to miss the mark slightly. Nixon's is slightly better: "Ah, you're a man of taste, extraordinary taste!;" Ammendola's version is also good: "come sai bene (compiacere) al mio gusto." Nixon's translation is nice because it captures the repetition of ideas: *sapere* here means "to have good taste" and *genius* "good taste." The phrase *sapere ad* is found also at Truc. 854 (*meretrix…sapit in vino ad rem suam*) and at Ter. Ad. 832 (*ad omnia alia aetate sapimus rectius*). — **meministin, here :** So prints Lindsay. Woytek, however, has *meminsti, here*. He argues that since the temporal adverb *hodie* often stands in hiatus, *here* can do the same. — **here :** The form *here* according to Weiss 214, "could be the old locative of a noun corresponding to Gk. χθές." The locative singular of athematic nouns is endingless (as in χθές) or adds the ending *-*i* (in Latin -*e*). The classical form *herī,* would be interpreted as borrowing the thematic locative ending -*ī* (as in *domī, humī, etc.*), which is also seen in *temperī* and *rurī* (which is sometimes used instead of *rure*).

109 : qua de re ego tecum mentionem feceram : The expression *mentionem facere* is common at all times and in many registers throughout classical Latin, and is a favorite of Cicero. In prose the most common form of the expression is *alicui alicuius rei mentionem facere*. Plautus uses *cum* instead of the dative also at Aul. 685 and Cist. 134, and uses *de* instead of the genitive of the thing also at Aul. 204 (cf. Mil. 993: *de me fiat mentio*).

110 : memini : The repetition of the verb is a common form of assent. — **ut … ne calefierent :** What type of clause is this? Bennett (1, 219) classifies it as a subjunctive "with Verbs of begging, requesting, etc., including, as extensions, Verbs of succeeding in one's request" which category is in turn placed in a more general category of "Substantive Clauses developed from the Volitive." Woytek follows Bennet, calling it a "Begehrsatz" and stating that Ammendola falsely calls it a final clause ("Ammendola fälschlich: Finalsatz"). Ammendola however, as it seems to me, merely suggested that one could look to classical final clauses as a comparison for *ut ne,* which is used commonly enough instead of *ne* by itself ("*ut ne* anche nell'uso classico la prop[osizione] finale negativa si trova a volte così construita"), since his paraphrase gives no hint that he thought it was actually a final clause: "sì, si ricorda purtroppo (che ha detto) che la murena e il gronco non debbono riscaldarsi, giacchè freddi si cardano molto meglio." Ammendola's paraphrase seems to come to closer to the truth than Bennett's classification or Woytek's generalization "Begehrsatz." The other examples that Bennett provides are all dependent on verbs of begging (*oro, obsecro, quaeso*), whereas this example is dependent on *mentionem feceras* understood from the pervious line. It would be best to call the clause an indirect command (since *ut ne* can be used as for many types of negative subjunctive clauses in Plautus) and so place it alongside the other examples on Bennett 1, 214 ("with verbs of ordering and commanding") to which this clause is more similar: Bacch. 749-750: *quid istis ad istunc usust conscriptis modum* [*in quo scribis*] *Ut tibi ne quid credat*; M.G. 185-185a: *hoc ei dicito Profecto ut ne quoquam de ingenio degrediatur muliebri*; Poen. 888: *nisi ero meo uni indicasso, atque* [*indicasso*] *ei quoque ut ne enuntiet.* — **murena et conger :** Murena and eel, two delicacies.

These two are mentioned together also at Aul. 399 (*congrum, murenam exdorsua quantum postest*) during the preparation of a wedding feast.

111 : nam nimio melius oppectuntur frigida : That eel is better cold is also mentioned at Mil. 760: *probus hic conger frigidust*. Ammendola suggests that Saturio is so hungry that he cannot stand to wait for anything to be cooked, and so wants to eat everything cold ("Saturione ha fame e, non volendo aspettare, insiste che sia meglio mangiar tutto freddo"). Woytek rightly calls this suggestion "gegenstandlos": rather than being impatient, Saturio wants to ensure that everything is prepared exactly as it should be, including that the eel be served cold. — **nimio melius :** With adjectives and adverbs of the comparative degree, *nimio* can be used instead of *multo,* e.g., Mos. 72: *nimio* citius; Mos. 1103: *nimio plus sapio sedens*; Rud. 460: *nimio minus altus puteus visust quam prius.* Similar occurances can be found in Cicero's letters, Lucretius, Horace, and Livy, but it seems to be slightly more common in Plautus than elsewhere (and absent entirely from Terence). — **oppectuntur :** hapax. Dionysius Lambinus : "manibus quasi pectinibus circum carpuntur et comeduntur." TLL: "digitis vel dentibus quasi pectine discerpere." Both Nixon and de Melo render *nimio melius oppectuntur* as "make much better picking." — **frigida :** Neuter plural referring collectively to *murena* and *conger,* as is standard usage in Classical Latin to refer to two or more inanimate nouns of different genders.

112 : quid cessamus : There are many other instances of the verb *cessare* being used in this type of question in Plautus (e.g., Asin. 125: *sed quid ego cesso ire ad forum?*; Cas. 237: *cesso caput pallio detergere?*; etc.). In the present line, Woytek glosses *quid cessamus?* as "*ne cessemus*" and

calls it a "Vorwurfsvolle Frage im Sinne einer Selbstaufforderung," a needlessly specific classification for a rather transparent formulation. — **proelium committere :** The use of military terminology to talk about food is found also at Men. 184-5 (*ego istic mihi hodie apparari iussi apud te proelium*) and especially at Capt. 152ff., where the metaphor is most fully developed.

113 : dum mane est … esse mortalis decet : Alliterative chiasmus. — **mane :** This adverb (= *termpore matutino*) is common in all registers and all periods of Latin. It is less frequently used as an indeclinable noun (although thrice in Plautus we have the word in the ablative in the phrase *a mani ad vesperum/noctem).* — **esse :** Plautus uses the short forms of both *ēsse* and *comēsse.* Forms like *comedere, comedit, edit,* etc., do not show up until the imperial period.

114 : nimis paene mane est : One would expect *paene nimis*, since the adverb *paene* almost always comes immediately before the word that it qualifies (in poetry and prose). The combination *nimis paene* seems to be somewhat of a frozen phrase: *nimis paene inepta atque odiosa eius amatiost* (Rud. 1204); *nimis paene animo es* (Pac. trag. 260); *videte ne nimium paene patientis* (Cic. Phil. 10.23). The reversed order is not found anywhere. The effect is to place more emphasis on the word *nimis.* — **mane quod tu occeperis :** Bennett 1, 319: "As a rule all subjunctive clauses in the indefinite 2d singular stand in the subjunctive." This is true in the protases of conditional statements, relative clauses, and with other subordinating conjunctions (*cum, ubi, quam,* etc.). The choice here of the perfect subjunctive rather than the present is motivated by aspect and by the semantics of the verb ("to begin"). Indeed, the perfect system of *occipere* is used 6 times as frequently as the present system by Plautus (about 60:10). Generally,

occipere is Plautus' favorite way to express "to begin," which he employs far more often than the classical verbs *incipere* or *coepisse/coepere*.

114 - 115 : mane quod tu occeperis negotium agere, id totum procedit diem : An example of folk wisdom which is common in many languages in various forms: Eng. the early bird gets the worm; Sp. *a quien madruga Dios le ayuda;* Por. *deus ajuda quem cedo madruga*; Fr. *l'avenir appartient à ceux qui se lèvent tôt*; It. *chi dorme non piglia pesci, chi primo arriva meglio alloggia*; Ger. *Morgenstund hat Gold im Mund*; Ru. кто рано встает, тому бог подает. Both Ammendola and Woytek compare Hesiod Erg. 579: ἠώς τοι προφέρει μὲν ὁδοῦ, προφέρει δὲ καὶ ἔργου. Perhaps it would not be too much of a stretch to mention Il. 2.24: οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα.

115 : procedit : "[sc.] feliciter, ut saepe apud Livium aliosque" (Ussing). The verb *cedere* and many of its compounds (*succedere*, *procedere*) can have the meaning "turn out (well), succeed." Observe the similar use of En. go, Ger. *gehen*, It. *andare*, Fr. *aller*, etc.

116 : quaeso : Plautus uses *quaeso* with the simple imperative, the future imperative, and the subjunctive (with and without *ut*). — **animum advorte hoc :** Always written as two words in Plautus. It was already obviously considered a unit that can take its own object, and the words appear next to one another more often then they are split by intervening material. Since the combination is elsewhere in Plautus used with an object, Woytek takes issue with Ammendola's note "hoc = huc." Ammendola's laconic note, however, seems to be more of an aid to translation

than a philological point (e.g., esse = comedere, Ammendola ad 113). — **iam heri :** The reading of B, which Lindsay and de Melo print. C and D have *enim iam heri*. Woytek prints *enim heri.* Woytek says that the reading *iam heri* "zumindest nichtssagend, wenn nicht gar störend erscheint." The argument is that *enim* creates a better logical connection between the two thoughts. Elsewhere, Woytek argues, *enim* is used with the word *dicam* after a change of speakers to clarify or add additional information (Cas. 372, Most. 888), and here, without a change of speaker, we have a "Kurzfassung dieses Schemas mit Unterdrückung des Verbums *dicam* und Übernahme der affiirmativen Partikel in den Hauptgedanken." The philological comparison is shaky, but in trying to justify his reading of *enim*, Woytek inadvertently calls attention to how the actors on stage may have interpreted this line. Since Saturio has already managed to derail the conversation to to the topic of food once (108-110), perhaps we can imagine that he attempts to do the same thing here at the pause in the line after *hoc.* Toxilus then immediately cuts to the chase, talking over Saturio. Such a staging would be possible whether one reads *enim* or *iam*.

117 : tecumque oravi : This turn of phrase is common in Plautus, where the classical idiom would demand the accusative of both the person and the thing. cf. Asin. 662: *orare tecum*; Cas. 324: *si is mecum oraret*; Rud. 773: *scin quid tecum oro, senex*? Ussing glosses it as "precando agere cum aliquo," Ammendola as "= te oravi." Woytek claims that this type of explanation "verwischt bloß die Schwierigkeit," claiming this usage is a preservation of the original meaning of *orare* ("to talk, speak"). This interpretation seems hard to support since *orare* almost always

has the meaning "to ask, beg" in Plautus and there seems to be very if any little semantic difference between *orare aliquem* and *orare cum aliquo*.

118 : dares utendos mutuos : This is the only attested combination of the expressions *dare utendum* and *mutuum dare* (*vel ferre, adferre, facere*), both of which mean "to give on loan." The reason motivating this redundant expression is unclear. Perhaps the poet got carried away with the homoioteleuton and sonic effects of the line (*nummos sescentos mihi dares utendos mutuos*). The inclusion of the word *mutuos* balances the word *nummos* (both of which share the same final sound -*os* and very similar initial sounds *nu-* and *mu-*) and, along with the *sescentos* and *utendos*, which share a nearly identical ending, forms a sonic chiasmus around *mihi dares*, the center of the idea and the *ut* clause. Including the initial *ut*, there are 6 syllables on either side of this 4-syllable nucleus. The repetition of the sound *ut* in *utendos* and the additional nasal sound in *mihi* add to overall beauty of the composition of this line. — **memini et scio :** The exact phrase (in the first person) is found below at 176 (*memini et scio et calleo et commemini*), 186 (*ni omnia memini et scio*), and at Curc. 384. The verbs *meminisse* and *scire* often appear in close proximity to one other.

119 : (memini) te me orare : Plautus uses *meminisse* with the accusative, the genitive, *de* with the ablative, indirect questions, and (as here) with the accusative and infinitive. Generally speaking, *meminisse* is followed by the present infinitive when the verb is in the first person and the subject is talking about his own memory (even if the remembered event is in the past). Second and third person forms are more usually followed by the perfect infinitive. Woytek right

notes: “Das dazwischengestellte *scio*…ist dieser Fügung offentsichlicht nicht hinderlich.” — **quod darem :** Not subjunctive in a subordinate clause in indirect statement, but irrealis: “what I would/could give you [if I had anything].”

120 : nihili parasitus est … : Saturio goes on to explain why good parasites should not have money at home. It is obvious that the parasite does not merely enjoy food, but derives special pleasure from eating the leftovers of others, a pleasure that even a banquet would not equal if payed for at his own expense. — **nihili :** Used also verse-initially by Saturio at 94 and 96. Perhaps it is one of his favorite words, or perhaps it merely suits his hyperbolic character. — **qui Argentumdonidest :** The manuscripts have *argentum domideste* and *argentum domi idē.* The reading Lindsay prints is a conjecture by Schoell and is obviously an attempt to create a funny-sounding name much like the long list of outlandish Persian names below at 702-705. A much better reading is Pylades’ *cui argentum domi est,* which both Woytek and de Melo print. The fact that the ending repeats two lines later (122: *si quid domi est*) is no problem: as Woytek notes, Saturio has “offenkundig keine Scheu vor Wiederholungen,” cf. 94 and 96, 95 and 97, etc.

121 : lubido … coepere : An objective genitive (substantive or gerund) is much more common with *lubido* in Classical Latin, but Plautus uses it almost exclusively with the infinitive. Off the 13 occurrences of the word in Plautus, all but two are joined with the infinitive (Trin. 746: *huic ducendi interea abscesserit lubido*; Mil. 1360: *iam non possum, amisi omnem lubidinem* [sed sc. *hoc facere*]) — **extemplo :** A favorite adverb of Plautus (67 times), Livy (378), and certain poets (Lucretius (18), Vergil (15), Ovid (10), Statius (9)), but not as common in other authors (3 times

in all of Cicero, twice in Tacitus, once in Seneca Iunior and Apuleius, absent in Horace, Propertius, Caesar, Catullus, Sallust, Petronius, etc.). — **coepere :** The present system of Classical *coepisse* is found only in Old Latin. In the indicative it is only found in the first person (Men. 960: *coepio*); in the subjunctive only in the first and third persons (Cato Or. 250.1: *coepiam*; Truc. 232. *coepiat*; Ter. Ad. 397: *coeperet*).

122 : tuburcinari : The verb *tuburcinari* is found only here, in a fragment of Titinius, once in a fragment of Sextus Turpilius, and one in Apuleius. Nonius glosses it as *raptim manducare.* — **de suo :** The possessive adjectives are used absolutely like this elsewhere in Plautus. cf. below 473: *nil gustabit de meo*; Aul. 294-5: *hic non poterat de suo senex opsonari filiai nuptiis?*; Bacch. 98: *et operam dare mi et ad eam operam facere de tuo*; Stich. 426 *vel decem* [sc. *amicas*], *dum de tuo*; *Trin.* 328-329: *nempe de tuo? - de meo*; Truc. 104: *de nostro saepe edunt.* — **si quid domi est :** On the repetition, see above on 120 : qui Argentumdonidest.

123 : cynicum esse egentem oportet parasitum probe : Saturio says that a good parasite should be like a cynic philosopher, i.e., poor. The joke lies in the fact that cynics tried to free themselves from dependency on others, very much unlike parasites. The Cynics are mentioned again in connection to proverbial poverty and simplicity at Stich. 703-704: *potius quam in subsellio cynice hic accipimur quam in lectis*. — **probe :** Woytek takes the adverb with *egentem,* but it could also go with *esse* or *oportet,* the latter being somewhat redundant but also preferable due to the proximity.

124-126: Saturio proceeds to list all of the qualities of a good parasite, only a few of which have any basis in or connection with the Cynic school of philosophers. For example, the Cynics were known for neglecting hygiene and money, rendering the bathing paraphernalia and the wallet which Saturio mentions unnecessary. The most notable thing about the list is that almost all the items are Greek words. Maybe part of the joke is Saturio's lack of understanding of Cynic philosophy, thinking instead that anything named with a Greek name is fitting for a philosopher.

124 : ampulla : Diminutive of *amphora* (< ἀμφορεύς). The container was probably used to hold oil for bathing. Plautus has *amphora* twice and *ampulla* three times, as well as the derivative *ampullarius*. — **strigilem :** = στλεγγίς, a scraper for scraping the oil off the body after bathing. — **scaphium :** = σκάφιον (< σκάφη), a small bowl for drinking. — **soccos, pallium :** Comic actors traditionally wore shoes called *socci*, while tragic actors wore Greek boots called *cothurni*. The *pallium* is a style of clothing worn by Greeks. Roman comedies set in Greece (as all of Plautus' comedies) were called *fabullae palliatae*, because all of the characters would be dressed in *pallia,* while Roman tragedies similarly set in Greece were called *cothurnatae.* Comedies and tragedies set in Rome were called *togatae* and *praetextae* respectively, after the names of Roman clothing. The mention of both *socci* and the *pallium* right next to one another is undoubtedly a metatheatric reference to the genre itself, and we can imagine that the actor actually pointed to his own *socci* and *pallium* while looking out towards the audience. So the ideal parasite which Saturio describes is the one found in the *fabulae palliatae* of Plautus.

125 : marsuppium : = μαρσίππιον, a diminutive of μάρσιππος, which is a pouch for money. Latin has many words for a wallet or purse: *pera* (= πήρα)*, perula, loculus, saccus, sacculus, mantica, crumena,* etc. — **inibi :** It is a feature of colloquial Latin to replace a relative pronoun with an adverb. Here *inibi* = *in quo.* Cf. Lindsay 80 and above on 61 : unde. — **paullum praesidi : "**A little bit of support." cf. a similar usage (and in the same metrical position) at Poen. 670 : *trecentos nummos Philippos portat praesidi.*

126 : qui … oblectet : Final clause. *qui* is the old instrumental form of the relative pronoun, = *quo.* The relative pronoun has both an *o*-stem and an *i*-stem, thus also *quibus* (*i*-stem) and the archaic form *quīs* (*o*-stem). — **familiarem suam vitam … modo :** "his own life only" (de Melo). On this use of *familiaris,* Woytek says "Das Adjective ist … semantisch kaum vom Possessivum verschieden." cf. Asin. 874: *fundum alienum arat, incultum familiarem deserit.* On analogy with this line, here *vita familiaris* would mean little more than *vita non aliena.* Woytek also compares Asin. 319: *habeo opinor familiarem tergum, ne quaeram foris.* Both Linday and de Melo punctuate Asin. 319 with a pause of some sort after *familiarem* (Lindsay with an em dash and de Melo with an ellipsis). The line is is best translated "I have, I think, as a comrade my back…"; *familiaris,* then, has its expected meaning (=*necessarius, amicus*). — **oblectet :** Ussing's gloss (*sustentet*) is improved by the TLL (*vitam oblectabilem, iucundam reddere*).

127 : nolo arguentum : The use of *nolle* with a direct object is much rarer at all periods than with the infinitive or subjunctive. — **argentum: filiam :** "Scharfe asyndetische Antithese, die auch durch die Ikten unterstrichen wird."

127 - 128 : utendam mihi da : “Lend me.” On the idiom *utendum dare,* v.s. ad 118.

128 : Saturio understandably misunderstands Toxilus’ intentions. — **numquam etaim :** “sino a quest’oggi, non ancora” (Ammendola); “niemals noch” (Woytek); “never yet” (de Melo). When used in negative sentences, *etiam* can mean *nondum.* cf. Epid. 336: *ille qui numquam etiam natust.*

129 : ad istuc : The second person meaning of the pronoun is felt here. — **quod tu insimulas :** When verbs of accusing are joined with the of the charge, it is usually, as here, the neuter accusative of a relative of demonstrative pronoun. Otherwise, the accusative of the person and the genitive or the infinitive of the charge is more common. — **quid eam vis? :** *quid = cur,* as often. — **scies :** 23 of the 31 occurances in Plautus of the form *scies* are found often at the verse end. The forms *sciam* and *sciet* show a similar tendency in their metrical position.

130 : quia forma lepida et liberali est: The same phrase is found at Epid. 43 (*quia forma lepida et liberali…*), nearly the same phrase at Mil. 967 (*lepida et liberali formast*), and the same pair of words at Rud. 408 (*ut lepide, ut liberaliter, ut honeste atque haud gravate*). Woytek claims that these two word are so joined “aus klanglichen Gründen,” which may be right, since the exact combination is found nowhere else in Latin. — **res ita est :** This word order is not as common as *ita res est,* which can be found in Plautus, Terence, and once at Cic. Att. 6.1.11. The complete expression would be *res ita est ut loqueris* (cf. Amph. 569: *profecto ut loquor res ita est*). The

inclusion of the word *res*, however, is somewhat unnecessary; the phrase *ita est* used absolutely (with no subject or with the subject implied) is more common at all periods of Latin.

131 : hic leno neque te novit neque gnatam tuam : Lindsay punctuates with a period, Woytek with a question mark, which de Melo also prints. A period is better: Toxilus' character becomes all the stronger and more convincing if he here is confidently stating the facts rather than inquiring about the state of affairs. After all, Toxilus reappears on stage at 81 claiming *omnem rem inveni* and proceeds to masterfully bend Saturio to his will. In a play that puts so much emphasis on Toxilus' unusual hybrid character (a slave playing the role of the young lover), it would more fitting for the actor to pronounce this line not as a question but with a tone that says "I know it all already." — **hic leno :** "leno qui hic habitat" (Woytek). The pimp's house is seen on one side of the stage, and Toxilus here gestures to it.

132 : me ut quisquam norit : This subjunctive clause can be interpreted in two ways. Bennett (1, 189) classifies it as an independent deliberative subjunctive in an "affirmative repudiating question or exclamation" which is introduced with *ut*, and he punctuates with an exclamation point. Ammendola translates "chi vuoi che mi conosca" and glosses "fierine potest ut me quisquam norit," suggesting that the subjunctive is dependent on some easily understood idea. Lambinus similarly: "egone committam, ut quisquam me norit…?" Neither of these interpretations is wrong. The deliberative subjunctive is an outgrowth of the jussive use (e.g., A. *hoc faciat.* B. *quid faciat?*) and substantive consecutive clauses following verbs like *facio/fieri* are potential subjunctives in origin (Woodcock § 136). So this line could have two flavors: as a

deliberative/jussive “Is anyone to know me…”; and as a potential/consequative: “(Is it possible) that anyone knows me, could anyone know me?” — **nisi ille qui praebet cibum :** After the subjunctive *norit,* the indicative *praebet* is emphatic: “who *actually* provides food.”

133 : ita est : A relatively common phrase in Plautus which, when used by itself after a change of speakers or a rhetorical statement/question, means little more than “yes, so it is,” while *non ita est* = “no.” Interestingly, Terence prefers (*non*) *sic est,* which he uses 9 times (*ita est* only once). Plautus, by way of comparison, uses *ita est* in this meaning 6 times and *sic est* twice. v.s. ad 131: res ita est. — **hoc :** Ablative, either causal (= *propter hoc, ob hanc causam*) or of manner (= *hoc modo, hoc pacto, hac ratione*). — **reperire :** The most common word for “find” in Plautus is *invenire* (134 attestations), followed by *reperire* (92 attestations). The verb *offendere* is used 12 times (most usually but not always of people, especially in the phrase *offendere aliquem domi*) and *nancisci* 9 times.

134 : cupio : sc. *reperire argentum* (Ammendola). Only the present system (present, future, imperfect indicative, present subjunctive and present participle) of this verb is used in Plautus (the participle *cupitus* is used twice). The perfect system and the imperfect subjunctive are entirely missing. The verb is used over 100 times in Plautus, and often is hardly any stronger than the more standard *velle,* which is used hundreds of times. — **tum tu me sine illam vendere :** The verb *sinere* is used frequently with both the accusative and infinitive (as here) and the subjunctive (without *ut,* e.g., *sine faciam*). The imperative (*sine*), however, seems to show a slight preference for the subjunctive in both Plautus and Classical Latin.

135 : tun illam vendas? : Bennett (1, 188) classifies this as a "repudiating question/ exclamation" introduced by *-ne,* cf. ad 132. The subjunctive can be used as such in a reply to reject or contradict the previous statement or suggestion. This usage is deliberative in origin. Another example can be found below at 186-188: PAE: *da hercle pignus*….TOX: *egon dem pignus tecum?*. Deciding to punctuate with a question mark or exclamation point is difficult; the non-standard interrobang would best capture the actor's intonation. Ammendola's gloss *patiar ut illam vendas?* captures the meaning well.

135 - 136 : allegavero qui vendat : "privatim misero" (Lambinus). In Plautus this word is always used of people and means "commission, charge, send someone [to do something]." The future perfect differs little if at all here from, e.g., Amph. 674: *alium ego isti rei allegabo.* The verb is often followed by a final relative clause indicating the purpose of the comission. cf. Amph. 183: *aliquem hominem allegent qui occillet*; Cas. 52: *pater allegavit vilicum qui posceret*; Cas. 55-56: *filius is autem armigerm allegavit suom qui poscat*; Poen. 773: *eum allegarunt qui diceret*.

136 : qui praedicet : The so-called subjunctive by attraction after the final subjunctive *vendat*. The subjunctive is used because Toxilus is not yet talking about a specific person. For the double asyndetic relative clauses, Woytek rightly compares Cap. 341-3: *aliun potius misero…tuom qui conveniat patrem, qui tua quae tu iusseris mandata ita ut velis perferat.*

137 - 138 : istic leno non sex menses Megaribus huc est quom commigravit : The sense is perfectly clear, but the construction is difficult. *istic leno* is the subject of *commigravit,* which may at first seem like hyperbaton but in reality reflects the tendency to front the important or main information in the sentence. This word order is reminiscent of Romance (e.g., It. *ma lui sono anni che è partito*). The case of *sex menses* is also problematic. Lindsay 5 says: "*Est* 'il y a' is suggested by Pers. 137, but *menses* is Acc., as we see from Aul. 4 *hanc domum iam multos annos est quom possideo et colo,* and corresponds to an Adverb of Time like *diu* in e.g., Amph. 302 *iam die est quom ventri victum non datis*." Woytek, however, suggests that *sex menses* is Nominative, arguing that the example of Aul. 4 is a contamination of *iam multi anni sunt quom* and *iam multos annons possideo*. The present example, then, would be a contamination of *sex menses sunt quom* and something like Merc. 541 *iam die est factum quom*. Eng. *it is* with a plural predicate (and often but incorrectly *there is*) would be a similar phenomenon. Neither explanation can be entirely refuted.

137 : sicut : Causal: "inasmuch as." — **istic leno :** The switch from *hic* (131) to *istic* is not "einfach Variation" (Woytek), changes the emphasis: *hic leno* = "this neighborhood's pimp, the pimp in this house"; *istic leno* = "the pimp I mentioned here, the pimp we're talking about." In other words, here *hic* is physically deictic, while *istic* is logically deictic. — **Megaribus :** Megara, about 30 miles west of Athens, belongs normally to either the second declension (*Megara*, n. pl.) or the first (*Megara*, f. sing.). The third declension is found only here and at Merc. 646.

138 : huc : Either of motion with *commigravit* (= *ad hunc locum, id est, Athenas*) or of time with the preceding phrase (= *adhuc*). The latter is much rarer but suggested by the word order. — **quom :** "since," cf. Bennett 1, 85 for *quom* 'since, seitdem.'

138 - 139 : pereunt reliquiae. posterius istuc tamen potest : It is hard to keep Saturio on topic. A thoughtful pause at the close of Toxilus' line (*commigravit*) in which Saturio appears to consider what Toxilus has just said would heighten the comic effect of Saturio's response: Saturio is making a noble attempt, but he cannot keep his mind off food. cf. Ussing: "Parasitus respondendi moram quaerit; illam rem defferri posse dicit; reliquias veretur ne, nisi statim prandium incipiatur, pereant;" Lambinus: "parasitus partim, quod animum habeat in patinis, partim quod filiam suam non libenter ad hanc simulatam venditionem tradat, hunc sermonem vult in aliud tempus differri."

139 : istuc : "This business of yours." — **tamen :** "[Even if we have lunch now,] we can still (*tamen*) take care of this afterwards." One must understand something like *etsi nunc edimus* (Woytek). — **potest :** sc. *fieri* (Jacobus Operarius, Woytek), *agi* (Ussing, Ammendola), vel sim. — **scin quam potest :** The use of the subjunctive in indirect questions is a rather late development in Latin. There are plenty of examples of both the indicative (for which see Bennett 1, 120ff.) and the subjunctive (Bennett 1, 326ff.) in Old Latin. The distribution, however, is likely not entirely random, although a more comprehensive examination is necessary. As one would expect, the indicative tends to be used when the question is talking about a real event or

possibility, or when the answer to the question is either already known or very easily verifiable. e.g, *videsne quid agit?* ("do you see what he's doing here!?") vs. *videsne quid agat*? ("do you see what he's doing (because I can't tell myself)?"). Here, *potest* is used instead of *possit* either to directly quote Sautrio (*posterius potest…scin quam potest?*) or to emphasize the actuality of the question ("do you know how it [actually] can be done?"). In effect, the indicative here makes the question rhetorical; Toxilus does not wait for a response, but answers the question himself. Had he said *scin quam possit?* he would be genuinely asking Saturio as to whether he knew how they could take care of the business.

140 : numquam hercle hodie : The phrase *numquam* (*hercle/edepol/ecastor*) *hodie* is common in Plautus. It is often used as a strong negative, with the temporal value of *hodie* being almost completely lost. — **ne frusta sis :** ne fallaris (Jacobus Operarius), ne te frustreris (Lambinus). In Plautus *frustra esse* is a synonym for *decipi* or *errare*. Elsewhere Plautus has *frustra* in its more common meaning (= *inaniter*).

140 - 141 : prius edes…quam affirmas : *edes priusquam affirmas.* The combination of a future indicative in the main clause (*edes*) and a present indicative in the *priusquam* or *antequam* clause seems, according the examples of Bennett 1, 104-105, to be elsewhere unattested in Old Latin. Although Bacch. 382 comes close (*nunc prius quam malum istoc addis, certum est iam dicam patri*). The following sentence (*nisi adducis, exigam*) shares a similar temporal structure.

142 : quantum potest : 19 times in Plautus, all but twice at the verse end. The expression is also a favorite of Terence. Ussing glosses the phrase as *quam citissime,* and both Ammendola and Woytek gloss it as *quam celerrime,* but both of these expressions are actually much less common in classical Latin than the simpler *quam primum* (*quam citissime,* as far as I can tell, occurs only three times: once in Cato, once in Plautus, and once in Aulus Gellius).

143 : exigam te ex hac decuria : expellam ex hoc ordine, ex hoc dignitatis gradu (Lambinus); expungam ex hac militia, ex hac statione (Jacobus Operarius); ex hac societate (Ussing). The word *decuria* properly means any group of ten (formed on the analogy of *centuria* < *centum*). Here and in a handful of other places it means little more than "group, club, association."

144 : TOX. quid nunc? SAT. quid est? : This exact exchange of questions occurs below at 654, as well as at Asin. 661and Most. 161. *quid nunc?* is also very common as a standalone question, and usually expresses either impatience (as here) or despair/confusion ("what should I do now?"). — **quin dicis :** The old instrumental form of the interrogative pronoun (*quī*) plus the negative particle *ne*: lit, "because of what not, why not?" In questions it mostly has the force of an exhortation or command, so that *quin dicis* nearly = *dic, dicas*.

145 : quaeso hercle me vende : This is the most popular way of saying 'please' in Plautus, followed closely by *obsecro.* The expressions *sis* (= *si vis*) and *sultis* (= *si vultis*) are also common enough. Finally, *te amabo* and *sodes* (=*si audes*) also occur a handful of times each. Both *quaeso* and *obsecro* can be joined with either the imperative or the subjunctive or used by

themselves. The other expressions show a strong tendency to be joined with the imperative. — **me quoque etiam :** The pleonastic addition of *etiam* to *quoque* can be found at all periods, and does little more than to place additional emphasis on the *quoque.* — **si lubet :** For the development of *lubet* to *libet,* see above on 10 : lubenter. A fairly common parenthetical expression in Plautus (10 times) and elsewhere.

146 : dum saturum vendas : Proviso clause. This is a variation on the joke above at 103. — **hoc, si facturu's, face :** A variation on the more common expression *age si quid agis*. cf. Casin. 831: *date ergo, daturae si umquam estis hodie uxorem*. Woytek also compares Euripides Iph. Aul. 817: δρᾶ γ' εἴ τι δράσεις. Ussing rightly glosses this and similar expressions as *noli morari*. — **face :** This form is common in Plautus (almost 40 occurrences), but not as common as the more standard *fac* (about 60 occurances). Plautus also has the forms *duce* and *dice*, which are also less common than *duc* and *dic* respectively. The disyllabic forms are older, and the monosyllabic forms evolved for these verbs, according to Weiss, because of the "peremptory character." In Plautus it is almost impossible to decide whether the disyllabic forms are legitimate archaic forms or whether they are reformations based on the analogy of other imperatives of the third conjugation. See Weiss 147, n80.

147 : bene facis : "bravo" (Ammendola). The expressions *bene facis, bene dicis, recte facis, recte dicis, bene agis,* etc., are all colloquial ways of expressing approval. The accumulation of forms of *facere* is almost comical (144: *facturus sis*; 146: *si facturu's*, *face*; 147: *faciam*, *bene facis*).

147 - 150 : The beginning of Toxilus' instructions to Saturio is give structure through alliteration and repetition of the sounds *pr/p/b, d,* and *f*: *bene facis. propera, abi domum; praemonstra docte, praecipe astu filiae, quid fabuletur: ubi se natam praedicet, qui sibi parentes fuerint*.

148 - 150 : The rhythm of the logical pauses in these lines is very balanced, organized around 5-syllable units. Both 148 and 149 open with a two-word, 5-syllable unit, while 150 reverses the order and closes with a 5-syllable unit (*und' surrupta sit*). The remaining half of each line is a longer unit which evenly increases in length over the course of the three lines: in 148, 7 syllables; in 149, 8 syllables; and in 150, 9 syllables. The sonic effect of this organizational pattern is aurally very pleasing.

148 : astu : 'cleverly.' Weiss 270: "Synchronically an ablative but continuing an instrumental." The adverbs *docte* and *astu* are used as a pair elsewhere in Plautus, e.g., Poen. 111: *ita docte atque astu filias quaerit suas.*

149 : quid fabuletur : "What she should say, invent." Jussive force. The verb *fabulari* often differs little in meaning from *loqui,* but here the etymology (>*fabula*) is likely felt (as Woytek suggests). Toxilus, as the director of the *fabula* which is about to unfound, tells Saturio to instruct his daughter what tale to tell. In later Latin, however, the word loses its specific flavor and comes to mean "to talk, speech" (whence Sp. *hablar*, Port. *falar*).

150 : sibi : Indirect reflexive, referring of course to Saturio's daughter. The reflexive pronoun, when used in a subordinate clause, can refer back to the subject of either its own clause or of the main clause. In this case, the fact that the subject of the main clause is not actually Saturio's daughter but Saturio himself (149: praemonstra, etc.) is forgotten by line 151, as if the construction were not *praecipe filiae* but *filia praecipatur/moneatur/dicat/faciat,* etc. — **und' surrupta sit :** *unde surrepta sit*. The *unde* can either stand for a relative pronoun as often in Plautus (=*a quibus parentibus*, vide supra ad 61, 125), or might simply mean "whence, from what land." The latter is prefered by Woytek and de Melo (who translates "what country she was abducted from"), the former by Lindsay. Of course it is impossible to decide for certain between the two interpretations, but joining the clause tightly to the one immediately preceding it is not only more sound logically, but has the additional advantage of adding more pathos to the girl's story: "instruct her who her parent were from whom she was snatched away."

151 : longe ab Athenis : This is the first explicit reference to the geographical setting of the comedy. References to locations in Greece in Plautus are always somewhat ironical and metatheatrical, since they call attention to the fact that these Greek plays are being performed neither in Greece nor in Greek. — **autumet :** i.e., *dicat.* The verb *autumare* is common in Plautus and found as well in other early fragments (Pacuvius, Accius, Lucilius) as a synonym for *dicere, affirmare.* It occurs sparingly in classical authors to add some archaizing flavor. It is found overwhelmingly in the preset, with only one attestation in the imperfect and perfect. The verb is shares its root with the defective verb *aio.*

152 : et ut affleat quom ea memoret : “et praemone eam, ut affleat, cum ea dicat, id est, ut fletu ornationem suam adiuuet, et verisimiliorem reddat” (Lambinus). Strictly speaking, one could say that the subjunctive clause *ut affleat* is dependent on the imperatives of 148 (*praemonstra, praecipe*). But given the distance, it may be better to hear this line as an afterthought. We can imagine that the actor pauses at the end of 151 (*autumet*), and that Saturio might even start to reply, when Toxilus adds, “Oh!, and [see to it that] she adds some tears to her story.” A jussive subjunctive can be used with or without *ut,* in the former case with something like *fac, vide,* or *effice* understood. — **quom ea memoret :** Subjunctive by attraction. Since Toxilus is taking the role of the director of the play within the play, perhaps the etymology of *memorare* (*memoria*) is felt here, much like with *fabulari* above: the Saturio’s daughter is recite from memory Toxilus’ *fabula.* See also below on 158 : aps chorago sumito. — **etiam tu taces? :** = tace (Woytek). The present indicative coupled with *etiam* in a question is often the equivalent of an imperative. Woytek compares 275 (*scelerate, etiam respicis?*), 413 (*etiam tu argentum tenes?*), and others from the *Persa*.

153 : ter tanto peior ipsa est quam: “She herself is three times as worse as,” cf. Amph. 943: *bis tanto amici sunt inter se quam prius* “they are twice as much friends now than they were earlier.” The idea here is that Saturio’s daughter more intelligent and a better actor than Toxilus expects, qualities which are not laudable in women, hence *peior* instead of *melior*.

154 : lepide hercle dicis : cf. Bacch. 68: *lepide memoras;* Cas. 927: *perlepide narrat;* Curc. 675: *lepide facis,* etc. The expression is a way of praising or expressing approval for what has just

been said or done, much like above 147: *bene facis*. Latin almost always includes a verb of some sort, while English tends to just use one word (nice, good, great, excellent, etc.). — **sed scin quid facias? :** *scin* for *scisne,* as always in Plautus. *facias* is a jussive subjunctive.

155 : tunicam atque zonam, et chlamydem … et causeam : "a tunic, a belt, a cloak, and a sombrero"; most of these items are associated with travel or exotic locations elsewhere in Plautus. cf. Merc 912-927 (*chlamys, zona*); Poen. 975, 1298 (*tunica*). The *causia/causea* was a wide-brimmed Macedonian hat (mentioned also at Mil. 1178 as part of a ship owner's outfit). The fact that three of the four words (*zona, chlamys, causia*) are Greek (or, in the case of *causia,* a Macedonia word which was likely borrowed into Latin from Greek) ironically adds to the exoticness of the costume: the words would sound slightly exotic to Plautus' audience, but in reality are right at home in the Greek setting.

156 : quam ille habeat : final subjunctive. — **qui … vendat :** subjunctive by attraction. — **eu probe! :** The adverb *probe* is common in Plautus and especially frequent at the verse end. The combination with *eu* (Grk. εὖ) is found also at Mil. 1146 and no where else in Latin. The expression *euge* (Grk. εὖγε) is slightly more common. Both of these Grecisms are confined almost exclusively to Plautus and Terence.

157 : quasi sit peregrinus : Clauses with *quasi* almost always take the subjunctive in Plautus, as in Classical Latin. — **peregrinus :** An adjective (often used substantively) derived from the adverb *peregre* "abroad" (**per-ager* lit.,"through the fields"), which itself comes from the almost

unused adjectival form *pereger*. — **laudo :** Another form of assent, used either absolutely (as here), or with various objects (Pers. 548, 598, Epid. 189: *consilium tuom*; Mil. 241: *commentum tuom*; Epid. 150: *te*).

158 : adduce : id est, *adduc*, cf. supra ad 146 (*face*). — **lepide :** The second time the word has been used in connection with Saturio's daughter (cf. 130). — **in peregrinum modum :** The expression *in modum* + adj. or gen. is a common synonym for *modo* + adj.

159 : πόθεν ornamenta : "unde ornamenta sumam?" (Lambinus). Alongside the use of Latinized Grecisms, one also often meets Greek words and expressions which have not been Latinized at all, as here. cf. Most. 973: μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω; Pseud. 483ff: ναὶ γάρ, καὶ τοῦτο ναὶ γάρ, etc; Cap. 880ff; Trin 187: παῦσαι. The line is not always so clear, however, and the decision to print in Greek or Latin letters is entirely editorial. One is always faced with the question as to why Plautus used Greek in the places he does. In many contexts it seems to add solemnity or emphasis, as in the above examples of oaths (μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω), promises (ναὶ γάρ), and commands (παῦσαι). With such a plain word as πόθεν, the question becomes trickier, especially since this is the only attestation of the word πόθεν fulfilling a grammatical function in a Latin sentence in all of Latin literature. Arguments that appeal to *metri causa* are always weak (i.e., that *unde* and πόθεν have different metrical shapes); if the poet wanted to use Latin, he could have found a way to do so. Perhaps Saturio is picking up on all of the foreign/Greek words that Toxilus used above in 155. Perhaps the use of the Greek word here is playing off of the fact that Toxilus has taken on the role of the director of the the drama (the play-within-the-play) which is

about to unfold, directing a drama being associated with all things Greek. Or perhaps this is a reference to a famous scene in a Greek comedy that we have lost. — **ornamenta :** The word *ornamenta* is used of actors' costumes also at Amph. 85, Capt. 615, Curc 464, and elsewhere. The use of the word, as such , is always slightly metatheatric, calling direct attention to the artificiality of the performance. The use of the word here, coupled with the response *aps chorago sumito*, makes it very clear that the plan to dupe the pimp in the Persa is to be seen as a play-within-a-play and so a metatheatrical comment on the performance of the drama itself. — **aps chorago sumito :** = Grk. χορηγός. cf. Trin. 858: *ipse ornamenta a chorago haec sumpsit suo periculo.* Another acknowledgement of the fictionality of drama (Woytek: "Durchbrechung der szenischen Illusion"). It seems that in Rome the choragus was responsible only for costumes and props, while in Greece the official of the same title was responsible for all costs associated with the training and outfitting of the chorus.

160 : dare debet: praebenda aediles locaverunt : Explanatory asyndeton: "He has to give it to you: the aediles have contracted to have it provided" (de Melo). — **dare debet :** The use of *debere* with an infinitive, so common in Classical Latin, in Old Latin is confined to this passage and Amph. 39 (See Bennett 1, 401). Elsewhere the verb has its original meaning "to owe." — **praebenda aediles locaverunt :** The aediles seem to have had some sort of contract or arrangement with the *choragus* for the supply of costumes and props.

161 : iam faxo hic aderunt : Strictly speaking one would expect the subjunctive after *faxo* (with or without *ut*), but Plautus will at times use the future: Amph. 1107: *magis iam faxo mira dices*;

Asin. 132: *faxo erunt*; and below at 439 and 446. There seems to be no difference in meaning between the future and the subjunctive, although the future is expecially common with the verbs *scire, dicere,* and forms of *esse* (with or without prefixes). The use of the future is presumably older, and then this paratactic expression was replaced by a hypotactic equivalent. This usage seems to be distinct from that seen above at 73. — **sed ego nihil horunc scio :** "sed ego simulabo nihil scire horum," (Jacobus Operarius); "sed ita haec agi oportet, quasi ego nihil eorum sciam," (Ussing). Both Woytek and Ammendola ("Saturione domanda se egli non debba far le viste di non saper nulla di quanto hanno tra loro concertato") follow these interpretations. De Melo's translation, however, seems to read the line differently : "But I don't understand what all this is about." In de Melo's version, it seems that Saturio simply does not understand why and how Toxilus' plan will work. In the other reading, Saturio is merely confirming his understanding that he is supposed to play the fool: "but *I* [am to pretend that I] don't know any of this." Both interpretations would depend on the intonation of the actor. It is possible that both are correct: perhaps Saturio is indeed saying that he does not understand the point of the plan (de Melo), but Toxilus, in his haste, hears the line as confirmation that Saturio understands that he is merely supposed to pretend that he does not understand anything (Ussing, et al.) — **nil horunc :** partative genitive. *horunc* from **horum-ce.*

162 : nihil hercle vero. nam ubi … : Toxilus' answer must either mean "No, you don't know anything. So let me tell you (*nam*): when…" or "Of course you should pretend to know nothing! Because (*nam*) I'll need you to claim her…" This will depend on the reading of 161 above. — **ubi :** With temporal force, as often.

162 - 163 : ubi … accepero … asserito : future perfect + future imperative. This is structurally equivalent to a future more vivid conditional statement with emphatic protasis.

163 : continuo : This word is used 48 times in Plautus, making it second only to *extemplo* (67 times) as his favorite adverb for expressing 'immediately, right away.' Other expressions occur with much less frequency (*subito,* 14 times; *repente,* 8 times; and *statim* only twice). — **a leone adserito manu :** The expression *asserere aliquem manu* (*in libertatem, liberali causa*) means "to declare someone free by laying hands on."

164 : sibi habeat, si non extemplo ab eo abduxero : "Let him keep her if I don't take her back from him right away." This type of conditional sentence (i.e., jussive subjunctive + protasis) is a common way of making promises. The classical expression *peream si/nisi* "let me perish if…" is analogous in form. — **extemplo :** vide supra ad 163 : continuo. — **abduxero :** The future perfect here does not express anteriority, but rather simple aspect in the future ("once and for all").

165 : istuc cura : "take care of this." : **interibi :** This word is found about 9 times in Plautus, once in Apuleius, once in Aulus Gellius, and nowhere else. The more standard words are *interim* and *interea*, both of which are more common in Plautus as well (31 and 24 times respectively).

166 : mittere … ut habeat : Either a final clause or a type of indirect command. See following note. **: ut habeat animum bonum :** The phrase *habere animum bonum* "have confidence, be

confident, be of good courage" is used 20 times in Plautus, being more common than *bono animo esse* , which is found about 15 times in Plautus. Both expressions are almost always found in the imperative (*habe animum bonum, bono animo es*, etc.), leading one to believe that the clause is not final, but a subordinated imperative. One might compare It. *Animo!* and Sp. *¡Animo!,* which are used in similar contexts with similar meanings.

167 : me esse effecturum hodie : An indirect statement after *ut habeat animum bonum.* This is the only such instance in Plautus of an indirect statement after either this phrase or the synonymous *bono animo esse*. Plautus elsewhere uses explanatory asyndeton: e.g., Epid. 601-601: *habe animum bonum. Ego illam reperiam*. **: nimis longum loquor :** The same forumla is found at Epid. 376 and 665. Cf. also Pseud. 687 : *nimis diu et longum loquor.*

168 - 182 : Since the beginning of Saturio's monologue at 53, all of our characters have been speaking in unaccompanied iambic senarii. Sophoclidisca's entrance begins the second major accompanied movement of the play, lasting until line 328. Sophoclidisca is one of three characters in the *Persa* all of whose lines are accompanied by music (the other two being Lemniselenis and Paegnium). A high proportion of Toxilus' and Sagaristio's lines are also accompanied by music (64% and 85% respectively; Toxilus' percentage is lower only because, as the main protagonist, he is on stage much more frequently than any other character). Timothy Moore has suggested that music in the *Persa* (and elsewhere in Roman comedy) helps to separate the "fun" characters from the "serious" characters (Moore 2001, 260). Thus, the characters that are more fully integrated into the topsy-turvy, role-reversing Saturnalian world of

the play (such as Toxilus, Sagaristio, Sophoclidisca, and others) are more closely associated with music, while real-world, serious, and/or less lovabale characters (i.e., intrusions into the Saturnalian space) are less often accompanied by music (Dordalus and Saturio). Sophoclidisca, as a slave who is sympathetic to Toxilus' love for Lemniselenis and generally a pleasant character, falls into the latter category. For more on the role of music in the *Persa* and on characterization of the protagonists, see the introduction.

168 : satis fuit : *fuit* for *esset* or *fuisset*. The perfect indicative can be used to express a contrafactual idea (with or without the protasis expressed) both in Plautus and in Classical Latin (especially with *fuisse* and modal verbs). e.g., M.G. 725, 730: *aequom fuit deos paravisse uno exemplo ne omnes vitam viverent; itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequom fuit*; Cic. Mil. 31: *si ita putasset, certe optabilius Miloni fuit.* See Allen and Greenough 517, Bennett 1 46-47, Lindsay 61. — **indoctae, immemori, insipienti :** Alliteration and ascending tricolon: *indoctae* (3 syllables), *immemori* (4), *insipienti* (5). The ascending tricolon is complemented nicely by the rhythm: *indoctae* is three heavy syllables, giving the unit a slow, dramatic start; *immemori* has the shape of the speedier choriamb; and *insipienti* repeats the choriambic rhythm of *immemori* and adds an additional heavy syllable at the end for emphasis, as if to close the unit.

169 : me pro barda et pro rustica habitam esse : The idiom *habere pro* "consider, regard as; treat like" is common in both Plautus and Classical Latin. — **barda :** A very rare adjective, attested only here and in two other places in Classical Latin. The meaning seems to be "stupid,

dense, foolish." The etymology is uncertain, although it may be either related to Grk. βραδύς or a possible loanword from Etruscan (de Vaan).

170 : bibo, at mandata non consueui simul bibere una : It seems that the second use of *bibere* here to mean "drink away, forget" is attested only in this passage. Although cf. Amph 631: *non ego cum vino simitu ebibi imperium tuom.* Jacobus Operarius glosses: *tamen non sum solita exsorbere iussa cum uino.*

171 : This line is given more structure through the gentle repetition of *m* and *s*: *me quidem iam satis tibi spectatam censebam esse et mores meos*. The alliteration in *satis spectatam* immediately before the caesura between the fifth fourth and fifth anapests is balanced by that of *meos mores* immediately before the end of the line.

172 : te iam sector : The verb *sectari* is used most often in the sense "pursue, follow, hunt, chase," and can be used, as here, of sheep following their shepherd. However at Ter. Eun. 262 the word is used by a parasite who is speaking of himself as a philosopher taking on followers: *ille ubi miser famelicus videt mi esse tantum honorem et | tam facile victum quaerere, ibi homo coepit me obsecrare | ut sibi liceret discere id de me. sectari iussi, | si potis est, tamquam philosophorum habent disciplinae ex ipsis vocabula | parasiti ita ut Gnathonici vocentur*. Something of this shade of meaning seems to be in play in this passage. Sophoclidisca jokes: "I've been a follower in your school for five years already, and in that time a sheep could have learned to read." Jacobus Operarius rightly glosses: te habeo magistram. — **quintum hunc**

annum : Acc. of duration of time. This is much more frequently expressed with cardinal numbers (=*quinque annos*) than ordinal numbers, although cf. Naevius *Bell. Pun.* 38 (Warmington): *septimum decimum annum ilico sedent.* The construction seems to be a combination of *quinque annos* and something like *hic est annus quintus quo/ut/postquam,* as at Men. 234: *hic annus sextust postquam ei rei operam damus;* cf. Stich. 29-30: *nam viri nostri domo ut abierunt | hic tertius annus.* — **quom interea :** "when meanwhile." Ussing decided to print *quo in tempore,* an emendation of Gertzius, which captures more precisely the sense here but which is unnecessary and which no later editor has printed. Nearly the same sense is found at Ter. Hec. 421-422: *dies triginta aut plus eo in navi fui | quom interea semper mortem exspectabam miser.*

173 - 174 : ovis si in ludum iret … nondum etiam edidicisti : The metaphor is slightly confused and shifts in meaning and reference from 172 to 174. In 172 it is Sophoclidisca who is following Lemniselenis like a disciple or sheep (*te sector*), but by 174 it is Lemniselenis who fares worse in learning Sophoclidisca's character than a sheep would in trying to learn to read. Lemniselenis thus becomes the bad disciple.

173 : ovis si in ludum iret, potuisset : Mixed contrafactual conditional. — **potuisset iam fieri :** The expression *fieri potest* (*poterat, potuit, posset, possit, potuisset*) with either a demonstrative pronoun (*id, hoc, illud, istud*) or a substantive clause (as here) as the subject is a favorite idiom in almost all registers and periods of Latin. — **ut probe litteras sciret :** Used as in Grk. γράμματα

ἐπίστασθαι and Eng. “know your letters.” Latin also says *litteras discere* and *litteras docere* (γράμματα μανθάνειν, γράμματα διδάσκειν).

174 : quom interim : This could either be parallel with and differ little in meaning from *quom interea* above, or it could be strongly adversative depending not on the main clause (*te sector*) but on the subordinate clause introduced by *quom interea*. In the first interpretation, the *quom* simply paratactically repeats the idea of the first *quom*: “I’ve been here for five years, and meanwhile a sheep…, and meanwhile you haven’t learned….” In the second interpretation, the meaning of *quom* changes in the second instance from temporal to adversative: “meanwhile a sheep could…*whereas* you haven’t.” Woytek favors the second interpretation, citing as parallels De. während, Eng. while, and It. mentre (<dum interim). But while there are instances in Plautus of adversative *cum* with the indicative (cf. Bennett 1, 141), the first interpretation is more natural and better reflects Plautine idiom. — **fans atque nefans :** Jacobus Operarius takes these words with *ingenium* (i.e., referring to Sophoclidisca) and glosses “nequivisti agnoscere meam mentem, aut quando loquuta sum, aut quando silui.” Ussing, on the other hand, takes the words as agreeing with the subjuect *tu* (i.e., referring to Lemniselenis) and glosses “et adulta et puellula.” Woytek suggests comparison with the Greek categories of ζῷα ἄλογα and ζῷα λογικά, and thus is able to more directly connect the line with the animal metaphor which proceeds. de Melo’s translation follows this interpretation and reads “while you, human or animal, have still not learned my nature.”

175 - 180 : The rather strict anapestic rhythm of these six lines adds a touch of solemnity to this passage. Sophoclidisca has been speaking in anapests since 168, but due to liberal substitutions it is only at 175 that the anapestic rhythm really asserts itself. Almost all of the anapestic feet from 175 to 179 follow the pattern short-short-long-short-short-long (except for the substitutions at the end of 178 and 179). The register of this passage is slightly higher, and the organization as such is tighter and more artistic. In 175 we have two clauses of identical length and rhythm with anaphora and homoioteleuton and the *variatio* from *ut* to *ne* (*potin ut taceas*? *potin ne moneas*). In 176 we have poetic fullness of expression with four verbs of similar meaning arranged chiastically by the first-person singular ending (*memini et scio et calleo et commemini*). In 177 and 178 we have the poetic words *scatere* and *pelagus*. Line 179 repeats the words *amare* and *miser* from 177. In lines 179 and 180 Sophoclidisca becomes philosophical and introspective as she tries to express the paradoxes of love. These two lines are balanced by an interlocking order of ideas (A: *miser est* B: *qui amat* A: *is nihili est* B: *qui nil amat*), while the sound *qui* is repeated in each of the four units (*qui, quidem, qui, quid*).

175 : potin ut taceas? : The word *potis* is almost always used with the infinitive, but it is joined with a substantive *ut* clause 17 times in Plautus and once in Terence. When the word is so used, it is always in questions and all but once has the exact form *potin ut* (Bacch. 35: *Quid si hoc potis est ut tu taceas, ego loquar?*). The use of this expression with the verb *tacere* is found also at Poen. 916 and Pseud. 940ff. For more on *potis* see above ad 40. — **potin ne moneas :** The only instance of a *ne* clause in this expression. Elsewhere Plautus uses *ut ne,* e.g., Bacch. 751: *potin ut cures te atque ut ne parcas mihi*?; Cist. 465: *potin ut mihi molestus ne sis*?

176 : memini et scio et calleo et commemini : The polysyndeton expresses Sophoclidisca's frustration. The combination *memini et scio* is less than accidental, used above at 118 and below again at 186. The words *calleo et commemini* are so paired for alliteration.

177 : amas pol misera : Lovers are frequently described by the adjective *miser*(*a*) in Plautus, as below 179 (*miser est qui amat*); cf. also As. 616: *uti miser est homo qui amat*; Bacch.208: *misera amans desiderat*; Cas. 684-685: *neque est nec fuit me senex quisquam amator | adaeque miser.* — **misera :** Since the verb is second person (*amas*), *misera* is most likely vocative and not nominative (in which case *misera* would function as an adverb and nearly = *misere*). — **id tuos scatet animus :** "ea re (amore) nunc animus tuus plenus est" (Ussing); "that's what your heart is flowing over from," (de Melo). The verb *scatere* means "to gush forth" and can belong to the second (as here), third, or forth conjugation. It is usually used of liquids, as it is in the only other passage in which it appears in Plautus: Aul. 558: *si* [sc. *fons*] *vino scatat.* The verb is normally intransitive; *id* is accusative of respect.

178 : ego istuc placidum [pelagus *A*] **tibi ut sit faciam :** Regardless of whether one reads *placidum* or *pelagus* (both of which are in the manuscripts), this line continues the metaphor of love as a rough sea or river which *scatet* introduced above. *pelagus* is the lectio difficilior, while *placidum* is likely a gloss on *pelagus* which later replaced it entirely. Woytek claims that *pelagus* better explains the gender of *istuc*, which, if we read *placidum,* should be masculine, referring to *animus* in the previous line. But there is no reason why the neuter *istuc* cannot refer generally to the entire situation, which is how Ussing understands the line, who glosses *istuc* with "quod

scatet." The fact that the very poetic word *pelagus* appears nowhere else in Roman comedy may give some weight to the reading *placidum,* but the verb *scatere* of the previous line (the reading of which is secure) is also almost equally as rare, found only in one other passage in Roman comedy.

179 : miser est qui amat : Sophoclidisca generalizes the situation of Lemniselenis, repeating the idea expressed in 177: *amas pol misera*. On the combination of love and misery, see above ad 177. Older editions gave these four words to Lemniselenis, probably because the words seem like a response to 177 above, and because the words that follow (*certo is*...) could also be seen as a response to *miser est qui amat*. However the lines work equally well if not better if read as a monologue in which Sophoclidisca muses about the nature of love. It is also unlikely that this fifteen line unit would be interrupted by four words spoken by Lemniselenis, who is most likely not present on stage at this time. On the unity of this part of Sophoclidisca's monologue, see also above on 175-180.

180 : quid ei homini opus vita est : Although the quantity of the *a* in *vita* is hidden, *vita* is most likely ablative, given Plautus' preference for the ablative with *opus est.* For a similar construction, cf. Aul. 723-724: *nam quid mi opust vita, qui tantum auri | perdidi, quod concustodivi sedulo*? For a similar sentiment, cf. Merc. 471: *quid mihist in vita boni?* ; Rud. 220: *quid mi meliust, quid magis in rem est, quam a corpore vitam ut secludam?*

181 : ut erae opsequens fiam : With *fieri* only here and at Curc. 81: *fi mi obsequens.* The adjective is much more common with *esse*, for which cf. Bacch. 459: *obsequens oboediensque est mori atque imperiis* patris; Curc. 258: *ut sit magistro obsequens*; Merc. 158: *Sicine mi obsequens es*?; Merc. 105; Most. 205. — **ea opera :** This is the oldest reading, taken from a palimpsest from the 3rd or 4th century, and is printed by Lindsay and de Melo, but Ussing and Woytek prefer *mea opera,* a reading found only in Renaissance manuscripts (although the variant *liberam ea opera* appears earlier). *mea opera* is obviously the better reading, since there are almost no parallels for *ea opera* but plenty of other instances (in Plauts, Terence, and elsewhere, especially in Cicero) of *opera* with a possessive adjective. The first person singular *mea* is the most common, but *tua, sua, nostra, vestra,* as well as the genitive forms *eius, illius, huius,* and *eorum* are attested as well.

182 : conveniam hunc Toxilium : The pronoun is strongly deictic: "I'll meet *this* Toxilius," i.e., the Toxilius who lives in this house. Very likely to have been accompanied by a gesture in the direction of Toxilius' house on stage. — **eius auris … onerabo :** i.e., eius aures iis onerabo quae mihi mandata sunt (Lambinus).

183 - 199 : Toxilius and Paegnium enter onstage now and do not notice Sophoclidisca, who remains onstage during their comical exchange about Toxilus' plans and the charges he has laid upon Paegnium. Part of the comedy of the scene rests in the dynamic between the two characters, the nature of whose relationship is not immediately apparent. The audience's expectations have already been overturned as they learned that the main lover of the play is a slave, and then again

when they found out that this slave has a parasite. As Paegnium appears on stage for the first time accompanying Toxilus, the audience must immediately ask itself what kind of relationship these two characters have. It seems from their initial exchange that the dynamic resembles that between a master and a quick-witted slave, which seems to be confirmed in line 193 when Paegnium speaks of *fides erilis* in relation to Toxilus. The audience would be asking itself whether our slave-hero has a slave of his own, whether Toxilus could simply be playing the role of master with one of the other slaves from his house, and why, in this case, Paegnium is so obedient. From his role, perhaps we can imagine that Paegnium indeed is a younger slave from the same house as Toxilus, who looks up Toxilus with brotherly admiration and who is ready to serve him as if he were his master. Such a dynamic, whether intended by the poet or not, would at any rate positively contribute to the comedic success of the scene. The beginning of the exchange also continues the presentation of Toxilus as the director of the play-within-the-play (v.i. ad 184 : docuisti, v.s. ad 159) as he struggles to make sure that one of his main actors has committed all of his lines to memory.

183 : satin haec … satin haec : The anaphora gives Toxilus' words a threatening and emphatic tone. — **satin haec meministi et tenes? :** This redundant doubling (as well that in *plana et certa*) echoes the repetition in Sophoclidisca's words above (176: *memini et scio et calleo et commemini*) and also Saturio's (118: *memini et scio*). This type of redundancy seems to be characteristic of subservient roles (i.e., of parasites or slaves, as a way to assure someone that their orders or wishes will be fulfilled, cf. also Curc. 384). By framing his question in this way, Toxilus casts Paegnium in the role of the slave, while he himself assumes the role of the master.

When three lines later Toxilus says *da hercle pignus, ni omnia memini et scio*, he accepts his role with playful reluctance. — **tenes :** The verb *tenere* as a synonym for *intellegere* or *percipere* is common in comedy and in Cicero's dialogues. This usage seems to have a slight colloquial flavor. cf. Eng. get; Ger. *begreifen, erfassen*; It. *capire*.

184 : melius quam tu qui docuisti : The sharp-witted reponse playfully pushes back against Toxilus, a reminder that both characters are more or less social equals. —**docuisti :** Toxilus is here presented as the director of the play-within-the-play. cf. the common expression *docere fabulam* ("produce, put on a play"). — **ain uero, uerbereum caput? :** With this remark, Toxilus tries to force Paegnium back into the role of slave. This and similar phrases (especially with the noun *uerbero* and the rarer adjective *uerbereus,* both of which refer properly to people who are fit for a beating and so are closely associated with slavish characters) are often used by a superior talking down to his inferiors (or between two slaves jockeying for position), cf. Amph 284: *ain uero, uerbero* (Mercury to a slave, and again at Amph. 344); Amph. 519 (Jupiter to Mercury); Cap. 551: *ain uerbero* (young man to a slave); Cap. 951: *interibi ego ex hac statua uerberea uolo erogitare*... (master to a slave); Pseud. 911: *sed eccum uideo uerberearn statuam* (slave to a slave). — **ain vero? :** "dici davvero? dici sul serio?" (Ammendola).

185 : ain enim vero : cf. Amph. 344: *ain vero? — aio enim vero.* The combination *enimvero* is often treated as a unit in Classical Latin, and it seems this can be also said of most of the 33 occurrences of this phrase in Plautus, although almost all modern editions of Plautus print the words separately. In Plautus the phrase tends to be found, as in Classical Latin, in either the first

or second position of a clause. The example here and at Amph. 344, where *enim vero* is used in response to *vero,* might look back to a time when the force of each of the words was felt separately, or the usage could be motivated merely by Plautus' tendency to use repetition as an organizational device. — **ego recte apud illam dixero :** Perhaps the best comparison for the construction is Amph. 591: *apud erum qui vera loquitur* ("who speaks the truth before his master"), where *apud quem = coram quo, ad quem*.

186 - 188 : The text of all modern editions reads:

TOX. non edepol scis. PAE. da hercle pignus, ni omnia memini et scio,

et quidem si scis tute quot hodie habeas digitos in manu.

TOX. egon dem pignus tecum? PAE. audacter, si lubido est perdere

In this case, Toxilus thinks Paegnium does not know what he his supposed to say, and Paegnium in turn tells Toxilus to make a bet that he does not know and that Toxilus knows how many fingers he has. The idea is that Toxilus would loose both bets, the one because Paegnium actually learned his lines, the second (it seems) because Toxilus is so lovesick that he cannot recall the simplest of information (or so uneducated that he cannot count to five). Lambinus, however, prints a slightly different version that might make more sense:

TOX. non edepol scis. PAE. da hercle pignus, ni omnia memini et scio.

TOX. equidem si scis tute quot hodie habeas digitos in manu,

eo dem pignus tecum. PAE. audacter, si lubido est perdere.

This reading gives 187 to Toxilus, with *equidem* for *et quidem.* Toxilus still has line 188 as well, but instead of a rhetorical question in response to Paegnium, it becomes the apodosis of the

conditional sentence in 187 (*eo* instead of *egon*). In this reading, Toxilus sarcastically dismisses Paegnium's suggestion to make a wager, saying "I'd make a bet instead that you know how many fingers you have today [i.e., a bet that you would actually stand a chance of wining]." Paegnium then replies: "Do so boldly (*audacter*), if you want to lose [because I can't count]." There are problems with both interpretations, but the second one fits slightly better with the power dynamic of the scene.

186 : non edepol scis : Plautus uses *nescire* far more often than *non scire,* but cf. Amph. 336: *non edepol nunc ubi terrarum siem scio*; Asin. 299: *non edepol scio* (also at Asin. 465, Bacch. 321, Epid. 461, Men. 824, Pseud. 1101); Mil. 1075: *non edepol tu scis, mulier.* These examples might be seen as a type of tmesis. — **da hercle pignus, ni omnia memini et scio :** dare pignus = "bet, place a bet, (lit.) give a pledge." The phrase *dare pignus* as well as the construction with *ni* is common enough in Plautus but are not found elsewhere. cf. Bacch. 1056: *ne ego cum illo haud ausim dare*; Cas. 75: *mecum pignus si quis uolt dato*; Epid. 699 *vel da pignus, ni ea sit filia*; Poen. 1242: *da pignus, ni nunc perieres* ; Truc. 275: *pignus da ni ligneae haec sunt quas habes Victorias.* — **ni omnia memini et scio :** v.s. ad 183 : satin haec meministi et tenes?.

187 : et quidem si scis tute : On who should speak this line, v.s. ad 186-188. If the line indeed should be given to Paegnium, then the *si* clause is the second term of the wager (the first being *ni* = *nisi*), this time positive. This would be the only instance of a positive *si* clause after the phrase *dare pignum* in Plautus. *tute* is emphatic for *tu.*

188 : On the possible meanings of this line, v.s. ad 186-188. — **si lubidost perdere :** si tibi lubet perdere (Lambinus). cf. 121: lubido extemplo coepere est conuiuium.

189 : bona pax sit potius : "let's stop arguing."

190 : sed ita volo te: curre[re] ut domi sis : Lindsay's text (with the imperative *curre*) is nearly impossible. There is no good parallel for *velle* with the imperative, and *ita volo te* is would be senseless here. The only way one could make this reading work is by imagining a strong interruption of Toxilus' thought after *te,* i.e., Toxilus begins by saying *sed ita volo te* and is planning on finishing the construction with an infinitive, as expected, but then pauses briefly, changes his mind, and orders Paegnium with an imperative. It is much easier, however, to read the infinitive *currere* (which is found in the Ambrosian palimpsest and is read by Woytek, de Melo, and Questa) and assume that the *ut* scans a short syllable by the law of Brevis Brevians (Iambic Shortening). The reading *curare* is also found in the manuscripts, which works just as well as *currere*, although less vivid. — **ut domi sis quom ego te esse illi censeam :** "run in such a way (currere) or take care (*curare*) that you're [already] home when I think you're [still] there," i.e., do it much faster than I would expect.

191 : faciam : This, long with *ita faciam, non* (*numquam*) *faciam*, and others, is a common way of emphatically responding to requests and commands in Plautus and Terence. — **quo ergo is nunc? domum … censeas:** Paegnium has started off in the wrong direction, obviously just to tease Toxilus.

192 : scelus tu pueri es : scelestus puer es (Lambinus).This is a fairly common mode of address in Plautus. cf. infra 848: *frustum pueri*; Poen. 273: *monstrum mulieris*. The expression *scelus viri* appears three times, while *flagitium hominis* appears four times. *scelus* is also used as a form of address without the genitive below at 290, 666, 743, and 793, as well at Bacch. 1176, Mil. 827, 841, and elsewhere. — **aliqui :** instrumental singular, = *aliquo modo, aliqua re*. — **ego qui te peculiabo :** aliquo te peculio donabo (Lambinus); aliquid peculii tibi dabo (Jacobus Operarius). This is the only attestation of this verb (although the participle *peculiatus* is found elsewhere). The verb should mean "give [someone something] as private property." In this context, it obviously refers to some sort of punishment, but what sort exactly is up for debate. Ussing thinks that it refers tamely to a beating ("Ironice hoc dici plagasque significari facile intelligitur. Errant qui obsenci aliquid hic inesse putant"), while others compare Pseud. 1188 (Har. *meo peculio empta*. Bal. *nemp' quod femina summa sustinent*), where something lewd is obviously meant by *peculium*. Neither interpretation, however, is particularly fun for Paegnium.

193-194 : "I know how (=that) shamelessness is usually reproached against a master's promise, and how they are never able to be forced to have a judge for that promise," i.e., they do not want to be held accountable for their promises.

193 : scio ut soleat : Indirect question instead of indirect statement. — **fide erili :** = *fidei erili* (dative with *opprobrari*). For more on the force of *fides erilis*, v. s. ad 183-199.— **impudicitia :** = *impudentia*.

194 : nec subigi queantur : The construction changes and the plural subject *eri, domini* must be understood from *fide erili* above, as if the first clause had been something like *eri qui pollicentur reprehendi soleant*. — **queantur :** The passive forms of *queo* and *nequeo* are rare, but when they are found, it is invariably with a passive inifinitive (as here). cf. Ter. Hec. 572: *forma in tenebris nosci non quita est*; Lucr. 1.1045: *dum veniant aliae ac suppleri summa queatur*. — **ut pro ea fide habeant iudicem :** "ut audiant iudicem, qui faveat fidei seruili" (Jacobus Operarius); "domini numquam de fide sua iudices habebunt, numquam de fide sua iudicium fieri patientur" (Ussing).

195 : abi modo : "Just go already." After this command it is likely that Paegnium begins his exit. — **ego laudabis faxo :** "You'll praise me. I'm sure of it." On the paratactic construction of *faxo* with the future instead of the subjunctive, v. s. ad 161 : iam faxo hic aderunt. — **sed has tabellas, Paegnium :** After the command *abi modo* we can imagine that Paegnium begins his exit, excitedly calling back to Toxilus "ego laudabis faxo," but comically forgetting the letter which he must deliver to Lemniselenis. This provides a good explanation for the strong initial adversative conjunction *sed,* the vocative Paegnium (the first time, in fact, we hear his name), and for why *has tabellas* , the object of *des* in the next line, is placed in such an emphatic position. Toxilus calls out: "But [you forgot] the letter, Paegnium! make sure you give it directly to Lemniselenis."

196 : ipsi Lemniseleni : "to Lemniselenis herself, directly/personally to Lemniselenis," cf. Curc. 465-488: *ipsi Phaedromo | credidi*; Merc. 277-278: *istos rastros uilico | Pisto ipsi facito coram ut tradas in manum*; Poen. 713: *tuos seruos aurum ipsi lenoni dabit*. Pseud. 644: *ego nisi ipsi Ballioni nummum credam nemini*. — **fac des :** i.e., *cura, fac ut des.* — **fac des et quae iussi nuntiato :** Note the use of the present and future imperatives together with little difference in force or meaning.

197 : Sophoclidisca, having remained silent and off to the side of the stage since 182 now reminds the audience of her presence and perhaps begins to proceed slowly to the center of the stage while Toxilus and Paegnium finish their conversation. — **cesso ire ego quo missa sum :** Perhaps better punctuated as a question than as a statement: cf. Asin. 125: *sed quid ego cesso ire ad forum, quo inceperam?*; Aul. 397: *sed cesso prius quam prosus perii currere?*; Cas. 237: *cesso caput pallio detergere*?. These and many other examples tend to be punctuated with periods in Lindsay and de Melo, but with a question mark in older editions. In most cases sentences with the verb *cesso,* either with the infinitive or absolutely ("delay, hesitate [to do something]"), sound better as rhetorical questions than statements. In the given instance, Woytek rightly punctuates with a question mark. The placement of the emphatic pronoun *ego* after rather than before the verb is additional (but not entirely definitive) support for this choice.

198 - 199 : Paegnium begins to proceed to Lemniselenis (*eo ego*), but Toxilus enters his house (*ego domum ibo*) without waiting to confirm that Paegnium has entered the pimp's house. To achieve the best comedic effect in this exchange, it is likely that Toxilius has already exited into

his house before Paegnium pronounces the ostrich joke in line 199 (*pace* de Melo, whose stage direction has Toxilus exit after the ostrich joke and before Paegnium says *illic hinc abiit intro huc*), or perhaps Toxilus even shuts the door as Paegnium is beginning to speak.

198 : i sane : The use of the adverb *sane* with imperatives is common in colloquial Latin. In English "then" (or archaically "pray") can help capture the force: "Then go!, Pray go!." In Plautus and Terence *sane* is especially common with the imperatives *i, ite, abi,* and *age*. — **face … geras :** *face ut geras*; for the imperative form, v.s. ad 146. — **hanc rem cum cura geras :** "manage this affair carefully." The ablative of manner *cum cura* is found in 6 other passages in Plautus and later was a favorite of Livy.

199 : uola curriculo : A careless and funny contradiction which de Melo's "fly running" well captures. — **istuc marinus passer per circum solet :** The ostrich is called the *passer marinus* because it is imported from overseas. Paegnium comically understands Toxilus' *uola curriculo* literally. The ostrich is the first thing that comes to mind that runs and flies concurrently.

200 - 204 : In these lines, Paegnium and Sophoclidisca explain with their words what is happening on stage and narrate their own thoughts without addressing one another. In line 200 Paegnium announces Toxilus' exit and the approach of Sophoclidisca, whom he does not yet recognize. In line 201 both characters recognize one another. In 202 Sophoclidisca offers a comment on the general reputation of Paegnium in town, and in 203 each character announces what they must do. Finally, in 204 Sophoclidisca addresses Paegnium directly. Much of the

comedy in these lines (and in the exchange which follows) lies in the way the two characters, who would rather have nothing to do with one another (the low esteem in which each one holds the other is made immediately apparent in the following exchange), hesitate and try to put off their inevitable meeting, not willing to acknowledge that they must work together to accomplish the designs of their respective masters.

200 : illic hinc abiit intro huc : Notice the accumulation of demonstrative/deictic and locative words. "He went away from here to here inside." The combination *illic hinc abiit* occurs at least 8 other times in Plautus, and *intro huc* 3 other times. One also finds the combinations *huc hinc* and *hinc intro.* This line is unique for the nearly redundant use of all three adverbs plus the demonstrative pronoun *illic* and the directional prefix in *abiit.* — **me aduorsum incedit :** "is approaching me." The word *aduorsum* is used with a preceding accusative also at Amph. 923: *nam ius iurandum uerum te aduorsum dedi*; Aul. 690: *egone ut te aduorsum mentiar, mater mea*?. But with verbs of motion the dative tends to be preferred: Cas. 461: *cum ei aduorsum ueneram*; Cas. 723: *cesso… ita ero meo ire aduorsum*; Men. 437: *ut uenias aduorsum mihi*. One could pedantically emend to *mi aduorsum*, or simply assume that the line between the prepositions *ad* and *aduorsum* was blurry and not strictly maintained.

201 : hicquidem : Often so printed because *quidem* is enclitic and does not bear its own accent. — **hic … # haec :** The pronouns are emphatic, used as each character recognized the other. Although there is a lapse in logic that Sophoclidisca pronounces *Paegnium hicquidem est* as if she just now realized who Paegnium was. Did she not recognize him as she eavesdropped from

the side of the stage during Toxilus' and Paegnium's exchange at 183-199? — **peculiarest eius :** *peculiarest = peculiaris est* (synaloepha). "her (Lemniselenis') personal slave." The word *peculiaris* (<*peculium*) is obvious and comical in being so out of place. Can a prostitute have a personal slave? But by now we are so far lost in the dramatic illusion that the strangeness of the expression is hardly noticed.

202 : quo ego sum missus : i.e., *ad quam* (Lambinus). The adverb *quo* is used in place of a pronoun, as is common in colloquial Latin. v.s. ad 61: *unde. (*Lindsay 1907, 48, 80). — **hodie hoc puero peior perhibetur :** Note the alliteration of *h* and *p* and the repetition of *r*: *hodie hoc puero peior perhibetur*. — **perhibetur :** For the use of *perhibere* as a synonym for *dicere* or *habere*, a usage very rare in Cicero, cf. Cist. 66: *ut perhibent viri*; Men. 261-262: *tum meretrices mulieres | nusquam perhibentur blandiores gentium*.

203 : Pa. compellabo. So. commorandust. Pa. <standumst> apud hanc obicem : So print Lindsay and de Melo. The line is rather corrupt, *standumst* being a modern addition and *obicem* being a modern suggestion for the *obieci* of the manuscripts. The attribution of *compellabo* to Paegnium is also modern, with the manuscripts and many older additions assigninging *compellabo* to Sophoclidisca and giving the entire rest of the line to Paegnium, supplying something else to fill out the line (e.g., *commorandumst mihi*). Woytek prefers the second interpretation and supplies his own nearly impossible emendation. We are generally left with two possibilities:

1. Soph: “This guy’s the worst. I’ll accost him.” [Soph. approaches Paeg. and blocks his way] Paeg: “Now I have to stop at this obstacle (i.e., Sophoclidisca).”
2. Soph: “This guy’s the worst.” Paeg: “I’ll go accost her.” Soph: “I have to delay him (*commorandust*)”. Paeg: “I have to stop at this obstacle.”

Since there is no philological way to solve all of the problems in this corrupt line, the second possibility is to be preferred: it better and more comically captures Paegnium’s and Sophoclidisca’s hesitation and reluctance to talk to and work with one another. v.s. ad 200-204 for the general tenor of the exchange. — **apud hanc obicem :** “apud hanc Sophoclidiscam, quae mihi moram obiiciet, vel quae mihi obiicitur” (Lambinus).

204 : Paegnium, deliciae pueri, salve. quid agis? ut uales? : Sophoclidisca’s insincere and fawning address is made more comical in contrast with the low opinion she express of him earlier (202) and by how quickly she will lose her patience with Paegnium and drop her attempt to be nice to him. — **deliciae pueri :** For this type of address, cf. ad 192: scelus tu peuri es. — **quid agis? ut uales? :** For typical ways to ask “how are you?” v.s. ad 17.

205 : di—me amabunt : The usual expression is *di te ament*. Paegnium tries and fails to say something nice to Sophoclidisca. The future *amabunt* is used in place of a subjunctive in a wish, as elsewhere in Plautus, cf. Bennet 1910, 1, 43. — **quid me? :** Sophoclidisca responds in surprise at Paegnium’s unexpected change of the usual formula. There are two ways to understand the question: either as **“**what about me?”, i.e., with *me* as the object of an understood verb and referring to Sophoclidisca; or “what do mean, ‘me’ (i.e., why didn’t you say ‘you’?)?”,

i.e., with *me* being a quotation of the unexpected *me* in Paegnium's line (for this type of direct quotation after *quid*, cf. Capt. 1006: Hegio: *salue, exoptate gnate mi.* Tyndarus: *hem, quid "gnate mi"?*). The interpretation depends only the intonation of the actor. The second interpretation produces better comedy, however, and therefore should be preferred. In this interpretation, Paegnium's response (*utrum hercle illis lubet*) would then dodge the actual question (i.e., "why did you say 'me' and not 'you'?"), pretending to understand Sophoclidisca's question in the first sense (i.e., "what should the gods do to me?"). Such a response is fitting with the clever sarcasm that we have seen from Paegnium so far. In a very similar fashion Paegnium knowingly misinterprets Sophoclidisca's words in 207 (cf. ad loc.), which adds credence to my interpretation here. — **utrum hercle illis lubet :** The words *illis lubet* are supplied by Lindsay. Other suggestions include *di volent* and *mavolent*. Woytek surprisingly chooses to print an ellipsis. Whatever the reading, the meaning is clear: "whichever [of the two choices available to the gods, i.e., *vel amare vel odisse* (Ussing)] they want."

206 : ut digna es : "As you deserve." The expression *ut dignus/digna es/est* is common in Plautus and Terence. — **odio hercle habeant :** sc. *te*. The predicate dative is common with the verb *habere,* "to have as (a source of)." — **faciant male :** sc. *tibi*. The expressions *bene facere* and *male facere* are used with the dative. Woytek is wrong in calling the conection of *odio habeant* and *faciant male* "zeugmatisch" on the grounds that one takes the accusative and the other the dative. The objects of both verbs are obvious and therefore unexpressed.

207 : mitte male loqui : The use of *mittere* with an infinitive to mean *omittere, desinere, deponere, finire* in Plautus is confined, according the TLL, to this passage and Aul. 651 (*iam scrutari mitto*). The construction, however, occurs at least four times in Terence and sporadically in Classical Latin. — **quom ut digna es dico, bene, non male loquor :** "Since I'm speaking as you deserve, I'm speaking well, not badly." Again Paegnium pretends to misunderstand what Sophoclidisca says. The idea is that *male loqui* can mean 'to speak badly (of someone)' or 'to speak badly (i.e., to make a mistake).' Sophoclidisca says the former, Paegnium hears the later. For a similar deliberate misinterpretation, cf. *ad* 205: quid me?

208 : quid agis? : "So, what's going on?" Sophoclidisca gives up fighting with Paegnium and instead tries to bring Paegnium back to the matter at hand. One can imagine a slight pause between 207 and 208 as Sophoclidisca dismisses Paegnium's sarcastic response with a gesture, takes a deep breath, and tries to contain her annoyance with Paegnium's antagonistic behavior. Her attempt to redirect the conversation is unsuccessful, however, and their slapstick exchange will continue for quite some time as they each try and fail to get information from one another. — **feminam scelestam te astans contra contuor :** Paegnium again purposefully misunderstands Sophoclidisca. Sophoclidisca' question *quid agis?* is here the equivalent of "how are you doing, what's happening?", but Paegnium understands the question literally as "what are you doing (right this moment)" and responds "I am currently standing next to and beholding a wicked woman." Woytek unnecessarily brackets *te.* — **contuor :** The third conjugation form *contui* (instead of *contueri*) is used in Plautus.

209 : certe equidem puerum peiorem quam te novi neminem : A beautiful and artful line. Note the very similar sounding *puerum* and *peiorum* at the center of the line, the alliteration at the end of the line in *novi neminem* (which becomes even more singsongy by the repetition of the syllable *nem* in *neminem*), the repetition of sounds at the beginning (*certe equidem*), and the similar sounding *certe* and *quam te*.

210 : quid male facio aut quoi male dico? : Perhaps struck by rhetorical artifice of Sophoclidisca's reply in 209, or perhaps because he did not expect Sophoclidisca to return his trash-talking so sharply, Paegnium backs off a bit and regroups. For the next few lines, Sophoclidisca takes on the role the aggressor of the exchange and Paegnium, tail between his legs, offers some lame responses, as in 212 ("takes one to know one!") and his childish repetitions in 216 and 217 (e.g., "Where are you going?", "Where are *you* going?"). — **quoi pol quomque occasio est :** sc. *ocassio maledicendi*: "[you badmouth] anyone there's an opportunity [to badmouth]." The tmesis of *quicumque* is occurs frequently in poetry, e.g., Hor. Od. 1.9.14-15: *quem fors dierum cumque dabit, lucro | adpone.*

211 : nemo homo umquam : *nemo umquam* is classical, but is relatively rare in Plautus and Terence, both of whom generally prefer the expression *numquam quisquam,* which in turn is very rare in Cicero. cf. ad 55: numquam quisquam. — **at pol :** Strongly aversative. — **at pol e multi esse ita sciunt :** The word *ita* emphatically repeats Paegnium's *ita* earlier in the line: *nemo homo umquam ita arbitrartust # at pol multi esse ita sciunt*. Sophoclidisca answers each of Paegnium's

words directly: *multi* being parallel with *nemo homo umquam, ita* with *ita,* and *sciunt* with *arbitratust*.

212 : heia # beia : While *heia* is a common interjection, *beia* is found only here. It is obviously used for comic euphony after *heia*: "interiectionem 'heia' irridens detorquet" (Ussing). Users of English are familiar with such games of consonant swapping to comically produce similar sounding words (which Nixon's "oh tush! oh slush!" tries to capture). This is part of the colloquial register of many languages but has likely escaped transmission in all but a few places in Latin due to the nature of the texts preserved . — **tuo ex ingenio mores alienos probas :** For the sentiment in Plautus, cf. Trin. 1049 : *quippe eorum ex ingenio ingenium horum probant*; Capt. 582: *omnes inveniri similis tui vis.* cf. Eng. takes one to know one; It. *Ci vuole un ladro per riconoscerne un altro*; Sp. *Cree el ladrón que todos son de su condición*.

213 : fateor ego profecto me esse ut decet lenonis familiae : fateor "me talem esse, qualem esse decet eam feminam, quae est ex lenonis familia," (Lambinus). *familiae* is dative with *decet*. The present system verb *fateri* occurs in Plautus overwhelmingly in the first person singular present indicative, with a handful of occurrences of the infinitive and the second person singular. The third person singular is attested only three times, the second person plural only once. Sophoclidica is here trying to be the better person by admitting her own low status, which obviously has no effect on Paegnium.

214 : iam satis dictum habeo : i.e., satis esse id quod a te dictum habeo; tu mihi satis dixisti. cf. Capt. 214: *sed satis verborumst*; Capt. 928: *satis iam audivi tuas aerumnas*. — **sed quid tu? :** The formula *quid tu?* is common in Plautus and Terence and is always followed by another question. "What about you?" — **confitere ut te autumo :** i.e., "confitere te talem esse, qualem autumo?" (Lambinus), confitere *te ita esse,* ut te *esse* autumo. — **autumo :** v.s. ad 151: autumo.

215 : fatear si ita sim : This is likely a present contrafactual conditional statement and not future more vivid. "In Early Latin a protasis in the present subjunctive may indicate either something whose future realization is suggested as possible or something which is clearly implied to be contrary to fact. Only context can determine what type we have in any special case," (Bennett 1, 274). Paegnium is not saying "I would say so (in the future), should I be so (in the future)," but "I'd say so (now), if I were so (now), but I'm not." — **iam abi, vicisti :** "Now go long, go on, you've won." Sophoclidisca tries a different tactic seeing that all else has failed. The word *abi* here, like Asin. 704 (*abi, laudo*) is not a command to leave, but rather a word to express assent or praise. Ammendola compares It. *va bene* and Woytek Ger. *geh weiter*. — **abi nunciam ergo :** Repeating the now familiar pattern, Paegnium again purposefully misunderstands Sophoclidisca's words and takes the imperative *abi* at face value. "No, now you leave!" — **hoc mi expedi : "**Explain me this." For *expedire* used metaphorically with the meaning "explain" (which also occurs regularly with other similar verbs like *enodare, enucliare, explicare, extricare*), cf. inter alia Amph. 521, 1081; Men. 614; Merc. 174; Pers. 640.

216 : quo agis? : sc. te, i.e., quo is, quo vadis. — **quo tu? # dic tu. # <dic tu.> # prior rogavi. # at post scies :** Rhetorical tactics known to anyone who has ever spoken with a three-year-old child. The meter of this line is missing a few syllables. Another solution is *quo tu? # dic tu. prior rogavi. # at post<erior> scies.* Woytek and de Melo print the latter, the former Lindsay and most older editions. The choice is impossible, but Lindsay's text is more lively and produces a more pleasing and comical exchange.

217 : eo ego hinc hau longe : Sophoclidisca gives in slightly to Paegnium but, by giving a purposefully vague answer, does not completely let go of her claim to the right to know where Paegnium is going first because she asked him first. Note the pleasant alliteration in *eo ego hinc hau*. — **et quidem ego hau longe :** Paegnium simply repeats after Sophoclidisca and so continues to play the same game as in 216. The meaning of *quidem* here, as in 105 above, is close to Grk. γε. Thus *et quidem ego* = καὶ ἔγωγε (Woytek). — **quo ergo tu is, scelus? :** "So then (*ergo*) where are you going, you rascal." Toxilus also addresses Paegnium with the word *scelus* above at 192.

218 - 222 : Now Sophoclidisca adopts Paegnium's rhetorical strategy and begins to repeat everything he says back at him.

218 : nisi sciero, numquam scies : A textbook example of the emphatic use of the future perfect in the protasis of a future more vivid conditional sentence. — **nisi sciero prius ex te, tu ex me numquam … scies :** Note that the loose chiasmus is a natural organizing principle in the

colloquial register of many languages. Here the word *tu* stands at the center of the utterance; it is flanked directly by *ex te* and *ex me*; which in turn are enclosed by the temporal adverbs *prius* and *numquam*; and the whole sentence is girded by the repeated verbs *sciero* and *scies.* Such organization is artful but not artificial. — **sciero :** In all periods and registers of Latin, the syncopated forms *sciero, scierim, scieris, scierit* etc. far outweigh the unsyncopated forms, which occur almost never. The perfect stem of compounded forms of the verb (*nescire, resciscere, asciscere, consciscere*), however, almost invariably appear with the *-v-*. — **hoc quod rogitas :** The frequentative verb *rogitare* is used with its full force here: "this which you're asking again and again."

218 - 219 : scies # scibis : For the *-bi-* infix in the third and forth conjugation, v.s. ad 15: congrediar…contra adgredibor, where we see a similar instance of (nearly) the same verb used twice in close proximity with both future forms.

219 : This line is another illustration of the principle discussed above in 218 of the naturally chiasastic structure of colloquial language. Sophoclidisca's response forms the second half of a chiasmus with Paegnium's line: *sciero, scies, scibis, audivero.* — **numquam ecastor hodie :** The oath *ecastor* is used especially by women. cf. Toxilus above at 140, who says *numquam hercle hodie hic prius edes*. As in the example at 140, the temporal value of *hodie* is almost entirely lost, with the combination *numquam hodie* meaning something like the English "never ever." cf. what Donatus says about Ter. Adelph. 215 (*qui potui melius qui hodie usque os prabui*?): "'hodie' non tempus significant, sed iracundam eloquentiam ac stomachum." — **ex ted :** For the

form, v.s. ad 39: a med. — **audiuero :** The emphatic use of the future perfect extends beyond conditional sentences and can be used in sentences with other subordinating conjunctions (here, *priusquam*) yet which still maintain the vivid future construction (i.e, future indicative in the main clause, future or future perfect indicative in the subordinate clause).

220 : itane est? itane est : Attempts to give a precise philological account for the *ne* in the response here (found also in the formula *egone? tune* at Cap. 857, Epid. 575, Stich. 634, and Trin. 634) are futile. Rather the speaker simply repeats back to the interlocutor exactly what is said to them. The effect can be mocking (as here), but in general it merely calls attention to the fact that the speaker is repeating everything thoroughly. This is likely related to the common form of assent in Latin whereby a part of what is said simply repeated (usually the verb or the subject, but many other variations are common enough). — **decet me :** sc. esse scelestum (Amendola). — **me quidem hau decet :** Woytek prints the Bothe's conjecture *addecet* on the grounds that Sophoclidisca should exactly mirror what Paegnium says. de Melo follows Woytek's text in his Loeb. This, however, misses the point and the joke. When Paegnium says *decet me* he has already realized that Sophoclidisca is repeating everything he says and tries to trick her into admitting that she is a scoundrel by forcing her to repeat something that she would not have said otherwise. Again, anyone who has ever played this game with a three-year-old child will recognize this tactic immediately. Sophoclidisca says *me quidem hau decet* and skillfully dodges the trap.

221 : quid ais? certumnest … : Paegnium's reply makes better sense given the above reading of *me quidem hau decet* than if Sophoclidisca had said *me quidem addecet.* If she had indeed said the former, Paegnium would not have hesitated to jump on the opportunity to celebrate the success of his trick. Instead, he pauses in surprise that Sophoclidisca saw through his trick and says in disbelief: "What? So you're not going to tell me where you're going, you scoundrel?" — **quid ais? :** Commonly used in conversation to express surprise at what has just been said. It is the equivalent of Gk. τί λέγεις;. — **certumnest :** *certum est* with the dative (here, sc. *tibi*) and infinitive is a favorite construction of Plautus. The particle *-ne* here is a modern addition, which Woytek refuses to print. While there are many parallels for questions in general with no marker in Plautus, there are six other occurrences of *certumnest* and no examples of *certum est* in a question without a particle.

222 : Sophoclidisca continues to copy Paegnium, but this time she artfully varies each of the words which Paegnium chose: *offirmastin* for *certumnest, occultare* for *celare*, and *quo te immittas* for *quo iter facias*. She keeps the word *pessume* at the end for emphasis. Despite the variation, the lines sound very similar and almost rhyme: *celare* and *occultare*; *quo iter facias pessuma* and *quo te immitas, pessume*. In addition, *offirmasti occultare* preserves the opening alliteration (with a different sound) of *certumnest celare*. — **offirmastin occultare :** "Have you decided to conceal?" This is the only example of *offirmare* with the simple infinitive, although cf. Ter. Hec. 450: *certum offirmarest viam me quam decrevi persequi.*

223 - 224 : par pari respondes…valeas : These words are given to Paegnium in all modern editions, but Woytek, because of a space in one of the manuscripts between *dicto* and *abi,* assigns *abi iam, quando ita certa rest* to Sophoclidisca. de Melo's Loeb follows Woytek's emendation. There is very little difference in these two interpretations, and the success of the scene is almost unchanged by this emendation. The words *abi iam quando ita certa rest,* however, might sound slightly better in Paegnium's mouth, since he has already used the command *abi nunciam* above at 215 to dismiss Sophoclidisca (on the meaning of Sophoclidisca's *iam abi, vicisti* v.s. ad loc.) and used the phrase *certum est* above at 221. Sophoclidisca moreover has on the whole been much more patient in this exchange than Paegnium, and her character, in my opinion, seems less likely to try to dismiss Paegnium with a gruff command than the other way around. Finally, the abrupt change of heart from *abi iam* (223) to *asta* (224) would also seem to be slightly out of character for Sophoclidisca. Therefore, contrary to Woytek and de Melo, the traditional assignment of these words to Paegnium should stand, as nothing is gained from the emendation. If we do give these words to Paegnium, we are to imagine that he slowly begins to turn around and walk away as he says them, and then says, either to himself or over his shoulder, *nihili facio scire.*

223 : par pari respondes dicto : i.e., dictum dicto par pari respondes, as at Ter. Phorm. 212: *et verbum verbo par pari ut respondeas.* Both Nixon and de Melo use the English phrase 'tit for tat' in their translations to preserve the alliteration. The expression *par pari respondere* is also found at Merc. 629, Truc. 939, and once one of Cicero's letters. — **quando ita certa rest :** The use of *quando* as a conjunction with temporal and/or causal sense seems to be present at all times in

Latin, from Plautus to modern Italian, but it tends to be avoided in most circumstances by Classical prose authors, who use *cum* in this context and use *quando* only as an interrogative adverb.

224 : nihili facio scire : "non curo scire" (Lambinus). *nihili* is genitive of indefinite value (v.s. ad 94: nihili); *nihili facio* is found in a few other passages and means 'I don't care.' The expression *nihili facere* is usually used by itself or with a pronoun as an object. This is the only example in Plautus of an infinitive as the object of the phrase. — **valeas :** Less frequent than *vale,* but present at all times as an alternate valediction.

225 : cedo manum ergo : "Then give me your hand." The imperative form *cedo* (pl. *cette*) is a combination of the the particle *ce* (as in *ecce* and the demonstratives *hic, istic,* etc.) and the verb *dare*. Some interpret these forms as "contractions" of *cedito* (future imperative) and *cedite* (present imperative). — **estne haec manus? :** "This is a hand, isn't it?" or "Is this the hand (that you're asking for)?"

226 : ubi est illa altera : "Where's that other one?" — **furtifica :** i.e., quae furta facit. The compound is unique to Plautus. Ussing rightly observes: "ad furta facienda aptior videbatur laeva manus, quippe quam homines saepe pallio vel toga occultarent, quamque ceteri minus observarent." — **domi eccam :** On the form *eccam* (*ecce* + *eam*), v.s. ad 83: eccum. — **huc nullam attuli :** A raising of the negative, = *huc eam non attuli,* "I didn't bring it with me."

227 : habes nescioquid : Sophoclidisca is made more suspicious by Paegnium's hesitation to show her both hands and by his lame excuse *huc nullam attuli.* — **ne me attrecta :** "Don't touch me!" In Plautus and other colloquial or otherwise non-Classical registers, the present imperative can be negated with *ne* to form a negative command where classical Latin would prefer *noli attrectare* or *ne attrectaveris*. Sophoclidisca likely begins to approach Paegnium when she says *cedo manum ergo* (225) and likely grabs Paegnium's right hand when he presents it. She probably maintains contact as she says *ubi illa altera est furtifica laeva,* and begins to grope Paegnium sometime between the words *laeva* (226) and *nescioquid* (227). This prompts Paegnium to say *ne me attrecta* and to try to free himself from Sophoclidisca's grip. — **subigitatrix :** 'a groper, fondler, molester, manhandler.' Lambinus: "mulier quae subigitare et attrectare mare solet." **sin te amo? :** "But what if I love you?" "si autem te amo, annon mihi licebit te subigitare?" (Lambinus).

228 : male operam locas : Not, as de Melo translates, "you're wasting your effort," nor, as Ammendola, "ci perdi il tempo," but *operam locare* means "to hire oneself out, to sell one's labor," and here it is being used obviously to refer to prostitution. "You're approaching the wrong customer." — **qui :** old instrumental, "how so?" — **quia enim nihil amas :** = *frustra amas* (Ussing). — **quom ingratum amas : "**When you love someone who is ungrateful," "[cum eum amas] qui amori mutuo non respondet," (Jacobus Operarius).

229 - 231 : Traditionally lines 229, 230, and 231 up until *at confidentia* are all given to Sophclidisca. Woytek again however has decided to play with the assignment of speaking roles,

and assigns Paegnium lines 229 and 230, continuing to speak after 228. Line 231 remains the same. de Melo's Loeb follows Woytek's reading. Both reading smake decent sense. To paraphrase the interaction from 227ff:

Pae: "Don't touch me!" (*pushes Sophoclidisca away*)

Soph: "But what if I love you?" (*continues to grope and hug Paegnium*)

Pae: "You've come to the wrong customer, whore!"

Soph: "Why's that?"

Pae: "Because it's useless to want someone who doesn't want you."

Soph: "But you should take advantage of your boyish good looks now (and sleep with me), so that when you're looks start to change you won't still be serving (i.e., serving your desires, or serving the desires of someone else). You're still so young and small."

Pae: "In love-making confidence is much more important than size."

With Woytek's reading, the end would have to mean something like this:

Pae: "Because it's useless to want someone who doesn't want you. These boyish good looks have to be on guard now (against wasting time with you), so that when I'm old, I will have made enough money in selling myself to others to buy my freedom."

Soph: "But you're still so young and small."

Pae: "In love-making confidence is much more important than size."

With the traditional assignment of the lines, Sophoclidisca is seen to continue her attempt to seduce the resisting Paegnium by encouraging him to take advantage of his youth while he can. The biggest obstacle in this interpretation is the meaning of *foede semper servias* and why exactly Sophoclidisca says *tu quidem haud etiam es octoginta pondo.* The phrase *foede servire*

could be a sexual innuendo (Amendola), in which case the idea would be either that Paegnium should somehow discharge his desire now so he will not be ruled by it when he is older. In this case, the statement *tu quidem haud etiam es octoginta pondo* must mean something like "you're so small, so far from being a real man (Ussing: "plane puerum esse dicit et longe a viri pondere abesse"), that you're not going to find anyone else to sleep with you, so you may as well sleep with me," or "you're so small and so ripe for love." Or, if *servire* is taken at face value and means little more than "be a slave," then Sophoclidisca has turned Paegnium's suggestion that she is prostituting herself (228) against him, advising him to start making money with his youth and saving up to buy his freedom, so that he is not still a slave when he gets older (and, by extension, still "foully serving" others to make some money). In this case the statement *tu quidem haud etiam es octoginta pondo* must mean "you're still so small, you still have time to cash in."

In Woytek's reading the word *vigilare* must mean "stay on guard (against your and similar advances)" instead of "stay up all night (to indulge)" or "be vigilant (for opportunities for love)." Paegnium says his looks must *vigilare* so as to not waste time with useless love affairs, but only on the ones which will provide him with enough money to buy his freedom (*ne foede semper servias*). "ein Knabe wie er hat nur eine kurze Zeitspanne vor dem Eintritt der Mannbarkeit zur Verfügung, in der er aus seiner körperlichen Schönheit Kapital schlagen kann; diese Zeit nun will er offenbar nicht durch eine Liaison mit der Magd vergeuden." The second person singular forms *fias* and *servias* are then interpreted as generalizing, i.e., "so that one doesn't have to serve anymore when one becomes old." Sophoclidisca's response (*tu quidem*

haud etiam es octoginta pondo) is then read to mean "you're so small, you're not fit for love, your plan will never work)."

The passage is indeed problematic, and neither reading is ideal. The traditional assignment of the lines however, in my opinion, should stand. It is simply funnier and more fitting to imagine that Sophoclidisca continues her attempt to seduce and convince Paegnium while Paegnium himself resists and fights her hugs and gropings than to think that Sophoclidisca simply gives up her attempt and that Paegnium breaks free from her at 228 and has so regained his composure after Sophoclidisca's sexual advances to immediately explain his "kühle, nüchterne Kalkulation" for profit (Woytek). In addition, the rather uncommon diminutive forms *formula* and *aetatula* seem to me to be more apt in the mouth of Sophoclidisca, who in this part of the exchange is trying to play the role of a flirtatious seductress than in the young and proud Paegnium, who, to judge from his response to Sophoclidisca's gibe at his puny 80 pounds (231), is at least somewhat defensive and insecure about his size and, by extension, age (for more on *formula* and *aetatula*, v.i. ad 229).

Later, at 286, Paegnium in his conversation with Sagaristio says that he hopes one day to be free, presumably by buying his freedom with money earned from prostituting himself (*nam ego me confido liberum fore, etc*). Following Woytek's assignment of the present lines, Paegnium's would merely be repeating a similar idea at 286; following the traditional assignment, Paegnium would be repeating the advice of Sophoclidisca in a confident tone to get the upperhand on Sagaristio, comically suggesting that it has always been his plan to buy his freedom through prostitution, but in reality just having been admonished to do so by Sophoclidisca. The latter in my opinion is more comical.

229 : temperi : adv., "at the right time, timely." The ending *-ī* is the inherited thematic locative ending (as in *domī, humī, etc.*), which has was added by analogy to athematic (third-declension) stems, such as in *temperī* and *rurī.* The ablative form *tempore* is more common in Cicero. In the form *temperi,* we see that the original vowel before the *r* was *e* and not *o*, since all non-initial short vowels before *r* weaken to *e* in Latin, e.g., *camera* > καμάρα. The *o* of the classical paradigm *tempus, temporis* was analogically restored from the nominative singular ending *-us* (< *-os*). cf. Weiss 118, 239, 307. — **vigilare oportet :** Whatever interpretation we take for the meaning of *vigilare* (for which, v.s. ad 229-231), it must be used intransitively, with *hanc formula atque aetatulam* as accusative subject. — **formulam atque aetatulam :** The word *formula,* a diminutive of *forma,* has lost its original diminutive force ("little beauty") everywhere in Latin except for this and one or two other passages. The world *aetatula* (dim. from *aetas*) is not as a rare. Both of these diminutives are used here to emphasize the youth and tenderness of Paegnium. For this reason, in my opinion, these words are much less likely to be pronounced by Paegnium. They seems to perfectly fit, however, the caressing, affectionate, and flirtatious tone of Sophoclidisca.

230 : ubi vorsicapillus fias : The manuscripts read *ubi capillus versipellis*, for which Ritschl suggested *versicapillus* (an otherwise unattested word), which Lindsay prints. It is much more reasonable to read, following Bothe, [*capillus*] *versipellis*, assuming that *capillus* was an attempt to clarify or the result of misunderstanding the strange word *versipellis*. Woytek and de Melo follow Bothe. — **fias…servias :** If spoken by Sophoclidisca, the second person forms refer of

course to Paegnium. If spoken by Paegnium, they must have general reference. — **ne foede semper servias :** On the possible meanings of this expression, v.s. ad 229-231.

231 : tuquidem hard etiam es octoginta pondo : lit., "you are hardly eighty [pounds] in weight." The word *pondō* is a frozen ablative form meaning "in respect to weight, by weight," and it is used frequently with numerals in all of Latin. It is the only evidence that continues the thematic form **pondus, pondi,* all other forms coming from *pondus, ponderis*.

232 : illa militia militatur : sc. Veneris. For military matters used as metaphors for love, cf. 24ff. — **militia militatur multo magis :** Note the alliteration and the balanced organization of the thought into four-syllable units, the last of which (*multo magis*) is spit into two two-syllable words.

233 : atque ego hanc operam perdo : "I'm wasting my effort." There is a plentiful abundance of ways to express this idea in Latin: alongside *operam perdere* one also finds the impersonal form *opera perit* as well as the expressions *operam ludere, operam abuti*, *frustra operam sumere/insumere, frustra operam conterere, frustra operam consumere.* — **quia peritae praedico :** "Because I'm talking to you who are experienced [in love]." More explicitly Lambinus: "tibi quae viros multos experta es." cf. Prop. 2.34.82: *sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit.* Although there is no other attestation of this expression, the alliteration (especially when compared with Poen. 880: *quia doctum doces*) suggests that the phrase was somewhat proverbial

or axiomatic, cf. the modern expressions: Eng. preach to the choir; It. *sfondare una porta aperta*; Ger. *offene Türen einrennen*; Ru. ломиться в открытую дверь.

234 : sed ego cesso : "I'm lingering, I'm wasting my time." cf. ad 197: cesso. — **mane :** One of the most common imperatives in Plautus, sometimes strengthened by the particle *dum*. — **molesta es :** "you're annoying me." — **ergo <ero> quoque, nisi scio :** "Yeah, and I'll continue to annoy you unless I find out…"

235 : ad vos : Paegnium finally gives in to Sophoclidisca. It is hard to think that he gives in so easily, so we must imagine that Sophoclidisca grabs Paegnium when she says *mane* (234) and does not let him go. We can also imagine that there is a decently long pause between *quo agas te* and Paegnium's response *ad vos* as Paegnium desperately tries and ultimately fails to free to free himself. Throughout this exchange the dynamic seems to indicate that Sophoclidisca's advances and her attempt to seduce Paegnium are effective, unsettling and flustering Paegnium even as he tries to maintain his composure. Thus we are to conclude that Paegnium makes a show of resistance, but halfheartedly, seemingly enjoying Sophoclidisca's attention and caresses against his will. — **quid id ad te attinent? :** "What's it to you?" Cicero uses both *pertinere* and *attinere* in this expression, with the former being about twice as common. Plautus, however, prefers *attinere,* and *pertinere* is rather infrequent.

236 - 238 : The allocation of the speaking parts in these two lines is a mess. Lindsay prints the following:

PA. enim non ibis nunc, vicissim nisi scio. SO. odiosu's. PA. lubet.

numquam hercle istuc exterebrabis, tu ut sis peior quam ego siem.

SO. malitia certare tecum miseria est. PA. mers tu mala es.

Woytek, however, whom de Melo follows, suggests:

PA. enim non ibis nunc vicissim, nisi scio. SO. odiosu's. PA. lubet.

SO. numquam hercle istuc exterebrabis. PA. tu ut sis peior quam ego siem?

SO. malitia certare tecum miseria est. PA. mers tu mala es.

The main alterations are dividing line 237 between Sophoclidisca and Paegnium and punctuating Paegnium's half as a question. Woytek is on the right course in assigning the first half of 237 to Sophoclidisca, noting that the sexual metaphor contained in *exterebrare* ('bore out, extract by boring') is best suited to the male or otherwise non-passive partner. Thus, since Paegnium should be the subject, these words must be spoken by Sophoclidisca. Paegnium's response, however, "Bore out what? That you are worse than I am?" seems not to follow exactly.

The text of Lambinus (1576) produces the best sense, who gives all of 237 to Sophoclisica and switches the assignments of 238:

PA. enim non ibis nunc vicissim, nisi scio. SO. odiosu's. PA. lubet.

SO. numquam hercle istuc exterebrabis tu ut sis peior quam ego siem.

PA. malitia certare tecum miseria est. SO. mers tu mala es.

Line 237 would then mean "You'll never bore it out of me that you are worse [i.e., better at seduction] than I am." This interpretation better respects the dynamic of the scene. Sophoclidisca

has earlier tried to seduce Paegnium and has been alternatively grabbing, restraining, and caressing him since at least 224. In line 236, it is Paegnium who tries to get the upper hand for the first time and grabs Sophoclidisca ("Now it's *you* who won't go anywhere until *I* know,"). In my reading the most fitting and also the funniest reaction from Sophoclidisca would be to enjoy, or at least pretend to enjoy, Paegnium's embrace, trying to force Paegnium's plan to backfire. For this reason, I propose giving the word *lubet* in 236, always assigned to Paegnium, to Sophoclidisca as well. The exchange would thus best be performed as follows:

> *236* : PA. Now it's *you* that won't go anywhere unless *I* find out. (*grabs her*) SO. (*in a flirtatious, seductive voice*) Now it's *you* who are being naughty [echoing Paegnium's *molesta es,* 234]. I like it (*lubet*)!
>
> *237* : (*Soph. conitnues*) But you'll never *bore it out of me* so that you're worse (i.e., better at seducing me) than I am.
>
> *238* : PA. It's miserable/impossible to contend with you in that. SO. You're a bad little thing.

The allocation of the speaking parts in the these verses will determine how the following verses are allocated as well, for which, v.i. ad 239-243.

236 : enim non ibis nunc, vicissim nisi scio : Most modern editions punctuate with a comma after *nunc* (Ussing, Lindsay, de Melo), whereas older editions (Lambinus, Operarius) place the comma after *vicissim*. Woytek rightly restores this older punctuation, which gives better sense and is more natural. — **odiousu's :** Sophoclidisca's response to Paegnium's *molesta es* above. — **lubet :** Perhaps better said by Sophoclidisca than Paegnium, for which v.s. ad 236-238.

237 : For the best way to distribute the speaking roles in this line, as well as for the meaning and metaphor of *exterebrabis*, v.s. ad 236-238.

238 : Note the balanced aliteration in *malitia, miseria, merx, mala.* For the distribution of the speaking roles, v.s. ad 236-238.

239 - 243 : Given our reading of the lines 236-238 above (v.s. ad loc.), the best allocation of these lines would be that printed by Jacobus Operarius:

239 : SO. quid est quod metuas? PA. idem istuc quod tu. SO. dic ergo, <quid est?>.

240 : PA. ne hoc cuiquam homini dicerem, omnes muti ut loquerentur prius.

241 : SO. edictum est magno opere mihi, ne cuiquam hoc homini crederem,

242 : omnes muti ut loquerentur prius hoc quam ego. at tu hoc face,

243 : fide data credamus. PA. novi: omnes sunt lenae levifidae.

The only fault of this text is the fact that the beginning of Paegnium's part at the end of 239 in response to *dic ergo, quid est* is not restored (e.g., Ritschl's *edictumst mihi*). Most other texts (Lindsay, Woytek, de Melo) invert all of the parts in 239, 240, and 241, and give Sophoclidisca *at tu hoc face, fide data credamus* in 242-243. In our reading Sophoclidisca's question *quid est quod metuas?* naturally follows up and continues her seductive remark in 238 ("you're a bad little thing"). After that, the allocation of the rest of the line and the following two lines makes little difference since the two characters say almost the same thing, and there is no good evidence in the text for who should say 240 and who should reply in 241-242. All agree, however, that

Sophoclidisca must say *at tu hoc face, fide data credamus,* and that Paegnium replies, *novi: omnes sunt lenae levifidae*.

239 : The end of this line has been variously restored in accordance with the attribution of the speaking parts, none of which seriously alter the meaning of the line. Both Woytek and de Melo's Loeb place a period and change the speaker after *dic ergo* and print Ritschl's conjecture *edictumst mihi* to be understood with the following line.

240 : ne hoc quoiquam homini edicerem : Dependent on whatever is restored at the end of line 239 (e.g., Ritschl's *edictumst mihi*). — **omnes muti ut loquerentur prius :** probably also dependent on the restored verb of 239, reflecting the content of the command which was given. The direct form would have been *noli edicere, prius*[*quam dicas*] *loquantur omnes muti.*

241 - 242 : These lines repeat almost exactly the previous statement.

243 : fide data credamus : "Let's make a promise and entrust [the information to one another]." — **novi: omnes sunt lenae levifidae :** Parataxis for hypotaxis, as often in Plautus and in colloquial registers of all languages generally. — **levifidae :** The only attestation of this word. Some older editors emend to the ablative *levi fide*.

244 : tippulae : Festus describes the *tippula* as "bestiolae genus sex pedes habentis, send tantae levitatis ut super aquam currens non desidat." This waterbug, then, is something proverbially

light. — **fides lenonia :** i.e., fides lenonis, an expression somewhat similar to Sallust's *punica fides*.

245 : One wonders, based on the presentation of the characters so far, if the speaking parts in this line should be inverted, so that the exchange would look something like this:

> PA: Tell me, I'll love you (i.e., please)! SO. Tell me, (*in a seductive voice, perhaps while moving closer to Paegnium*) I'll love you! PA: I don't want you to love me. SO. You're obtaining that easily.

The traditional reading makes better sense of the words *facile impetras*, which seem fitting in Paegnium's mouth, but less sense of the words *nolo ames*, which seem almost impossible in Sophoclidisca's mouth, unless she here has had a sudden change of heart and has given up her attempt to seduce Paegnium. This is, of course, a possibility worth considering, and it could be made believable by the movements of the actors on stage (if, for example, Paegnium has become more aggressive in physically restraining Sophoclidisca, so that Sophoclidisca becomes uncomfortable and is forced to admits here that she never wanted to sleep with him in the first place and was only seducing him to try to get some information out him). The inversion of the speaking roles, however, makes better sense of *nolo ames* by giving it to Paegnium, who has all this time been resisting Sophoclidisca's advances. The words *facile impetras* would in this reading be said somewhat resignedly by Sophoclidisca, calling attention to how well Paegnium is resisting her enticements. If one switches the speaking roles in this line , Sophoclidisca must continue speaking from the end of 245 into 246 (*tecum habito*). This is not impossible, however, and it produces a nice change in rhythm, with Paegnium starting the exchange in 245 and

Sophoclidisca taking the lead at the beginning of 246. Neither interpretation, however, is without difficulties. — **dic amabo :** The form *amabo* is frozen and grammaticalized expression meaning 'please,' common enough in Plautus, but not as common as other ways of saying please (esp. *quaeso, obsecro, sis, sultis*). — **nolo ames :** i.e., *nolo ut ames*. This response deliberately takes the word *amabo* literally, when in reality it had lost much of the meaning 'love.' This is a strategy (i.e., deliberately twisting the meaning of Sophoclidisca's words) that Paegnium had used earlier.

246 : tecum habeto # et tu hoc taceto : Note the homoioteleuton of the response (*-eto, -eto*) and how the words *et tu hoc taceto* rearrange the consonant sounds of the first part (*tecum habeto # et tu hoc taceto*). — **et tu hoc taceto # tacitum erit :** The future infinitive (*taceto*) is repeated in the future perfect passive: "Do it!" "It will be done." The repetition of the verb means that the consonant sounds *t* and *c* also continue to repeat. — **celabitur :** Note again the continued repetition of the sounds *t* and *c,* as well as the syllable *-bi-* which looks back to the *-be-* in the *habeto* of the first part of the line.

247 : Sophoclidisca and Toxilus finally reveal their respective charges. We can imagine that between 246 and 247 the actors make some sign of peace or agreement on stage (such as a handshake or the like). — **Toxilo has fero tabellas ero tuo :** Note the natural chiastic organization of the idea: ABCBA. The two most important word of the sentence (*Toxilo, tabellas*) are placed in the first positions of each half of the chiasmus. Note also the alliteration and repetition of sounds: *Toxilo has fero tabellas ero tuo.* — **abi, eccillum domi :** For the form

eccillum (*ecce illum*), cf. ad 83 : eccum. It stands in the accusative here, and we must understand a verb like *offendes* ('you'll find him'), etc. This form is the origin of the demonstrative pronoun *quello* in Italian.

248 : The homoioteleuton in *Lemniselenem tuam eram obsignatam abietem* is nothing to extraordinary for Plautus but would be avoided in most circumstances in Classical Latin. — **hanc obsignatam abietem :** "This sealed fir-wood." The word *abies* refers to the fir tree and to the wood which comes from it. This is one of the only instances where it is used by metonymy for *tabellae.* This is a very common type of metonymy (i.e., to refer to writing with the name of a type of wood) across languages. Much the same thing has happened in German and English with the words 'book' and 'Buch' (='beech' and 'Buche').

249 : quid istic scriptum? : "What's written in there?" — **iuxta tecum, si tu nescis, nescio :** "I don't know any more than you do." This is said perhaps because they are both illiterate, or perhaps merely to emphasize the fact that Paegnium does not know the contents of the letter any more than Sophoclidisca does. — **iuxta tecum :** In Old Latin *iuxta* is always and adverb and never used as a preposition. The word is used only five other times in Plautus and is joined with *cum* in every instance. Woytek glosses "una tecum nescio"; Ammendola, "pariter ac tu."

250 : nisi fortasse blanda verba : "nihil aliud hic scriptum est nisi fortasse blanda verba" (Ammendola). — **abeo :** Present for future, as is particularly common with verbs of motion in colloquial registers. — **et ego abiero :** The future perfect here differs little in meaning

from *abeo*. The difference can almost be captured by the translation "I'm going" for *abeo* and "I'm gone" for *abiero*.

251 - 271 : Since the opening of the second act at 168, and especially during the long exchange between Sophoclidisca and Paegnium, not much has happened to advance the plot. Now Sagaristio appears on stage and the main plot of the play begins to unfold. Sagaristio sings a song to thank Jupiter that he has come into a large sum of money which his master has entrusted to him to buy some oxen. Sagaristio, however, plans to steal this money from his master and give it to Toxilus so that he can buy the freedom of Lemniselenis. Sagaristio realizes that he will be severely punished by his master. For this reason, in order to pay back his friend, Toxilus follows through with his plan to deceive the pimp and cheat him out of money with Saturio and his daughter. The strength of the friendship between Toxilus and Sagaristio is apparent throughout the play.

251 : Iovi opulento incluto Ope gnato : Note the preponderance of back vowels (*o, u*) and the homoioteleuton in *opuleunto incluto gnato*, both of which serve to heighten the solemnity of the prayer. — **Iovi opulento…Ope gnato :** Saturn and Ops (=Rhea), the earth-goddess of plenty and bounty, are the parents of Jupiter. In giving thanks for the wealth (*opes*) which makes it possible to offer help (*opem*) to Toxilus, the words *opulentus* and *Ope gnato* are particularly fitting.

252 : valido, viripotenti : The tendency in Old Latin for alliteration is particularly apparent in prayers, as above in 251 and below in 253 (*copias commodanti*). — **viripotenti :** *vīripotenti*

(‘powerful in strength’) not *viripotenti* (‘fit for a man, husband’). This compound occurs only here.

253 : opes, spes bonas, copias : Note the balanced homoioteleuton: *-es, -es, -as, -as.* The words *opes* and *copiae* (**co-opia*) are etymologically related, although one wonders if this relationship would have been felt by Plautus or his audience. They are, however, also joined at Rud. 664. The words *opes* and *spes* also are joined together at Amph. 1053, Cap. 445, and elsewhere.

254 : There is some text missing from this line in which, to judge from the plural verb which follows in 256 (*danunt*), Sagaristio probably names some other gods. No suggestion to fill the lacuna is adequate, although Ussing’s *disque omnibus ago gratias* is probably not too far off from the sense of the missing words. — **vitulor :** This rare and preclassical word means something like “to be happy, to celebrate, to sing joyfully of.” The etymology is uncertain, although it may bear some relation to Grk. εὐοῖ.

255 : amico amiciter … commoditatis copiam : Note that each half of the line is composed of an alliterating unit. — **amico amiciter :** cf. Merc. 499 *amice amico operam dedi.* The doubling of the word *amicus* is common enough, as in Curc. 332, Merc. 385, 887, and others. The use of the suffix *-iter* to make adverbs from thematic adjectives is found at all periods of Latin, but is especially common in Early Latin and especially rare in Classcial Latin. — **commoditatis copiam :** “A supply, abundance of convenience.” Note that these words correspond very closely with *copias commoditanti* above in 253.

256 : danunt : This form (=*dant*) appears 12 or 13 times in Plautus and is formed by adding the ending *-nont(ur)/-nunt(ur)* to the thematic vowel of the verb. The form *danunt* is the only form of this type to appear more than once in Old Latin. Weiss theorizes that the form was created by analogy with the verb *sino* (which has a similar meaning): *situs* : *sinunt* :: *datus* : *danunt* (Weiss 386). — **ut afferam :** Either an explanatory clause in apposition to *hanc commoditatis copiam* (Woytek), or final clause. — **egenti :** This echoes Toxilus' description of himself in the first line of the play (*qui amans egens*).

257 : magis : "Alterum comparationis membrum ἀνακολούθως omissum est," (Ussing). Lambinus suggests "quam me esse regem Persarum" to fill in the sense. Perhaps in his excitement for his friend Sagaristio skips ahead to explain what has happened without finishing his thought. — **somniabam neque opinabar nec censebam :** The tricolon increases suspense.

258 : eam fore mihi occasionem : The accusative-infinitive clause is in apposition to the *quod* of the preceding line. — **ea nunc quasi decidit de caelo :** A similar expression is used in many languages to talk about an unexpected event.

259 : domitos boves : i.e., oxen for plowing. — **sibi :** Indirect reflexive, referring, of course, to the subject of the main clause. More usually a demonstrative adjective is used in this context (*ei, illi, huic*).

260 : dieseptumei : = *dieseptumi* = *die septimo,* "on the seventh day, in a week." The form *septumei/septumi* is a locative, like *postri-die,* etc.

261 : stultus, qui hoc mi daret argentum : The relative clause is causal, explaining *stultus* (*est*). — **quoius ingenium noverat :** Woytek claims that the clause is a rare example of the indicative in a relative clause with concessive force ("although he knew"). This interpretation, however, seems forced, especially since a statement of fact works just as well here: "he's stupid because he gave money to me, whose character he knew."

262 : nam hoc argentum alibi abutar : The verb *abuti* is used almost always with the accusative in Old Latin and only later begins to be used with the ablative in Classical Latin (Bennett 2, 208). That this is the result of the influence of the synonym *consumere* (Woytek) seems unlikely. Rather it is likely a result of the common occurrence in Latin that intransitive verbs become transitive and take the accusative when compound with prepositions, like *adire, adloqui, congredi* (Woodcock 18 i). In Classical Latin the use with the ablative was "restored" by analogy with *uti,* which was always joined with an instrumental ablative. — **boves quos emerem non erant :** "There were no cows that I could buy." Sagaristio imagines what excuse he will give to his master when he returns empty-handed. The direct statement (instead of something like *dicam non fuisse etc.*) adds vividness.

263 : amico prosperabo : i.e., prosperitatem afferam amico (Lambinus). The verb is not common in prose. — **genio meo multa bona faciam :** i.e., et animo meo obsequar, et genio meo indulgebo (Lambinus). Compare the use of *genius* in the phrase *sapis multum ad genium* (108).

264 : diu quo bene erit, die uno absolvam : "I will spend up in one day that by which I will be happy for a long time." Note the artfulness of the repetition of nearly the same sound in the antithesis *diu…die uno*. — **diu quo bene erit :** sc. mihi. — **tuxtax tergo erit meo :** To capture the onomatopoeia, de Melo translates, "It'll be swish-swash for my back." — **non curo :** Adversative asyndeton.

265 : nunc amico hominibus domitis mea ex crumina largiar : A difficult and corrupt line. The line should obviously mean "Now I'm going to give my friend some help at my expense with the oxen (*domitis* almost certain refers to oxen, cf. 259)." Lindsay's reading (P) makes little sense. Many critics have tried to make sense of the line, but Woytek, who follows Sonnenschein's reading, produces the best reading: *nunc amico homini hibus domitis.* The word *hibus* is a rare form of the dative/ablative from *hic haec hoc* (like *ibus* from *is ea id*, cf. Weiss 344). If this conjecture is right, then the fact that the line was corrupted and misunderstood makes sense, given the unusualness of the form. The use of the dative and the ablative with *largiri* is difficult (which is normally used with the dative and the accusative). One can explain it as an ablative of means borrowed from constructions like *donare aliquem aliquo,* and one can compare Pseud. 395-6: *postquam erili filio largitu's dictis dapsilis,* where *dapsilis* is a thematic ablative with *dictis* for *dapsilibus.* — **ex crumina :** "From my purse." The word is common

enough in Plautus but occurs relatively infrequently in later authors. *crumīna* is sometimes written *crumēna.*

266 : nam id demum lepidum est : Sagaristio gives another reason for his action: deceiving greedy, old, rich men is just pleasurable in and of itself. — **triparcos :** The word is a hapax, built on Greek models like τρισμέγιστος, τρίσμακαρ, τρισάθλιος, an others. Elsewhere Plautus has *trifur, trifurcifer,* and *trivenefica.* The attachment of numerals to nouns and adjectives to make a quasi-superlative form is common in the colloquial register of many languages (cf. Modern Greek πεντακάθαρος, etc.).

267 : bene admordere : "Get a good bite out of." This verb is used in the same sense and context at Pseud. 1125: *scortum quaerit, habet argnetum, iam admordere hunc mihi lubet*. — **qui salinum servo obsignant cum sale :** "qui etiam salem servis praeparce et maligne praebent… quod est obsonium vilissimum," (Lambinus). "salem, rem et parvi pretii et omnino necessarium [sic], avari homines, ne servi plus iusto utantur, claudunt et obsignant," (Ussing). — **salinum cum sale :** Woytek helpfully offers the comparisons: Cap. 914: *cum carne carnarium*; Cist. 655f: *cistella cum crepundiis*; Men. 702 *marsuppium cum argento*; Stich. 647: *cadum cum vino.*

268 - 268^{a} : virtus est, ubi occasio ammonet, dispicere : Lambinus offers two interpretations of this line: (1) *dispicere* is the subject infinitive and we must understand *dispicere* to means something "videre quid opus sit facto"; (2) *dispicere* is dependent on ammonet and something like "eam [i.e., occasionem] non praetermittere" as the subject of *est*. Both interpretations

produce approximately the same sense, and something must be understood or supplied in both cases. — **quid faciet mihi? :** The subject is Sagaristio's master.

269 : verberibus caedi iusserit : "He will order for me (sc. *me*) to be beaten with lashings." — **iusserit :** The future perfect *iusserit* differs little in meaning from the future *iubebit,* except perhaps to emphasize the simple (non-continuous) aspect of the action. — **compedes impingi :** "and for shackles to be thrown on" — **vapulet :** As the text stands, this must mean "Let *him* (i.e., my master) get a beating." In this respect, Festus' remark is helpful: *vapula tum dici solitum, quum vellent minantibus significare se eos neglegere et non curare.* The word has been corrected to *vapulem* by many editors, giving the sense "Let him beat me, I don't care!" This reading is worth considering, and the following lines seem to make better sense with *vapulem*, but it is not printed in any recent edition.

270 : ne sibi me credat supplicem fore: vae illi! : "So that he won't believe that I will supplicate him. Woe to him!" The first part of this line seems to follow better from *vapulem* than from *vapulet*: "Let me beat me, I'm not going to beg [for forgiveness]!" With this interpretation, the *vae illi* would then mean "much the worse for him [since he'll be wasting his time and energy in beating me]!" Otherwise, *vae illi* must have a similar meaning to Festus' understanding of *vapulet* above (Woytek). This seems worse.

270 - 271 : nil iam mi novi offerre potest quin sim peritus : “mihi nihil obvenire potest, quin sim expertus. assuefactus sum verberibus et plagis, et in eis exercitatus.” Once again, this remark seems to follow better from *vapulem* than *vapulet.*

272 - 301 : This exchange between Paegnium and Sagaristio does nothing to advance the plot of the play, but is rather a comic interlude. As in the above exchange between Paegnium and Sophoclidisca (200-250), which also did little to advance the plot, the focus here is on Paegnium’s insolence.

272 : pensum meum quod datum est confeci : i.e., he delivered Toxilus’ letter to Lemniselenis.

273 : emere oportet, quem tibi oboedire velis : “You need to buy him whom you’d like to obey you.” For the sentiment, cf. Trin. 1061: *emere meliust quoi imperes*. The remark in the Trin., as one would expect, is said by slave to a free man who is not his master; The unexpected context of Paegnium’s comment here, pronounced by a slave and directed to another slave, calls attention to the topsy-turvy character roles in the inverted fictional world of the *Persa*.

274 : exhibeas molestiam, ut opinor, si quid debeam : “You would be really annoying, I think, if I should owe you anything.” The future less vivid conditional and the present contrafactual conditional are logically very close to one another, and there are many instances in Old Latin where two present subjunctives must have contrafactual meaning (although the reverse rarely happens, if ever). This sentence, however, could refer to both the present and the future, and it is

up to the reader to decide. — **exhibeas molestiam :** The phrase *exhibere molestiam* is found also at Capt. 817, three times in Cicero's letters, and once in Seneca's letters.

275 : qui nunc sic tamen es molestus : "you who are now [although I don't owe you anything] nevertheless (*tamen*) are being such a pain." The meaning of *tamen* is better understood by supplying the implied concessive clause (Lambinus writes, "cum tibi nihil debeam"). — **scelerate, etiam respicis :** From this remark (and from Sagaristio's preceding commands *mane* and *asta*), we can imagine that Paegnium has turned and begun to hastily make his exit at 272 when he says *nunc domum propero*. During the exchange from 272 to 275, it is likely that Paegnium never turns to fully face Sagaristo, but continues to move offstage. His lines in 273, 274, and 275 are all directed more towards the audience than to Sagaristio.

276 : scio ego quid sim aetatis : The use of the partitive genitive *aetatis* with neuter pronouns (quid, aliquid, id, hoc, illud, etc.) is a favorite expression of Plautus that comes up a handful of times in Cicero as well. For a full list of these types of expressions, see Bennett 2, 24-35. — **eo istuc maledictum impune auferes :** "That's why (*eo*) you'll get away with (lit., carry off) this slander of yours with impunity." Paegnium says that he would return Sagaristio's insult (*scelerate*), if he were not Sagaristio's junior.

277 : ubi Toxilust tuos erus? : Sagarisito has finally gotten Paegnium's attention and poses this question. — **ubi illi lubet :** Paegnium's manner of refusing to give decisive answers by repeating some aspect of the question (here, *ubi*) is known to the audience from his above exchange with

Sophoclidisca. — **nec te consulit :** "And he doesn't ask you, i.e., he doesn't need to report to you."

277[b] - 278 : etiam dicis? : The use of *etiam* in a question turns the question almost into an imperative. cf. above: 152, 275, and below 413, 542.

278 : venefice : Sagaristio hurls his second insult. The world *veneficus* ('poisoner, wizard') is common in Plautus and in Classical Latin.

279 : ulmitriba : Paegnium has up until this point held himself back from verbal abuse, but after Sagaristio's insistence and two insults (*scelerate, venefice*), he is unable to further resist his natural inclination to invective. The word is attested only here, and is a tatpurusha compound of *ulmus* (elm tree) and a nominal derivative of the Greek verb τρίβειν ('pound, rub, wear out/ away'), so *ulmitriba* = 'one who wears out elm trees, one who is always beaten with elm rods."

280 : male dicis maiori : Lindsay, de Melo, and older editions punctuate with a period, but Ammendola and Woytek punctuate with a question mark, following the Goetz-Schoell text. The question mark is to be preferred as it better captures Sagaristio's incredulity in the face of Paegnium's insolence. Note the alliteration, which Paegnium is about to outdo. — **prior promeritus perpetiare :** "Having deserved it [my abuse] by being first, you ought to endure it," i.e., "you started it, so deal with it!" Note how thoroughly Paegnium one-ups Sagaristio's alliteration by increasing the number of sounds repeated and by adding to his alliteration on *p* the

recurring word-internal sound *r*: *prior promeritus perpetiare*. The verb *promerere* is often used as a deponent.

280[a] : servam operam, linguam liberam : As if the alliteration in 280, we have here another alliterative pair (*linguam liberam*) and the alternating repeating endings *-vam, -ram, -uam, -ram,* all arranged in a chiasmus. It is as if Paegnium is using this display of rhetorical skill to avoid answering Sagaristio's questions.

281 : dicisne mi ubi sit Toxilus? : Sagaristio repeats the question for the third time, after which both characters lose their patience and the verbal fireworks really get going. — **dico ut perpetuo pereas :** Once again, Paegnium repeats a part of Sagaristio's question in his answer (*dico*) but finishes it in an unexpected way. Note that Paegnium continues the alliteration on *p* and the repetition of *r* which he began in 280. — **ut perpetuo pereas :** Indirect command.

282 : caedere hodie tu restibus : "You'll be beaten with ropes today." — **tua quidem, cucule, caussa! :** Note the continued alliteration: *tua quidem, cucule, caussa!* Woytek alone punctuates this remark as a question, which is likely wrong. — **cucule :** "homo ignave" (Lambinus). Literally, the word means "cuckoo," with which it is likely cognate. It is hard to say whether the IE words for "cuckoo" (Skt. *kokila,* Grk. κόκκυξ, and others) are all cognate with one another or all whether some of them developed independently because of onomatopoeia. **— caussa :** The decision to print *causa* or *caussa* is largely editorial, yet we know that the word must have been pronounced with a double consonant, since a single *s* would have been rhotacized.

283 : si os perciderim tibi : The literal meaning ("I'll break your jaw") and the obscene meaning (referring to forceful oral sex) are present, but the latter would have been reinforced by some lewd movements of Paegnium's hips on stage. One even wonders if the first scenario (involving fists) would have occurred to anyone in the audience. — **metuam, morticinie :** Paegnium closes this line with alliteration as well. — **morticine :** "you cadaver!" The word is an adjective derived from *mors.* It normally refers to the rotting flesh of animals.

284 : video ego te: iam incubitatus es : "I see you, you've already been sat on multiple times." The frequentative verb *incubitare* dervives from *incubare* "to sit on (like a hen on eggs)." This passage seems to be the only instance of the verb being used in an obscene sense. Here, Sagaristio accuses Paegnium of already having played the passive role in a sexual encounter today.

285 : at non sum, ita ut tu, gratiis : "But unlike you I didn't do it for free." Paegnium admits to Sagaristio's accusation, but turns it back around on him: Paegnium claims at least to have received some sort of renumeration for his service. Lambinus's paraphrase is nice: "attamen non sum gratis stupratus, ut tu, qui te constuprandum gratis praebes, quia deformis es." — **gratiis :** This adverbial form ("for free," lit., "out of courtesy or favor") is always trisyllabic in Old Latin, but the popular pronunciation was later disyllabic (*gratīs*), which is the form and pronunciation with which the word entered many Western European languages. — **confidens :** "How brazen of you." — **sum hercle vero :** Paegnium's response plays off the fact that the word *confidens* can

have both positive and negative connotations. This habit of turning his interlocutor's words on their head is already very familiar to the audience.

286 : nam ego me confido liberum fore, tu te numquam speras : sc. liberum fore. Paegnium here seems to suggest that he can use his good looks to save up enough money to buy his freedom, which Sagaristio cannot hope for. See the above note about the problem of the allocation of speakers in 229-231 for more about this idea.

287 : potin ut molestus ne sies? : A rather common expression of impatience or resentment in Plautus, occurring also at Cist. 465, Epid. 63, and Men. 627. — **molestus ne sies # quod dicis facere non quis:** At 275 it was Paegnium who used this language of Sagaristio (*exhibeas molestiam*), and now Paegnium reminds him of it: "you can't do yourself what your saying, i.e., not be a pain)." Not that end of the Paegnium's line rhymes with Sagaristio's: *ne sies, non quis*.

288 : abi in malam rem : "Go to hell!" The phrase occurs four other times in Plautus, once in Terence, and no where else in Latin. It is certainly a reference to torture or a beating generally. — **at tu domum :** sc. abi. Once again, Paegnium responds with an unexpected and zeugmatic twist: *abi in malam rem* is a frozen curse, yet Paegnium picks up on the verb of motion (*abire*) and uses it in a different context. — **nam ibi tibi parata praesto est : "**Because it's [sc. *mala res*] ready and waiting for you there." Note the alliteration on *p* and the sonic effect of *ibi tibi* and *praestost*.

289 : vadatur hic me : The verb *vadari* means to force someone to appear in court by means of bail. With the simplest interpretation, going to court is being used as a metaphor for being punished. — **utinam vades desint, in carcere ut sis :** Paegnium's response is again unexpected, since he takes Sagaristio's words literally: "Would that you not have witnesses, so that you'll be in jail."

290 : quid hoc? : "What did you just say?!" — **quid est? :** "What of it?" — **etiam, scelus, male loquere? :** "You're still insulting me?" This makes the most sense if one understands Sagaristio's *quid hoc*? as the indignant lead-up to this question. Maybe one can even imagine that Sagaristio is so mad that he can barely speak, and Paegnium's *quid est?* eggs him on.

290 - 291 : tandem ut liceat, quom servos sis, servom tibi male dicere : "let it be permitted for a slave to insult you, since you are a slave." The subjunctive is jussive, which is sometimes used with *ut*. Alternatively, one may understand *permitte* (Lambinus) or *fac* (Ammendola) as introducing the *ut* clause. — **servos sis, servom :** Note the hissing affect of the repetition of *s* and the five heavy syllables in the middle of the line, which Paegnium uses to add emphasis to his words.

291 - 292 : specta quid dedero : Sagaristio is furious and threatens Paegnium with a beating: "haec dicuntur a Sagaristione cum gestu et vultu minantis et fortassis pugnum intentantis." The future perfect *dedero* is used to emphasize the simple aspect of Paegnium's beating.

292 : nil, nam nil habes : "You're not going to give me anything, because you don't have anything." Paegnium again, as is his wont, deliberately misinterprets Sagaristio's words as if Sagaristio were saying that he would give Paegnium some sort of gift. There is also the possibility of understanding Sagaristio's *specta quid dedero* as a sexual threat, akin to Paegnium's previous threat *si os perciderim tibi* (283, v. ad loc.). In this case Paegnium's response *nam nil habes* would additionally be an affront to Sagaristio's potency. — **di deaeque me omnes perdant :** Sagaristio would have continued with a *si* or *nisi* clause if Paegnium had not interrupted him: "I'll be damned if…"

293 : amicus sum, eveniant volo tibi quae optas : "I'm your friend, I want what you want to happen to you [i.e., that you be damned]," sc. ut di te perdant. Paegnium is really good at this game of quickly reinterpreting what his interlocutors say, as is a good *servus callidus.* Here the verb *velle* is used with the subjunctive (with ellipsis of *ut*), as happens most of the time when the subject of the main verb and the subject of the subordinate verb are different. The reason that *optas* is indicative and not subjunctive (as one would expect in a subordinate clause after *eveniant*) is because Paegnium is talking about something specific: "I want what you're wishing for right now [that you be damned] to happen."

293 - 294 : atque id fiat, nisi te hodie, si prehendero, defigam in terram colaphis : "And so be it, if I don't, if I catch you, fix you into the ground with punches." And so Sagaristio continues from where he was interrupted. *atque id fiat* picks up and repeats the idea of *di me omnes perdant* (292), which is followed by *nisi difigam*. The future perfect *prehendero* is used to

emphasize the aspect. The word *colaphus* is Greek (κόλαφος, from κολάπτειν), although it is found much more commonly in Latin than in Greek. Perhaps the foreign-sounding word added some gravity to Sagaristio's threat.

295 : tun me defigas? : "*You* fix *me*?!" The verb is subjunctive because Paegnium is quoting/ repeating Sagaristio's words with contempt and incredulousness. The subjunctive does not depend on anything, and therefore there is no need for an elaborate periphrasis like "tun fieri potest ut me defigas?" (Ammendola). — **te cruci ipsum adfigent propediem alii :** "Soon others will fix you up on a cross." The word *propediem* ("soon," from *prope* and *dies,* lit., "[on a day] near to today") is present in comedy and is used a few times in Cicero's dialogues, but it is extremely common in Cicero's letters and is a favorite word of Livy. Otherwise it is not found elsewhere, suggesting that the word was a part of the colloquial register which Livy just happened to enjoy using. — **adfigent :** Note the difference in force between *adfigere* and Sagaristio's *defigere* (294).

296 : qui : This is *quī*, the old intrusmental/ablative. It is used occasionally to introduce wishes in Old Latin. — **qui te di deaeque :** Sagaristio wants to curse Paegnium again, but leaves off the last word (*perdant*) and holds his tongue. It is possible that Sagaristio is merely better able to restrain himself from engaging in invective, or perhaps he is simply unable to keep up with the pointed wit of Paegnium. It may very well be a combination of the two, but the actor could play up the latter to greater comic effect. — **hinc porro :** This slightly pleonastic phrase is used one other time in Plautus, thrice in Lucretius, and once in Vergil. Terence also has *dehinc porro* once.

296 - 297 : scis quid hinc porro dicturus fuerim, ni linguae moderari queam : This is cited as the first instance in the history of Latin of the future active participle plus the perfect subjunctive (*dicturus fuerim*). In Classical Latin this form is reserved for when the apodosis of a contrafactual conditional statement (both present and past, primary and secondary sequence) is in some sort of dependent clause, such as an indirect question (as here), a result clause, or a clause introduced by *quin*. Additionally the form in *-urus fuerim* may be exchanged for the form in *-urus fuissem* with no change in meaning when the apodosis is in an indirect question, regardless of sequence. For more information and examples of this construction, see Bennett's Latin Grammar, 210-211. In this line, we have a present contrafactual conditional statement (using, as often, the present instead of the imperfect subjunctive) which has been subordinated in an indirect question. The direct statement would have been *dicam ni queam* (= *dicerem ni possem*) or *dixissem ni queam* (= *dixissem ni possem*). The closest parallel in Old Latin may be Cist. 3-5: *soror si mea esses, qui magis potueritis mi honorem ire habitum, nescio.* Here the perfect subjunctive *potueritis* replaces the expected pluperfect subjunctive of the apodosis (i.e., *potuissetis*) because it is subordinated in the indirection quesion *nescio qui* (= *ut*). The perfect subjunctive of *posse* is used in this construction even in Classical Latin because *posse* lacks a future participle and the form *futurus fuerim ut possem* fortunately never caught on.

297 : potin abeas? : For the use of *potis* with the subjunctive instead of the infinitive, v.s. ad 175 : potin ut taceas? — **abigis facile :** "you're driving me away easily," i.e., "you're making it easy for me to leave by being so annoying."

298 : nam umbra mea hic intus vapulat : "because my shadow is being beaten here inside." The expression is practically without parallel and difficult to understand. It likely means, "I'm going to be beaten so badly that even my shadow will feel it," but it may also have the additional meaning, "they are so mad that they have begun beating my shadow in my absence." Paegnium says this as he makes his exit. — **ut istunc di deaeque perdant! :** After Paegnium has left the stage, Sagaristio can no longer contain his anger and pronounces this curse, half to himself and half to the audience.

299 : proserpens bestia : Plautus uses this expression for 'snake' three other times, but also uses *anguis* and *excetra.* — **bilinguis :** The word literally means "having two tongues" and is at times used exactly as our "bilingual," but at other times it can mean "deceitful, false." The second meaning is the immediately obvious one in this passage, although it is impossible to imagine that Plautus (and even the audience as well) failed to feel the force of the first meaning as well, using the word almost ironically to describe a Greek slave in a Greek comedy speaking Latin on a stage in Rome.

300 : foris aperit : The entrance of a character is often announced by a character on stage with reference to the opening of or knocking on a door. — **eccere :** The etymology of this word is uncertain, but it is usually (and most convincingly) understood as *ecce* + *re* 'look here, in fact!' or *ecce* + *rem* 'look at this thing!' The use of *re* here could be comparable to the usage in expressions like *re ipsa, revera,* or *reapse.*

301 : egreditur intus : The adverb *intus* usually expresses place where, like its cognate ἐντός. However at times it use to express motion towards (instead of the expected *intro*) and motion away from (as here, where *intus* = ἔνδοθεν). This latter usage is mostly confined to comedy.

302 - 328 : Sagaristio remains on stage as Toxilus and Sophoclidisca enter from Toxilus' house. Toxilus and Sophoclidisca have a brief exchange before Sophoclidisca exits into the pimp Dordalus' house. Toxilus and Sagaristio remain on stage, and Sagaristio teases his friend before revealing that he has acquired the money to help procure Lemniselenis.

302 : paratum iam esse : The subject is the *unde* clause. — **dicito :** sc. Lemniseleni. — **unde argentum sit futurum :** Toxilus is referring of course to the plan that he has worked out with Saturio to use his daughter to trick the pimp.

303 : iubeto habere animum bonum : Toxilus used this phrase earlier of Lemniselenis at 166. On the expression v. ad loc. — **dic me illam amare multum :** "Tell her I love her a lot." There is likely very little difference in force between the future imperatives *dicito, iubeto* and *dic.*

304 : ubi se adiuvat, ibi me adiuvat : This has the ring of a proverb. cf. 'If you're happy, I'm happy'; 'Happy wife, happy life'.

305 : satin ea tenes? : The verb *tenere* here as often is used like our "got it?" — **magis calleo quam aprugnum callum callet :** lit., "I am more clever than a pig's skin is thick." The verb *callere* most often means "to be experience, skilled, clever," but its original meaning is "to have hard, calloused skin," derived from *callum,* which refers to thick animal skin. — **aprugnum** : An adjective derived from *aper*. — **callum callet :** figura etymologica.

306 : Sophoclidisca leaves after Toxilus' command *propera, abi domum*, and Sagaristio begins speaking his lines (306-307) while she is exiting and before Toxilus notices him on stage. — **nunc hiuc ego graphice facetus fiam :** "Now I'll be beautifully witty with him." The adverb *graphice* is used three other times in Plautus, twice of which are in the *Persa* (464, 843). The word is of course Greek, and originally means 'related to writing or painting, suited for writing or painting.' It is often joined with τέχνη (ἡ γραφικὴ τέχνη) to refer to the art of painting (Plato) and writing (later sources). In Latin the adjective is only rarely used to refer specifically to the arts of writing or painting and usually has the more general meaning 'fine, exquisite, masterly, as if painted.' Nevertheless the original, specific meaning of the word is still felt, and there is something metatheatrical or ekphrastic about calling the scenes in a play "like a painting, suited for writing" and the like.

307 : subnixis alis : "sublatis lacertis et manibus ad latus admotis atque acclinatis" (Lambinus), i.e., "with arms akimbo." — **me inferam :** "I'll present myself, come in." This phrase, along with *subnixis alis*, is a sign of pompousness on Sagaristio's part, cf. Mil. 1044-1045: *magnum me faciat # viden tu ignavum ut sese infert?* — **amicibor gloriose :** "I'll put my cloak on haughtily."

The verb, used properly of clothing which hangs from the upper body (unlike *induere* or the more general term *vestire*) is derived from *ambi-* and *iacere*, possibly a calque on Gk. ἀμφιβάλλειν. On the formation of the future of the fourth conjugation with the infix *-bi-,* v.s. ad 15 : adgredibor.

308 : ansatus : An adjective derived from *ansa* 'handle', likely cognate with Gk. ἡνία 'reins.' — **magnifice conscreabor :** "I'll clear my throat augustly." The verb is a hapax, although Plautus also has the verb *screare* 'to hawk.'

309 : quid agitur, ut valetur : On the impersonal passive use of *agere* in this context, v.s. ad 17. This is the only attested use of *valere* in the passive.

310 : ecquid, quod mandavi tibi, estne in te speculae? : There is no parallel for *ecquid* and *ne* together in the same question. The best explanation is that Toxilus starts his question twice. First, when he says *ecquid quod mandavi* we expect the main verb to be something like *fecisti.* Then he pauses momentarily and slightly changes the construction: "do I have any hope in you?" The understood antecedent of *quod,* then, would function as as an accusative of respect: "as for that which I…" So Lambinus: "non aliquid mihi spei parvulae est in te, quod attinet ad id, quod tibi mandavi?" — **speculae :** The word is *spēcula* (diminutive from *spēs*), not *specula* (from *specere*).

310 - 311 : adito. videbitur. factum volo. venito. promoneto : The future imperatives and the short, staccato clauses add to Sagaristio's solemn tone and are reminiscent of legal language. He is speaking to Toxilus as a Roman patron would speak to a client (Ammendola). — **videbitur :** "It will be seen to." Impersonal passive. — **factum volo :** This predicate use of the perfect participle is common with *dare, reddere, facere,* and (as here) *velle* and *cupire* (see Bennett 1, 437-440 for examples of this construction). Translate: "I want [to see] it done." — **venito. promoneto :** "Come here and remind me [what you want]." This again is reminiscent of the language of a patron and is probably better than the alternative reading *promoveto,* which simply repeats the idea of *venito*.

312 : quid hoc hic in collo tumet : For *quid est hoc quod*.... Sagaristio is apparently wearing his wallet around his neck. — **vomica est :** A boil, sore, ulcer, or tumor, from *vomere.* — **pressare parce :** "Don't press it!" *pressare* is a frequentative verb from *premere*. *parce* here is used like *noli* with the infinitive or *cave* with the subjunctive. Toxilus has obviously made a move to touch the swelling as or after he asks his question.

313 : ubi qui : Normally *qui = aliqui* only after *si, nisi, ne,* and *num.* Here the form can be explained because *ubi* comes close in meaning to *si.* cf. Asin. 209: *ubi quid dederam*; Trin. 256: *ubi qui eget*; and below 435, 595. — **mala manu :** "Not gently, with a rough, bad hand." — **dolores cooriuntur :** cf. Amph. 1092: *exorti dolores*; Stich. 165: *dolores mihi oboriuntur cotidie.*

314 : quando istaec innatast tibi : sc. vomica. The compound *innasci* is usually used metaphorically; here it is a vivid and fitting descriptions of the growth of a boil. — **secari iubeas :** "You should have it removed."

315 : metuo ne immaturam secem, ne exhibeat plus negoti : Both clauses are fear clauses, although the second is logically dependent on the first.

316 : inspicere morbum tuom lubet : "I'd like to see…" Toxilus makes another attempt to touch the bulge under Sagaristio's cloak.

316 - 317 abi atque cave sis a cornu : "Step back and please watch out for the horn." The joke is that Sagarisito talks as if he has actual oxen in his wallet, but it would be hard to believe that there is not some phallic joke here. — **sis :** A frozen expression (contraction of *si vis*) which means 'please.' On ways of saying 'please' in Plautus, v.s. ad 145. — **cave a :** 'be on guard against, watch out for.'

317 : quia boves bini hic sunt in crumina : "Because I've got a pair of oxen here in my wallet." If the reading *bini* is right, *boves bini* means 'a pair, a yoke of oxen.' This would surprisingly be the only attestation of exact phrase. If the conjecture *bimi* (from *bis-hiems*) is right, then 'two-year-old oxen.'

318 : emitte sodes, ne enices fame : "Let them out, please, so that you won't starve them to death" *sodes = si audes,* another colloquial expression meaning 'please.' The compound *enicare* is far more common in Plautus than the simple verb *necare*, which is used only 5 times. For the variation *enicare/enecare,* v.s. ad 48. — **sine ire pastum :** "Let them go graze." *pastum* is the accusative of the supine of *pasci.* Toxilus may have guessed that Sagaristio has acquired the money, or he may simply be trying to find out what ever it is that his friend is hiding from him.

319 : enim metuo : The placement of *enim* in the first position in a clause is confined almost exclusively to comedy. Here the logical (causal) connection to the preceding line is "(I'm not going to let them go graze) because I'm scared that…" — **reicere in bubile :** The *bubile* is a stall for oxen. Beside this passage, the word is found elsewhere only in technical texts. For *reicere* cf. Verg. Ec. 3.96: *Tityre, pascentis a flumine reice capellas*. — **ne vagentur :** Although this clause is logically dependent on *ut possim,* both are fear clauses dependent on *metuo*.

320 : ego reiciam. habe animum bonum : "I'll put them back, don't worry." Toxilus has by now figured out that his friend has found some cash and assures Sagaristio that he will pay him back. The phrase *habere animum bonum* seems to be one of Toxilus' favorites, cf. 166, 303. — **credetur, commodabo :** Sagaristio, realizing that Toxilus has seen through his game, gives up and now speaks directly about the money. *credetur* means something between "I trust you" and "it's a loan on credit," and likely both are understood. *commodare* is the standard word for loaning: "I'll lend it to you."

321 : sequere hac : sc. *via*. A favorite expression of Plautus and Terence, like our "right this way." The phrase might be something of a frozen expression that has lost much of its semantic value and which is used here to evoke the tone of a patron (as Sagaristio tries to do above),not having any weight as a stage direction. Alternatively, Sagaristio may actually lead Toxilus off to a corner of the stage so as to surreptitiously hand over the money to his friend. — **argentum hic inest :** Sagaristio displays and hands over the wallet. — **quod mecum dudum orasti :** The verb *orare* can take many constructions (infinitive, *ut/ne, aliquem, aliquid, aliquem aliquid, aliquid ab aliquo*). The construction with the accusative of the thing asked for and *cum* with ablative of the person asked occurs a few times in comedy and is otherwise rare.

323 : nunc mi Eretria erit haec tua domus : "Now your house here will be Eretria for me." This is another way of saying that Sagaristio will do for Toxilus what he was supposed to do in Eretria. Sagaristio maintains the official tone of a patron. — **nimis tu facete loqueres :** As if Toxilus had heard Sagaristio at 306: *nunc huic ego graphice facetus fiam*.

324 : omne argentum incolume redigam : "I'll drive all the money back to you whole." *incolume* is predicate and reinforces *omne*. The verb *redigere* is used instead of the more usual *reddere* perhaps as a joking reference back to the oxen that Sagaristio is supposed to purchase. — **actutum :** This is a favorite adverb of Plautus (70 occurances) which is not too common in other authors or periods. Plautus also likes the near synonyms *ilico* (82 times) and *extemplo* (54 times), and also occasionally uses *celeriter, confestim, protinus,* and *subito* in similar contexts.

325 - 326 : cf. 81-82.

325 : sycophantiis : “tricks.” Plautus is the only author to use this Greek word.

326 : tanto melior : Toxilus is the subject, sc. tu es.

327 : et mulier ut sit libera : The *ut* is an indirect question, parallel to the *quo pacto* clause above and continuing from where Toxilus left off before Sagaristio interrupted him with *tanto melior*. — **mulier :** i.e., Lemniselenis, not the daughter of Saturio.

328 : usus est : This expression is a favorite of Plautus and is not used in Classical Latin. It is synonymous with *opus est* and is also used with the ablative by analogy. — **utere ut vis :** “use me as you like.” cf. Aul. 142-143: *utere atque impera, si quid vis*.

329 - 399 : These lines present a conversation between the parasite Saturio and his daughter, who enter onto the stage shortly after Toxilus and Sagaristio exit to discuss their plans. Saturio’s daughter, who remains namesless throughout the play, distinguishes herself by her intelligence, her eloquence, and by her sense of honor. She is unwilling to participate in the shameless and possibly dangerous scheme of her father, but is ultimately forced to comply. Few if any other women in comedy are portrayed so nobly as Saturio’s daughter.

329 - 336 : Saturio's line have an exaggerated and somewhat solemn tone and are rhetorically polished, as one would expect in either a prayer or in formal instructions.

329 : quae res bene vortat : "And let this turn out well." This formula is common in Plautus. It is also found with the adverbs *male* and *recte* replacing *bene. quae* is a connecting relative, which lets the audience know that Saturio has just finished explaining his plan to his daughter offstage. — **mi et tibi et ventri meo :** A rising tricolon ending with the comical personification of Saturio's belly.

330 : perennitatique adeo huic : "And also for this perpetuity." If this reading is right (and some editors have proposed emendations), the abstract noun must mean something like "the perpetual continuation (of this supply of food)." — **perpetuo cibus :** The palimpsest has *perpetuo cibo*, which is a dative in apposition to *perennitati huic* which would explain the unusal expression. This reading makes fine sense and it is the reading which Woytek chooses to print. The nominiative *cibus* is Leo's conjecture. In this case *cibus* would be the subject of the verbs in the following line and *perpetuo* would be an adverb. This reading also produces decent sense.

331 : supersit, suppetat, superstitet : Another tricolon, with alliteration of *s* and the repetition of *p* and *t*. The words hardly differ in meaning, and any attempts to percisely distinguish the connotation of each are overly pedantic.

332 : cum dis volentibus : "With the favor of the gods." The only instance of this exact phrase, although Cato has *cum divis volentibus*. cf. Mil. 1351: *cum dis benevolentibus*.

333 : cui rei opera detur : The passive expression (*opera datur alicui rei*) is much less common than the active (*dare operam alicui rei*). Perhaps the use here is the result of Saturio's distant, formal tone. — **scis, tenes, intelligis :** Another rising tricolon, each member doubling the amount of syllables of the previous word. The accumulation of verbs of knowing or understand is reminiscent of 118, 176, and 186 above.

334 : communicavi tecum consilia omnia : The phrase *communicare consilia* is common in both Caesar and Livy. Saturio's tone is that of a person of power (general in the military, public magistrate) giving official orders.

335 : ea causa : "for this reason," a fairly common causal transition in comedy but not in other genres. — **ad hoc exemplum :** "in this way." This expression is uniquely Plautine. Other authors would write *hoc modo* or *ad hunc modum*. — **te exornavi :** "I've equipped you"; a reference to the play-within-the-play that is about to be produced; cf. Saturio's question at 159: *πόθεν ornamenta*?

336 : venibis tu hodie, virgo : The future tense, the emphatic use of the pronoun *tu*, and the melodramatic use of the vocative *virgo* to refer to his own daughter all contribute to the comical seriousness and fatality of Saturio's tone.

337 : quamquam libenter escis alienis studes : In this context one cannot help but think of the Latin proverb *plenus venter non studet libenter*, although this may well be anachronistic.

338 : tuin ventris causa filiam vendas tuam : Note the loose chiastic organization of the thought: *tui ventris…filiam…tuam*. The contrast between *tui* and *tuam* at the beginning and end of the clause heightens both the pathos and the ridiculousness of the situation. *vendas* is potential subjunctive.

339 : mirum quin : The use of a *quin* clause after *mirum* is uniquely Plautine. There are ten of these sentences in Plautus, and traditionally they are explained as a development from a paratactic expression where *quin* = "why not?" Frank Fowler ("The *Mirum Quid* Sentences", *CP* 7.3: 1912), however, argues convincingly that these sentences should be connected to *quin* clauses which are dependent on negative verbs/ideas of doubting or preventing. In his opinion, all of these *mirum quin* sentences should be punctuated with a question mark, and *mirum* should take on a negative meaning through irony or sarcasm, i.e., "Of course it's strange that…" sarcastically to mean "It's not strange at all that…" — **regis Philippi causa aut Attali :** Philip V of Macedon (r. 221-179) and Attalus I of Pergamon (r. 241-197). The idea is that Saturio is not engaging in this dangerous plan for anyone else's sake or for any greater purpose other than feeding his belly.

340 : mea : sc. causa. — **quae sis mea :** subjunctive either by attraction ("you who are mine") or in a causal relative clause ("since you are mine"). Note the emphatic repetition of *mea* ("you are *mine,* so of course I'm doing this for *my* sake").

341 : pro anicilla me habes : The phrase *pro aliquo aliquem habere* "to consider someone something/someone" is common in all periods of Latin.

342 : utrum : The *utrum* of 341 is the interrogative adverb which introduces alternate questions. This *utrum* is used as an indefinite relative (= *utrumcumque*) and is the subject of *videbitur.* The same variation can be seen above at 277: *ubi Toxilus est tuos erus? # ubi illi lubet* 'Where is Toxilus?' 'Wherever he likes.' — **magis in ventris rem :** "more useful for my stomach.' The use of *in rem* (wherein *res* means 'benefit, advantage') with either a genitive or a possessive adjective is largely confined to comedy.

343 : meum imperiumst in te, non in me tibi : Note the chiastic organization of the thought (*meum…in te…in me tibi*) and the variation between *meum* and *tibi*. Words like *imperium* and *ius* are frequently used with *in* plus the accusative to mean 'power over.' — **opino :** Normally deponent in Classical Latin, *opino* is sometimes found in Old Latin.

344 - 348 : Saturio's daughter offers a cool and philosophical response. Note the general tone of composure which is rhetorically underscored by the alliteration on *p* throughout these lines, as well as the alliteration on *m* and *v* in 346.

344 : tua istaec potestas est : “This is your power, you have the power to do this.” — **verum tamen :** Strongly adversative.

345 : pater : Woytek rightly notes that the vocative emphasizes the earnestness of her appeal. — **pauperculae :** The diminutive form at once evokes pity and reflects the delicateness of the virgo’s character as well as her desire to remain as uncritical of her father as possible.

346 : modice et modeste meliust vitam vivere : Note not only the two sets of alliteration but also the two figurae etymologicae (*modicus* and *modestus* both from *modus*; *vita* from *vivere*). The line has a proverbial ring to it. cf. Rus. бедность не порок.

347 : nam ad paupertatem si admigrant infamiae : “If bad repute accompanies (is added to, moves to, moves in with) poverty.” This is the only attested use of the compound *ad-migrare*.

348 : gravior paupertas fit, fides sublestior : “Poverty becomes more oppressive, credit becomes slighter.” Note the chiasmus. *fides* here is used here to mean both “trust” in the general sense and “credit” in the financial sense.

349 : enim vero odiosa es : “You’re really being a pain” — **non sum neque me esse arbitror :** “I’m not and I don’t think I am.”

350 : cum parva natu recte praecipio patri : "When, although I'm young, I'm rightly admonishing my father." The clause may be a rare instance of causal *cum* with the indicative (Ammendola), or it may just be temporal (i.e., "I don't think I'm a pain when I admonish…"). The adjective *parva* must be concessive. The use of the ablative of the supine of *nasci* with expressions of age is common ("in respect to birth"), although not particularly common with the adjective *parvus.* Note the alliteration on *p*.

351 : nam inimici famam non ita ut natast ferunt : lit., "Enemies don't relate (i.e., spread around) one's reputation like it came to be." i.e., even if Saturio and his daughter have good intentions, people will inevitably twist the story.

352 : ferant : "So be it! Let them say what they will." — **eantque maxumam malam crucem :** "And let them go be hanged!" The normal expression would be *i in malam crucem*, but the simple accusative of direction/destination is also used at Men. 328 and Poen. 799. The expression is combined with *maxumam* only here and at Cas. 611 and Poen. 347.

353 - 354 : "I don't consider any enmities more important than if an empty table should be set for me now."

353 : plure : Lindsay prints *plure* for the *pluris* of the manuscripts for the sake of the meter (on which see Woytek ad loc.). *pluris* (a predicate genitive of indefinite value with *existimo*) produces better Latin and is printed by Woytek and de Melo.

354 : quam … si : taken together, "than if." The unusual distance between the two words is explained by the emphatic prolepsis of the subject *mensa inanis*.

355 : hominum immortalis est infamia : This comically alters the epic concept of κλέος ἄφθιτον (Woytek). The genitive *hominum*, which is dependent on *infamia*, is placed first to be nicely juxtaposed with *immortalis*.

356 : One notes that the virgo continues to handle her situation with composure, offering philosophical musings on human nature in an attempt to dissuade her father from his intentions.

357 : quid? metuis ne te vendam? : Saturio of course fails to see his daughter's actual concerns.

358 : insimulari nolo : "I don't want to be charged falsely"; "suspicione carere volo, ne falso quidem argui volo" (Lambinus). — **at nequiquam nevis :** "but you don't want it in vain." The verb *nōlō* is a contraction not of **non-volō* but of **ne-volō* (**neu̯ol-* > **nou̯ol* > *nōl*), as can be seen here.

359 : meo modo istuc fiet potius quam tuo : *istuc* refers generally to the entire plan. Note how the possessive adjectives emphatically frame the entire line (*meo…tuo*).

360 : fiat : Woytek and de Melo print Palmer's emendation *atat*, which they give to the virgo (Palmer had given it to Saturio). The problem likely arose because the entire line was given to the virgo in earlier editions, and one needed to explain how *fiat* could stand right next to the question *quae hae res sunt?* The reading of the manuscripts, however, can stand if one gives the question *quae hae res sunt*? to Saturio. In this interpretation, the virgo would pronounce the word *fiat* in a resigned tone would show very visible signs of despair, prompting her father to snap out of his selfish thoughts of food for enough time to ask his daughter with compassion why she is so upset. — **cogita hoc verbum :** "Think about this saying." This use of the word *verbum* to mean "saying, expression" is almost nowhere to be found in Classical Latin.

361 - 363 : si minatus est … quanta afficitur miseria : The use of the perfect indicative in the subordinate clause and the present indicative in the main clause mirrors the so-called *cum* 'whenever' clause and has a generalizing, almost gnomic tone: "if a master has threatened (i.e., whenever a master threatens)…"

361 : Note the two pairs of alliteration (*minatus est malum, servo suo*) which adds to the aphoristic tone of the idea. — **malum :** as often, "a punishment, beating" (cf. 288: *abi in malam rem*).

362 : tam etsi : for *tamen etsi,* as often; 'although, even if, notwithstanding that.' — **id futurum non est :** The text is problematic, but this reading (that found in P and printed by Lindsay and de Melo) is to be preferred to *daturus non est,* which Woytek prints (following Ritschl). The entire

phrase means “even if it’s not going to happen (i.e., even if the master is not actually going to beat the slave).” — **ubi captum est flagrum :** “When the whip is taken (i.e., when the master picks up the whip).” For the perfect *captum est* in an aphoristic subordinate clause, see above ad. 361 - 363: si minatus est.

363 : dum tunicas ponit : The subject is now the slave, who is undressing in preparation for his beating. More usually the compound verb *deponere* is used. The plural *tunicas* is explained by de Melo as referring to both “his tunic and his undergarment.” This is likely correct (cf. Aul 637) and can be compared to our plurale tantum ‘clothes.’ — **quanta adficitur miseria ! :** The exclamation comes emphatically at the end of the idea.

364 : ego nunc quod futurum est formido tamen : The virgo now explains the parallel between her situation and the situation of the slave: “Now I’m still scared of what’s not going to happen.” The logical connection (“just like the slave, now I’m…”) must be supplied.

365 : virgo atque mulier nulla : i.e., “no female.” — **quin sit mala :** “who isn’t bad”; *quin* here for *quae non*.

366 : quae praeter sapit quam plact parentibus : “who is wiser beyond what is pleasing to her parents”; *quam* follows the comparative idea in the adverbial use of *praeter* (‘beyond’), whence *praeterquam* as one word.

367 : The virgo repeats Saturio's proposition only to turn it on its head in the following line. This is a colloquial rhetorical technique familiar in all languages.

368 : reticet : The simple verb *tacere* is much more common in Plautus and in all Latinity than *reticere*.

369 : malo cavere meliust te : lit., "It is better for you to be on guard against a beating." Saturio is fed up with his daughter's protests and threatens her. *cavere* with the simple ablative (instead of the ablative with *ab*) is largely confined to comedy.

369 - 370 : at si non licet cavere : sc. malo. The daughter does not realize that her father is threatening her and interprets *malo* not as a beating, but as moral or social disgrace.

370 : nam ego tibi cautum volo : i.e., *malum cautum esse.*

371 : malusne ego sum? : Saturio realizes that his daughter is taking about a different kind of *malum* and asks, "am I being wicked?" — **non es neque me dignumst dicere :** "No, you're not, and it's not fair for me to say so." *me* is not ablative with *dignum* but the accusative subject of *dicere*.

372 : verum ei rei operam do ne alii dicant quibus licet : "Rather I'm working at this, that others to whom it is permitted (to say so) don't say so)"; the *ne* clause is in apposition to *ei rei*.

373 : dicat quod quisque volt : Similar in sense to the beginning of 352. *quisque* is technically the subject of both *dicat* and *volt*, but whereas English prefers to place a common subject in the main clause ("let each say…"), Latin often prefers the reverse.

373 - 374 : ego de hac sententia non demovebor : As far as I can tell, the only other instances of this expression occur at Cic. *In Verrem* 1.1.52.9 and Cic. *Pro Sestio* 101.12. The *ego* is in emphatic contrast (adversative asyndeton) with the preceding *dicat*.

374 : meo si liceat modo : "If we could do things my way, lit., if it were permitted (to act) in my way." One must supply an infinitive like *facere* (Woytek) or better yet *fieri* (Ammendola) or *agere*.

374 - 375 : si liceat … facias : The conditional is either future-less-vivid or present contrafactual (with present and not imperfect subjunctives, as often in Plautus). Which force the audience would hear depends on the intonation of the actor: a future-less-vivid would have a slightly more hopeful tone (with the thought that the virgo might still have some chance of changing her father's mind); a present contrafactual would be implied by a slightly more desperate and resigned tone ("If we could do things my way, you'd act wisely [but I know that that's not going to happen]"). In this instance we can see why these two conditional sentences often overlap with one another: they both refer to remote possibilities or potentialities, with one being much more remote than the other.

375 : sapienter potius facias quam stulte : The emphatic words are placed in the first and final positions. — **lubet :** Saturio passes over whether he is acting wisely or stupidly and replies instead, "It's just pleasing to me like this."

376 : lubere tibi per me licere intelligo : "intelligo tibi licere per me facere, quidquid tibi libet" (Lambinus). Here *lubere* (subject infinitive of *licere*) must mean something like Lambinus's periphrasis (*facere quidquid libet, tuae libidini obsequi*). — **per me :** Not "for me, as far as I'm concerned" (Ammendola: "per parte mia, quanto a me"), but rather "using me, through me."

377 : verum lubere hau liceat, si liceat mihi : Contrafactual conditional: "but it would hardly be permitted for it to be pleasing (i.e., do what you want) if it were permitted to me…" — **si liceat mihi :** A restatement of 374: *meo si liceat modo*.

378 : futura es dicto oboediens an non : "Are you going to be obedient to my word or not?" — **futura es :** For *erit*; the periphrastic future (the future active participle plus the present of *esse*) is more common in colloquial Latin than in Classical Latin and becomes increasingly popular in medieval and Christian Latin. — **patri :** Placed emphatically at the end of the verse, this dative is best understood in one of three ways: (1) in apposition with *dicto*, as if Saturio had said *mihi* instead; (2) with *oboediens* supplied in the second member of the question ("or are you not

(going to be obedient) to your father?"); (3) as a simple dative of reference ("for your father's sake").

379 : futura : "Yes." — **scisnam tibi quae praecepi :** The verb *praecipere* is used by Toxilus at 148 when he explains to Saturio what he must have his daughter do and say. If Toxilus is the director of this farce, then Saturio has taken on the role of the stage manager.

380 : et ut vi surrepta : cf. Toxilus' instructions to Saturio at 150. The text is slightly problematic: some manuscripts have *id ut* for *ut vi.* Leo brackets *vi* on the grounds that *vi non surriptur* (which seems overly pedantic), and Woytek follows Leo. de Melo prints [*id*] *ut* [*vi*]. — **surrepta fueris :** Like *fuerint* (381), perfect subjunctive in an indirect question dependent on *praecepi* above (379). — **docte calleo :** For *calleo,* cf. ad 305.

381 : habeo in memoria : The expression *habere in memoria* occurs two other times in Plautus and twice in Terence as well, and is otherwise rather rare. The more common Classical expression is *tenere memoriā*.

382 : necessitate me mala ut fiam facis : The ablative *necessitate,* which is understood with *facis*, is placed emphatically in the first position. Note the two alliterating pairs. — **me mala ut fiam facis :** The object *me*, as often, is proleptic. The verb *facere* can be used with two accusatives ('to make someone/something someone/something') or with an *ut* clause. Here we see a combination of these two constructions.

383 - 384 : verum videto … ubi voles … ne haec fama faciat : "But see to it that, when you will want to marry me off, this reputation doesn't…" The future imperative (*videto*) with the future indicative in the subordinate clause (*voles*) is the equivalent to a future more vivid conditional. Note the continued alliteration.

383 : nuptum dare : "to give me in marriage"; A common expression. *nuptum* is accusative of the supine of *nubere*.

384 : faciat repudiosas nuptias : "makes my marriage divorce-worthy." The adjective is found only here in Latin. It is derived from *repudium* 'divorce', which is itself related to *pudet* and *pudor*.

385 : tace stulta : Since Saturio goes on to try to soothe his daughter's worries (however tenuously), the tone here is likely somewhat sympathetic or playfully dismissive ("oh, be quiet, silly girl") rather than insulting ("shut up, idiot"). — **non nunc hominum mores vides :** The adverb *nunc* is used adjectivally, as if *nunc hominum* = Gk. τῶν νῦν.

386 : quoiiu' modi hic cum mala fama facile nubitur? : So prints and punctuates Lindsay, as if it were a continuation of the question in 385. But most other editors print 385 as a question and place a full stop at the end of 386, as if Saturio answers his own question.

387 : dum dos sit : proviso clause: “as long as there is a dowry.” — **nullum vitium vitio vortitur :** “No fault turns up as a fault.” *vitio* is predicate dative/dative of purpose. Note the alliteration in both *dum dos* and *vitium vitio vortitur*.

388 - 389 : “Then remember that I don’t have a dowry.” — **veniat in mentem tibi :** The expression *venire in mentem alicui* is a favorite of Plautus, Terence, and Cicero and not uncommon elsewhere as well.

389 : cave sis tu istuc dixeris : On *cave* with the subjunctive as a negative command, cf. ad 51.

390 : deum virtute : Also at Aul. 166; Mil. 676, 679; Tri. 346, 355.

391 : quoi dos sit domi : Either subjunctive by attraction or because the relative clause is concessive.

392 : librorum eccillum habeo plenum soracum : “Look here at this box full of books I have.” This is the only use of *soracus* (σώρακος) in Latin. It is unclear whether Saturio is referring to actual books (i.e., books that he has studied to become a professional parasite) or if he merely means that he has enough knowledge to teach his daughter (or her future husband) to be a parasite as well. The latter is more likely.

393 : adcurassis : i.e., *adcuraveris*. The form is like *faxo, faxis*; the double *s* occurs when the stem ends in a vowel (*adcura-*). cf. Weiss 419-420. — **quoi rei :** correlative with *hoc*.

394 : dabuntur dotis tibi inde sescenti logi : "Six-hundred jokes of a dowry will be given to you from there." — **inde :** Either temporal ("then, after that") or, more likely, referring to the *soracus* ("from there"). — **sescenti logi :** For *sescenti* as an impossibly large number, cf. ad 36. *logi* here refers to jokes, as at Stich. 221, 455 (Woytek).

395: atque Attici omnes, nullum Siculum acceperis : Sicilians speak neither Greek nor Latin well; the Athenians are renowned for their eloquence and wit.

396 : cum hac dote poteris vel mendico nubere : "With this dowry you will be able to marry even a beggar." The joke seems to be that even if Saturio's daugher marries a beggar, with this dowry of jokes they will never go hungry.

397 - 398 : The virgo realizes that her attempts to dissuade her father from his purpose are in vain and surrenders, as if to say: "Let's get this over with."

397 quin tu me ducis si quo ducturu's, pater? : Similar in form and force to *hoc, si facturu's, face* above (146).

398 : face quid tibi lubet : Plautus uses *quis, quis* for *qui, quae, quod* when the relative is indefinite (Weiss 351).

399 : bonum aequomque oras : This seems to be somewhat of a set phrase to express approval, cf. Most. 682, Rud. 184. The superlative form *optumum atque aequissimum oras* occurs an additonal four times. A bit of the original meaning of *orare* ("to speak") can be felt in these phrases. — **dicto sum audiens :** lit., "I am obedient to your word." For the phrase *dicto* (*imperio*) *esse audiens,* cf. Amph. 989, 991; Asin. 544; Men. 444; Trin. 1062; Truc. 125; and below 836.

400 - 448 : These lines contain an exchange between Toxilus and the pimp Dordalus, who is introduced for the first time. They both insult each other, pulling out all the stops in an impressive display of Plautus' renowned verbal fireworks. Toxilus finally hands over the money which his friend Sagaristio has stolen for him, and the pimp exits to fetch Lemniselenis. Although both Toxilus' and Doradalus' insults are equally scathing, Toxilus of course receives more sympathy from the audience merely due to the fact that pimps are considered worthy of ridicule and abuse.

400 - 404 : Dordalus provides a convenient summary of his relationship and agreement with Toxilus, in case the audience has lost track of this side of the story while the trick with Saturio's daughter has been being prepared.

401 : iuratust : The verb *iurare* is sometimes deponent in Plautus, although the active is much more common. — **sese hodie argentum dare :** The present infinitive with *iurare* is not as common as the future.

402 - 403 : si non dederit atque hic dies praeterierit … amiserit : Conditionals with future perfects in both the protasis and the apodosis are rare in Latin. What has likely happened here is the following: (1) the *dederit* is the standard, aspectually-motivated reflex of Latin to place a future perfect in vivid future conditional statements; (2) *praeterierit* is for the sake of paralleism with *dederit* but, due to the semantic value of the phrase *hic dies praeterit,* it already takes on more of the expected temporal value of the future perfect ("this day will have passed by"); (3) the *amiserit* places emphasis on the anteriority of the second verb in the protasis which the simple future could not have done: "if he does not give me the money, and this day will have passed, he will have lost…"

403 : ego argentum, ille iusiurandum amiserit : Zeugma; the verb *amittere* is used properly with *argentum*, but there is no parallel for *iusiurandum amittere*.

405 : curate isti intus : Toxilus enters while looking back and shouting instructions back into his house. This is a very common transitional technique in Plautus. *isti* is adverbial, = *istic,* "over there." It is somewhat pleonastic with *intus*, and this is the only example of this combination of locative adverbs. cf. 85: *curate istic vos.* — **iam ego domum me recipiam :** "I'll be right back."

406 - 416 : Toxilus immediately begins to abuse the pimp, dangling the *crumina* full of money in front of him. Each time Dordalus tries to snatch it away from him, Toxilus quickly moves it out of his reach. The lines are full of rhetorical embellishments. cf. the similar invective against a pimp at Curc. 494-504.

406 : quid agitur : cf. 17, 309. — **lutum lenonium :** "You pimping filth." For *lutum* as a term of reproach, cf. Catullus 42.13 and Cic. *Pis*. 62.1 The adjective *lenonius* is confined almost exclusively to Plautus. Note the alliteration.

407 : commixtum caeno sterculinum publicum : "You public dung-pit mixed with filth." *sterculinum* (also written *sterquilinium*) is a diminutive noun from *stercus*. *caenum* here is a synonym for *lutum*, but unlike *lutum,* which sometimes refers to actual mud or dirt, *caenum* almost always has a element of moral judgement. Note the repetition of *c*.

408 : impure, inhoneste, iniure, illex : Note the alliteration caused by the repetition of the privative prefix *in-*. Note also the rhyme in *impure* and *iniure,* which sets up the audience to expect a fourth member which rhymes with *inhoneste.* This expectation is not met and instead we end with *illex,* the two heavy syllables of which the actor doubtlessly exaggerated and after which he likely paused briefly before adding *labes populi*. Woytek glosses *iniure* and *illex* with ἄδικος and ἄνομος respectively, which is no doubt right.

409 : pencuniai accipiter : "a hawk of money," i.e., pencuniae rapax (Lambinus). — **avide atque invide :** "greedy and a hater"; vocative. There is probably a false figura etymologica here.

410 : procax, rapax, trahax : Although it depends on the speed at which the actor pronounces 409 and the end of 408, these disyllabic adjectives in *-ax* probably are felt to rhyme with *illex* (408). *procax* and *rapax* are common adjectives, while *trahax* is a hapax derived from *trahere* (like *rapax* from *rapere*). The verbs *trahere* and *rapere* are often used together, cf. Rud. 853, Trin. 291, Cic. Or. 2.176.3; Sal. Cat. 11.4.3, Iug. 41.5.3. — **trecentis versibus :** "In three-hundred verses", for an indefinitely large number.

411 : impuritias : hapax, "impurities, foulnesses." — **traloqui :** hapax, "talk across/over, recount."

412 - 416 : Toxilus switches from pure verbal abuse to physically taunting the pimp with the money.

412 - 414 : accipin argentum? accipe sis argentum … tene sis argentum … tu argentum tenes? … ut argentum accipias : The technique of holding something just out of reach and repeating "come on, get it!" will be familiar to bullies and dog owners. *accipin* = *accipisne.* Note the alliteration in 412 and the chiasmus in 413.

414 : te facere ut accipias : *te* is proleptic object. — **lutum :** cf. 406.

415 : non mihi censebas copiam argentum fore : "You didn't think that I was going to have a supply of money, did you?" The imperfect is often used with *non* to express unrealized expectations.

416 : qui nisi iurato mihi nil ausu's credere : "You who didn't dare to give me any credit (trust me) unless I had sworn an oath." *iurato* has active meaning (cf. ad 401) and express time prior to the main verb. On the meaning of *credere* here, cf. ad 320.

417 - 426 : The pimp's response is just as scathing and rhetorically effective as Toxilus' invective. It is also 10 lines long and it often responds directly to certain aspects of Toxilus' speech. The first five lines of both speeches are full of insults and invective; then follow three lines of repetitious talk about the money; the final two lines in each case conclude and sum up the speech.

417 : sine respirare me, ut tibi respondeam : "Let me catch my breath so that I can respond to you." A similar expression with slightly different context is found at Epid. 204: *manedum, sine respirem, quaeso*. The idea here is that the leno is out of breath from shock after listening to Toxilus' invective, and needs to take a big breath to begin his own.

418 - 419 : Note the alliteration on *s*, which produces a hissing sound and enhances the power of the invective.

418 : vir summe populi : “You highest man of the people.” A sarcastic answer to Toxilus’ *labes populi* (408). These expressions with the genitive *populi/popli* are somewhat common in Plautus: Asin. 665: *decus popli*; Cas. 536: *praesidium popli*; Mos. 15: *deliciae popli*; Pseud. 365: *fraus popli*. — **stabulum servitricium :** “You slave-girls’ brothel.” *stabulum* is used as term of abuse also at Cas. 161: *stabulum nequitiae* and Truc. 587: *stabulum flagiti*. Based on the context, it here likely means “brothel.” If the reading *servitricium* is right, it would be a hapax meaning “slave-girl,” likely formed on analogy with *meretrix* (although it may also be interpreted as an adjective). The manuscripts have the adjective *servitritium,* also a hapax.

419 : scortorum liberator, suduculum flagri : “Freer of prostitutes, sauna of the whip.” *suduculum* is hapax and has been variously understood, but the interpretation “sauna, sweating room” is likely right, especially given Asin. 297: *gymnasium flagri*, also a place name. Note the chiasmus.

420 : compedium tritor, pistrinorum civitas : “You who wear out shackles, you citizen of mills.” For *compedium tritor,* cf. 279 *ulmitriba*; 795: *stimulorum tritor.* The latter is also spoken by Dardalus to Toxilus. Woytek’s intrepretation of *civitas* as *civis* (like *servitus* for *servus* below at 425) is likely right and is adopted in de Melo’s translation.

421 : perenniserve : hapax. — **lurcho :** "glutton." — **edax, furax, fugax :** These words in *-ax* sonically mirror Toxilus' *procax, rapax, trahax* (410). The adjectives are derived from *edere, furari,* and *fugere*.

422 - 424 : These three lines answer and correspond to 412-414.

422 : cedo sis mi argentum, da mihi argentum, impudens : This line corresponds to 412: *accipin argentum? accipe sis argentum, impudens*. Both lines repeat *arguentum* twice, include sarcastically *sis,* and end emphatically with *impudens*.

423 : possum a te exigere argentum : cf. 414: *possum te facere ut argentum…* — **cedo :** On the form, v.s. ad 225.

424 : reddis : As often in Latin, *reddere* can be used as a synonym for the simple verb *dare*. — **nilne te pudet? :** "Do you have any shame?" The same question is found at Amph. 1034 and Asin. 993.

425 : leno te argentum poscit : The double accusative with *poscere* is common enough. Note the switch to the third person. — **solida servitus :** lit., "You thorough servitude." *servitus* is voc., = *serve,* like 420 *civitas* = *civis* (Ammendola, Woytek).

426 : pro liberanda amica : "[money] in exchange for freeing your girlfriend." For this use of the gerund/gerundive with *pro* (not especially common), cf. Aul. 456: *pro vapulando* — **ut omnes audiant :** "So that everyone hears it." Dordalus likely pronounces the words *pro liberanda amica* much louder. The words *ut omnes audiant* are directed equally at the fictional inhabitants of Athens as well as the members of the audience.

427 : ne tua vox valide valet : Note the alliteration and the figura etymologica. *ne* is an emphatic affirmative particle (= Gk. ναί).

428 - 430 : Interpretations of each of these individual lines seem to miss the mark. They must be taken together and understood as one logical unit. literally, "(428) I have tongue born for returning the favor. (429) Salt is supplied to me at the same price as it is to you. (430) If my tongue doesn't defend me, it will never lick any salt." To paraphrase: "(428) It is in my nature to give tit for tat. (429) We both need to make a living somehow (or, with a play on *sal,* wit/verbal abuse is just as important to me as it is to you). (430) I have to defend myself and take care of business, or I'll starve to death."

428 : referundae habeo linguam natam gratiae : "I have a tongue born for giving thanks (i.e., returning the favor)." The phrase *referundae gratiae* is a dative of purpose with *natam.* For *linguam habere,* cf. 280; cf. also Curc. 707: *haec* (sc. *lingua*) *nata est mihi*.

429 : sal : On the two possible meanings of this word and this line, v.s. ad 428-430.

430 : numquam delinget salem : sc. lingua. The same expression is used at Curc. 562: *numquam delingues salem*.

431 : iam omitte iratus esse : On verbs of stoping or ceasing in Plautus, v.s. ad 207: *mitte male loqui*. — **id tibi suscensui :** The verb *succensere* like its synonym *irasci* is always used with the dative. *id* is internal object and in apposition with the *quia* clause which follows in 432.

432 : te negabas credere argentum mihi : "You said that you weren't trusting me with the money." Woytek's assertion that *negare* here = *recusare* on the grounds of the infinitive construction makes sense of the line but is unnecessary. The normal function of *negare* ("to say that not" with an indirect statement) fits just fine here.

433 - 434 : "Is it any wonder that I wouldn't trust you, so that you could do to me the same thing that bankers generally do?" — **mirum quin :** For the *mirum quin* clause in Plautus, v.s. ad 339. These sentences are best punctuated as questions. — **crederem ut … faceres :** The *ut* clause is technically result, but both verbs have present contrafactual force.

434 : argentarii : The Latin word is slightly more common in Plautus than the Greek *trapezita*. For the sentiment, cf. Curc. 377-378: *habent hunc morem plerique argentarii, ut alius alium poscant, reddant nemini*.

435 : ubi quid credideris : On *quid* = *aliquid* after *ubi,* v.s. ad 313.

435 - 436 : citius extemplo a foro fugiunt quam ex porta ludis quom emissust lepus : " They immediately flee from the forum faster than a rabbit at the games when it's let out from the gate." Note the two alliterating pairs (*foro, fugiunt, ludis, lepus*). — **ludis : "**at the games, during the games."

437 : cape hoc sis : Toxilus is still mocking Dordalus and taunting him with the wallet at the beginning of this line, as we can see from Dordalus' response. Toxilus seems to finally hand over the money at the end of this line or the beginning of the next. At any rate, it must occur before he says *fac sit mulier libera*. The joke at the beginning of this line may be that Toxilus is actually ready to give Dordalus the money, but quickly moves it out of his reach automatically, as if out of habit.

437 - 438 : nummi sescenti hic erunt, probi, numerati : It is possible that Toxilus actually has a huge wallet with 600 coins in it, or maybe the *nummus* should be understood to refer to some definite value that could be represented with some other combination of fewer coins. But in my opinion it is equally likely that *sescenti* here is used to refer to an indefinitely large quantity of money. The joke would then lie in the words *probi* and *numerati*, which comically attempt to cover up the vagueness of *sescenti*: "Here's a gazillion dollars…and it's all good and counted!" This may influence Dordalus' hesitation and desire to have the money checked in 440. For *sescenti* in this sense, cf. ad 36.

439 : iam faxo hic erit : On the form *faxo* with the future indicative, v.s. ad 161.

440 : non hercle quoi nunc hoc dem spectandum scio : Dordalus likely pauses after he says *iam faxo hic erit* in 439 and turns to begin his exit, but then stops and says this line mostly to himself. Toxilus of course hears him and the conversation continues.

441 : metuis in manum concredere : Judging from Dordalus' response in the following line, one must understand *argentario* or the like with this expression: "Are you scared to give it a banker directly (*in manum*)?"

442 : mirum quom : Lindsay prints *quom* for the *quin* of the manuscripts. Woytek and de Melo print Langen's suggestion *ni.* With the reading *quom,* one understands: "Strange, isn't it (i.e., that I'm afraid; said sarcastically)? When the bankers leave…" With the reading *ni*, one understands: "It's a strange occurrence if the bankers don't leave…"

442 - 443 : citius iam a foro argentarii abeunt quam in cursu rotula circumvortitur : "The bankers now leave from the forum quicker than a wheel rotates in its course."

444 : abi istac travorsis angiportis ad forum : "Go away this way to the forum, taking the backstreets." — **istac :** "This way"; words like *istac, hac, illac, recta,* and *qua* (among others) were originally understood with the ablative *via* before developing their own life as directional

adverbs (cf. the similar phenomenon with Gk. ὁδός). — **travorsis angiportis :** abl. absolute; "with the backstreets having been traversed."

445 : eadem : Most commentators understand *opera*: "at the same time, on the way". But given *istac* above, one may just as reasonably understand *via* "by this same way." This latter interpretation is reflected in de Melo's translation.

446 : per hortum : Presumably a small garden somehow connected Toxilus' and Dordalus' houses. cf. the similar phrase at Epid. 660: *exi istac per hortum.* — **iam faxo hic aderit :** cf. 161, 439. This phrase and similar variations (*iam faxo hic aderunt, erunt, erit*) are found also at Bac. 715, Epid. 156, Mil. 463, Pseud. 393, Truc. 428, and Ter. Phorm. 308. — **at ne propalam :** The negative is *ne* and not *non* because the sentence is still technically dependent on Toxilus' *facito* in 445. One understands either *facias* ("But don't do it openly") or *transeat* ("But don't let her come over openly"). The simple adverb *palam* is much more frequent in Plautus (about 40 occurrences) than *propalam* (found in only two other passages). In Classical Latin the adverb is found most commonly in history (esp. Livy, Suetonius, and Tacitus), but even these authors prefer the simple form *palam.*

447 : sapienter sane : "Quite wise of you" (de Melo). — **supplicatum cras eat :** "Let her go to pray tomorrow" i.e., to thank the gods for having been freed. She likely should go to the temple to pray right away, but Toxilus is anxious to settle everything and puts it off to tomorrow.

448 : dum stas, reditum oportuit : sc. te. "While you're standing here, you should have returned (lit., should have been brought back) already." For the expression, cf. Most. 1093: *factum iam esse oportuit*, "it should have been done already." For *dum stas*, cf. e.g., Epid. 344: *mihi cesso quom sto.*

449 - 752 : The fourth act is over 300 lines long and makes up more than a third of the play. During these 300 lines, there are many exits and entrances, but there is always at least one actor on the stage. It is in many ways the dramatic centerpiece of the play. Here we see Toxilus' plan with Saturio and his daughter successfully put into action. Everyone plays their role perfectly, and the pimp Dordalus is tricked and punished, so that Toxilus is able to pay back the money which his friend Sagaristio had given him to buy Lemniselenis.

449 - 461 : In this short monologue Toxilus expresses his confidence in his plan and summons Sagaristio and Saturio's daughter, both of whom have been decked out in elaborate and exotic outfits.

449 : si quam rem accures sobrie aut frugaliter : "If you take care of something soberly or carefully…" The combination of the adverbs *sobrie* and *frugaliter* is also found at Epid. 565. The adverb *sobrie* is frequently found with the root *cur-*: Capt. 225: *ut hoc sobrie…accurate agatur*; Epid. 565: *ille eam rem adeo sobrie et frugaliter accuravit*; Mil. 812: *et praecepta sobrie ut cures face*; Pseud. 939: *si hanc rem accurassis*. No other Latin author uses the adverb *sobrie* as often as Plautus.

450 : solet illa recte sub manus succedere : "It (sc. *res*) tends to succeed well under your hands." The phrase *succedere sub manus* is found two other times in Plautus (Mil. 873 and 1143). It may be a metaphor borrowed from pottery or other crafts (so Woytek and de Melo).

451 - 452 : ferme ut quisque rem accurat suam, sic ei procedit postprincipio denique : "And generally (*ferme*) as each cares for his own affair, so does it turn out for him afterwards." — **ferme :** A modern improvement for the *firme* of the manuscripts. — **postprincipio :** "in the aftermath, in the course of it," lit., after the beginning. The singular is nowhere else attested, but *postprincipia* is attested a few times in Classical Latin with the meaning "progress, course." Woytek explains the singular form *postprincipio* by comparing the common expressions *initio, principio.* — **denique :** Pleonastic with *postprincipio*.

453 - 454 : These two lines repeat the generalizations of 449-450 and 451-452 more specifically. — **si malus aut nequamst :** "If he's bad or worthless." *nequam* and *frugi* (454) are the two most common indeclinable adjectives in Latin. — **male res vortunt quas agit :** For expressions with *vortere* ("to turn out") in Plautus, cf. ad 329. — **sin autem :** A favorite transitional phrase of Cicero which appears in comedy only here and once in Terence.

455 - 456 : After six lines of generalizations and aphorisms, Toxilus finally begins to speak specifically of his own situation. — **hanc ego rem :** In the preceding six lines, Toxilus has used the word *res* no fewer than three times (more if one counts the times which the word must be

understood as the object or subject of a verb). Now that he is talking about his own situation, the *hanc* is strongly deictic and the *ego* strongly emphatic. — **proventuram bene confido mihi :** sc. *rem, esse*. The dative *mihi* is heard with both *confido* (often used with a reflexive dative) and *proventuram* ("will turn out well for me").

457 : nunc ego lenonem ita hodie intricatum dabo : For the use of the perfect passive participle with verbs like *facere, dare, reddere, velle,* and *cupire*, v.s. ad 311: factum volo. Here *intricatum dabo* means "I'll entangle, embarrass him."

458 : ut ipsus sese qua se expediat nesciat : Woytek may be right that the entire phrase is the result of contamination of two ideas (i.e., *ut sese* (*quis sit*) *nesciat* and *ut nesciat, qua se expediat*). But more likely Woytek is thrown off because the proleptic object (which is technically the subject of the subordinate clause) is the same as the object of the verb of the subordinate clause. If, for example, the sentence were *ut ipsus sese quid faciat nesciat*, no one would think of contamination. The *sese* is almost definitely to be understood as a proleptic object. — **ipsus :** On the form, cf. ad 42.

459 - 461 : Toxilus calls into his house for Sagaristio and Saturio's daughter to come out onto the stage.

460 - 461 : et istas tabellas quas consignavi tibi, quas tu attulisti mi ab ero meo usque e Persia : "and that letter which I sealed up for you, which you brought to me from my master all

the way out of Persia." Toxilus will use this forged letter to trick the pimp. The first relative clause (*quas consignavi tibi*) reveals the true origin of the letter, while the second (*quas tu attulisti…*) jokingly refers to the letter as if it were actually from Toxilus' master. — **usque e Persia :** This is the first reference to Persia in the play.

462 - 469 : This short interlude between Toxilus' monologue and the entrance of the pimp Dordalus (470) lets the audience appreciate Sagaristio's and the virgo's comically exotic costumes.

462 - 465 : These lines of Toxilus are spoken exactly like a director or producer. They are also filled with Grecisms: *eugae, basilice, tiara, schema, crepidula, graphice.* These words, besides adding an exotic flair to an exotic scene, perhaps reflect some sort of theater jargon.

462 : numquid moror? : "Am I delaying at all?" The same phrase is used below at 726 and in a few other places in Plautus (with and without *num*). — **eugae, eugae :** For the word and the spelling, cf. ad 90. The repetition underscores Toxilus' excitement. — **exornatu's :** The verb *ornare* and its derivatives are used to talk about Toxilus' plan also at 158-159, 335, and in the following line. — **basilice :** One of Toxilus' favorite words, v.s. 29, 31, v.i. 806.

463 : tiara ornatum lepida condecorat schema : "Your turban (*tiara*) adorns your costume (*ornatum*) in a fine fashion (*lepida schema*)." — **tiara :** In Greek literature, the τιάρα is always a specifically Persian headdress. In Aeschylus' *Persians* it is the headdress of the Persian king

(661). It must have appeared comically stereotypical on Sagaristio. — **lepida schema :** Ablative. Sometimes Greek neuter nouns ending in alpha (both singular and plural) are declined in Latin as feminine singular nouns.

464 : tum hanc hospitam autem crepidula ut graphice decet : "And then (*tum*) how picturesquely (*graphice*) in turn (*autem*) the sandal suits this visitor!" — **hospitam :** The feminine form of *hospes.* — **crepidula :** Diminutive form of the Greek word κρηπίς, a boot. — **graphice :** On the word and its possible meanings, v.s. ad 306.

465 : sed satin estis meditati? : "Have you rehearsed enough?" The verb *meditari* is often in used in Plautus to mean "rehearse, practice (lines, etc.)."

465 - 466 : tragici et comici numquam aeque sunt meditati : Ironic.

466 - 469 : Toxilus addresses these lines to his friend Sagaristio alone until the final command *nunc agerite vos*.

467 - 468 : These lines are exactly identical with the instructions which Toxilus gives Saturio at 727-728.

467 : e conspectu : "Out of sight," common enough in most periods of Latin.

470 - 479 : In this monologue the pimp addresses the audience before he sees Toxilus on stage. He is proud of his good behavior and almost promises to turn his life around.

470 : quoi homini di propitii sunt : Similar generalizing phrases are found at Aul. 810, Curc. 531, 557; the phrase is found more often with specific references (*di propitii sunt mihi/tibi/illi, etc.*). — **aliquid obiciunt lucri :** "They throw him some profit."

471 : nam : For this use of *nam* to give a concrete example or explanation of a general or aphoristic statement, v.s. ad 3. — **ego hodie compendi feci binos panis in dies :** lit., "Today I have saved two loaves daily," i.e., Dordalus no longer has to feed Lemniselenis. Normally, *compendium facere* = "make a profit, save"; here, the genitive is similar to *dotis dare* above at 394: "I made two loaves of saving." — **binos panis in dies :** *binos* is distributive: "two loaves each day daily." *in dies* is the normal expression for "every day, daily."

472 : ita ancilla mea quae fuit hodie, sua nunc est : "So the slavegirl that was mine today is now her own." Note that *mea* is placed outside of the relative clause in which it belongs to contrast emphatically with *sua*. — **argento vicit :** The subject is unclear. de Melo translates as if it were Toxilus, but Lemniselenis would be the easier reading: "She won with money."

473 : alienum cenabit : *alienum* is internal accusative (sc. *cibum*). In Classical prose the verb *cenare* is usually intransitive. — **nil gustabit de meo :** *meo* is used substantively ("from my (property, etc.)"); alternatively, sc. *sumptu* or even *cibo*.

474 : sumne probus, sum lepidus civis? : “Aren’t I upstanding, aren’t I a nice citizen?” Woytek points out the irony in Dordalus’ question and monologue: he is likely not even an Athenian citizen (cf. 137-8: *sic ut istic leno non sex menses Megaribus huc est quom commigravit*).

474 - 475 : qui … femina : “I who today made the Athenian state, which is already the greatest, greater and increased it with a woman citizen.” — **maxumam maiorem :** *maxumam* agrees with *civitatem, maiorem* is predicate. — **civi femina :** The word *civis* can be masculine or feminine. Here, the noun *femina* is used almost as adjective to specify the gender. Terence has the expression *civis virgo* at Eun. 857-858 and Adelph. 725.

477 : nec satis a quiquam homine accepi : “I haven’t taken security from anyone.” In the language of business and commerce, *satis* refers to bail or security and is commonly found with verbs of giving or taking (*dare, accipere, petere,* etc.). — **a quiquam homine :** The form *quiquam* is an old instrumental which is used as an ablative. — **prosum :** Alternative spelling for *prorsum*.

478 : nec metuo, quibus credidi hodie, ne quis mihi in iure abiurassit : i.e., *nec metuo ne quis eorum quibus credidi abiuassit*. “I’m not afraid that anyone whom I trusted today will deny this in court.” For the form *abiurassit,* cf. ad 393: *accurassis*.

479 : bonus volo iam ex hoc die esse—quod neque fiet neque fuit : The pimp seemingly promises to turn over a new leaf. We can imagine that he takes a brief pause after *esse* to think over this proposition before immediately denying that it is possible.

480 : hunc hominem … hodie … doctis deducam dolis : Note the two alliterating triplets. — **in trasennam :** "into a net, snare." The word *tra(n)senna* is of uncertain origin; the suffix *-enna* (if it is indeed a suffix) is not particularly common in Latin literature outside of toponyms. — **doctis dolis :** "Learned tricks"; this usage is found also at Bacch. 1095 (*is me attondit doctis dolis indoctum*), Mil. 147, 248, and Pseud. 485, 527.

481 : itaque : "and thus, and accordingly", introducing a statement with expands and explains the preceding line. — **insidiae paratae sunt :** Also at Mil. 1389: *paratae insidiae sunt*; cf. Poen. 549 and 884. — **aggrediar virum :** A common type of performative utterance in ancient drama, i.e., in which one of the actors announces his movement on stage immediately before (or simultaneous with) the action itself.

482 : quid agis? # credo : The word *credo* is often used in response to greetings or congratulations, meaning something like "thanks, I'm sure of it." Here Dordalus in his happiness is imagining that Toxilus is congratulating him. Toxilus asks "how are you doing?"; Dordalus hears "what are you doing?" and comically responds "trusting you." The joke is that Toxilus is engaging in an elaborate plan to trick Dordalus, which Dordalus completely falls for. — **unde agis te, Dordale? # credo tibi :** It is likely that Dordalus completely fails to hear or comprehend

what Toxilus is saying, because there is almost no way that *credo tibi* could logically (even if very comically and tenuously) follow Toxilus' question. Ussing's interpretation is likely correct: "nam in hoc verbo repetendo (i.e., credo) sibi placet comica ratione." Note also the singsongy rhythm and rhyme in *undagis te, Dordale?*

483 : di dent quae velis : A very common greeting in Plautus. — **eho :** This interjection is confined to comedy and can be used in a wide variety of contexts to either get someone's attention or emphasize a command or question.

484 : credo edepol, credo, imquam, tibi : Dordalus repeats himself for the third and forth time. Whereas in line 482 Dordalus was likely singing his lines in a near-trance, not paying attention to what Toxilus says, he now is shaken out of his reverie and perhaps shouts at Toxilus. — **iam liberta auctu's? :** "Have you been increased by a freedwoman?", i.e., "iamne fecisti, ut Lemniselene ex ancilla liberta esses?" (Lambinus).

484 - 486 : enicas. quin tibi me dico credere : "You're killing me. I'm really (*quin*) telling you that I trust you." For the common expression of exasperation *enicas*, cf. ad 48a. The particle *quin* here marks the climax of Dordalus' repetitions of the word *credere*. — **dic bona fide :** "Tell me in good faith." cf. Aul. 772. — **<pol aio> :** The end of this line is problematic (the manuscripts seem to have something like the letters **olet**), but Dordalus must say something that gives an affirmative answer to Toxilus' question. Woytek prints his own conjecture *<s>ol<ide>,* also saving two of the letters which appear in one of the manuscripts.

487 : i ad forum ad praetorem, exquire : The praetor was a magistrate who, among many other responsibilities, could free slaves by touching them with a special staff called a *vindicta*. The use of a second imperative (with asydenton) after the imperative of 'to go' is a common feature of Plautus and of the colloquial register of many other languages. — **siquidem credere mihi non vis :** "if you don't want to believe me"; Dordalus turns the tables on Toxilus.

488 : libera, inquam, est : Dordalus' second of four uses of the word *inquam* in this exchange. Dordalus seems to gradually lose his patience with Toxilus' excitement and incredulity.

489 : numquam enim posthac tibi nec tuorum quoiquam quod nolis volam : "After this I'll never want for you or for one of your own what you don't want." Woytek is right to see in this statement a declaration of Toxilus' friendship for Dordalus, citing Sallust's definition of friendship (Cat. 20.4): *idem velle atque idem nolle*. But although it may seem like a genuine expression of gratitude, it is more likely either said thoughtlessly in excitement or, alternatively, is part of Toxilus' plan to deceive, trick, and ultimately ridicule the pimp.

490 : abi : Either "go away," as if Toxilus was crowding Dordalus on stage, or more similar to our "get out of here." — **ne iura :** For the use of *ne* with the imperative, cf. ad 227: ne me attrecta. This usage is particularly common with monosyllabic and disyllabic imperatives. — **sati' credo :** The final repetition of *credo*.

491 : aio, inquam, apud te est, inquam : The doubling of *inquam* (cf. *inquam* at 484 and 488) is emphatic and especially comical and redundant after *aio*.

492 : ita me di ament ut : A relatively common expression in Plautus for swearing and promising: "let the gods so (*ita*) love me, as (*ut*)." — **ob instanc rem tibi multa bona instant a me :** The verb *instare* more often than not has a negative connotation ('threaten, impend'), which here foreshadows the coming deception and abuse of the pimp.

493 : nam est res quaedam, quam occultabam tibi dicere : "There's a certain thing that was concealing [and didn't want] to say to you." This is the only occurrence of the verb *occultare* with the infinitive in Latin. Woytek suggests a contamination between *quam nolui dicere* and *quam occultabam,* which seems pedantic. The meaning of the verse is obvious without assuming any contamination of construction, and it is clear that the semantic range of the verb *occultare* was broad and flexible enough to accommodate an infinitive.

494 : und' tu pergrande lucrum facias : For the use of pronominal adverbs (e.g., *quo, unde, inde, huc,* etc.) in the place of pronouns, whether relative or demonstrative, cf. ad 61: unde and Lindsay 1907, 48, 80. Here *unde* is the equivalent of *ex qua (re)*. The subjunctive *facias* is final ("so that you can make…"). — **facias: faciam :** Note the strong adversative asyndeton, reenforced by the repetition of the same verb in a different person. The audience likely would have paid little attention to the fact that *facias* is subjunctive while *faciam* is future; the repetition of the vowel sounds is enough to emphasize the contrast. — **facias: faciam ut mei memineris**

dum vitam vivas : Note the three alliterating pairs. — **faciam ut mei memineris :** "I'll make you remember me." This is a relatively common formulation in Plautus, cf. Aul. 257, Bacch. 328, Curc. 210, Mil. 354, etc. Here is used as a threat (as at Capt. 800) which Dordalus however does not perceive.

495 : bene dictis tuis bene facta aures meae auxilium exposcunt : i.e., "aures meae non sunt contentae benedictis tuis, sed postulant praeterea benefacta benedictis consentanea" (Lambinus). — **bene dictis tuis bene facta aures meae :** Note the sonic effect of seven consecutive disyllabic units.

496 : tuom promeritumst, merito ut faciam : The meaning of *promereri* can be both positive and negative: 'deserve (a favor)' or 'deserve (what's coming to you).' The joke is that while Dordalus hears the former, Toxilus means the latter. cf. the two meanings present in 494: *faciam ut mei memineris.* — **ut scias :** "so that you know…," a fairly common expression in Plautus, especially with commands.

497 : pellege : i.e., *perlege*, "read them through." — **hae quid ad me : "**What are they to me?" sc. *pertinent* or *attinent*, both of which can be left out. Toxilus tries to give Dordalus the letter when he says *tene,* but Dordalus cautiously does not take it immediately. — **immo ad te attinent et tua refert :** "No, they actually do pertain to you and are of interest to you."

498 : nam ex Persia ad med adlatae modo sunt istaec a meo ero : The order of the words in this line is disputed; the meaning, however, is clear. Woytek prints *nam ex Persia sunt istaec allatae mi a meo ero,* and de Melo prints the same, but with *haec* for *istaec.* — **nam :** The *nam* announces an explanation of why this affair concerns Dordalus, but Toxilus does not follow through immediately with this promise. It is almost as if Toxilus uses the *nam* and the incomplete explanation as bait to catch the interest of Dordalus. — **modo :** According to Woytek, the *modo* is likely a gloss on the *hau dudum* at the end of the line and should not be printed. — **hau dudum :** This is the only attested occurrence of this combination of words. It must mean "just now."

499 : quid istae narrant # percontare ex ipsis. ipsae tibi narrabunt : This type of light personification of letters and texts is common in both Greek and Latin.

500 : clare : "out loud." — **hau verbum faciam :** "I won't say a thing." for the phrase, cf. Cas. 921, Poen. 1355.

501 : salutem dicit : "says hello"; this is a standard opening for letters.

501 - 502 : Toxilo Timarchides familiae omni : "Timarchides (says hello) to Toxilus and the rest of the slaves." Toxilus of course comically focuses on himself. Also note that Toxilus puts his own name before his master's, whereas the more usual order would be *Timarchides Toxilo*

salutem dicit. — **si valetis, gaudeo :** The more common form is *si vales, bene est,* although cf. Cic. Att. 4.14.1.3: *si iam melius vales, vehementer gaudeo*.

503 : ego valeo recte : "I'm doing fine." It is also common in letters to follow up questions about how the recipient is doing with a statement of one's own current status. — **rem gero et facio lucrum :** "I'm doing business (managing my business) and making profit." Note the chiasmus.

504 : neque istoc redire his octo possum mensibus : "And I can't return to you in these eight (coming) months." — **istoc :** Once again we have the use of a pronominal adverb to stand for a pronoun. Here, *istoc = ad vos.* cf. ad 61, 494. Note how the second-person force is felt in *istoc*. — **his octo mensibus :** The ablative is time within which. The demonstrative *his* points forward in time.

505 : itaque hic est quod me detinet negotium : i.e., *et ita est hic negotium, quod me detinet*. "And thus is the business here which is detaining me."

506 : Chrysopolim Persae cepere urbem in Arabia : "The Persians have captured the city Chrysopolis in Arabia." The Greek name *Chrysopolis* means "golden city" and is almost certainly invented to emphasize the wealth of the city add a touch of exoticism to the narrative. This is the second specific reference to Persia or the Persians in the play, the first above at 461.

507 : plenam bonarum rerum : Grammtically refers back to *urbem,* although at least one editor has written *plenum* as if to agree with the *oppidum* which follows.

508 - 509 : ea comportatur praeda, ut fiat auctio publicitus : "This booty (i.e., that we captured from Chrysopolis) is being gathered so that there can be a public auction."

509 : ea res me domo expertem facit : i.e., "That's why I'm away from home." Normally *expers* is used with the genitive, but there are a few exceptions sprinkled throughout Latin literature where it is used with the ablative, undoubtedly due to the overlap of the genitive and the ablative with other similar adjectives.

510 - 512 : Since these lines pertain to the honor and hospitality which are due to Sagaristio, one can imagine that Sagaristio playfully urged Toxilus to have these lines added to the letter. It is also likely that Sagaristio and Saturio's daughter never entirely leave the stage when Toxilus tells them to move out of sight (467: *e conspectu*), but rather move off to the side of the stage and listen to Toxilus' conversation with Dordalus. While Dordalus is reciting these lines of the letter, one can imagine that Sagaristio vigorously nods in assent.

510 : operam atque hospitium ego isti praehiberi volo : Note the emphatic juxtaposition of the pronouns *ego* and *isti.* The expression is a variation of the type found at 612: *hau possum quin huic operam dem hospiti.*

511 : cura quae is volet : The future is used by analogy with with conditions like *si quid volet, cura,* etc.

512 : nam is mihi honores suae domi habuit maximos : "Because he has shown the greatest respect for me at his house." *suae domi* is locative. The expression *alicui habere honorem* is common throughout Latin.

513 : quid id ad me aut ad meam rem refert : The construction *refert ad* is much less common in Classical Latin than the usage with either the genitive or the feminine singular ablative of the possessive pronoun (*mea, tua,* etc.). Here the preposition *ad* is likely the result of the construction which expressions with similar meaning take: *attinere, pertinere,* etc. cf. 497: *quid ad me* and *immo ad te attinent*. — **quid rerum gerant :** For Plautus' preference for this type of partitive genitive (instead of, e.g., *quas res gerant*), cf. ad 86.

514 : aut quid erus tuos : sc. *quid rerum gerat erus tuos*. — **stultiloque :** This adjective is attested only here. On this adjective and the related nouns *stultiloquium* and *stultiloquentia,* all of which are calques on the Greek words μωρόλογος and μωρολογία, cf. 49: *morologus*. — **nescis quid tibi instet boni :** In Indo-European languages with a fully functioning genitive case, the placement of the partitive genitive in the last place (after the verb) is very common in both direct and indirect questions, cf. the common order of words in Russian: скажи мне, сколько ты будешь блинов. On the construction with *instare*, cf. 492.

515 : neque quam tibi Fortuna faculam lucriferam adlucere vult : "Nor (do you know) what little profit-bringing torch Fortune wants to shine at you." Toxilus poetically repeats what he said in *nescis quid tibi instet boni*. — **faculam :** Diminutive form from *fax*. — **lucriferam :** The adjective (from *lucrum* and *ferre*) is found only here and in the following line. Some editors print Ritschl's suggestion *lucrifera*[*m*], so as to make the adjective agree not with *faculam* but with *Fortuna.* This is doubtlessly motivated by Dordalus' response *quae istaec lucrifera Fortuna?,* but it produces worse sense in the question. — **adlucere :** Likely here with the dative *tibi* ("to shine at you"). The interpretation "to light a torch for you" (as almost all translations, dictionaries, and commentators read) misunderstands the syntax of the sentence: *faculam lucriferam* is not the object of *adlucere,* but the accusative subject. — **vult :** The indicative is used here instead of the subjunctive (cf. *instet*), either because Toxilus is emphasizing the actuality of the statement, or because he understood the sentence more as a relative clause than an indirect question (i.e., *nescis faculam quam…*), or simply because in the colloquial register of Latin the indicative is sometimes preferred to the subjunctive in many clauses.

516 : istas quae norunt roga : For the personification of writing, cf. ad 499.

517 : ego tantundem scio quantum tu : "I know just as much as you." For *tantundem* (*tantum* + *dem*), v.s. ad 71: *tantidem.* — **nisi quod pellegi prior :** *nisi quod* "except for the fact that" is common in all registers.

518 : ut occepisti : This parenthetical phrase occurs 14 other times in Plautus, always in the first or second person singular. It also is found once in the pluperfect (*ut occeperas*). On this verb and other verbs of beginning in Plautus, cf. ad 114. — **ex tabellis nosce rem :** cf. Mos. 199: *ex factis nosce rem*. — **bene mones :** Plautus uses *bene mones* and *recte mones* with similar frequency (one *haud male mones*). On similar phrases of assent, cf. ad 147: bene facis.

519 : fac silentium : This expression is found elsewhere at Amph. 15: *ita huic facietus fabellae silentium*. — **nunc ad illud venies quod refert tua :** "Now you'll come to that (part of the letter) that concerns your affair."

520 : simul : Either *eodem tempore* or *una secum*.

521 : forma expetenda liberalem virginem : The line, being as it is made up of only four words, moves slowly. *forma expetenda* is ablative of description: "of beauty to be desired."

522 : furtivam, abductam ex Arabia penitissuma : "stolen, taken from the deepest parts of Arabia."

523 : eam te volo curare ut istic veneat : *eam* is proleptic object for *curare ut ea veneat*.

524 : ac suo periclo is emat qui eam mercabitur : "And let he who will buy her buy her at his own risk." — **suo periclo :** "at his own risk." This phrase is explained in the following line. cf.

665: *tuo periclo.* cf. also Trin. 858: *suo periculo*. — **emat … mercabitur :** The words are almost identical in meaning. The former is more common than the latter.

525 : mancipio neque promittet : "No one will promise to sell her formally" (de Melo); "mancipio promittere est promittere se traditione alicuius rei translaturum in eum, cui rem tradas, eius rei proprietatem" (Lambinus). — **nec quisquam dabit :** "dare mancipio est transferre in eum, cui rem tradas, dominium, vel rem eius, cui tradas, facere."

526 : probum et numeratum argentum : cf. ad 437 - 438: nummi sescenti hic erunt, probi, numerati. — **ut accipiat face :** The subject of the *ut* clause is of course Sagaristio.

527 : haec cura et hospes cura ut curetur : Note the alternating aliteration in *hae cura et hospes cura* and also the slightly comic redundancy in *cura ut curetur*.

528 : quid igitur? : The meaning of this question (which we find often both in Plautus and in other authors) is always something like "so, what now?"

528 - 529 : postquam recitasti quod erat cerae creditum, iam mihi credis? : "Now do you trust me, after you have read out that which had been entrusted to the wax?" Note the repetition of *qu/c* in the entire line (*postquam recitasti quod erat cerae creditum, iam mihi credis*) and the slight jingle at the end with the sounds *c* and *r*: *cerae creditum ... credis*. — **recitasti :** The verb is not very common in Old Latin, appearing a couple of times in Cato and only three other times

in Plautus (one of which was above at 500). It was a favorite word of Cicero, used well over 150 times in all of his works, and it remained popular after (and probably because of) Cicero. — **quod erat cerae creditum, iam mihi credis :** Antanaclasis with *credere,* since the verb means something different in the expressions *cerae credere* and *alicui* (*homini*) *credere*.

529 : hasce : sc. *tabellas.*

530 : iam hic credo aderit : The same formulation is found also at Bacch. 47. For similar types of expressions, cf. ad 446: *iam faxo hic aderit*. — **arcessivit :** "He has fetched," i.e., "he has gone to fetch" (cf. Woytek and Ammendola *ad loc* and de Melo's translation). The interpretation "he has gone to fetch" makes the best sense in translations to modern languages, but it must be remembered that there is nothing in the verb *arcessere* which implies more than "to fetch." I.e., Toxilus says simply "He got (fetched) her from the ship. He'll be here soon, I think." — **a navi :** In Plautus the ablative of *navis* is always *navi.*

531 : litibus nec tricis : "(I don't need any) lawsuits or snags." Sometimes *tricae* means "nonsense"; here, one sees the etymological connection to *extricare.* — **quam ob rem argentum enumerem foras? :** "Why should I count out (*enumerem foras*) money?" The verb *enumerare* means 'count out', while *foras* means 'out(side)' (with motion implied). Here the two words together mean something like "count out money for something which is beyond the walls of my house." *enumerem* is deliberative subjunctive.

532 : nisi mancipio accipio : "Unless I buy it (i.e., *mercimonium*) formally" (de Melo), lit., "unless I buy it with the right to ownership." Note the figura etymologica and the resulting homoioteleuton. For the phrase, cf. ad 525: *mancupio nec promittet nec quisquam dabit*.

533 : tacen an non taces? : cf. Rud. 1399: *tacen an non*; for the form (in both direct and indirect questions), cf., e.g., Aul. 431: *volo scire sinas an non sinas*; Capt. 74: *estne invocatum an non est*?; Capt. 455: *at enim dubitavi, hos homines emerem an non emerem*; Capt. 846: *iuben an non iubes*; etc. — **numquam ego te tam esse matulam credidi :** "I never thought that you were such a pisspot." This is the only attestation of the use of the word *matula* as an insult. Toxilus seems to employ the common argumentative strategy of insulting the courageousness or manliness of his opponent.

534 : quid? metuis? : Woytek wrongly argues for printing *quid metuis?* as one question. The tone here is provocative, and an insulting pause between the two words fits this tone better. Thus the punctuation should be either a comma or a question mark: "what, you scared?" — **sensi ego iam compluriens :** "I've experienced this already many times." Outside of one passage in Cato where the word is repeated three times, the adverb *compluriens* is found nowhere else in Latin.

535 : neque mi haud imperito eveniet, tali ut in luto haeream : The sentence is difficult, but it is likely that *haud imperito* is a litotes which belongs together: "Nor will it happen to me, who am hardly unacquainted (with such tricks), to get stuck in such mud (i.e, again)." The other option is that *haud* is to be taken pleonastically with *neque*: "Nor at all will it happen to me,

since I don't know anything about these things, to get stuck in such mud." The first interpretation is more natural, the second may be heard, however, underneath the first, much like the double meanings at 492 and 494. Woytek understands the line in this way and does a good job of explaining the possible interpretations. — **tali ut in luto haeream :** The phrase *in luto haerere, esse* ('to get stuck, be stuck in the mud') seems to have been somewhat proverbial, cf. Ter. Phorm. 780: *in eodem luto haesitas*.

536 : nil pericli mihi videtur # scio istuc, sed metuo mihi : Woytek rightly reads this exchange: Dordalus understands the *mihi* of Toxilus' line to go not with *videtur* but with *pericli* (i.e., "It seems that there's no danger, risk for me"), and so responds: "I know this, [I'm not worried about you,] but I'm scared [that there will be a danger] for myself."

537 : mea quidem istuc nil refert: tua ego hoc facio gratia : Note the strong antithesis between *mea* and *tua,* which is further emphasized by the adversative asyndeton. The *istuc* refers to what Dordalus just said; the *nil* is adverbial: "that you're scared doesn't concern me at all."

538 : ut tibi recte conciliandi primo facerem copiam : For *ut facerem* after the present *facio,* cf. the examples at Lindsay 1907, 56. Lindsay writes: "That the strict laws of Sequence should often be defied by the colloquial Latin of Plautus is only natural." The *primo* is dative with *tibi. recte conciliandi copiam* = "the opportunity for making a good purchase (lit., of rightly procuring)."

539 - 540 : habeo gratiam : Plautus uses both *gratiam habere* and *gratiam/as agere,* but the former is more common. — **sed te de aliis quam alios de te suaviust fieri doctos :** "suavius est nos documentum capere ex aliorum casibus quam alios ex nostris" (Lambinus). — **sed te de aliis :** sc. *doctum fieri.*

541 - 542 : ne quis vero ex Arabia penitissuma persequatur : The ellipsis of the main verb (of fearing) heightens the sarcasism. One can assume either an ironic question or a very sarcastic statement (Lambinus: *tune metuis* or *metuendum est*). — **etiam tu illam destinas :** On questions with *etiam* (the force of which nears an imperative), cf. ad 152: *etiam tu taces?* Here the word *destinare* is used with a meaning specific to the jargon of commerce: "to buy, intend to buy."

542 - 543 : videam modo mercimonium : Either "just let me see the merchandise" or "provided that I see the merchandise." — **aequa dicis :** "What you say is fair" (de Melo). Plautus does not use the neuter plural elsewhere in similar expressions. The neuter singular and adverbs are much more common. cf. ad 147: bene facis, 399: bonum aequomque oras, 518: bene mones.

543 - 544 : sed optume eccum ipse advenit hospes ille qui has tabellas attulit : These words are the cue for Sagaristio and the virgo to begin their entrance. The line is rather long and filled with demonstrative and otherwise deictic words (*eccum, ipse, ille, has*). We can imagine that Toxilus took his time saying this line, pronouncing it much louder than his other lines, placing additional emphasis on the demonstrative words, and perhaps looking over his shoulder and gesturing to Sagaristio.

544 - 545 : hicine, haecine : For the forms (**hi-ce-ne, *hae-ce-ne*), cf. ad 42: sicine.

545 : iuxta tecum aeque scio : cf. 249: iuxta tecum, si tu nescis, nescio. In this line and the next Toxilus endeavors to exaggerate his ignorance.

546 : nisi quia : "except for the fact that." This usage of *quia* (=*quod*) is almost entirely absent from Classical Latin and much more familiar in Late Latin, but substantive *quia* clauses (where the causal force is almost entirely absent) are fairly common in Old Latin. For many examples, cf. Bennett 1, 130-132. One might cautiously say that this is an example of a "vulgar" or "popular" mode of expression that continued alongside with but is not attested in Classical Latin, only to later reemerge as stylistic standards changed. Just as *quod* is actually the neuter accusative of the relative pronoun used adverbially, *quia* is a neuter accusative plural built from the *i*-stem (and not the thematic stem) of the relative/interrogative pronoun (other *i*-stem forms are abl. *quī* and nom.pl. *quēs*). See Weiss 2009, 350. — **specie liberali est :** Ablative of description: "of free-born beauty." cf. 130, 521.

547 : sat edepol concinnast facie : Another ablative of description. "She has a beautiful face." The adjective *concinnus* is not particularly common in Old Latin, nor is found particularly frequently describing physical traits. The word is a favorite of Cicero, who often uses it to describe discourse and style of speaking, and it is often found with words like *oratio, sententia, versus, sermo,* etc. — **ut contemptim carnufex! :** "How contemptuously the scoundrel (praises

her)!" Toxilus is criticizing the way in which the pimp is looking at the girl, presumably with a view to making profit.

548 : taciti contemplemus formam : "Let's be quiet and behold her beauty." Classical Latin generally prefers the deponent form *contemplari,* while Old Latin *comtemplare.* — **laudo consilium tuom :** The same phrase is found at Epid. 189. cf. Trin. 1148: *quin conlaudo consilium et probo.* The expression *laudare consilium* is also found a few times in Cicero.

549 - 672 : In this long exchange between Toxilus, Dordalus, Sagaristio, and Saturio's daughter, Dordalus is ultimately convinced to buy the girl and leaves to fetch the money for her. All of the actors in the play-within-the-play play their roles perfectly. The modern reader is particularly impressed by the eloquence and intelligence of the virgo, which is a rarity in Plautus.

549 : satin Athenae tibi sunt visae fortunatae atque opiparae? : Sagaristio asks this question as if a tourist on his first visit to Athens. He and the virgo enter on stage and pretend not to notice Toxilus and Dordalus.

550 : urbis speciem vidi, hominum mores perspexi parum : "I've seen the appearance of the city, but I've too little inspected the character of the people." Note the adversative asyndeton and the parallelism (genitive, accusative, perfect verb). The obvious reference is Od. 1.3: πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω. The philosophical nature of this statement is in keeping with the earlier portrayal of the virgo (329-399).

551 - 552 : These lines are spoken between Toxilus and Dordalus, with Sagaristio and virgo either not hearing or pretending not to hear.

551 : numquid in principio cessavit verbum docte dicere? : "Did she hesitate at all to say something learnedly in the beginning?" Toxilus does not fail to recognize the intelligence behind the virgo's words (unlike Dordalus). The comedy here arises from the fact that Toxilus says exactly what the audience would have been thinking.

552 : hau potui etiam in primo verbo perspicere sapientiam : Dordalus is less excited than Toxilus.

553 - 560 : These lines continue the conversation between Sagaristio and the virgo (549-550) and are spoken as if Toxilus and Dordalus cannot hear. After Sagaristio's further question about the virgo's impressions of Athens (553), the virgo has a short monologue (554-560, interrupted only by Toxilus' short exclamation at 557: *eugae*) in which she further displays her intelligence and eloquence. We can imagine that during these lines she turns towards the audience and delivers her speech very dramatically. Although there is nothing explicitly hilarious in her words (although irony is present), the very ridiculousness of the entire situation produces comedy.

553 : quid id quod vidisti : sc. est. By far the most common version of this type of question is simply *quid est quod,* which is found often in Plautus and elsewhere. *quid id est quod* is found

two times in Plautus, and *quid est id quod* and *quid id quod* one time each. — **ut munitum muro tibi visum oppidumst? :** Sagaristio refers of course to the famous Long Walls (τὰ μακρὰ τείχη) which surrounded Athens.

554 : si incolae bene sunt morati : "If the inhabitants are well-mannered" The play is on *murus* and *moratus*. — **id pulchre moenitum arbitror :** "I think that it's well-walled." sc. *oppidum*.

555 : perfidia et peculatus ex urbe et avaritia si exulant : "If perfidy and embezzlement and greed go into exile from the city…" Note the alliteration in *perfidia et pecuatus* and the repeated sounds in *peculatus ex urbe*... and *si exulant*. These three begin a list of ten vices which the virgo claims should be absent from the ideal city. The word *peculatus* (fourth declension noun derived regularly from *peculari*) refers specifically to the embezzlement of public money.

556 : optrectatio : disparagement.

557 : eugae : Toxilus cannot contain his excitement at how well the virgo is speaking. — **indilgentia :** negligentia (Lambinus).

558 : quod pessumum aggressu est : "i.e., pessinum ad aggrediendum et suscipiendum," (Lambinus), "which is most difficult of all to tackle," (de Melo). — **scelus :** "facinus est quod quis faciens manus suas sanguine contaminat, ut si quis hominem interficiat: est etiam factum impium in deos, aut parentis, aut patriam," (Lambinus).

559 : haec unde aberunt : There is a slight anacoluthon since the initial construction (*si exulant*) is completely forgotten by the end of the long list of vices. — **haec :** Neuter plural, referring collectively to everything just mentioned. — **unde :** Here for *a qua urbe.* The antecedent is *ea urbs*. For this use of *unde* and other pronominal adverbs, cf. ad 61, 202, 494. — **ea urbs moenita muro sat erit simplici :** "That city will be sufficiently walled with a simple wall." Note the two alliterating pairs.

560 : ubi ea aderunt, centumplex murus rebus servandis parumst : "When they are present, a hundredfold fall is not enough to save things." The word *centumplex* is found only here and is coined to contrast with the *simplex* of the previous line. *rebus servandis* is dative of purpose. For the contrast between *sat* and *parum* cf. also Bacch. 991-992, Epid. 634.

561 : quid ais tu? : "So what do you say, what do you have to say?" — **quid vis? :** "What do you want from me?" — **tu in illis es decem sodalibus :** "You're among (one of) those ten comrades." i.e., Dordalus fits in with the list of ten vices which the virgo just compiled.

562 : te in exilium ire hinc oportet : "You should go into exile from here." i.e., like the other vices (cf. 555: *si exulant*). — **quid iam? :** "Why's that?" or "What's that?" or "What now?" — **quia peiiurus es :** Toxilus' criticism, as Woytek notes, must come from stereotypes about pimps, since Dordalus nowhere in the play goes breaks the oaths which he swears.

563 : verba quidem haud indocte fecit : Dordalus either does not respond to Toxilus' joke in 562 and continues the conversation as if from 561 by making a general statement about the virgo's intelligence, or comically agrees with Toxilus' criticism that he is a *periurus,* saying "Well, (you're right,) her words were hardly unlearned." — **ex tuo, imquam, usu est :** "It's to your advantage, I'm telling you." Somewhat similar in form and meaning to the expressions *ex sententia esse* and *e re esse* (*in rem esse*).

564 : edepol qui quom hanc magi' contemplo, magi' placet : The *qui* is the instrumental form which is here being used adverbially with the *edepol,* similar to *ut* or *ne.* Ammendola rightly translates *edepol qui* with "per dio davvero che…" The entire line may be rendered: "Indeed it's true that when I look at her more, I like her more." On the active form *contemplo,* cf. ad 548.

564 - 565 : si hanc emeris, di immortales! nullus leno te alter erit opulentior : Technically a future more vivid conditional with emphatic protasis, although the use of the future perfect *emeris* is motivated almost entirely by considerations of aspect and not of emphasis. — **di immortales! :** This is the only instance in Plautus where the words *di immortales* interrupt a sentence. — **opulentior :** i.e., Dordalus will be able to amass a fortune because of the beauty of the virgo, as Toxilus goes on to explain in the following lines.

566 : evortes … homines fundis, familiis : "You will turn people out of their estates and households." i.e., men will squander their fortunes to be with the virgo. The future *evortes* and the following futures (*habebis, cupient, veniet*) continue the apodosis of the conditional

statement which begins in 564. The expression *evertere aliquem aliqua re* is Classical (Lambinus, Ammendola, Woytek). Note the sonic effect of the alliteration at the end of the line and the homoioteleuton which continues into the next (*cum optumis viris*). — **tuo arbitratu :** "At your pleasure, as you like." Plautus uses the ablative *arbitratu* with the possessive adjectives (*meo, tuo, suo*) and pronouns (*huius, eius, cuius*) over 25 times.

567 : cum optumis viris rem habebis : "You'll have business with the best men." For this meaning of *res*, cf. 503: *rem gero*. — **gratiam cupient tuam :** "They'll want your favor."

568 : venient ad te comissatum : "They'll come to you to party." The verb *comissari* (which Plautus uses only in the supine) is derived from Gk. κωμάζειν and refers properly to the drunken procession of young men through the streets, but is also used to refer more generally to merry-making and reveling. — **at ego intro mitti votuero :** "But I'll forbid them from being let in, I won't let them enter." cf. Ter. Eun. 442-441: *Phaedriam intro mittamu' comissatum*. The future perfect *votuero* (=*vetuero*) instead of the simple future is motivated only by aspect and not by tense.

569 : at enim illi noctu occentabunt ostium : "But they will sing songs to your door at night." The reference is the παρακλαυσίθυρα, a genre of song which lovers would sing to the closed door of the house of the beloved. The form *noctu* seems to be made on analogy with the regular locative form *diu* (Weiss 252). — **exurent fores :** "They will burn down your doors." Threats of violence against the door, which is usually presented as one of the lover's main adversaries,

are common in the genre of the παρακλαυσίθυρα. The words *fores* and *ostium* are used interchangeably in comedy, although *ostium* refers to the entire door and *fores* to the two leaves of the door.

570 : proin tu tibi iubeas concludi aedis foribus ferreis : "Then (*proin*) you should order for your house to be locked up with iron doors." *iubeas* is jussive subjunctive. Note the alliteration in *tu tibi* and *foribus ferreis* and the continued repetition of the adjective *ferreus* in the following lines.

571 - 572 : ferreas aedis commutes, limina indas ferrea, ferream seram atque anellum : *commutes* and *indas* are jussives like *iubeas* above. The verb *commutare* here is either taking a predicate adjective ("you should change your house (so that it is) iron") or one must understand an ablative like *tuis aedibus* ("you should (ex)change an iron house for your (current) house"). Note that the word *ferreus* is placed so that it opens lines 571, 572, and 573 and closes lines 570 and 571 (line 572 upsets this pattern, ending instead unexpectedly with *ferro parseris*). — **limina indas ferrea, ferream seram atque anellum :** "you should put on iron thresholds and lintels, an iron bar and door ring." *limina* likes refers to the thresholds and the lintels of the doors together. The *sera* is a bar used to lock the door, and the *anellus* presumably the ring with which one opens the door.

572 : ne sis ferro parseris : “Don’t spare the iron, please.” *parsi* (originally an *s*-aorist) is a perfect form of *parcere* found mostly in Old and post-Classical Latin. The form *peperci* (a reduplicated perfect) is preferred by classical authors.

573 : ferreas tute tibi impingi iubeas crassas compedis : This punchline is funny because it does not follow at all from what Toxilus has been saying in the previous lines. By effectively calling Dordalus a slave, Toxilus may be repaying Dordalus for his jibe at 420: *compedium tritor.* The phrase *impingi compedis* is also found above at 269. — **tute tibi … iubeas :** Like 570 *tu tibi iubeas.*

574 : i sis [in] malum cruciatum : For similar phrases, cf. 288, 352. — **i sane tu—hanc eme; asculta mihi :** Toxilus begins as if to curse Dordalus off in response to his *i malum cruciatum,* but restrains himself, seeing that it is not to his advantage to abuse Dordalus too much yet. Thus the initial imperative *i* is reinterpreted as a particle emphasizing the next imperative (*eme*), similar to *age.* — **ausculta mihi :** The imperative *ausculta* is used with about the same frequency in Plautus as the near synonym *audi*.

575 : modo ut sciam quanti indicet : The expression with *modo* (“just let know, I should know”) is similar to 542 - 543: *videam modo mercimonium*. — **quanti indicet :** “At what price he (i.e., Sagaristio) values her.” — **vin huc vocem :** i.e., *visne ut eum huc vocem?* — **ego illo accesero :** “I’ll go there.” The future perfect here approaches the simple perfect in meaning. *illo* is a directional adverb.

576 : quid agis, hospes? : With the word *hospes* we can imagine that Toxilus is comically exaggerating his ignorance of the situation. Perhaps he knowingly nudges Sagaristio with his elbow. — **venio, adduco :** This type of asyndeton is not uncommon with verbs of motion. — **adduco hanc ad te, ut dudum dixeram :** Note the accumulation of dental sounds.

577 : Note the alliteration on *n* and *v.* — **nam heri in portum noctu navis venit :** Sagaristio's words are directly to Toxilus (who already knows this information), but are obviously spoken so as to verify what Toxilus had early said to Dordalus. — **veniri hanc volo :** "I want this girl to be sold." Normally one would expect the form *vēnīre* (which is used as the passive of *vendere*), which some editors print and which might be right. Woytek explains the formation of *veniri* as motivated by the already passive meaning of the word and compares forms like *fitur* (for *fit*) and *clueor* (for *clueo*). Note also, in addition to the alliteration, the seeming word play between *venīre* and *vēnīrī* and *īrī* of the next line.

578 : si potest; si non potest …quantum potest : Note the nearly comical repetition of the word *potest*. — **iri hinc volo :** This phrase plays on the sounds of the words *veniri hanc volo* of the previous line. — **quantum potest :** A fairly common expression in Plautus and Terence which is present but not exceptionally common in later authors.

579 : salvos sis : A variation on the more common greeting *salve*. The phrase *salvos/salva sis* occurs 17 times in Plautus and nowhere else in Classical Latin, although it later became a

favorite greeting during the Renaissance. — **siquidem hanc vendidero pretio suo :** Sagaristio understands the words *salvos sis* not as the frozen greeting that they are but literally and replies: "[I will be well] if I sell this girl at her price."

580 : atqui aut hoc emptore vendes pulchre aut alio non potis : "Either you'll sell her well either with this buyer or you won't be able with another." *hoc emptore* is ablative absolute ("with this man being the buyer"); also *alio* (sc. *emptore*). With *potis,* sc. *es* or *eris*.

581 : tam quam di omnes qui caelum colunt : sc. *amicus huic sum…amici huic sunt*. i.e., "(I am his friend) as much as all the gods who inhabit the sky (are his friend)." Toxilus is obviously being sarcastic and poking fun at the pimp, but Dordalus takes these words seriously and in the following line corrects Toxilus by clarifying that pimps are not usually dear to the gods.

582 : tum : "In that case." — **tu mi es inimicus certus :** cf. the famous Latin proverb (found first in Ennius' fragments): *amicus certus in re certa cernitur*. — **generi lenonio :** "to the pimping class." For the adjective *lenonius,* cf. 244, 402.

583 : numquam ullus deus tam benignus fuit qui fuerit propitius : "Never was any god so kind with the result that he was actually propitious (to the pimping class)." *qui fuerit* is relative clause of result, breaking the normal rules of sequence to stress the actuality and the endurance of the result. Note also the chiasmus in *benignus fuit qui fuerit propitius*.

584 : hoc age : "huic rei attentum te praebe" (Lambinus). This is a fairly common expression meaning something like "pay attention," lit., "do *this* (and not *that*)."— **opusnest hac tibi empta? :** lit., "Do you need her sold?" This is a variation on the common use of the ablative of the perfect passive participle with *opus est*. e.g., *opus est facto = opus est facere*; *opus est cauto = opus est cavere*; *opus est hac empta = opus est hanc emere.* — **si tibi venissest opus :** *si tibi venisse est opus*; "If you need for her to have been sold." The use of the perfect infinitive is either motivated by aspect (and equivalent to the present infinitive) or answers the perfect participle *empta*.

585 : si tibi subiti nihil est, tantumdemst mihi : "If you aren't in a rush, I'm not either," lit., "if you don't have anything sudden, I have the same." With *tantumdem est mihi* sc. *subiti.*

586 : indica : For the verb *indicare* 'to put a price on, to value', cf. 575. — **fac pretium :** "Make a price, make a bid, name a price." — **tua mers est, tua indicatiost :** "It's your merchandise, it's your valuation (price), it's your job to put a price on her." "tuum est indicare et tuae merci pretium constituere," (Lambinus).

587 : aequom hic orat : For this type of expression, cf. ad 147: bene facis, 399: bonum aequomque oras, 518: bene mones, 543: aequa dicis. — **vin te pulchre vendere :** Dordalus cautiously answers with a question. Note the sonic effect of opening and closing the question with the same sounds as Sagaristio's question (*vin ...-ere*).

588 : ego scio hercle utrumque velle : Toxilus acts as a referee during the exchange. — **age indica prognariter :** The meaning of the adverb here is disputed (maybe "clearly" or "decisively"), but the sense of the line is abundantly clear.

589 : priu' dico : cf. Capt. 803: *prius edico*; Men. 47: *praedico prius*; Pseud. 119; Truc. 780. — **hanc mancupio nemo tibi dabit :** On the phrase *dare mancupio,* cf. 525, 532.

590 : indica minino daturus qui sis, qui duci queat : "indica, quanto minimo pretio eam daturus sis, ut a me emptore abduci queat," (Lambinus). The *qui* is instrumental. *daturus sis* is present subjunctive of the active periphrastic, showing time posterior to the main verb. The subject switches in the second clause (*qui duci queat*) to the virgo.

591 : tace, tace — We find the repetition of *tace* (as in the colloquial registrar of any language) two other times in Plautus, once in Terence, and once in Apuleius. — **nimi' tu quidem hercle homo stultus es puerilter :** "You're too childishly stupid." Dordalus immediately is ready to buy the girl and asks for the price, but Toxilus interrupts him and, using reverse-psychology, urges him to not be so ready to believe everything that Sagaristio says. This not only extends the scene and heightens the comedy, but also works very well in further convincing Dordalus that he should buy the girl. These words are spoken aside, as if Sagaristio could not hear them.

592 : quid ita? # quia : The question *quid ita?* ("why's that?") is often answered by a clause introduced by *quia* in Plautus. Cicero also often will rhetorically ask *quid ita?* and respond with his own *quia* clause. — **te ex puella priu' percontari volo :** Note the alliteration.

593 : quae ad rem referunt : For *refert* with *ad,* cf. 513. — **atque hercle tu me monuisti hau male :** "You've given me some good advice." One cannot help but laugh at the irony of the pimp's words. For *monere bene/male/recte* cf. 518: bene mones; 147: bene facis.

594 : vide sis : Like our "(Would you) look at that!" — **ego ille doctus leno paene in foveam decidi :** "I, the cunning pimp, almost fell down into a ditch." Dordalus expresses surprise at his own haste; he should be more careful given his great experience with pimping (i.e., he is *doctus* in matters relating to buying and selling girls). The use of *ille* here corresponds exactly to our use of the definite article *the* in apposition to some other noun or pronoun. *paene in foveam decidere* (=*paene deceptus sum,* Lambinus) has an axiomatic ring to it.

594 - 595 : decidi, hic nisi adesses : The past tenses of the indicative are sometimes used in the apodosis of a present contrafactual conditional sentences when the action almost happened or was very likely to happen.

595 : quantum est adhibere hominem amicum : Exclamation: "How much it is to use a friend!" I cannot find an exact parallel for *quantum* by itself with the infinitive. — **ubi quid geras :** On *quid* = *aliquid* after *ubi,* v.s. ad 313, 435.

596 : quo genere aut qua in patria nata sit aut quibus parentibus: Toxilus urges Dordalus to ask Sagaristio exactly what he had instructed Saturio to tell his daughter to say at 149-150: (*praecipe*) *quid fabuletur: ubi se natam praedicet, qui sibi parentes fuerint, und' surrupta sit.* cf. also Saturio's discussion with the virgo at 379-381.These indirect questions (*sit*) are dependent on *volo te percontari* (598).

597 : ne temere hanc te emisse dicas me impulsore aut inlice : "So that you won't say that you bought her thoughtlessly with me being the instigator or enticing you." cf. Mos. 916: *me suasore atque impulssore*. *me impulsore aut inlice* is an ablative absolute similar in type to 580: *me emptore.*

598 : quin laudo, imquam, consilium tuom : For the phrase *laudare consilium* cf. ad 548: laudo consilium tuom.

599 : After his short exchange with Dordalus, Toxilus turns to Sagaristio and addresses this line to him. — **nisi molestum est :** This phrase, which usually softens a request, is found in Plautus, Terence, and Cicero's dialogues. — **paucis :** sc. verbis, as often. — **maxume :** "Certainly." cf. Curc. 315; Pseud. 661: *tuo arbitratu, maxume*. The use of *maxume* to agree or consent is likely a translation of Grk. μάλιστα.

600 : suo arbitratu : For the phrase, cf. 566. — **quid stas? :** "Why are you standing around?" A common question in comedy. — **itidem :** The word *itidem* comes up a few times in Lucretius and Cicero, but almost completely skips over the Augustan period before becoming popular in Apuleius.

601 : ut liceat : Indirect command with *roga* (600). — **etsi :** While it is true that the word *etsi* can sometimes introduce independent clauses, I see no reason to not punctuate with a comma after *velis,* making the *etsi* clause subordinate to the imperatives in 600: "Although he already said…go ask him anyway."

602 : dixit dare : For the present infinitive of the indirect statement to be simultaneous in time with *dixit, dixit* must have present-perfect meaning here: "He has said that he gives." — **potestatem eius :** "The right (power, opportunity) of it," i.e., *potestatem interrogandae puellae* (Lambinus). *eius* is neuter.

603 : eumpse : There are certain forms of *ipse* in Plautus which decline as if it were a compound of the demonstrative *is* and *-pse* (which is interpreted as a particle). — **ut ne contemnat te ille :** "So that he doesn't despise you." I.e., so that Sagaristio respects Dordalus for handling the purchase himself. — **sati' recte mones :** cf. 518 and 593.

604 : Now Dordalus addresses Sagaristio and asks him for permission to question the girl. — **volo ego hanc percontari :** Note the various constructions used with *percontari*: here and at 598,

599, *percontari aliquem*; at 592 and below at 611, *percontari aliquid ex aliquo.* — **a terra ad caelum, quidlubet :** "From earth to the sky, (ask) anything you want." There is no exact parallel for the seemingly proverbial expression *a terra ad caelum*.

605 : iube dum : The use of *dum* with imperatives originally added the meaning "a bit" (like *manedum,* "wait a second"), but was extended to the function of softening commands generally. — **ea huc accedat ad me :** Indirect commands (with or without *ut*) with *iubere* are rare, but not impossible. — **i sane ac morem illi gere :** Addressed to the virgo. The expression *morem alicui gerere* (lit., "to perform one's will") is more common in colloquial registers, but not unknown in other genres.

606 : percontare, exquire quidvis : Sagaristio turns back to Dordalus. cf. Epid. 696: *exquire, rogita quod lubet*; Merc. 503: *exquire quidvis*.

606 - 608 : age, age nunc tu, in proelium vide ut ingrediare auspicato : These words are traditionally given to Toxilus; Woytek assigns them to Sagaristio. de Melo follows Woytek. Understanding the traditional assignments is diffficult, and Woytek's version makes sense and may be right. Part of the difficult here is keeping track of how many conversations are going on: in the preceding and following lines, each of the four characters on stage has at least one separate exchange with each of the other three characters. If one should want to make sense of the traditional assignment of lines here, perhaps the best way to do so would be to understand the following: in line 603 Toxilus and Dordalus are speaking with one another; in line 604 Dordalus

addresses Sagaristio and speaks with him until *ad me* of 605; the second half of 605 is addressed by Sagaristio to the virgo; the first half of 606 by Sagaristio to Dordalus; in the second half of 606 and 607 Toxilus continues his private conversation wit Dordalus from 603, urging him to be confident; finally, the second half of 607 and all of 608 are spoken by the virgo, who overhears what Toxilus says says privately to Dordalus. Her words are technically addressed to Toxilus and Sagaristio (or perhaps even to all three men on stage), but in reality they are likely said as an aside (since no one else on stage acknowledges her words), a somewhat sarcastic commentary on the situation perhaps directed at evoking the empathy of the audience.

607 : auspicato : "under a good omen." Technically from the perfect participle of *auspicari*, the word *auspicato* can be explained either as an adverb in *-o* or as a type of one-word ablative absolute. — **liquidumst auspicium :** "The omen is clear." This combination of noun and adjective is found also at Epid. 182, Pseud. 762.

608 : ut praedati pulchre ad castra convertamini : "that you return to camp having made some nice booty." This line continues the metaphor introduced in 606 with *in proelium*. Note the alliterating triplet (*curabo…castra convertamini*) which is interrupted by the alliterating pair (*praedati pulchre*).

609 : concede istuc, ego illam adducam : Said to Dordalus. — **age, ut rem esse in nostram putas :** For the phrase *in rem esse,* cf. 342 and ad 563: ex tuo usu.

610 : ehodum huc : “Hey, [come] here.” The interjection *eho* tends to be found introducing questions and commands. It is found with *dum* only here in Plautus and four times in Terence. cf. especially Ter. Andr. 184: *ehodum ad me.* — **vide sis quid agas :** These words are directed to the virgo, out of earshot of Dordalus. — **curabo ut voles :** “I’ll take care of it as you will like.” The future of *velle* is found in the phrases *ut voles* and *ut volet* throughout Latin.

611 : sequere me : These two words are addressed to the virgo. The rest of the line is addressed to Dordalus. — **ex hac percontarier :** For the construction *ex aliquo percontari,* cf. ad 604. The archaic infinitive *percontarier* is used by Plautus 11 times, 10 of which are at the verse end.

612 : enim volo te adesse : sc. cum ego puellam percunctabor (Lambinus). — **hau possum quin huic operam dem hospiti :** “I can’t help supporting mu guest,” (de Melo). Bennett 1, 247 notes nine instances of this type of *quin* clause after *non* (*haud*) *possum*.

613 : quoi erus iussit : sc. operam dare. — **quid si hic non volt me una adesse? :** Some more reverse-psychologically. — **immo i modo :** “No, just go.” *i modo* comes up a few times in Plautus.

614 : do tibi ego operam : These words are addressed to Dordalus. “I’m giving you my attention.” — **tibi ibidem das, ubi tu tuom amicum adiuvas :** The pimp rather philosophically reflects: “You give yourself attention at the same time when you help your friend.”

615 : exquire. # heus tu, advigila : Woytek follows Ritschl and gives all of these words to Toxilus, who would direct *exquire* to Dordalus and *heus tu, advigila* to the virgo. The difference is very small. If we keep the traditional assignment, the imperative *exquire* would continue from *immo i modo,* after Sagaristio is interrupted by a short exchange between Dordalus and Toxilus. — **advigila :** "Be vigilant, careful." — **satis est dictum :** cf. 214: satis iam dictum habeo; Poen. 607. This might be a translation of Grk. ἅλις λόγων.

616 : scio ego officium meum, ut quae rogiter vera, ut accepi, eloquar : lit., "I know my duty, (namely) that which things I am asked I must speak out the truth as I have heard." It seems that the *ut accepi* might refer to what Saturio has instructed her to say. In this case, these words would either not be understood by Dordalus (Woytek), or the entire line would be addressed to Toxilus, out of Dordalus' earshot. Alternatively, this line could be directed at the audience (like our interpretation of 607-608 above ad 606-608) as a type of commentary on the situation, especially since Toxilus does not respond directly to this comment. — **scio officium meum :** For the phrase *scire officium,* cf. Merc. 522: *scis facere officium tuom*; Poen. 12: *si tuom officium scias*.

617 : virgo, hic homo probus est … non diu apud hunc servies : Woytek gives the second half of this line (*non die apud hunc servies*) to Dordalus, which seems impossible.

618 : ita pol spero, si parentes faciunt officium suom : The virgo of course refers to Saturio (and Toxilus) pulling off their trick successfully, but it seems likely that Dordalus understands

her words as referring to her parents coming to find her and buying her back from him. This line may also be a commentary on the situation directed at the audience, as above at 607-608 and 616.

619 - 620 : nolo ego te mirari, si nos ex te percontabimur patriam tuam aut parentes : Woytek is right to see politeness and caution in this remark, as if Dordalus is worried about offending or scaring the ostensibly noble prisoner (see Woytek *ad loc*.). — **si nos ex te percontabimur patriam tuam aut parentes :** For the construction *ex aliquo percontari,* cf. ad 604, 611. Note the alliteration on *p* and the repetition of *t*.

620 : qur ego hic mirer, mi homo? : "Why should I be surprised here, my sir?" The adverb *hic* here does not mean "here" but rather "in this situation, given this circumstance," which is a fairly common classical usage. — **mi homo :** "my sir" or "my good fellow" (de Melo). Unsurprisingly we find this form of address only in drama.

621 : servitus mea mi interdixit ne quid mirer meum malum : "My slavery has forbidden me from being surprised at all at my misfortune." Judging from Dordalus' response (*noli flere*), we can assume that the virgo has likely begun to weep (or at least speak very melodramatically). The use of *interdicere* with a *ne* clause is only found elsewhere in Plautus at Mil. 1056-1057, although there are few examples in Terence, Caesar, and Cicero as well. *quid* (*aliquid*) here is likely adverbial ("at all") and not to be taken with *meum malum* (as in de Melo's translation: "any misfortune of mine"). Note the alliteration on *m* in the entire line.

622 : ah, di istam perdant! : This is said as a compliment in surprise at the acting talent of the virgo. Colloquial English will also use various curses to praise someone's skills or prowess.

623 : ut sapiens habet cor, quam dicit quod opust! : Lambinus rightly glosses *sapiens habet cor* with *cordata est*. cf. Poen. 131: *sapienter, docte et cordate et callide*. — **quid nomen est tibi? :** One of the more common expressions in colloquial Latin for asking for someone's name.

624 : nunc metuo ne peccet : "Now I'm scared that she'll fail, mess up, make a mistake." cf. Mil. 904: *ne quid peccetis paveo*. — **Lucridi nomen in patria fuit :** One can answer the question *quid nomen tibi est?* with either the nominative (as the subject of *est*) or with the dative (as here, with or without the inclusion of *mihi*).

625 : Nomen atque omen quantivis iam est preti : lit., "Of how great a price is the name and omen already!" The name Lucris sounds like it is related to the Latin word *lucrum* ("profit") hence Toxilus' reference to the *omen* ("sign"). Lambinus explains: "vel propter nomen ipsum, quod tibi lucrum per se ostentat, quantivis emere debes." Note the wordplay in the similar sounding *nomen* and *omen*. For *quantivis preti* ("whatever price you want," i.e., "worth a lot"), cf. Epid. 410: *ne tu habes servom graphicum et quantivis preti.* — **quin tu hanc emis :** From this point on Toxilus stops encouraging Dordalus to be careful and instead excitedly urges him to buy this girl. This psychological tactic works well in many situations.

626 : nimi' pavebam, ne peccaret. expedivit : These words are said as an aside, perhaps directly to the audience. For *pavebam, ne peccaret,* see ad 624. *expedire* here means "extricate" or "set right" or even "set free." The meaning depends on whether one understands *id, me, se,* or something else.

627 : mihi quoque Lucridem confido fore te : "I trust that you will be Lucris for me as well." Dordalus understands *Lucris* as an adjective meaning "profitable." — **tu si hanc emeris :** Toxilus repeat's Dordalus' *si te emam* of the pervious line.

628 : numquam hercle hunc mensem vortentem, credo, servibit tibi : "She won't serve you, I think, for an entire month." The idea is that she will earn so much money in one month so as to buy her freedom. *numquam hercle* is a common emphatic negative in Plautus. *hunc mensem vortentem* is accusative of extent of time and most likely refers to one month (so Lambinus, Ammendola).— **servibit :** On the formation of the future tense of the fourth conjugation with the infix -*bi-,* v.s. ad 15, 219, 307.

629 : optata ut eveniant operam addito : "Add, apply effort so that what you want happens." *optata* respons to *ita velim.*

630 : nihil adhuc peccavit etiam : These words are an aside, directed to the audience.

631 : in culina, in angulo ad laevam manum : The virgo comically takes the question very literally and provides a very detailed response.

632 - 633 : haec erit tibi fausta meretrix: natast in calido loco, ubi rerum omnium copiast saepissuma : The prostitute will "lucky" because she was born on the left-hand side of the kitchen (Ammendola right sites Varro: *quae sinistra sunt, bona auspicia existimantur*) and because, as Toxilus explains, she was born "in a hot place where there is the most regular supply of good things." The kitchen is seen as an omen for the virgo's future as a successful prostitute: both the kitchen and the brothel are *callidi loci,* for obvious reasons.

634 - 635 : tactus lenost : "The pimp has been tricked!" This meaning of *tangere* is not particularly common. — **qui rogaret ubi nata esset diceret lepide lusit :** "She has smartly tricked (the pimp) who asked her to say where she was born." — **qui rogaret :** i.e., *cum ille rogaret.* — **diceret :** In an indirect command after *rogare* (without *ut*). — **lepide lusit :** Note the alliteration in this phrase. cf. Bacch. 642: *lusi lepide*. — **at ego patriam te rogo quae sit tua :** Note the prolepsis of *patriam*.

636 : quae mihi sit, nisi haec ubi nunc sum? : The virgo responds truthfully to comic effect, since Athens is actually her *patria*, but Dordalus understands her to mean that she has accepted her fate of slavery. The subjunctive *sit* may not potential (Ammendola, de Melo), but rather merely repeating the *sit* from Dordalus' indirect question in the previous line. — **quae fuit :**

Either a relative clause ("the one which was") or the indicative in an indirect question, which is not uncommon in Plautus.

636 - 637 : quae fuit … quod fuit, quando fuit : Note the repetition.

637 : pro nihilo esse duco : "I consider as nothing."

638 : tamquam hominem, quando animam ecflavit, quid eum quaeras qui fuit : "Just like a man, when he has breathed out his soul, why would ask who he was?" Both *hominem* and *eum* are taken proleptically, the former in the *quando animam ecflavit* clause, the latter in the *qui fuit* clause. *qui fuit* is an indirect question with the indicative or alternatively a relative clause (v.s. ad 636: *quae fuit*). — **animam ecflavit :** This poetic and euphemistic expression is found also at Truc. 876.

639 : ita me di bene ament, sapienter! : "As well as the gods may love me, [she responded] wisely!" On the phrase, cf. 492: *ita me di ament ut*.— **atque eo miseret tamen :** The *atque* is be slightly adversative (so Woytek) with *tamen*: "But for that reason [i.e., that she replied wisely] I pity her nevertheless."

640 : sed tamen : "But still, despite that." — **quae patriast tua, age mi actutum expedi :** The *quae patriast tua* shows that the origin of the occasion use of the indicative in indirect questions

(v.s. ad 636, 638) is the result of paratactic constructions like this one. — **age mi actutum expedi :** v.s. ad 215: hoc mi expedi.

641 : quid taces? : This expression ("why aren't you saying anything?") is largely confined to Plautus, Terence, and Cicero's orations. — **quando hic servio :** On this use of *quando* (as a subordinating conjunction with temporal/causal force), cf. ad 223: *quando ita certa rest.* — **haec est patria mea :** The virgo continues to insist ironically on the truth.

642 : de istoc rogare omitte : For *omittere* with the infinitive, cf. ad 207: *mitte male loqui*; and ad 431: *iam omitte iratus esse.*

642 - 643 : (non vides nolle eloqui?) ne suarum se miseriarum in memoriam inducas : Woytek improves this line (especially the understanding of the pronoun *se* and the possessive adjective *suarum*) by punctuating with a period after *omitte* and then: *non vides nolle eloqui, ne suarum se miseriarum in memoriam inducas?* Note the placement of *suarum* directly next to *se* and the resulting two alliterating pairs.

644 : captusne est pater? : sc. *ab hostibus* (Lambinus); i.e., "Is your father a prisoner of war?" (de Melo). — **non captus, sed quod habuit perdidit :** Comically fitting for the virgo's actual father, the parasite Saturio, yet of course this is lost on Dordalus.

645 : haec erit bono genere nata : The future tense here has the meaning "maybe", a meaning very familiar in Italian. — **nihil scit nisi verum loqui :** Once again, the comedy in these words lies in the fact that they mean something more to Toxilus and the audience than to the pimp Dordalus.

646 : quid illum miserum memorem qui fuit? : "Why should I speak of that wretched man who was?" *memorem* is deliberative subjunctive. *qui fuit* here likely means *qui mortuus est*.

647 : nunc et illum Miserum et me Miseram aequom est nominarier : de Melo renders *Miserum* and *Miseram* as Mister Wretched and Miss Wretched because the virgo uses the adjectives as if they were names.

648 : quoiusmodi is in populo habitust? : "What what sort was he considered among the people?" sc. *esse.* — **nemo quisquam acceptior :** "No one was more welcome." This is not the most common usage of *acceptus*. Once again, this statement applies both generally to someone who is loved by others and to Saturio the parasite specifically, who always strives to be welcomed into the homes of others.

649 : servi liberique amabant : Woytek is perhaps right is seeing two meanings in this statement: (1) the rich foreign father whose daughter the virgo is pertending to be is loved by both his slaves and children; (2) Saturio the parasite has sexual relationships with anyone (*servi liberique* = "free and slaves," i.e., everyone) to feed himself. — **hominem miserum praedicas :**

If Woytek's interpretation of *servi liberique amabant* is right, then this remark of Toxilus is particularly funny.

650 : quom et ipsus prope perditust et benevolentis perdidit : The emendation *probe perditust* ("is well ruined") for *prope* ("is nearly ruined") may be right. Note the alliteration on *p*.

651 : emam, opinor # etiam 'opinor'? : In languages with verbs that inflect for person, it is fairly common in this type of surprised question to merely repeat the verb form which was used instead of inflecting it again.

653 : iam hoc tibi dico : It seems like Dordalus begins to hesitate after Toxilus says *eme modo* (652). The virgo then jumps in to try to convince him further. Perhaps Toxilus even surreptitiously gestures to the virgo to get her to say something.

653 - 654 : actutum ecastor meu' pater, ubi me sciet veniisse, ipse aderit et me aps te redimet : "My father, when he finds out that I have been sold, himself will be present right away and will buy me back from you." The futures in the subordinate clause (*ubi sciet*) and the main clause (*aderit, redimet*) are on the model of future more vivid conditional statements. — **quid nunc? :** For the question, cf. ad 144.

655 : audin quid ait? : For the indicative in an indirect question, cf. 636, 638. — **etsi res sunt fractae, amici sunt tamen :** "Even if his fortunes are shattered, he still has friends." For the

expression *res sunt fractae*, cf. Verg. Georg. 4.240: *et res miserabere fractas*. This line can also apply equally well to the parasite Saturio, who likely has squandered his possessions. As the virgo says *amici sunt tamen*, perhaps she gestures towards Toxilus, who is the friend who is going to help Saturio reclaim his daughter in the end of the play.

656 : ne sis plora : "Don't cry, please." The virgo has perhaps started to cry again in line 655. For the use of the negative particle *ne* with the present imperative to form a negative command (particularly common in Plautus with monosyllabic and disyllabic imperative forms) cf. ad 227 and 490. — **libera eris actutum :** For the adverb *actutum,* one of Plautus' favorites, cf. ad 324. — **si crebro cades :** "si crebro viris succumbes" (Lambinus). There is no exact parallel for *cadere* in this sense, but the meaning is clear, and the verb is perhaps chosen to create an alliterating pair of disyllabic words, adding a nice jingle to this suggestive remark. Many of the other instances of *crebro* in Plautus occur in alliterating pairs: Curc. 398: *crebro commeant*; Mil. 206: *crebro commutat*; Mil. 850: *hoc illi crebro capite sistebant cadi*; Truc. 682: *crebro commeo.* — **crebro :** For the adverbial use of the neuter ablative singular (*crebro*) cf. ad 46: sedulo.

657 : vin mea esse? : The comedy in this question lies in the fact that Dordalus thinks his previous remark ("you will be free right away, if you often fall [on your back into bed]") has comforted and convinced the virgo. There is likely a short pause before and after this question to give the audience time to laugh and heighten the comedy. — **dum quidem ne nimi' diu tua sim, volo :** Note the almost perfect alteration between monosyllabic and disyllabic words and the alliteration in *dum quidem ne nimis diu*.

658 : satin ut meminit libertatis? : Questions beginning with *satin* are common enough in Plautus, although, as Bennett notes (1, 471), the adverb *satis* often does not retain its exact meaning. Bennett punctuates this sentence with an exclamation point and takes *ut* as exclamatory, which may be better. In any case, the question here does not expect any answer. cf. Bennett 1,471 for other examples of *satin* with ut in rhetorical questions or exclamations. — **dabit haec tibi grandis bolos :** "She'll give you great hauls." The word *bolus* comes from Greek βόλος (from βάλλειν) and refers properly to throw of a fishing net and so, by extension, can refer generally to profits in Latin, although this usage is not found in Greek.

659 : age si quid agis. ego ad hunc redeo. sequere. redduco hanc tibi : Note the effect of the short staccato clauses. — **age si quid agis :** i.e., "si emere vis, eme ne tamdiu cunctare," (Lambinus). This is a way of saying "hurry up." cf. the similar phrase at 146: *hoc si facturu's, face.* The exact expression *age si quid agis* is found at least three other times in Plautus. — **ego ad hunc redeo. sequere. redduco hanc tibi :** The words *ego ad hunc redeo* are directed at Dordalus, and the *hunc* refers of course to Sagaristio; *sequere* is likely also directed at Dordalus, but it can equally well be directed at the virgo (they both follow Toxilus back to where Sagaristio is standing anyway); *redduco hanc tibi* is directed at Sagaristio.

660 : adulescens, vin vendere istanc? : Woytek is right in seeing this question as simply a way to restart the negotions between Dordalus and Sagaristio, since Sagaristio has already agreed to sell her above at 579. — **magis lubet quam perdere :** sc. *vendere* with *lubet*. The response is

puzzling unless it is understood as a very general and banal observation that selling something for profit is better than loosing it.

661 : tum tu pauca in verba confer : For the expression *conferre in pauca verba*, cf. Asin. 88, Cas. 648, Men. 6; the more common expression is *dicere/loqui/respondere paucis verbis*. — **qui datur, tanti indica :** lit., "Set the price (*indica*) at as much as she is given." *qui* is instrumental, as often. *tanti* is genitive of price. For the verb *indicare,* cf. 575 and 586.

662 : faciam ita ut te velle video, ut emas. habe centum minis : "I'll do as I see you want, so that you buy her. Have her for 100 minas." Although it might be better to punctuate with an additional comma after *ita,* making the clause *ut te velle video* not correlative with *ita*, but depending on *ut emas*: "I'll bring it about that you buy her, as I see you want to."

663 : nummus abesse hinc non potest : i.e., "Not a penny less." de Melo prints his own conjecture here, *drachuma* for *nummus*, which in his opinion produces better rhythm. cf. Rud. 1330: *talentum magnum. non potest triobolum hinc abesse*.

664 : quod nunc dicam : "[from that] which I will say now." The *hinc* of the previous line looks forward to *quod*.

665 : tuo periclo : For the phrase, cf. ad 524: ac suo periclo is emat qui eam mercabitur.

666 : Toxile quid ago? # di deaeque te agitant irati, scelus : Dordalus asks, "What should I do?" (with the indicative where one would expect a deliberative subjunctive), but Toxilus answers almost as if he had asked "How am I doing?" — **di deaeque te agitant irati :** "The gods and goddesses are after you in their anger," (de Melo). — **scelus :** For the word *scelus* as an insult, cf. ad 192.

667 : qui hanc non properes destinare : The relative clause is causal (*qui* = *cum tu*). For the meaning of the word *destinare* in the language of commerce, cf. ad 541-542: *etiam tu illam destinas*. — **habeto :** sc. *sexaginta minas.* The reading *habebo* (sc. *eam*) might be better, however. de Melo prints *habebo*; Woytek chooses to print a lacuna here instead.

667 - 668 : abi, argentum ecfer huc. non edepol minis trecentis carast. fecisti lucri : These words are traditionally given to Toxilus, but Woytek has assigned them to Sagaristio. It is certainly better to keep the traditional assignment (as de Melo does in his text), since the words seem more fitting for a friend (Toxilus) congratulating his buddy for his purchase.

668 : non edepol minis trecentis carast : "She is not (i.e, would not be) expensive for three hundred minas." — **fecisti lucri :** The genitive is originally partitive: "You have made (a lot) of profit"; here one can understand a type of tmesis of the verb *lucrifacere* (= *lucrifecisti*).

668[a] : This line is problematic, and a lacuna has long ago been postulated. Woytek keeps Linday's suggestion *habeto* but gives it to Sagaristio ("let him have her") instead of to Dordalus

("let him have the money"), which de Melo decides to print as well. Unfortunately it is impossible to decide between these two options. Even if one gives the *habeto* to Sagaristio, Dordalus must say something in the beginning of the line (in the lacuna) like "here's the money, have the money." — **eu! praedatu' probe :** "You've made some fine booty." The suggestion that Toxilus is here talking to himself (Lambinus: "nonnulli putant Toxilum apud se loqui sibi gratulantem, quod praeclaram praedam a lenone fecerit") is likely right since, as we have seen, this type of comedy, wherein the audience knows something that one of the characters does not (here, Dordalus thinks that the words are for him) is particularly common in this scene. The Greek adverb *eu* ("well [done]!") is almost as common in Plautus as *euge* (*eugae*). For a similar alliterating pair, cf. 608: *curabo ut praedati pulchre ad castra convertamini*.

669 : etiam pro vestimentis huc decem accedent minae : "For her clothing, another ten minas will be added to this." *huc* here means *ad has sexaginta minas* (Lambinus).

670 : abscedent enim, non accedent : "They (sc. *minae*) come off, not be added." The joke here is that the virgo will not need her clothes for her new profession. This joke seems to have been lost on most commentators, who seem to see these words as referring only to the financial transaction.

670 - 671 : non tu illum vides quaerere ansam, infectum ut faciat : "Don't you see that he is seeking an opportunity to make it undone (i.e., to undo the sale)?" These words are addressed to Dordalus. Toxilus means that Sagaristio is trying to go back on his word because he regrets his

decision to sell the girl. This, of course, makes Dordalus all the more eager. The word *ansa* means literally "handle of a pot" (cf. 308: *ansatus*) and by extension can mean "opportunity, occasion" (much like the Greek word λαβή). For the wordplay (figura etymologica) *infectum ut faciat*, cf. Amph 884: *ea quae sunt facta infecta ut reddat clamitat*; Aul. 741: *Quid vis fieri? factum est illud: fieri infectum non potest*; Cas. 828: *haec ut infecta faciant*; etc.

671ª - 672 : There is obviously a lacuna in the beginning of this line. It is likely that in this lacuna, the pimp Dordalus says something like "Allright, I'll go get the money," and begins to exit. During this exit, but before he has completely left the stage, Toxilus then says *atque ut dignust perit,* either to himself or to Sagaristio and the virgo. Dordalus does not hear this remark, and just before he completely exits, turns back and shouts to Toxilus *heus tu serva istum* ("Hey, watch that guy [i.e., Sagaristio, so that he doesn't run away]!").

673 - 682 : Dordalus leaves to go get money, and meanwhile Toxilus praises the virgo's performance and repeats some instructions to Sagaristio.

673 - 674 : operam adlaudabilem : Note the jingle that occurs from the near homoioteleuton: *operam adlaudabilem* (*p* and *b* and *r* and *l* sound very similar) — **probam et sapientem et sobriam :** Taken together with *operam adlaudabilem,* there is a perfect alternation of the endings *-am* and *-em*. Woytek is right in understanding these three words as explaining the adjective *adlaudabilis*; hence the explanatory asyndeton between *adlaudabilem* and *probam* and the polysyndeton in the remainder of Toxilus' line.

674 - 675 : si quid bonis boni fit, esse id et grave et gratum solet : "When something good happens to good people, it tends to be both important and appreciated." cf. Cap. 358, which expresses the same idea and also alliterates on *b* and *g*: *quod bonis bene fit beneficium, gratia ea gravida est bonis*.

676 : audin tu, Persa? : Toxilus seems to pay no attention to the virgo's words (as frequently above) and turns to Sagaristio, who seems, to judge from Toxilus' quesiton, to not be listening or paying attention. Toxilus comically calls his friend *Persa,* as a director may refer to an actor by his character's name, even after the show is over.

676 - 677 : Toxilus, to judge from Sagaristio's response (*ne doce*), seems to be repeating instructions which he has already given to Sagaristio offstage. — **ubi argentum ab hoc acceperis, simulato :** As often, this sentence shows the form of a future more vivid conditional (with emphatic protasis). — **simulato quasi eas :** For the phrase *simulare quasi,* cf. ad 84: simulabo quasi. — **ne doce :** For the use of the negative particle *ne* with the present imperative to form a negative command (particularly common in Plautus with monosyllabic and disyllabic imperative forms) cf. ad 227, 490, 656.

678 - 679: per angiportum rursum te ad me recipito illac per hortum : For the words *angiportus* and illac, cf. 444: *abi istac travorsis angiportis ad forum*.

679 : quod futurum est praedicas : "You're saying what's going to happen (anyway)," i.e., "you're wasting your time telling me this, because I already know what to do." For the phrase, cf. Mil. 909: *sic futurum est*.

680 - 681 : at ne cum argento protinam permittas domum, moneo, te : There are multiple ways to punctuate this sentence, depending on how one understands the *ne* clause and the meaning of the verb *permittere*. With Lindsay's text, the *ne* clause could is dependent on the *moneo*; the *te* is understood as the object of *permittas,* which seems to need an object here. The problem with this is of course the awkward (and unlikely if not impossible) placement of *te,* which seems to naturally want to be understood as the object of *moneo.* Woytek prints a stop after *domum*, understands the *ne* clause as and independent negative command, and takes *moneo te* almost as an afterthought. The problem with this is that *permittas* must be understood in a middle/passive sense ("permit yourself, let yourself"). While there are no parallels for this with *permittere,* there are other instances in Old Latin of active verbs functioning in this way. This is an instance where it is impossible to decide between the two interpretation, but it is also of little importance: the meaning is totally transparent.

681 : quod te dignumst, me dignum esse vis? : lit., "Do you want for that which is worthy for you to be worthy for me?" Sagaristio seems to be upset with the repetition of the instructions, and says that unlike Toxilus (who might need things repeated to him multiple times), he himself only needs to be told something once.

682 : tace, parce voci : Funny because Toxilus has been the one talking. For the phrase, cf. Mil. 1330: *ne parce vocem*. — **praeda progreditur foras :** Note how the joke of referring to the pimp with the noun *praeda* is given further emphasis through alliteration. These words announce the return of Dordalus.

683 - 710 : The pimp Dordalus returns with the money, and has taken two *nummi* from the price to compensate for the price of the wallet which holds the money. Sagaristio takes the money and says that he must go right away to deliver some letters and comically adds that he wants to look into setting free his twin brother who is a slave in Athens. Before Sagaristio exits, Dordalus asks him his name, and Sagaristio replies elaborately and comically.

683 : probae hic argenti sunt sexaginta nummi : cf. 437 - 438: *nummi sescenti hic erunt, probi, numerati*; 526: *probrum et numeratum argentum*.

684 : duobis nummis minus est : *duobus nummis* is ablative of degree of difference. *minus* is an adverb. — **quid ei nummi sciunt :** The verb *scire* is being used in the sense "know how to" and one must understand an infintive (*facere*), as we can see from Dordalus' response. On this usage of sciunt, cf. ad 6: *sciunt mihi respondere*.

685 : cruminam hanc emere aut facere ut remigret domum : "They [know how to] pay for this wallet or make it go back home." sc. *sciunt.* i.e., "ea gratia duos nummos detraxi, ut

crumenam emas, aut si emere nolis, et duos nummos qui desunt tibi dari postulas, crumena mihi reddas," (Lambinus).

686 - 687 : ne non sat esses leno : Fear clause with *metuebas*; the *non* negates the *sat.* For the idea, cf. Ter. Phorm. 508: *ne parum leno sies.* — **id metuebas miser :** The *id* is in apposition with the clause *ne non sat esses leno*. Note the alliterating pair here at the end of the line, balancing the *ne non* of the beginning of the line. — **impure, avare :** This line (687) expands on the thought of the preceding line (686), beginning with adding two more vocatives after *miser.* — **ne crumillam amitteres :** This clause is technically also dependent on *metuebas* and in apposition with *id*, but it is largely added as an afterthought (hence the asyndeton), logically following from the vocative *avare*. — **crumillam :** The diminutive (only here) adds to the acidity of the insult: "so that you wouldn't lose this worthless wallet of yours?"

688 : sine, quaeso : *quaeso* ("please") can be used with both the imperative and the subjunctive (with and without ut). — **quando leno est :** For this use of quando, cf. ad 223 and 641. — **nil mirum facit :** For the expression (*nil/non*) *mirum facere,* cf. Bacch. 1044: *non mirum facis*; Cap. 582; Pseud. 434: *quid mirum fecit?*; Pseud. 512: *mirum et magnum facinus feceris.*

689 : lucro faciundo ego auspicavi in hunc diem : "I took auspices for this day for making profit." *lucro faciundo* is dative of purpose. The verb *auspicari* is more ususally deponent. cf. Rud. 717: *non hodie isti rei auspicavi, ut cum furcifero fabuler,* where the *ut* clause is used like the final dative *lucro faciundo* here.

690 : nil mihi tam parvi est quin me id pigeat perdere : "Nothing is so worthless for me that I wouldn't repent losing it." *parvi* is genitive of value.

691 - 692 : hunc in collum, nisi piget, impone : "Put it on this neck, unless you repent." — **hunc in collum :** Normally *collum* is neuter, but the masculine *collus* is attested a number of times in Old Latin. However the emendation *huc* for *hunc* (as Woytek and de Melo print) might be better. — **nisi piget :** Responds directly to Dordalus's remark *nil mihi tam parvi est quin me id pigeat perdere*. — **vero fiat :** It is better to redivide the line so that *vero* follows the imperative *impone*, since *vero* does not normally occur at the beginning of a sentence in Plautus, but can add emphasis to imperatives.

692 - 693 : numquid ceterum me voltis? : "Do you need me for anything else?" or "Do you want anything else from me?" The double accusative with *velle* (normally, as here, with a personal pronoun and a neuter pronoun) is a very common expression in colloquial Latin. — **quid tam properas? :** "Why are you in such a rush?" *tam* with verbs is much more common in Plautus and Terence than in Classical Latin. — **ita negotiumst :** "Such is business" or "because (causal *ita*) I have business."

694 : mandatae quae sunt, volo deferre epistulas : Travellers, merchants, and sailors often were used as couriers. cf., e.g., Merc. 385: *eo ego ut quae mandata amicus amicis tradam*.

695 : autem : "moreover."

696 : eum ego ut requiram atque uti redimam volo : The most usual construction with *velle* is an infinitive when the subjects of *velle* and the subordinate idea are the same or an *ut* clause when the subjects are different. These constructions, however, are often confused in colloquial Latin. cf., e.g., ad 62: *quadrupulari me volo.*

697 : atque edepol tu me commonuisti hau male : We can imagine that Toxilus can barely suppress his laughter at Sagaristio's joke. The joke, however, might have some practical value, in case Dordalus remembers seeing someone similar to the merchant hanging around with Toxilus in the past. Therefore, Toxilus responds: "You've jogged my memory well!"

698 : videor vidisse : "I seem to have seen." For the expression, cf. Epid. 537: *nam noscito ego hanc, videor nescio ubi mi vidisse prius*; Mos. 270: *non videor vidisse lenam callidiorem ullam alteras*; Mos. 820. — **forma persimilem tui :** "in form very similar to you." The word *persimilis* is only here in Plautus; it occurs thrice in Cicero, once in Horace, and nowhere else.

699 : eadem statura : abl. of description. — **quippe qui frater siet :** Causal clauses introduced by *quippe qui* ("since he…") can take the subjunctive or the indicative. The difference in meaning is generally what one would expect with the indicative or the subjunctive in relative clauses.

700 : quid est tibi nomen? : It seems funny that Dordalus has waited so long to ask Sagaristio his name. This question seems to logically follow from what precedes: if Dordalus knows the name of the merchant, perhaps he could help him find his twin brother. For the question, cf. 623. — **quod ad te attinet :** There is a lacuna in this line; Leo suggests *sciscit*; Schoell's *hospes, quid is at te attinet*? is perhaps better.

701 : quid attinet non scire : lit., "Why does it matter not to know?" One might have expected the negative with the main verb instead of with the infinitive. — **ausculta ergo, ut scias :** Sagaristio clears his throat in preparation for the four-line, eight-part name which follows.

702 - 705 : The names are built mostly from Greek and Latin components, but are meant to have an exotic or Persian flavor. All of the names except the first (*Vaniloquidorus*) end with the Greek patronymic suffix *-ides*, which produces a singsongy effect. — **Vaniloquidorus : "**qui vana loquitur et vana verba dat [dorus from δῶρον]," (Lambinus). — **Virginesvendonides:** "virginis venditor," (Lambinus), i.e., "the son of the seller of virgins." — **Nugiepiloquides :** "qui multas nugas loquitur" (Lambinus). The component parts are *nugae,* the Greek preposition ἐπί, and *loqui*. — **Argentumextenebronides :** "qui argentum ex tenebris eruit," (Lambinus); although the conjecture *argentumexterebronides* (as if from *terebrare* and not from *tenebrae/tenebrare*) may make more sense: "Silverdiggerson"(de Melo). — **Tedigniloquides :** "qui te digna loquitur," (Lambinus); "Serveyourighttalkerson," (de Melo). — **Nugides Palponides :** These names come from *nugae* and *palpare* respectively. Ritschl proposes *nummosexpalponides*, i.e., *qui nummos palpando et blandiendo exprimere potest* (Ammendola). Woytek proposes

Nuncaesexpalponides, i.e., *qui nunc aes expalpat*. All of these have approximately the same meaning, although Woytek's suggestion nicely fits with the names in the following line (note the components *nunc-, -semel-, numquam-*). — **Quodsemelarripides Numquameripides :** "quod semel arripuit numquam postea sibi eripi sinit," (Lambinus); "Whativegrabbedonceson Youllnevergetbackson," (de Melo). — **em tibi :** "There you go!"

706 : nomen multimodis scriptum est tuom : "Your name is written in many ways." The adverb *multimodis* is formed, of course, from *multis modis*.

707 - 708 : ita sunt Persarum mores, longa nomina, contortiplicata habemus : "That's the way of the Persians, we have long, complicated names." The adjective *contortiplicata* is found only here. — **numquid ceterum voltis? :** cf. 692 - 693.

709 : et vos, nam animus iam in navist mihi : cf. Ter. Eun. 816: *iamdudum animus est in patinis*.

710 : cras ires potius, hodie hic cenares : These subjunctives are slightly difficult to classify, although the intended meaning is clear: "cras ire deberes potius, hodie hic cenare," (Lambinus). The most vivid and correct category is Bennett's "subjunctive of unfulfilled past obligation", a use developed from (but not exactly the same as) the present jussive subjunctive (Bennett 1, 176-177, with many examples).This must be what Woytek is getting at when he calles them "Iussivi der Vergangenheit."

711 - 730 : Sagaristio leaves the stage and, following Toxilus' instructions, enters Toxilus' house from an unseen entrance in the back. In the short scene which follows, Toxilus congratulates Dordalus on his purchase; Dordalus in turn voices his concern that someone might immediately claim the girl as free and enters his house to take care of some business, leaving Toxilus to watch over the virgo momentarily. During this time, Toxilus quickly calls out Saturio from his house to claim his daughter as free and tries to repeat his instructions, but Saturio cuts him off just before Dordalus returns.

711 : postquam illic abiit, dicere hic quidvis licet : Toxilus pretends that he has been waiting for Sagaristio to leave to congratulate Dordalus on his purchase. Note the contrast between *illic* (=*ille*) and *hic* (adverb).

712 : ne hic tibi dies inluxit lucrificabilis : The pimp Dordalus will repeat this phrase below at 780: *pessumus hic mi dies hodie inluxit corruptor*. *ne* is the affirmative particle. Note the (false) etymological play between *lux* and *lucrum*. The adjective *lucrificabilis* is found only here.

713 : nam non emisti hanc : "You didn't buy her," i.e., you didn't waste any money. — **verum fecisti lucri :** For *facere lucri* (=*lucrifacere*), cf. ad 668. Note that the ending of this line (*fecisti lucri*) inverts the ending of 712 (*lucrificabilis*).

714 : illequidem iam scit quid negoti gesserit : "He already knows what business he has done." i.e., he knows that he has profitably sold her.

715 : qui mihi furtivam meo periclo vendidit : The relative has an explanatory function and therefore is slightly causal in meaning. For *meo periclo*, cf. ad 524 and 665. The adjective *furtivus* is used to describe the virgo above at 522 in the forged letter that Toxilus has Dordalus read aloud.

716 : argentum accepit, abiit : Note the alliteration and the homoioteleuton (the *-um* of *argentum* is elided).

716 - 717 : qui ego nunc scio an iam adseratur haec manu? : "How (*qui*) do I know now whether she soon is going to be claimed as free?" For the expression *asserere aliquem manu* (sc. *in libertatem*), cf. ad 163 *a leone adserito manu*.

718 : in Persas? : "to the Persians?" i.e., "to Persia?" The use of the name of the people to refer to the place (e.g., "the Athenians" for "Athens") is more common in Greek, but not unknown in Latin. — **nugas! :** "Nonsense!" Either an accusative of exclamation, or one must understand a verb (Lambinus: *nugas egero*). Plautus also uses the nominative (*nugae*) in such exclamations (in which case, sc. *sunt*).

718 - 719 : credidi gratum fore beneficium meum apud te : "I thought that my service would be pleasing for you." Woytek rightly calls Toxilus' words "psychologisch glänzend"; Toxilus sees that Dordalus is starting to feel uncomfortable about his rash purchase and pretends that he thinks that Dordalus is being ungrateful.

719 - 721 : One almost feels pity for the pimp, who here declares his trust and affection for Toxilus. An ancient audience, however, would have likely laughed at the irony of Dordalus' words.

719 - 720 : gratiam tibi, Toxilus, habeo : For the phrase *gratiam habere,* cf. ad 539. Note the alliteration here and at the end of the line with *sensi sedulo*.

721 : mi dare operam bonam : The phrase *operam alicui dare* is very common in Plautus, but adjectives with *operam* are fairly uncommon. *bonam operam dare* occurs elsewhere only at Poen. 683 and 806. Although cf. Cist. 739: *at enim ille quidam operam bonam magis expetit quam argentum*. — **tibine ego? immo sedulo :** Toxilus, as it seems, forgets that Dordalus still thinks that Toxilus is acting out of friendship and asks with surprise: *tibine ego?* [sc. *sedulo operam bonam do*]. He immediately catches himself, changes his tone of voice, and says: *immo sedulo*.

722 - 723 : oblitus sum intus dudum edicere quae volui edicta : "I forgot a while ago to order what I wanted ordered." sc. *esse* with *volui edicta*. — **adserva hanc :** "Watch her." Woytek

thinks that it would be unlikely for Dordalus to exit here and leave the expensive virgo in the care of another. While it is true that his exit helps to move the plot forward, it also speaks to the trust that Dordalus has in Toxilus, who has succeed in convincing the pimp of his friendship and goodwill.

724 : pater nunc cessat : "Now my father is delaying." It seems that Toxilus has given Saturio instructions to exit from his house after Dordalus left. The virgo is understandably impatient for her father to come and claim her as free. — **quid si admoneam :** "What if I remind him?"

725 - 726 : nunc est illa occasio inimicum ulcisci : "Now is the chance to take revenge on the enemy." Woytek understands *meum* with *inimicum*; de Melo translates "your enemy"; much better is simply "the enemy," as if Toxilus imagines the whole team (himself, the virgo, Saturio, and Sagaristio) united against a common enemy. cf. especially 757: *nunc ab eam rem inter participes dividam praedem et participabo*. — **numquid moror? :** cf. 462.

727 - 728 : These two lines are exactly identical with the instructions which Toxilus gives to Sagaristio above at 467-468. It is possible that there has been some copying error, but it is equally likely that Toxilus, who has already been accused by both Saturio and Sagaristio for being overzealous in the repetition of his instructions, has repeated these words so many times that they have become automatic. Less likely but still possible is that these words resemble some sort of formula used by directors for instructing actors on their entrances and exits.

729 : tum turbam facito : “Then make a fuss, then make a scene.” Note the alliteration. — **dictum sapienti sat est :** “A word (i.e., one word) is enough for one who knows,” i.e., “You don’t have to tell me more than once”; or “A word is enough for a wise man (for him to do what you ask).” Note how Saturio answers Toxilus’ alliterating pair with one of his own.

730 : tunc, quando abiero : Toxilus, despire Saturio’s objections, continues to repeat his instructions. — **quin taces? :** The question with *quin* is a strong suggestion which nears the force of an imperative. cf. 625: *quin tu hanc emis?*

731 - 737 : Dordalus returns after having beaten his slaves for not taking adequate care of his house. He thanks Toxilus again for his service, and Toxilus exits into his house to enjoy the company of Lemniselenis, thus opening up the opportunity for Saturio to approach the pimp and claim the virgo as his daughter.

731 : transcidi loris omnis adveniens domi : “Arriving home, I flogged everyone with whips,” or “Arriving, I flogged everyone at home with whips.” A locative expression (*domi*) with a verb of motion (*adveniens*) where one might expect an accusative (*domum*) is not unattested in Plautus, but it is perhaps better to understand *domi* not with the participle but with the first three words of the sentence. The meaning of the line, however, is clear and hardly changes with either interpretation.

732 : ita mi supellex squalet atque aedes meae : "So filthy are my furniture and house." The *ita* explains the previous clause in a paratactic way, as if the the previous clause had been a result clause (i.e., *ita mi supellex squalet ut omnes transciderim*). Note the alliterating pairs.

733 : redis tu tandem? : Dordalus' lines (731-732) are said to himself as he enters from his house. Toxilus addresses Dordalus first with this question, as if he had been anxiously waiting for Dordalus to return. In fact, Toxilus is impatient, but not for the reason that Dordalus suspects. — **redeo :** The repetition of the verb is one of the many ways to say "yes" in Latin.

733 - 734 : ne ego hodie tibi bona multa feci : lit., "Truly I've done many good things for you today." *ne* is the affirmative particle. These words do not seem to follow directly from what precedes, so perhaps there is a slight pause after *redeo* as Toxilus tries to think of something to say.

736 : pol istuc quidem omen iam ego usurpabo domi : "omen se accipere ait et id, quod omine portenditur, iam facturum." The *omen* refers to Dordalus' wish *ut bene sit tibi*. Toxilus says that he is going to go home and be well, since he will enjoy the company of Lemniselenis, as he explains in the following verse.

737 : inclinabo me cum liberta tua : In a sexual sense, "cubabo cum liberta tua," (Lambinus).

738 - 752 : In this final scene in the fourth act, Saturio approaches the pimp, and the virgo immediately greets him as his father. Dordalus realizes right away that he has been tricked, and Saturio summons him to court.

738 - 739 : nisi ego illunc hominem perdo, perii : Saturio says these words to himself. — **atque optume eccum ipsum ante aedes :** With these words, Saturio recognizes Dordalus. For the expression, cf. 542: *sed optume eccum ipse advenit.*

739 - 740 : salve multum, mi pater : The virgo addresses Saturio before he says anything. It is unclear whether this was part of Toxilus' elaborate and detailed instructions or whether Saturio hesitates to approach Dordalus and must be pressured somewhat by his daughter. If the latter is the case (which would funnier), then the virgo's words are said deliberately and loudly, as if to remind Saturio what he must now do. — **salve, mea gnata :** We can imagine that Saturio really exaggerates these words. — **ei! Persa me pessum dedit :** "The Persian has given me over to ruin." *pessum* is an adverb which is likely a contraction from *pedis* and *versum,* like *sursum* from *sub* and *versum*. It occurs commonly with the verbs *ire* and *dare*. Here there is likely a slight wordplay on *Persa* and *pessum*.

741 : pater hic meus est : The virgo now turns to Dordalus and repeats what he has already heard. — **hem, quid? pater? perii oppido :** Dordalus cannot contain his surprise, grief, and despair. The adverb *oppido* ('completely') is of unclear origins, but it found exclusively in the colloquial register.

742 - 743 : quid ego igitur cesso infelix lamentarier minas sexagintas : "Why then am I, wretched, hesitating to lament my sixty minae?" Dordalus immediately realizes the consequences of this discovery.

743 - 744 : ego pol te faciam, scelus, te quoque etiam ipsum ut lamenteris : It is likely that the first *te* is proleptic, and the second *te* (with *ipsum*) is the object of *ut lamenteris*. The combination *quoque etiam* is almost pleonastic. For *scelus* as a form of address, cf. 192, 290, and 666.

745 : ambula in ius : This phrase seems to be somewhat formulaic. It is found (always in the imperative) also at Curc. 621, 624, Rud. 860, and Ter. Phorm. 936.

746 : illi apud praetorem dicam : "I'll tell you there before the praetor." *illi* is the adverb, for *illic*. — **sed ego in ius voco :** The formula *in ius vocare* is familiar from the Twelve Tables: *si in ius vocat, ito*.

747 : nonne antestaris? : The verb *antestari* is also familiar from the Twelve Tables: *si in ius vocat, ito, ni it, antestamino*.

747 - 749 : tuan ego causa … civis homines liberos? : "Should I rub the ears of any free mortal for your sake, you scoundrel, who buy free citizens here?" The touching of the ear was a gesture

used to summon witnesses. Lambinus clarifies further: “personas honestas et incolumi fama non licebat sine antestatione invitas in ius trahere. infames et fures et lenones licebat.”

750 : sine dicam : “Let me speak!” Also at Cist. 454 and Ter. Hec. 744. — **nolo :** sc. *sinere*. — **audi :** One might imagine that Saturio has begun to physically drag Dordalus off stage. — **surdus sum :** For the phrase, cf. Poen. 255: *audi # surdus sum*. — **ambula :** cf. 745, although here the verb is likely in its more usual sense.

751 : sequere hac, scelesta feles virginaria : “Follow this way, you criminal maiden seducer.” Lambinus’s conjecture *sceleste* for the *scelesta* of the manuscripts might be right and is printed by Woytek. The adjective *virginarius* is found only here. Lambinus explains the entire phrase: “sic lenonem appellat, quod avide virginem emerit, et quasi rapuerit: feles enim animal est rapax.”

752 : sequere hac, mea gnata : The drastic change in tone with which Saturio must pronounce 751 and 752 produces a comic effect.

753 - 776 : Toxilus enters from his house and solemnly gives thanks to the gods for the successful completion of all of his plans. He calls out Lemniselenis, Sagaristio, Paegnium, and other servants from the house to begin preparing a celebratory banquet.

753 : hostibu' victis, civibu' salvis, re placida, pacibu' perfectis : Toxilus begins his prayer in thanks to the gods with a long list of ablative absolutes which express the grounds for his thanksgiving. He of course exaggerates the scale of his accomplishments, imagining his triumph over Dordalus as a large military victory which has secured peace and security for the state and its citizens. Note the staccato rhythm of this line created by the short, two-word clauses. Also note that all of the ablative absolutes in this line start with a third declension noun in the plural ending in *-ibus* and whose second member ends in *-is,* except for *re placida,* variationis causa. Also note how the alliteration on -p punctuates the line. — **pacibu' perfectis :** "conditionibus pacis transactis" (Lambinus).

754 : bello exstincto, re bene gesta, integro exercitu et praesidiis : Toxilus continues to imagine his situation as a military victory. While the previous line is comprised entirely of two-word clauses, this line is a rising tricolon, with a two-, three-, and finally four-word clause.

755 - 756 : "Since you, Jupiter, have helped us well, and also all the other gods who have power in heaven, I am thankful and give thanks to you, because I have well punished my enemy." — **nos :** i.e., Toxilus, Lemniselenis, and all the others who assisted in the execution of the schemes. — **Iuppiter, iuvisti :** A reference to the false etymology for *Iuppiter*: *iuvans pater* (Woytek). — **caelipotentes :** The adjective is found only here. — **eas vobis gratis habeo atque ago :** The phrase *eas gratis* is likely for *eius rei grates* (Ussing). Plautus elsewhere has *grates habere* (Stich. 403, Trin. 821) and *grates agere* (Merc. 843). For the use of both *agere* and *habere*

together, cf. Liv. 23.11.12: *pro his tantis totque victoriis verum esse grates deis immortalibus agi haberique*. —

757 : nunc ob eam rem inter participes dividam praedam et participabo : The two verbs have slightly different meanings. *participabo* means *participes praedae faciam* (Lambinus). For the doubling of the expression (*inter participes dividam* and *participabo*), cf. 756 *habeo atque ago*. Note the alliteration.

758 - 758ª : hic volo ante ostium et ianuam : Note again the doubling. — **meos participes bene accipere :** For this meaning of *accipere,* cf. ad 648: *nemo quisquam acceptior*.

759 - 759ª : statuite hic lectulos, ponite hic quae adsolent : "Set up the couches here, place here what is usually placed." With *adsolent*, sc. *poni*. Note that Toxilus continues to speak with repetitions and fullness — **hic statui volo primum aquilam :** The reading is difficult. Many of the manuscripts have *primum aquila mihi,* which would continue the military metaphors from the preceding lines. Ritschl corrected to *aquolam* (a diminutive from *aqua*), and others have proposed *aulam mi, amphoram,* and *aliqua.* For lack of a better choice, de Melo prints *aliqua*, which fits decently well with the line which follows.

760 : unde ego omnis hilaros, ludentis, laetificantis faciam ut fiant : Note the continued accumulation of synonymous phrases. Note also the triple repetition of *l* and *f*, the first instance of each of which is contained within a word and the second two of which are word-initial:

hilaros ludentis, laetificantis faciam ut fiant. Note also the accumulation of almost comic repetition of *facere* at the end of the line.

761 : quorum opera mi facilia factu facta haec sunt quae volui effieri : "by whose work the things which I wanted to happen became easy for me to do." Note the alliterating triplet (which is picked up again at the end of the line with *effieri*) and the figura etymologica in *facilia factu,* which picks up the accumulation of the verb *facere* at the end of the previous line.

762 : nam improbus est homo qui beneficium scit accipere et reddere nescit : This has a proverbial ring to it; Terence has *benificium accipere* and *beneficium reddere,* but there is not another instance of both of the verbs together.

763 : quor ego sine te sum, quor tu autem sine me es? : If the attribution of 179 is correct (v. ad loc.), then these are the first words spoken by Lemniselenis who is also making her first appearance on stage. *autem* here is without strong adversative force, "on the other hand."

763 - 764 : agedum ergo accede ad me atque amplectere sis : "So then come here and embrace me please." *agedum* with the imperative is common in Plautus with the imperative, as is *age* alone; for *dum* alone following an imperative, cf. 605. *agedum ergo* with the imperative also at Mil. 345, Rud. 720, 785. — **ego vero :** "Ok, I [will come and embrace you]." sc. *accedo et amplector* (*accedam et amplectar*). — **oh, nil hoc magi' dulcest :** For *nil hoc dulcius*. The use of

the adverb *magis* with the positive degree to form the comparative is not unknown in colloquial and poetic Latin.

765 : sed, amabo, oculus meu', quin lectis non actutum commendamus? : For *amabo* ("please"), cf. ad 245. The phrase *oculus meus* as a term of affection also at Cist. 53, Mos. 311, Stich. 764. The diminutive *ocellus* is also found. All of these instances use the nominative for the vocative, which is not uncommon and is undoubtedly influenced by the fact that the vocative is morphologically distinct from the nominative in only one instance in Latin. — **quin lectis non actutum commendamus? :** *nos* is accusative: "Shall we not right away commit ourselves to the couches?" The *lecti* are obviously the couches set out for the banquet, but it would only take one gesture or a change in tone to make give the line a slightly obscene meaning, which should almost always be preferred in Plautus.

766 : omnia quae tu vis, ea cupio : "I want everything that you want." — **mutua fiunt a me :** With these words Toxilus expresses his mutual feeling. The closest (and perhaps only) parallel to expression is Mil. 1253: *mutuom fit*.

767 : accumbe in summo : Toxilus begins to assign the places on the three couches which circle the table. — **ego nil moror: cedo parem quem pepigi :** The meaning is difficult, but as it stands, the text must mean: "I don't care (where I lie), just give me the companion whom I've settled." The only way to make sense of this remark would be if the *parem* refers to Toxilus, and Sagaritio would be saying that he would like to lie next to his friend. Lambinus's emendation

from *parem quem* to *partem quam* (referring to the money which Sagaristio gave to Toxilus) might have some sense.

768 : temperi : "at the right time," "when the time is right." — **mihi istuc temperi serost :** "This 'at the right time' of yours is too late for me." The neuter demonstrative *istuc* is being used like the neuter article in Greek, in that it is introducing a verbatim quotation. — **hoc age :** "animum habe ad hoc quod agitur attentum, omitte ista ab hoc negotio aliena," (Lambinus). For this expression, cf. ad 584.

768[a] - 769 : hunc diem suavem meum natalem agitemus amoenum : Notice the accumulation of adjectives with *diem*. *amoenum* is predicative: "Let's celebrate this sweet birthday of mine as a pleasant one" (de Melo). Toxilus calls this day his birthday because he has been, as it were, reborn through the acquisition of his love Lemniselenis and his triumph over his enemy Dordalus.

770 : do hanc tibi florentem florenti : *tibi florenti* refers most likely to Lemniselnis; with *hanc florentem,* sc. *coronam*. Lambinus understands *hanc florentem* to refer not to a crown, but to Lemniselenis herself, with *tibi florenti* to Sagaristio, which can hardly be right. — **tu hic eris dictatrix nobis :** These words follow better from the preceding words if we understand that Toxilus has crowned Lemniselenis, and thus declares her to be the leader of the party. Just as in Greek it is usual for the leader of the party to be called συμποσίαρχος, βασιλεύς, or στατηγός, so

in Latin can he be referred to as *magister, arbiter,* or even (as here), *dictator*. This last term, however, is very rare in this sense.

771 : age puere : Lemniselenis begins to give orders to Paegnium. — **ab summo :** "starting from the first (highest) couch." — **septenis cyathis :** "with seven ladles." Ammendola looks at the following metaphor (*committe hos ludos*) and explains the number seven as a reference to the usual number of laps in chariot races. Woytek points instead to a few passages from Martial and argues that the number seven is chosen to match the number of letters in Toxilus' name. — **committe hos ludos :** This is the usual expression for the start of games, and it is obvious to see how the language could be transferred metaphorically to a feast. For a different metaphor, cf. 112: *proelium committere.*

772 : move manus, propera. Paegnium : Note how alliteration organizes the ideas. Paegnium has begun to fulfil Lemniselenis' orders, but is obviously going about it too slowly for Toxilus.

773 : bene mihi, bene vobis, bene meae amicae : With all of these, sc. *sit*. Toxilus here begins his toast.

774 : quia te licet liberam med amplecti : It is hard to decide which pronoun is the object and which the subject of the infinitive *amplecti*. de Melo takes *med* as the subject, but given the word order and 764 above (*amplectere sis*), perhaps it is better for Lemniselenis to be the subject. The *quia* clause is either substantive (like *quod,* cf. ad 546: *nisi quia*) or causal. It the latter case it

would be technically connected to the *optatus,* or to the thanks to the gods implied in the preceding clause.

775 - 776 : bene omnibu' nobis : sc. *sit*. — **hoc mea manu' tuae poclum donat, ut amantem amanti decet :** "My hand is giving this cup to yours, as is right for a lover to a lover." — **bene ei qui invidet mi et ei qui hoc gaudet :** Lemniselenis proposes her own toast "to he who envies me and to he who rejoices in this." Lambinus takes these two relative clauses to have specific referents, namely Sagaristio, who is jealous because he does not have such a beautiful girlfriend, and Toxilus, who has achieved his ends. This may well be the case, but it may also be a general remark.

777 - 858 : As Toxilus and his friends are enjoying their banquet, Dordalus enters and delivers a monologue in which he pitifully realizes that he has been tricked by Toxilus and the Persian. He still thinks, however, that Toxilus has merely encouraged him to undertake a shady business deal, and does not yet realize that Toxilus had plotted the entire scheme. Dordalus approaches the banquet and begins to upbraid Toxilus. After a brief exchange of abuse from both Toxilus and his friends and Dordalus, the banqueters surround the pimp to give him a beating.

777 : qui sunt, qui erunt quique fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac : cf. Amph. 553-554: *quia id quod neque est nec futurum est mihi praedicas*; Bacch. 1087: *quiquomque ubi sunt, qui fuerunt, quique futuri sunt posthac*. This type of expression (composed of the present, future, and past of the verb "to be") is familiar from Homer onwards, e.g., Il. 1.70: τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ'

ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα. The use of the synonymous expressions *qui erunt* and *qui futuri sunt,* as Woytek explains, is to create two sound units in the line (*qui sunt* with *qui erunt* and *quique fuerunt* with *quique futuri sunt*).

778 : solus ego omnibus antideo facile, miserrumus hominum ut vivam : "I alone easily surpass all of them, that I live as the most wretched of men." *omnibus* is the antecedant of the relative clauses in the previous line and is either dative with the compound *anteire* or ablative of comparison. The result clause (*ut vivam*) is difficult after the preceding words, but the thought and sense are very clear.

779 - 780 : pessumus hic mi dies hodie inluxit corruptor : Somewhat ironically repeats Toxilus' remark at 712: ne hic tibi dies inluxit lucrificabilis.

781 : ita me Toxilu' perfabricavit : For this use of *ita,* cf. ad 732: *ita mi supellex squalet atque aedes meae.* — **perfabricavit :** "suis artibus et dolis perdidit," (Lambinus). The verb is found only here. — **divexavit :** "in diversas partes vexavit," (Lambinus). cf. Cic. Phil. 13.21.7: *agros divexat civium optimorum*.

782 : vehiclum argenti : "magnam vim argenti ad quam portandam vehiculo opus sit," Lambinus. — **neque quam ob rem eieci, habeo :** The meaning of this clause is either as in de Melo's translation ("and I don't have the object for which I threw it away") or Jacobus Operarius's paraphrase ("neque video quare emisi"). In the former interpretation, one

understands *eam rem ob quam vehiculum argenti eieci nunc non habeo*; in the latter, one understands *quam ob rem* to be introducing an indirect question (as one often finds after *non habere*) with the indicative.

783 : qui : For the use of the adverbial form *quī* (really an old instrumental form) to introduce wishes, v.s. ad 291. — **illum Persam atque omnis Persas atque etiam omnis personas :** The final part of the curuse (*atque etiam omnis personas*) is likely added, as Ussing sees, for the comic effect of alliteration and wordplay, i.e., merely because *persona* sounds like *Persa*. But the choice of the word must be motivated my more than mere chance. Dordalus likely points to everyone on stage when he says it ("and curse all the actors!"), creating a slightly metatheatrical joke by reminding everyone of the artificiality of the production. Perhaps there is even a deeper irony in the word, since Dordalus does not yet know that everyone involved in the plot were actors employed by Toxilus.

784 : ita misero Toxilus haec mi concivit : For the expression, cf. Men. 902: *suo qui regi tantum concivit mali*.

785 : Judging from this line, one would think that Dordalus still thinks that Toxilus has merely encouraged him to undertake a shady business deal, and does not yet realize that Toxilus had plotted the entire scheme. — **quia ei fidem non habui argenti :** "quia ei argentum non credidi," (Lambinus). The genitive with *fides* is likely objective. — **eo mihi eas machinas molitust :** *eo* is correlative with the preceding *quia.* Note the alliteration on *m* which is broken up by *eo* and *eas*.

786 - 787 : quem pol ego … quod spero : Dordalus does not finish his thought. Lambinus explains these two lines with the elaborate periphrasis: *nolim mereri montis aureos, nolim mereri Croesi divitias, aut aliquid tail, ut non….* But perhaps Ammendola's suggestion of supplying something like *fieri non potest ut non* is easier and more elegant.

788 : hoc vide, quae haec fabulast? : Dordalus speaks these words to himself (note the second person imperative): "Look at this, what's the story?" The question *quae haec fabulast* is also found at Men. 1077, Mos. 937, Rud. 355, Ter. Andr. 747, and Ter. Eun. 689.

789 - 790 : o bone vir, salveto, et tu, bona liberta : Dordalus addresses Toxilus and Lemniselnis. The words are likely pronounced with contempt and sarcasm. — **Dordalus hicquidem est :** These words and the response (*quin iube adire*) have been variously assigned to Toxilus, Lemniselenis, and Sagaristio. There is no good way to decide who should speak these lines, but Lindsay's texts makes fine sense and so should be left as is.

791 : Ussing gives this entire line to Toxilus, which Woytek also prints. de Melo, however, prints the text of Lindsay, with Sagaristio saying *agite, applaudamus*. While it might be slightly better for Toxilus to turn to his friends and encourage them to clap before greeting Dordalus, there is also nothing wrong with having Sagaristio pronounce these words.

792 : locus his tuos est, hic accumbe : Toxilus invites Dordalus to recline at the table. — **ferte aquam pedibus :** This command is given likely to Paegnium and the other servant(s) attending the banquent. This is probably a joke at Dordalus' expense, since the slaves are ordered to wash his feet and not his hands. cf. 769: *date aquam manibus.* —**praeben tu, puere? :** It is somewhat difficult to figure out to whom these words are addressed. Woytek understands *vinum* as the object and Paegnium as the addressee. Lambinus and Ammendola understand *aquam* as the object, but do not specify the addressee. If one is to understand *aquam*, then it is hard to believe that the addressee is Paegnium, since, as we see from 794, he still has the ladle in his hand is likely serving the wine; therefore the addressee must be one of the other attendants. Lindsay also had trouble with this line, it seems, and in his apparatus proposes *PA. praeben tu* (sc. *pedes*)? *DO. puere*... Any of these could be right, but Woytek's interpretation seems to be by far the least likely, since one would expect Toxilus to continue talking about the *aqua* which he mentions in the previous sentence.

793 : ne sis me uno digito attigeris, ne te ad terram, scelus, adfligam : *ne attigeris* is a negative imperative, *ne adfligam* is a purpose clause or an implied fear clause: "Don't touch me, please, even with one finger, so that I don't (lest I) beat you into the ground." For the expression *digito tangere,* cf. Rud. 810. For *ad terram adfligere,* cf. Rud. 1010. These words are likely directed either at Paegnium or at the servant who tries to wash his feet, but they could also be addressed to Toxilus, since it seems that 795 and 796, if the entirety of both lines is to be understood as directed to Toxilus, take no notice of Paegnium's threat in 794.

794 : at tibi ego hoc continuo cyatho oculum excutiam tuom : “But I’ll (lit.) shake out your eye right away with this ladle.” — **hoc cyatho :** “Ein cyathus wäre zur Ausführing der Drohung gut geeignet,” (Woytek).

795 : quid ais? : On the addressee of this line and the text, cf. ad 792 and 793. It is obvious that starting at least from *quomodo me hodie voravisti* Dordalus is speaking with Toxilus, but are the words *quid ais, curx, stimulorum tritor* directed at Paegnium (in response to his threat in 794) or Toxilus (ignoring Paegnium’s threat)?. — **crux :** “Worthy of the cross.” — **stimulorum tritor :** cf. 279 *ulmitriba*; 420: *compedium tritor*. “qui stimulos teris corpore tuo,” (Lambinus).

796 : ut me in tricas coniecisti, quomodo de Persa manu’ mi aditast? : de Melo is right in punctuating these indignant, rhetorical questions with exclamation points. — **in tricas coniecisti :** “in negotia impedita et inexplicabilia,” (Lambinus). For *tricae,* cf. 531. — **quomodo de Persa manu’ mi aditast :** “How I’ve been deceived about the Persian!” The expression *manus adire alicui* (“to deceive, trick”) is found only in Plautus and is of uncertain origin.

797 : iurgium hinc auferas, si sapias : Toxilus responds to Dordalus’ anger rather calmly, lit.,“You’ll take away this dispute from here, if you know what’s good.”

798 : at, bona liberta, haec scivisti et me celavisti? : Dordalus appeals to Lemniselenis as if she should have had some sympathy for him. He is comically surprised that she displayed no urge to protect her pimp from being tricked.

798 - 800 : stultitia est, quoi bene esse licet, eum praevorti litibu' : "It is stupidity for one for whom it is permitted to be well to turn to disputes"; "stultum est, cui bene et beate vivere licet, omissa beate vivendi facultate et copia, ad lites potius se conferre," (Lambinus). The verb *praevorti* here means "to prefer."

800 - 801 : posterius ted istaec magis par agere est : i.e., Dordalus should sit down and have a drink (since he can have a good time now) and worry about these disputes later.

801 - 802 : uritur cor mi : i.e., from anger — **da illi cantharum. exstingue ignem, si cor uritur, caput ne ardescat :** Using metaphors of fire to talk about anger is very typical in Latin, but Toxilus takes Dordalus' remark *uritur cor mi* literally and comically says: "give him a cup, put out the fire if your heart is burning, so that your head doesn't go up in flames as well." It is rather obvious that Toxilus is offering Dordalus a cup of wine (and not water, as Ammendola would have it) so as to calm his nerves.

803 : ludos me facitis, intelligo : Note the paratactic construction. The expression *aliquem ludos facere* is found at least 9 other times in Plautus (and once with the dative at Rud. 593). Often explained as a synonym for *ludificari,* it is better explained as *facere* with both an internal (*ludos*) and external (*me*) accusative, as often with Gk. ποιεῖν.

804 : vin cinaedum novom tibi dari, Paegnium? : Woytek follows Ussing in moving the question mark to after *dari*, understanding the question as directed not to Paegnium, but to Dordalus. The vocative *Paegnium* is then understood as part of the following sentence. I however see nothing wrong with having the question ("Want a new catamite to be given to you?) being addressed to Paegnium and having *cinaedus* refer not to Toxilus' friend Paegnium but to Dordalus (especially since Paegnium has played an important role in the success of Toxilus' plans), and I can find no good parallel in Plautus for the word order vocative + *quin* + imperative.

805 : quin elude, ut soles, quando liber locust hic : "Have your fun, as you always do, since you have a free field here," (de Melo). Note the repetition of *l*. For this use of *quando,* cf. 223, 641, 688.

806 : basilice te intulisti et facete : Paegnium obeys Toxilus' command in 805 and, as it seems, approachs and hits Dordalus. Note the sonic effect of *basilice te* ... facete.— **basilice :** The forth time Toxilus uses this word, v.s. 29, 31, and 462.

807 - 808 : hunc inridere lenonem lubidost : For *lubido* with the infintive, cf. ad 121.

809 : perge ut coeperas : Toxilus approves of Paegnium's attack on Dordalus and encourages him to continue. Plautus, Terence, and Cicero all use *ut coeperam* and *ut coepi* parenthetically.

— **hoc, leno, tibi :** sc. *est* or *do*. Paegnium hits Dordalus again, either with his fist or his ladle. The impact is either immediately after *tibi* or coincident with *hoc*.

810 : perii! perculit me prope : "I've perished! He nearly knocked me down!" Note the alliteration. — **em, serva rursum :** "en garde!" Paegnium hits Dordalus once again.

811 : delude ut lubet : Note the rhyme in *-lude* and *lube-*. — **erus dum hinc abest :** A reminder that Toxilus is a slave and that his master is away. cf. 29.

812 : viden ut tuis dictis pareo : Note the indicative in the indirect question.

813 - 814 : sed quin tu meis contra item dictis servis atque hoc quod tibi suadeo facis? : "But why don't you in turn likewise follow my words and do what I urge you to do?" After Dordalus' reminder that Toxilus is slave in 811, Paegnium must purposefully use the verb *servire* here.

815 : restim tu tibi cape crassam ac suspende te : "Get yourself a thick rope and hang yourself." The use of *tibi* here is very similar to the reflexive dative common in the colloquial register of the Germanic languages, e.g., Eng. "Buy yourself a house", "I'll have myself a drink"; more colloquially, "I'm gonna have me a good dinner"; Ger. Ich kaufe mir ein Haus; Dan. Jek går mig en tur. Note how alliteration dictates the word order: *restim tu tibi cape crassam*.

816 : cave sis me attigas : “Don’t touch me, please.” On the grammaticalization of *cave* with the subjunctive to form a negative command, cf. ad 51. The form *attigere* is found in Old Latin for Classical *attingere*.

816 - 817 : ne tibi hoc scipione malum magnum dem : “So that I don’t give you a big beating with this staff.” It seems that the stereotype that pimps carry canes is nothing new. — **tu utere, te condono :** With the imperative *utere,* one must understand *scipione* (Lambinus, Ammendola, and the TLL). Woytek prefers to understand *malo*, but the phrase *uti malo,* as far as I can tell, is without parallel.

818 : da pausam : Elsewhere in Plautus, the expression is *pausam facere*: Poen 459, Rud. 1205, Truc. 731.

819 : ego pol vos eradicabo : The verb *eradicare* (“funditus perdere,” Lambinus) is found five other times in Plautus, twice in Terence, and is rare otherwise. — **at te ille :** sc. *eradicabit*. This type of ellipsis is especially common in the colloquial register of heavily inflected languages, cf. Ru. не он меня, а я его! — **qui supra nos habitat :** i.e., Jupiter.

820 : non hi dicunt, verum ego : Paegnium takes full credit for his words.

821 : age, circumfer mulsum : Toxilus’ first concern, as is Lemniselenis’, is the success of the party. He has already asked Paegnium to stop at 818, and now he tries to move along the party by

calling to Paegnium to resume his duty of pouring the wine. — **bibere da :** cf. Gk. δὸς πιεῖν, Eng. give to drink, Ru. дай выйпить/попить. In most if not all of these examples, one must understand an object and the infinitive is infinitive of purpose.

822 : iam diu factum est, postquam bibimus : "iamdudum non bibimus," (Lambinus). The construction is slightly awkward, but the meaning is clear enough: "It's been long since we last drank." — **sicci :** A familiar expression in many languages.

823 : di faciant ut id bibatis quod vos numquam transeat : *faciant* is jussive; *ut bibatis* is substantive clause of result; *quod transeat* is either subjunctive by attraction ("that which never passes through") or relative clause of characteristic ("that which would never pass through"). Dordalus seems to be referring euphemistically to poison.

824 : nequeo, leno, quin : "I can't help but…"; sc. *facere*, as at, e.g., Mil. 1342: *nequeo quin fleam*. — **saltem staticulum :** Note the alliteration. The *staticulus* is a type of light choral dance. — **Hegea :** Note mentioned elsewhere, but likely a famous dancer.

825 : video vero, si tibi sati' placet : "See if you like it!" At this point we can imagine that Paegnium does a little dance over to Dordalus and hits him. Note the alliteration in *video vero* and the sonic effect of *si tibi sati'*.

825 - 826 : me quoque volo reddere Diodorus quem olim faciebat in Ionia : Toxilus is of course referring to a different dance. The dancer Diodorus is also likely famous, but unknown to us. At this point we are to imagine that Toxilus joins Paegnium in dancing around Dordalus and hitting him. — **me quoque volo reddere :** "I also want to render [unto Dordalus]…" For the accusative subject of the infinitive with *velle* when the subject of the main verb and the infinitive are identical, cf. ad 62: quadrupulari me volo.

827 : malum ego vobis dabo, ni[si] abitis : To judge from the response *etiam muttis*, we can imagine that Dordalus says these words in a low voice as he cowers away from the attack. The comedy lies in the contrast between the threat and the pimp's tone and body language.

828 : iam ego tibi, si me irritassis, Persam adducam denuo : Sagaristio now approaches Dordalus and joins Paegnium and Toxilus in beating him. It is likely at this moment that Dordalus finally realizes that the entire sale was orchestrated by Toxilus and his friends. — **si me irritassis :** For the sigmatic future perfect (here used in the protasis of a future more vivid conditional), cf 393: adcurassis.

829 : iam taceo hercle : If these words are to be kept (they were bracketed by Leo and both Woytek and de Melo keep them in brackets), one must imagine that Dordalus has momentarily given up resistance until he makes the connection between Sagarisitio and the Persa. — **ac tu Persa es :** ἡ ἀναγνώρισις; Dordalus finally realizes ὅτι οὗτος ἐκεῖνος. — **admutila[vi]isti ad cutem :** "who fleeced me down to the quick," (de Melo).

830 : hic eius geminust frater : We can imagine that Toxilus can hardly refrain from laughing as he says this. — **hicinest? :** For the form, cf. ad 42 and 544-545. — **ac geminissimus :** The formation of the superlative from adjectives that would not logically have a superlative is a feature of comedic and colloquial language, e.g., ipsissimus, patruissimus, etc.

831 - 832 : di deaeque et te et geminum fratrem excrucient # qui te perdidit: nam ego nihil merui : Dordalus has already realized that Sagaristio is the Persa, but sarcastically curses both Sagaristio and his twin brother. Sagaristio chooses the ignore the sarcasm in Dordalus' remark and says: "[Let the gods torture him] who destroyed you; I haven't earned anything (i.e., I don't deserve to be cursed or tortured)." — **at enim quod ille meruit, tibi id opsit volo :** Dordalus likely continues speaking sarcastically, knowing that Sagaristio and the Persa are the same person.

833 : agite hunc sultis ludificemus : Toxilus likely says this to everyone generally, but must specifically be encouraging Lemniselenis to join in the abuse of the pimp. — **nisi si dignust, non opust :** "There is no need [sc. *hunc ludificare*] unless if he deserves it." The restraint of Lemniselenis is admirable. The combination *nisi si* occurs 12 other times in Plautus and is not uncommon in other authors.

834 : et me hau par est : "And it's hardly right for me." It seems that Lemniselenis does not want to take part in the abuse because she owes Dordalus at least some respect as his freedwoman. — **credo eo quia non inconciliat, quom te emo :** *credo* is parenthetical; *eo* and

quia are correlative; with *eo* one is to understand *te hau par est.* The entire line is said sarcastically: "For that reason (*eo*), I believe, because he didn't make any trouble when I bought you."

835 : at tamen non—tamen : "inducitur puelle aegre assentiens Toxilio, hortanti ut lenonem ludificet. Attamen, inquit, patronus quodammodo est, et quamvis mihi obstiterit et male de me meritus sit, quod me prostituere paratus fuerit, non tamen adduci possum ut eum ludificem, quia dominus fuit," (Lambinus). — **cave ergo sis malo :** cf. 369: *malo cavere meliust te*. Toxilus seems to be lightly threatening Lemniselenis to not disobey him.

836 - 837 : te mihi dicto audientem esse addecet : On the phrase *dicto esse audiens,* see above ad 399. — **nam hercle absque me foret et meo praesidio :** Present contrafactual with imperfect subjective *foret*. The subject of *foret* is the entire situation: "If it were without…" Note the placement of -*que* in *absque me ... et meo praesidio,* like τε…καί. — **hic faceret te prostibilem propediem :** "He'd be making you prostitutable right away." If the adjective is right (other read *prostibulam*), it found only here and at Stich. 765. For *propediem,* cf. ad 295.

838 - 840 : Toxilus offers a general reflection about the nature of freedmen in an attempt to encourage Lemniselenis to join in abusing Dordalus.

838 : sed ita pars libertinorum est : "Such is the part of freedmen." *pars* here is used as synonym for *sors*, but the meaning "part" (as in a part in a play) can also be heard. — **nisi**

patrono qui adversatust : "Except for [the freedman] who has resisted his patron." The idea is that a freedman will be free in name only until he has contradicted or resisted his patron, or otherwise asserted his freedom.

839 - 840 : nec sati' liber sibi videtur … ni id ecfecit, ni ei male dixit, ni grato ingratus repertust : "He doesn't consider himself sufficiently free unless he has done this, unless he has slandered him, unless he has been found to be unthankful to one who deserves thanks." Note the two rising tricola with anaphora: *sati' liber, sati' frugi, sat honestus*; *ni, ni, ni*.

841 : pol bene facta tua me hortantur tuo ut imperio parem : Lemniselenis gives up her resistance and gives into Toxilus.

842 : ego sum tibi patronus plane qui huic pro te argentum dedi : Toxilus claims the status of *patronus* for Lemniselenis on account of the fact that he has paid money for her. The idea that a slave could be a *patronus* is of course comical, unrealistic, and a product of Toxilus' fantastical worldview.

843 : graphice hunc volo ludificari : For the adverb *graphice* and its possible meanings cf. ad 306. The word is also at 464. — **meo ego in loco sedulo curabo :** Lambinus paraphrases *meo in loco* with κατ' ἐμὸν μέρος and *pro mea parte*. The meaning seems to rather clear, although I cannot find an exact parallel. For the adverb *sedulo,* cf. ad 46.

844 : certo illi homines mihi nescioquid mali consulunt, quod faciant : It seems that at least since 833, the banqueters have laid off from beating Dordalus as Toxilus tries to convince Lemniselenis to join in the fun. During this time, perhaps Dordalus has slowly backed away from the group, and now he sees them all turn to face him and to begin their approach.

845 : hicin Dordalus est lenoo, qui hic liberas virgines mercatur? : cf. 749: *qui hic commercaris civis homines liberos.*

846 : hicin est qui fuit quondom fortis ? : The idea might be captured by "Who's tough now, punk?" — **quae haec res est? :** It is after these words that Sagaristio likely hits Dordalus. — **colapho me icit :** "He has hit me with a box to the ear." For *colaphus,* cf. 294.

847 : malum vobis dabo : Dordalus repeats his empty threat from 827, which he likely says in the same, helpless tone of voice. — **at tibi nos dedimus dabimusque etiam :** "We've already given you [a beating] and we're going to give you another one still (*etiam*)." — **natis pervellit :** "He's plucked my butt!" Depending on the interpretation of the following line, these words refer either to pinching or the plucking of hair. Judging from the response, it is Paegnium (unsurprisingly) who deals Dordalus this sexual punishment.

848 : licet: iam diu saepe sunt expunctae : Lambinus paraphrases: "licet tibi nates pervellere, saepe enim et diu sunt dipilate." But *expungere* is almost certainly a reference to anal sex. — **loquere tu etiam, frustum pueri? :** "Are you still talking, you piece of a boy?" The meaning of

frustum pueri seems pretty clear, but this is the only instance of *frustum* as an insult. cf. Lambinus: “tune etiam loqueris, qui puer non es, sed pueri parvula pars?” For the genitive *pueri,* cf. ad 192: *scelus tu pueri es*; 204: *deliciae pueri*.

849 : patrone mi, i intro, amabo, ad cenam : Lemniselenis, after having recently assented to Toxilus being her new *patronus,* mockingly addresses Dordalus with *patrone mi*. She likely hits him as she says *i intro,* thus jokingly pretending that she is merely nudging him forth as she invites him to dinner. The literal meaning of *amabo* is perhaps brought out on stage through Lemniselenis’ tone and emphasis.

850 : mea Ignavia, tu me inrides? : *mea Ignavia* is vocative, referring to Lemniselenis: “tu quae mea ignavia es, id est, quae meam ignaviam testaris, quaeque libera non esses, nisi nequam et ignavus fuissem, nunc me irrides?” (Lambinus).

851 : quiane te voco, bene ut tibi sit? : Lemniselenis continues to play the fool and pretend, as in 849 above, that she is merely inviting Dordalus to dinner. — **nolo mihi bene esse :** Dordalus tries to get Lemniselenis to stop beating him by repeating her euphemism. This plan backfires immediately, as we can see from Lemniselenis’ response (*ne sit*), which takes Dordalus’ words literally.

852 : quid igitur? sescenti nummi quid agunt, quas turbas danunt? : Toxilus sarcastically asks: “What then, what good are those 600 coins (lit., what are they doing), what disturbances

are they giving?" Toxilus is of course referring to the money which Dordalus received for Lemniselenis, and asks Dordalus, "Was it worth it?" Note the anthropomorphism of the money. For *danunt* (=*dant*), cf. ad 256.

853 : sciunt referre probe inimico gratiam : The subject is naturally Toxilus and his friends and not the *nummi* (so Ammendola)

854 : sati' sumpsimu' supplici iam : Toxilus ends the abuse. Note the alliteration.

855 : fateor, manus vobis do : "I admit it; I'm throwing in the towel." The gesture is that of a defeated and surrendering soldier giving up his hands to be bound. — **et post dabis sub furcis :** sc. *manus*. "And after (*post* with temporal meaning) you'll give your hands under the forks." The *furcae* are forked-shaped torture devices. Woytek understands these words to be a sexual threat and so gives them to Paegnium, which de Melo does not follow.

856 : abi intro—in crucem : "Go inside…to be crucified." Sagaristio unexpectedly completes his sentence. For the expression, cf. ad 352. — **an me hic parum exercitum hisce habent? :** *hisce* is the subject, an archaic nominative plural (Weiss 343, 344). *exercitum* is a predicate perfect passive participle ("Do they consider me to be insufficiently worked?"). The question is directed at the audience.

857 : convenisse te Toxilum memineris : “You will remember that you have met Toxilus.” This is a response to Dordalus’ question, explaining why they have gone overboard in their abuse.

858 : spectatores, bene valete. leno periit. plaudite : As usual, the audience is commanded or encouraged to applaud at the end of the play. The end seems somewhat abrupt, and one feels as if *leno periit* is the moral message of the play and the grounds for the approval and applause of the audience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ammendola, G. (1922), *Il "Persa": testo, introduzione e commento* (Lanciano).

Auhagen, U (2001), "Toxilus und Lemniselenis: ein paradoxes Liebespaar"in *Studien zu Plautus' Persa*, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Benz, L. (2001), "Mimica convivia und das Sklavenbankett im plautinischen Persa" in *Studien zu Plautus' Persa*, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Bertini, F. (1968), *Plauti Asinaria cum commentario exegetico* (2 vols.) (Genoa).

Camerarius, J. (1558) *M. Accii Plauti Comoediae XX*. (Basel). (With notes in Latin on *Persa*)

Christenson, D.M. (2000), *Plautus: Amphitruo* (Cambridge).

Dickey , E and A. Chahoud, edd. (2010), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge).

Ernout, A. (1961) *Plaute, tome V, texte ét. et trad. par A. Ernount, deux. éd. rev. et corr.* (Paris)

Faller, S. (2001), "Persisches im Persa" in *Studien zu Plautus' Persa*, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Fontaine, M. (2010), *Funny Words in Plautus* (Oxford).

Fortson, B. W. IV (2007) *Language and Rhythm in Plautus* (New York).

Fraenkel, E. (1922) *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin).

Fraenkel, E. (1928). *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (Berlin).

Franko, F. (1999), Review of Moore 1998 in *BMCR* 1999.05.03.

Gentili, B. (1979). *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre* (Amsterdam).

Goldberg, S.M. (1984), Review of Woytek 1982, in *Classical Philology* 79.3: 247-250.

Gratwick, A.S. (1982), "Drama," in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature, vol. 2: Latin Literature*, ed. E.J. Kenney, pp. 77-138. Cambridge

Gratwick, A.S. (1993), *Plautus: Menaechmi* (Cambridge).

Gurlitt, L. (1921), *Die Komödien des Plautus* (Berlin).

Hartkamp, R. (2001), "leno periit - Die Rolle des Kupplers Dordalus zwischen Ritual und Realität" in *Studien zu Plautus'* Persa, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Hofmann, W. (1989), "Plautinisches in Plautus' Persa," in *Klio* 71: 399-407

Hüffner, F. (1894) *De Plauti Comoediarum exemplis Atticis quaestiones maxime chronologicae* (Göttingen).

Jachmann, G. (1931) *Plautinisches und Attisches* (Berlin).

Lefèvre, E. (2001), "Plautus' Persa zwischen néa und Stegreifspiel" in *Studien zu Plautus'* Persa, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Legrand, P. (1910) *Daos. Tableau de la comedie grécque* (Paris).

Leo, F. (1895) *Plautinisches Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie* (Berlin).

Lindsay, W.M. (1900) *The Captivi of Plautus: Edited with Introduction, Apparatus Criticus and Commentary* (London).

Lindsay, W.M. (1907) *The Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford).

Lowe, J.C.B. (1989), "The *virgo callida* of Plautus, *Persa*," in *Classical Quarterly* NS 39: 390-99.

MacCary, W.T., and M.M. Willcock (1976), *Plautus: Casina* (Cambridge).
Marigo, A. "Difilo comico nei frammenti e nelle imitazioni latine" in *St. it. fil. cl.* 1907: 375-534.

Manuwald, G. (2001), "Die 'Figur' der virgo in Plautus' Persa" in *Studien zu Plautus'* Persa, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Melo, W.D.C. de (2002), "The Sigmatic Future in Plautus" in *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Amsterdam, June 24-29, 2001*, eds. A. M. Bolkstein et alii. 75-90, (Amsterdam).

Melo, W.D.C. de (2002), "The Type *faxo* in Plautus and Terence," in *OUWPLPP* 7: 163-80.

Melo, W.D.C. de (2006), "If in Doubt, Leave It In: Subject Accusatives in Plautus and Terence", *OUWPLPP* 11: 5-20.

Melo, W.D.C. de (2007) *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond* (Oxford).

Melo, W.D.C. de (2011) *Plautus vol. 1-5* (Cambridge).

Meyer, M. (1907) "De Plauti Persa" in *Comm. Philol. Ienenses* 8: 143ff.

Moore T.J. (1998) *The Theater of Plautus* (Austin).

Moore, T. (2001), "Music in Persa" in *Studien zu Plautus' Persa*, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Moore, T.J. (2012) *Music in Roman Comedy* (Cambridge).

Müller, G.L. (1957), "Das Original des plautinischen Persa" (Ph.D. diss., Frankfurt).

O'Neil, E. N. (1971), Review of Segal 1968 in *Classical Philology* 66.1: 62-4.

Partsch, J. (1910), "Römisches und griechisches Recht in Plautus Persa," in *Hermes* 45: 595-614.

Prescott, H.W. (1916) "The Interpretation of Roman Comedy" in *Classical Philology* 11: 125ff.

Questa, C. (1995), *Titi Macci Plauti Cantica* (Urbino).

Questa, C. (2007) *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio* (Urbino).

Segal, E.S. (1968), *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus* (Harvard).

Sharrock, A. (2009) *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence* (Cambridge).

Sherberg, B (2001), "Das Vater-Tochter-Verhältnis im plautinischen Persa. Zur Funktion der ersten Szene des dritten Aktes" in *Studien zu Plautus' Persa*, ed. S. Faller (Tübingen).

Slater, N.W. (1985), *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind* (Princeton)

Smith, P. L. (1986), Review of Slater 1985 in *Phoenix* 40.2: 218-220.

Stewart, R. (2012) *Plautus and Roman Slavery* (Oxford).

Suess, W. (1910) "Zwei Bemerkungen zur Technik der Komödie II: Der Komödienschluß" in *Rh. Mus.* 65: 450ff.

Traill, A. (2010) Review of Sharrock 2009 in *BMCR* 2010.11.53.

Weiss, M. (2009) *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin* (Ann Arbor).

Wilamowitz, M.U.V. (1893) *De Tribus Carmnibus latinis commentatio* (Göttigen).

Wilamowitz, M.U.V. (1925) *Menander, Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin).

Wiles, D. (1988), "Taking farce seriously: recent critical approach to Plautus", in *Farce: Themes in drama 10: Farce,* ed. J. Redmound, pp. 261-271 (Cambridge).

Woytek, E. (1982), *T. Maccius Plautus: Persa; Einleitung, Text und Kommentar* (Vienna).