

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A NOT-SO-MINOR CHARACTER IN TERENCE'S *EUNUCHUS*

In an article on the minor characters of Terence's *Andria* H. de la Ville de Mirmont, writing briefly on the *ancilla* Mysis, compares her unfavorably with Pythias, one of the two *ancillae* of Thais in the *Eunuchus*. He describes Pythias as "le type de la véritable soubrette de comédie, dévouée à sa maîtresse, et, de plus, adroite et madrée."¹ In the present paper my aim is to show that, though Pythias can be regarded as a minor character inasmuch as she neither initiates any major part of the action nor is significantly affected by the play's outcome, her role is nevertheless an important one; and in the course of so doing I hope also to demonstrate how, as the situation demands, Terence lends emphasis to her character by according her a markedly distinctive manner of speaking. If that claim is substantiated by the evidence offered below, it implies a significant modification of the commonly held view that in Terence all characters speak a uniform, undifferentiated Latin.² In the case of Pythias there are two features that particularly contribute to her idiolect: *hapax legomena* and, more importantly, the manner in which she uses language that is wholly or predominantly restricted to female speakers in Latin comedy. As regards *hapax legomena* a word of warning may not be out of place. In an author whose total oeuvre is less than 6000 lines many words will necessarily appear once only; whether in a given case a word is significant or not requires careful consideration, with due account being taken of both speaker and context. Thus it is surely a matter of chance that *aqua* appears once only in Terence (compared with roughly sixty examples in Plautus), whereas no one will doubt that when Terence, who normally avoids coarse language, makes the slave Geta address the *leno* Dorio as *sterculinum*, he has chosen that *hapax legomenon* deliberately. As for Pythias' use of female speech, a striking example is afforded by her use of *amabo* as a "polite modifier" of questions and imperatives. Details are given below in the note on *Eunuchus* 534, where some differences between Terence's and Plautus' usage are also noted.

1. H. de la Ville de Mirmont, "Les personnages épisodiques dans l'*Andrienne* de Térence," *RPh* 38 (1914): 137–50.

2. The commonly accepted view is well stated by the late Professor F. H. Sandbach in his important paper on "Menander's Manipulation of Language for Dramatic Purposes," in *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens* 16 (1969/70): 113–43: "but within this similarity of style [sc. of Menander] there are marked differences between individual characters, of a kind that I do not see reproduced by Terence in his adaptations." With characteristic frankness Sandbach went on to say "although Professor Arnott has kindly shown me an article soon to be published [= "*Phormio Parasitus*. A study in Dramatic Methods of Characterization," *G&R* 17 (1970): 32–57] . . . in which he makes it clear that such differentiation is by no means completely absent." See also Robert Maltby, "Linguistic Characterization of Old Men in Terence," *CP* 74 (1979): 136–47. A follow-up of Sandbach's paper by W. G. Arnott, with the title "Menander's Manipulation of Language for the Individualisation of Character" is to be published in *Lo spettacolo delle voci*, ed. Francesco de Martino and A. H. Sommerstein (forthcoming).

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

The pivot on which the plot of the *Eunuchus* turns is the rape by Chaerea, disguised as a eunuch, of the young girl, Pamphila, whose identity as an Athenian citizen the *meretrix* Thais is seeking to establish. Chaerea's account of his sexual conquest is delivered in a scene (3.5) that begins just after the play has reached its halfway mark (549–614). Up to this point Pythias has made only two brief appearances, though these are of importance, since they are closely linked with all the action that follows Chaerea's escapade. But from the moment that she reappears from Thais' house at 643 she is—apart from two scenes (771–816 [the siege scene] and 971–1001)—continuously on stage until her final exit at 1023. More importantly, during the time that she is on stage she plays a substantial part in at least one scene with each of the main characters in the play with the exception only of the *miles* and his parasite. So she has scenes with Chremes (3.3 and 4.5), Phaedria (4.3 and 4.4), Thais (5.1), Chaerea (along with Thais in 5.2), and Parmeno (5.4 and 5.6); she also takes part in scenes with her fellow *ancilla* Dorias and the eunuch Dorus. Indeed, the only female character that has (marginally) a larger part in the whole of Terence is her mistress Thais.³

In what follows I take in turn each scene (or group of scenes) in which Pythias appears; and though the actions and words of a character within a play are inseparable, it will be convenient for the purposes of the present paper to treat them separately. Accordingly, I first consider the part Pythias plays in each scene, and then list and comment on those linguistic features that seem to me worthy of note.

The entry into Thais' house of the pseudo-eunuch Chaerea and the rape he there commits, an act that so gravely threatens to ruin Thais' hopes of establishing Pamphila as a marriageable Athenian citizen, are facilitated by the very steps that Thais takes to further her plans. For, having persuaded her lover to go away for a few days, she then herself leaves her house to dine with the *miles* Thraso as a reward for handing Pamphila over to her. But she also urgently needs to see the *adulescens* Chremes, who (she believes) will be able to provide the proof of Pamphila's Athenian citizenship; and to this end, before she leaves to dine with Thraso, she leaves Pythias with instructions that she is to give to Chremes when he arrives. Though at this point Pythias speaks only two words (504 *ita faciam*), the instructions she receives are to play a significant part in the exchange between Chremes and Pythias that follows thirty lines later (531–38). Thais' instructions comprise three alternative suggestions for ensuring a meeting between Chremes and her. Being aware that Chremes may be reluctant to have further dealings with a *meretrix*, she puts the three suggestions in an order that corresponds in descending order to her own preference and is, conversely, likely to be increasingly acceptable to Chremes. Pythias is to propose to Chremes (1) that he should wait till Thais returns from her dinner with Thraso; or (2) if that is not convenient, that he should come back (sc. another time); finally, (3) if neither of those suggestions is acceptable, Chremes is to be brought to see Thais at Thraso's house.

At 507 Chremes enters, delivers an entrance monologue, in which he expresses at some length his suspicion that Thais has designs on his person or his pocket, and knocks preemptorily on the door of Thais' house (530–31). Pythias appears, greets him warmly, and puts to him in turn each of the three suggestions that Thais had

3. The figures can be extracted from Table 1 (p. 111) of Robert Maltby, "The Distribution of Greek Loan-words in Terence," *CQ* 35 (1985): 110–23; from his total of 141 lines for the two *ancillae* in *Eun.* must be subtracted ca. 21 lines spoken by Dorias, giving a total for Pythias of 120 lines, compared with 143.5 lines spoken by Thais. For Menander undifferentiated totals for lines spoken by women are given by David Bain in "Female Speech in Menander," *Antichthon* 18 (1984): 31.

instructed her to convey to him. But, as commentators have noted, in so doing she reverses the order of the first and second suggestions,⁴ while retaining the final position for Thais' third suggestion—the suggestion that is, of course, acted on and that (as Thais was aware when she made it) was likely to lead to trouble.⁵ Pythias' reversal of Thais' first and second suggestions is not, as it was once fashionable to suppose, a sign of Terence's clumsy handling of his Greek original, but a deliberate act of the playwright, designed to bring out features of the characters of both speakers—Chremes suspicious and brusque to the point of rudeness, Pythias ingratiating and persistent. As Chremes has just ended his monologue with the assertion that he will not come a third time to see Thais (530 *non hercle veniam tertio*), Pythias' inversion of Thais' first and second suggestions gets her exchanges with Chremes off to a bad start; for when she begins with "Thais maxumo / te orabat opere ut cras redires," the audience already knows that Chremes will reject the request. Pythias' second suggestion—which had been Thais' first, and which she realized might not be convenient to Chremes (502 *si id non commodumst*)—is similarly rejected by him, and when Pythias seeks to press the matter, she is met with the imprecation, "Go and be hanged!" (536 *malam rem hinc ibis?*). Then, as the plot of the play requires, Chremes accepts the third suggestion and agrees to join Thais at Thraso's house. The short exchange of only eight lines (531–38) between Chremes and Pythias has not only produced the necessary dramatic outcome, but has also—with skilful economy—given some substance to both characters. And in the case of Pythias an important element has been the lively and distinctive nature of her language, whose most striking features are annotated below:

531 o capitulum lepidissimum: as Donatus points out, Pythias answers Chremes' surly boorishness with *faceta meretricis disciplina*; and it is to her greeting that Donatus' ὑποκορίσματα . . . τῷ ἰδιωτισμῷ applies. Each of Pythias' three words carries its own weight; their combination produces an overpowering attempt at blandishment, to which Donatus notes Chremes' reaction: *blandimentum rusticus insidias putat*. For the intensifying effect of *o* + vocative⁶ cf. McGlynn, *Lexicon Terentianum*, s.v. I (3) and (e.g.) R. H. Martin (Cambridge, 1976) on *Adelphoe* 256 and

4. The role of Chremes has been deeply scrutinized by "analysts" seeking to unravel both Terentian and Menandrian strands and also strands of Menander's *Kolax* and *Eunouchos*. My own view is that in essence the comings and goings of Chremes in Terence's play are the same as those of his counterpart in Menander's *Eunouchos*, though, as the evidence I offer below indicates, language and emphasis may owe much to Terence's own hand. For the present paper, though, those questions are (I believe) irrelevant. It seems to me that the correspondence between 500–503 and 532–38 (and, almost certainly, the reversal by Pythias of the order in which she delivers to Chremes Thais' first and second suggestions) derive from Menander. The seminal paper on this subject remains Walther Ludwig, "Von Terenz zu Menander," *Philologus* 103 (1959): 1–38, printed with an important *Nachtrag* (1971) in *Die römische Komödie: Plautus und Terenz*, ed. Eckard Lefèvre (Darmstadt, 1973).

5. Triggering off the siege scene (4.7) in Terence's play (with its addition from the *Kolax*). I assume, as the likeliest hypothesis, that in Menander's *Eunouchos* there was a confrontation before Thais' house between "Chremes" and "Phaedria's" rival (i.e., the character corresponding to Thraso in Terence's play). I assume, further—though it is no more than an assumption—that the rival was not a *miles*, and that the confrontation, consequently, was based on the respective legal arguments of "Chremes" and the rival; the essence would then be on the lines adopted by Chremes in lines 805–8 of Terence's play.

6. Patrick McGlynn, *Lexicon Terentianum* (London and Glasgow, 1963–67) s.v. II (1), following P. Richter in *W. Studemund's Studien*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1890), 389–642, takes *capitulum* as accusative of exclamation, as is certainly the case with *o lepidum caput* at *Ad.* 966. Here, however, Chremes' comment, *dico ego mi insidias fieri?*, shows clearly that Pythias' *o capitulum lepidissimum* has been addressed directly to him in the vocative. There is some (but by no means complete) overlap between Terence's use of *o* + vocative and Menander's ὦ + voc.; for the former see notes on *Ad.* 256 and 790 in Martin's edition (Terence, "Adelphoe" [Cambridge, 1976]), and for Menander cf. A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1973) on *Dyskolos* 823.

983. The use of the diminutive as an endearment needs no illustration, but the fact that *capitulum* is *hapax legomenon* in Terence is noteworthy. Plautus has the noun at *Asinaria* 496 and *Curculio* 293, but in neither of those instances is it used in an address. The fact that the superlative of *lepidus* occurs in Terence only here and *Adelphoe* 911 (*pater lepidissime*—again in an address), where its exceptional emphasis is noted by Demea's delighted aside (*euge! iam lepidus vocor*) demonstrates its emphasis here. Compare and contrast Plautus *Miles* 725 and Terence *Adelphoe* 966 *o lepidum caput!*, which have neither diminutive nor superlative.

532–33 Thais maxumo / te orabat opere: Terence has *maxumo opere* at *Hautontimorumenos* 626 and *opere maxumo* at *Phormio* 760, but only here does he have the hyperbaton *maxumo . . . opere*. Though Plautus has the same hyperbaton at *Casina* 992–93 (*tu maxumo / me opsecravisti opere*), *Miles* 75, and *Pseudolus* 897, in Terence, who is much more sparing in the use of hyperbaton than Plautus, its use here seems to be intended to give greater emphasis to Pythias' request.

534 and 537 amabo: the use of *amabo* with question or imperative is the single most striking marker of female speech in Latin comedy. But, before turning to its use by Pythias, two important differences between Plautus and Terence in its usage must be noted: (1) whereas in Plautus *amabo* is occasionally spoken by men (though almost always in addressing women), in Terence it is exclusively spoken by women; (2) its usage is proportionately much more frequent in Plautus than it is in Terence (roughly once in every thirty-two lines spoken by females in Plautus, but only once in sixty-one lines in female speech in Terence). It is against this general background that Pythias' use of *amabo* in the *Eunuchus* needs to be seen. Of the total of eleven examples in the whole of Terence eight are in the *Eunuchus*, and of those eight, six are spoken by Pythias (534, 537, 663, 674, 838, 915).⁷ Since the aim and function of *amabo* is to establish a closer rapport with the person addressed, its frequent use by Pythias helps to define her character and to emphasize her role in the play.

535 mi Chremes: "the vocative *mi, mea*, which in any case has an ingratiating force, mostly precedes the noun when spoken by women, whereas it mostly follows the noun when spoken by men" (Martin, *Adelphoe*, ad 288). Cf. J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*³ (Heidelberg, 1951), 138 and Donatus on *Hecyra* 824 (*mi Pamphile inquam amabo*): *haec blandimenta sunt muliebria*.⁸

Though the exchange between Chremes and Pythias has occupied less than nine lines, salient traits of both their characters have been made clear to the spectators—in Pythias' case not least by the language she uses; on the stage, as in life, first impressions count most.⁹

Pythias next appears at 643, when she reenters from Thais' house and delivers an entrance monologue, eavesdropped by Phaedria and (it seems) Dorias;¹⁰ in it she proclaims her distress on discovering that Pamphila has been raped by the pretended eunuch. The highly rhetorical language with which she begins (long verse [*mutatis modis cantica?*], rhetorical questions with anaphora [*Ubi . . . inveniam? aut ubi*

7. The other examples in *Eun.* are spoken by Thais (130, 150), while the other three Terentian exx. are spoken by a *meretrix* or her servant (*Haut.* 404, *Hec.* 70 and 824). There is a detailed discussion of *amabo* as used by women in comedy in J. N. Adams, "Female Speech in Latin Comedy," *Antichthon* 18 (1984): 61–63.

8. For a fuller discussion of *mi/mea* + vocative cf. Adams, "Female Speech," 68–72.

9. "Most of the female words come at the start of utterances. There is an accumulation at the start of the scene" (Adams, "Female Speech," 75, discussing *Ad.* 288–98).

10. Dorias' movements hereabouts present some difficulty. She delivers a monologue from 615–28 and next speaks at 656, when she addresses Pythias. The Oxford Text adds her name to the scene heading for 4.2 (629–42), though it does not appear in the MSS in the scene heading. Her presence during the present scene, however, is assured by Pythias' instruction at 726, when she tells Dorias to take inside the *aurum* she has brought from Thais; it is inconceivable that Dorias has already been inside the house at that point.

quaeram?], accusative + infinitive of exclamation) follows a pattern that recurs frequently in Terence,¹¹ especially (but by no means exclusively) in the despairing outbursts of the lovelorn *adulescens*. But, though the pattern is a recurrent one in Terence, in Pythias' case the strength of her emotions is further emphasized by a number of distinctive features in her language. That is particularly so when her monologue becomes a dialogue with Phaedria, on whom she vents her anger, since at this juncture she believes that Pamphila has been raped by the real eunuch, Dorus, whom Phaedria had given as a present to Thais.

643 scelerosum . . . atque inpium: both adjectives are "loaded" words; *scelerosus* (for which Plautus normally uses *scelestus* or, less often, *sceleratus*) is *hapax legomenon* in Terence and does not occur at all in Plautus: *inpius*, which Plautus uses only rarely of persons, is confined in Terence to the present passage and *Adelphoe* 304 (*o hominem inpium!*), where also it refers to a youthful seducer.

644 facinus facere: for the *figura etymologica*, here emphasized by the enclosing *au-dax . . . ausum*, cf. Heinz Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin, 1934), 34–38. Whereas Plautus has over a dozen examples of *facinus facere*, this is Terence's only example—though *Phormio* 429–30 ("quin quod est / ferundum fers? tuis dignum factis feceris"), where Phormio goads Demipho by pretending to make a reasonable offer, is comparable; see also *Andria* 854 *facinus faxo* and *Hautontimorumenos* 314 *fit . . . facinus*.

645 scelus: for *scelus* = (approximately) *homo sceleratus*, cf. McGlynn, *Lexicon Terentianum*, s.v. III.¹² Although the usage, common enough in Plautus, is particularly favored by Terence (e.g., *An.* 317 "abin hinc in malam rem cum suspicione istac, scelus?"—in a Terentian insert), all three examples in *Eunuchus* are associated with Pythias, here and at 941 being spoken by her, while at 1018 the slave Parmeno, realizing that he has been tricked by her, so addresses her.

646 discidit . . . conscidit: apart from the play on words of the two verbs at the diaeresis and line-end of the iambic octonarius, note that the only other example of the latter verb in Terence is at 820, where Thais castigates Pythias for what has gone on in her house during her absence.¹³

648 ut ego unguibus . . . illi in oculos involem venefico: for the vigorous metaphor of *involare* cf. 859, also spoken by Pythias. These are the only examples in Terence, and in this metaphorical sense it is rare elsewhere; cf. Plautus *Mostellaria* 203 "vix comprimor quin involem illi in oculos stimulatrici" and Lucilius 1096 (= Loeb 1001). *Veneficus*, common enough in Plautus, is used by Terence only here and at 825, where in the altercation between Thais and Pythias it is used by Thais of Pythias.¹⁴ *Unguibus* is in fact *hapax* in Terence, but may be treated with the same reservation as is suggested for *conscindere* in the previous note.

Between 643 and 648 Phaedria has eavesdropped on Pythias' outburst. As V. E. Hiatt, *Eavesdropping in Roman Comedy* (Chicago, 1946), p. 55, n. 40, remarks, he gains no precise information from what he overhears: "the eavesdropping possesses dramatic value only insofar as it serves to develop suspense." At 650 (with *adibo*) he steps forward to engage in dialogue with Pythias and now learns the reason for her emotional outburst. Though their exchange of words clearly shows Pythias' anger and

11. See Bruno Denzler, *Der Monolog bei Terenz* (Zürich, 1968), 77–83 and, especially, the monologue of the *nutrix* Sophrona at *Ph.* 729 ("quid agam? quem mi amicum invenian misera? aut quoi consilia haec referam? aut unde auxilium petam?").

12. Cf. Donatus on *Eun.* 645, *plus enim est "scelus" quam "scelestus."*

13. This is perhaps a good example where not too much should be read into the significance of what is a common enough word and one that exactly describes what happened to Pamphila.

14. See the detailed comments below on this scene (5.1 [817–39]).

Phaedria's bewilderment at what has happened, their language is not here marked by any notably individual features.¹⁵ It is only after Phaedria has gone off at 663 to look for the eunuch that in the remarks exchanged between Pythias and Dorias, who both remain on stage, some marked individualization of language returns. However, note Donatus' comment on the first words that Dorias addresses to her fellow *ancilla* at 656:¹⁶ "AV OBSECRO MEA PYTHIAS 'mea' et 'mea tu' et 'amabo' et alia huiusce-modi mulieribus apta sunt blandimenta"; and on *au* see on 680 below. Dorias' words are a reminder that Pythias shares some elements of her speech with other female speakers; it is the manner in which, and the frequency with which, she uses those elements that distinguish her from other female speakers.

663 amabo: for Pythias' penchant for this usage cf. 534n.

[**664 mea tu:** these words are spoken *to* Pythias; for the manner in which the two *ancillae* address each other see 720n.]

666 potesse: this form of the infinitive occurs only here in Terence and is the only instance in Terence where it has the sense of "be capable of sexual intercourse" (cf. Martial 11.97.1 and *OLD*, s.v. 7b); Pythias is not afraid to call a spade a spade.

667 conclusissem . . . commissem: the assonance lends emphasis, as at 646 (q.v.). Such assonances, however, are not peculiar to Pythias, but are a feature of Terence's style, especially in long-verses; cf. *Adelphoe* 689 and 709 (both in long verses, and spoken respectively by *senex* and *adulescens*).

Phaedria, who has gone into his own house at the end of 663, returns with Dorus, the real eunuch, at 668. From Dorus Phaedria extracts the information that the rapist of Pamphila is none other than Phaedria's younger brother, Chaerea. At 717 Phaedria orders Dorus to go back into his house and follows him, leaving Pythias and Dorias on stage. During the time that Dorus has been on stage Dorias speaks only half a line, in which she merely confirms Pythias' comment *ofactum bene*. During these same lines, though Pythias has an important role to play in establishing the identity of the rapist, the highlight of the scene is the way that Phaedria manipulates the dialogue between himself and Dorus. Accordingly, though Pythias displays her indignation when Phaedria casts doubt on her assertion that Dorus is not the "eunuch" who was brought to their house, the dramatic situation does not call for her language to be as colorful as it had been earlier. Nevertheless there are one or two touches to be noted:

674 amabo: see on 534.

15. The use of unusual vocabulary is the most striking means by which Terence lends emphasis to Pythias' speech; but it is possible also to heighten language, especially in long-verse sections, by the employment of rhetorical stylization, as happens in 4.3 [643–67] and the long-verse section of 5.4 [943–70]. This latter type of heightening is, of course, not confined to Pythias (see n. 11 above). But neither this fact nor the fact that there are other subdued passages where the dramatic situation calls for no special emphasis on Pythias' role invalidates the general point that, as and when the dramatic situation demands, Pythias has at her disposal a range of linguistic weapons that help to emphasize her role within the play.

16. The one-line intervention of Dorias at 656 raises a small problem of staging, since Pythias takes no notice of her presence or of what she says. Dorias' words (*au obsecro, mea Pythias*) are, of course, signalingly those of a woman speaker, but they are not in any way peculiar to Dorias alone; see further on 664 below and the cross-reference to 720n.

680 au: Donatus ad loc. says, “‘au’ interiectio est conturbatae feminae nec constantis sibi”; see also Donatus on 899 and *Andria* 751. Terence uses *au* much more often than Plautus, whose only certain example is at *Stichus* 259;¹⁷ but what is unusual here is that this is the only example in Terence where it stands at a line end in enjambment with the next line. That adds a little extra urgency to Pythias’ rebuttal of Phaedria’s suggestion that she is mistaken.

687–88: the alliteration of “videre vero velles” and the triple alliteration in the following line help to underline the contrast between the physical attractiveness of the pseudo-eunuch (Chaerea) and the decrepitude of the real eunuch (Dorus): *vietus vetus veterinosus* (both *vietus* and *veterinosus* are *hapax* in Terence and neither occurs in Plautus) is additionally interesting in that Donatus on *colore mustelino* indicates that Menander’s original (= frag. 163) also had alliteration here (αὐτός ἐστιν γαλεώτης γέρων).

718 techinam: this Greek loan-word is used by Plautus and Terence almost as a *vox propria* for a stratagem or piece of trickery devised by a slave; such is its use here and in the only other passage in which it is used by Terence (*Haut*. 471 *falli te sinas / techinis per servolum*),¹⁸ where the speaker is a *senex*. Here its use by Pythias has a dramatic significance, for (in conjunction with what she says in the next line) it foreshadows her intention to pay Parmeno back in his own coin (see 918–20 and 5.4 and 5.6): the only specific initiative that Pythias will take within the play is a *techina* against a slave whom she regards as responsible for a *techina* against her own household.

720 Dorias: the contrast in the way Pythias and Dorias address each other merits a note. At 656 Dorias addresses Pythias as *mea Pythias* (for prefixed *mea* see on *mi Chremes* at 535), and at 664 with *mea tu* (paralleled only at *Ad*. 289, where it is spoken by the elderly nurse Canthara to her mistress, the *matrona* Sostrata). By contrast Pythias addresses Dorias *tout simple* as *Dorias* (538 and here). That perhaps suggests that, though Pythias is younger than Dorias, she ranks above her in Thais’ domestic hierarchy; cf. also the way she gives an order to Dorias at 726: *tu aufer aurum hoc*.

Scene 4.5 (727–38) provides the second meeting between Chremes and Pythias, and thus forms a balancing scene with their first meeting in 3.3 at 531–38. But, whereas in the former scene the part that Pythias plays evokes from her a number of noteworthy linguistic features, here her function is only to receive from the inebriated Chremes the news that Thais is on her way home from Thraso’s dinner party;¹⁹ accordingly she has no need to assert herself by any marked individuality in her language. The same is true of the next scene (4.6 [739–70]) in which, for the first time within the play, Chremes and Thais meet, and Thais informs him that Pamphila is his sister and warns him of the impending arrival of Thraso and his men, who will seek to reclaim Pamphila by force. During this scene Pythias’ only role is to receive Thais’ instruction to go inside to fetch the box containing Pamphila’s birth-tokens and to return with

17. Interestingly enough, *Stich*. 259 also is spoken in enjambment by an *ancilla*; see the note *ad loc.* of Hubert Petersmann (*T. Maccius Plautus: Stichus; Einleitung, Text, Kommentar* [Heidelberg, 1973]), “[the enjambment] trägt . . . der Lebhaftigkeit der Szene Rechnung.” The two other examples in *Eun.* (656 [Dorias] and 899 [Thais]) both have *au* followed by *obsecro*. In general see Adams, “Female Speech,” 54.

18. See Robert Maltby, “Greek Loan-words in Terence,” *CQ* 35 (1985): esp. 118–23.

19. The fact that Thais had left before Chremes, but is to arrive at her house after him has given rise to much discussion and divergence of opinion between “unitarians” and “analysts”; see Ludwig, “Von Terenz zu Menander,” 354–408. That discussion is not directly relevant to what I am discussing here. But it is worth noting that the plot requires that Chremes should arrive before Thais and be detained outside her house, since Thais must not go inside her house until (a) Chremes has been convinced by her that Pamphila is his sister, and (b) Thraso (or the rival who must have featured in Menander’s *Eunouchos*) has been persuaded (by a show of force in the case of Thraso, or the threat of legal action, if the rival did not himself threaten *force majeure*) to withdraw, leaving Thais in possession of Pamphila.

them and show them to Chremes (753–54, 767). In the siege-scene that follows Pythias takes no part,²⁰ and it is probable that she goes into Thais' house at 770, to reenter at 817 with Thais, who will herself have gone inside at the end of 810.

In the scene that follows (5.1 [817–39]) Thais fiercely (if perhaps unjustly) castigates Pythias for allowing Pamphila to be raped by the eunuch; and, not unnaturally, it is Thais' language that becomes heated, while that of Pythias is for the most part subdued, until the sight of Chaerea, still in eunuch's dress, at 834 gives her hope that the culprit can be caught and punished. Since this is the only scene in the play where Pythias, taking part in a dialogue between two persons, plays a subservient role, I have here given notes on the language of both Thais and Pythias; but in the interests of clarity I have distinguished Thais' utterances by enclosing them in square brackets.

817 [scelesta: while the masculine adjective is common in both Plautus and Terence, the feminine *scelesta* occurs only in the *Eunuchus*, once applied to Thais by Phaedria (71) and twice in the present scene (here and 832), where Thais uses it to address Pythias in the vocative.]

820 [conscissa: Thais may be repeating the word that Pythias had used at 646 (see note ad loc.).]

824 ephebus: though the word is used by Terence only here and at *Andria* 51, it is a Greek loan-word for which there is no Latin equivalent;²¹ I doubt, therefore, if its use is significant.

825 [venefica: a further invective adjective in the vocative, with Thais using of Pythias the adjective that Pythias had herself used of Pamphila's rapist at 648 (q.v.).]

829 [sacrilega: the third example of vocative invective against Pythias; Thais is understandably incensed by what has happened, even though Pythias cannot fairly be blamed for it. The adjective *sacrilegus* is used by Terence only in *Eunuchus* and *Adelphoe*.²² In the *Eunuchus*, in addition to the present instance, it is used by Pythias of Parmeno at 911 and 922, while at 419 Parmeno has used it of Gnatho (in what, therefore, must be a Terentian insert).]

832 [scelesta, ovem lupo commisisti. dispudet: the whole of this line is noteworthy: for *scelesta* cf. 817n.; for the proverb cf. August Otto, *Die Sprichwörter der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890; reprint ed. Hildesheim, 1964), s.v. *lupus* 5, comparing (e.g.) Plautus *Pseudolus* 140 and Cicero *Orationes Philippicae* 3.27 "o praeclarum custodem ovium, ut aiunt, lupum"; *dispudet*, with its strongly intensifying prefix, is *hapax* in Terence (though there are examples in Plautus).]

834 era mea, tace tace, obsecro: servants in Terence address their mistresses in the vocative with *era* alone, apart from the present instance; the addition of *mea* here presumably adds a slight note of greater intimacy, though Pythias does not go so far as to use the still more familiar word-order with *mea* prefixed (for which see on 535). The use of *obsecro* with an imperative (and mostly placed after it) is a common usage,²³ but this is the only example in Terence where the imperative is doubled²⁴—adding a note of urgency to the request (cf. Donatus ad loc. for a slightly different emphasis).

838 amabo: see 534n.

20. A less likely possibility—since there is no indication of her exit at 770 or her return at 817—is that she may have been present as a silent onlooker during the siege-scene.

21. See Maltby, "Loan-words," 118–23.

22. See Martin, "*Adelphoe*," on *Ad.* 265.

23. See Adams, "Female Speech," 55–58.

24. *audi . . . audi obsecro* at *An.* 860–61 is not parallel; for *obsecro* with a single imperative cf. *Eun.* 685 *tace obsecro* (Pythias) and 899 *au tace obsecro* (Thais to Pythias).

In the scene that now follows (5.2 [840–909]) the main dialogue is between Thais and Chaerea, still dressed as a eunuch and anxious to make amends for what he has done by marrying Pamphila. To this dialogue Pythias adds a number of comments, warning her mistress not to trust Chaerea too readily and rebuking Chaerea for his rape of an Athenian citizen—it is Pythias who reveals this fact to Chaerea (857–58). Though Pythias' interventions are few till near the end of the scene (when, much to her disgust, she realizes that Chaerea is to be granted Thais' pardon), her remarks are often forceful and vigorously expressed.

859–60 conservam! vix me contineo quin involem in / capillum, monstrum: *conservam* picks up Chaerea's excuse in the previous line (*conservam esse credidi*), where the noun repeats Chaerea's own description of the girl at 366, these three instances being the only examples of the word in Terence. For the graphic metaphor of *involare* cf. 648n. Elsewhere in Terence (*Haut.* 290, *Phorm.* 106 and *Eun.* 646) *capillus* refers to the long hair of a young woman. In this instance Terence may be alluding to the girlish long hair of Chaerea and to a role-reversal of the sexes: at 646 Pythias describes how Chaerea had torn the hair of the girl he had raped; now *she* expresses the wish to seize *his* hair.

862 furcifero: this term of abuse is much favored by Plautus, who has fifteen examples of the word. Apart from the present passage it is always, in both Plautus and Terence,²⁵ put in the mouths of male characters, most commonly being spoken of, or by, slaves. Though Pythias does not directly address Chaerea at this point, the forcefulness of the word in the mouth of a woman is further strengthened by the fact that, although Chaerea is still keeping up the pretense of being the eunuch Dorus (e.g., 850–51), and thus a legitimate object of scorn and abuse, Pythias knows full well that she is in fact speaking of Chaerea, a *civis Atticus*.

904 apage: Terence's two examples of this Greek loan-word are both in the *Eunuchus*: at 756 Chremes had rejected Thais' taunt of cowardice with *apage sis*.²⁶ More important is the fact that it is overwhelmingly a masculine expletive. So, in Plautus' numerous examples only once is it put in the mouth of a woman, at *Poenulus* 225 in the soliloquy of Adelpasium. As with *furcifer* at 862 (q.v.) Pythias' use of a predominantly masculine locution, addressed directly to a free man, emphasizes the forcefulness of her personality.

With the discovery that Chaerea is Pamphila's violator and his declaration that he wishes to marry her, and with her Athenian citizenship all but proved, the main action of the play is effectively concluded. But more action is still to follow and, once more, Pythias will be involved. At the end of 5.2, when the reconciliation between Thais and Chaerea is evident, Pythias has one last dig at Chaerea—ridicule being the only weapon left to her; when Chaerea expresses his anxiety to get inside, because he feels ashamed to be seen outside dressed as a eunuch, Pythias' parting shot to him is *virgo vero!*—a remark that is all the more telling, since he has just raped a virgin (857–58); hence Donatus (on 908) εἰρωνικῶς.

In the next short scene (5.3 [910–22]) Pythias still has a role to play; she reaffirms her intention of getting her own back on Parmeno for instigating Chaerea's *flagitium*, and she elicits from Chremes, as he approaches with his old nurse, the conclusive proof that Pamphila's birth-tokens do in fact show her to be Chremes' sister. After

25. Terence has four examples of the word, three of them in *Eunuchus*. At *An.* 618 Pamphilus so addresses his slave Davos; in *Eun.* 798 Chremes so calls Thraso (the passage is thus a Terentian insert), and at *Eun.* 989 the slave is so addressed by the father of Phaedria and Chaerea.

26. See Maltby, "Loan-words," esp. 118 and 121–22; and cf. Men. *Pk.* 396 ἀπαγ' ἐς κόρακας.

her relatively subdued behavior in the presence of her mistress Pythias' language once more takes on a strongly personal tone.

911 sacrilego: Pythias applies the same word to Parmeno also at 922 below. For the use of the feminine *sacrilega* earlier in the play see 829n.

915 amabo: cf. 534n.

916 edepol: Aulus Gellius (*NA* 11.6.1) states that, whereas oaths by Hercules are exclusively masculine and oaths by Castor exclusively spoken by females, the oath by Pollux *et viro et feminae commune est*.²⁷ It is true that *pol* and *edepol* are used by both sexes in both Plautus and Terence, but when appropriate allowance has been made for the fact that in both authors women speak far fewer lines than men, some significant differences emerge in the relative frequency with which each sex uses each oath in each author. In both authors *pol* is relatively more commonly spoken by females, in Terence overwhelmingly so. The statistics for *edepol* need handling with great caution. In Plautus it is both, in absolute totals, commoner than *pol* (by a proportion of 3:2) and, proportionately, more commonly used by men than women (by a proportion of almost 2:1). In Terence *pol* outnumbers *edepol* by fifty-five to twenty-three and the latter is more commonly used by women than men (the proportion is roughly 6:1). However, in spite of these differences between Plautus and Terence it is clear that in both authors the stronger form *edepol* is preferred to *pol* by male speakers (Plautus 338:159, Terence 13:10), and it is against that background of *edepol* as a more vigorous oath, and preferred by males, that its usage in the *Eunuchus* should be considered. All three examples are spoken by women, one by Thais (867), the other two by Pythias (here and 1002). Pythias' use of the stronger *edepol* perhaps helps in each case to underline her satisfaction at the turn of events; by contrast its use by Thais at 867 emphasizes the despair that she feels at what has happened.

922 perterrebo sacrilegum: the verb is *hapax* in Terence, and in Plautus occurs only at *Mostellaria* 1136; for *sacrilegus* cf. 911n.

The last line of 5.3 (922) restates Pythias' already heralded intention of exacting revenge on Parmeno for putting Chaerea up to his misdeed. Here, for the first and only time in the play, Pythias acts entirely on her own initiative, and the present scene (5.4), in which she persuades Parmeno to walk into the trap she has set for him, is balanced by 5.6, when she is able to exult over the crestfallen slave. In setting her trap she once more draws on her considerable resources of language; but, for the most part, it is not by distinctive vocabulary, but by the high-flown style in which she simulates—for Parmeno's benefit—a distress that she had genuinely given voice to earlier in the play (4.3 [643ff.]).²⁸ Her first two lines (941–42) are delivered aside in *senarii*; then, declaiming aloud to ensure that Parmeno will hear her, she switches to *trochaic septenarii*.

941 pro istis dictis et factis, scelus: for *dicta et facta* as an embracing "all you've said and done" the nearest (and only) parallel in Plautus is *Mostellaria* 923 *egone te . . . ausim dicto aut facto fallere?* This is the sole instance of the phrase in Terence; once again Pythias uses assonance to emphasize her intention of exacting total revenge from Parmeno. For *scelus* applied to a person cf. 645n. (also spoken by Pythias).

27. For fuller details of the use of oaths in Latin comedy cf. Adams, "Female Speech," 47–54 and Maltby, "Loan-words," 115–17.

28. Cf. Hiatt, *Eavesdropping*, 57, summarizing the situation; also Juliane Straus, *Terenz und Menander. Beitrag zu einer Stilvergleichung* (Zürich, 1955), 7 (quoted below on 943ff.).

943ff. For the mock-tragic tone of Pythias' language (alliteration, anaphora of the emotional *o*) cf. Straus, *Terenz und Menander*, 7: "Eun. 943 will Pythias dem Parmeno einen Streich spielen, denkt sich ein unheilbares Unglück aus und fingiert tiefe Trauer: 'Pro deum fidem! Facinus foedum! O infelicem adulescentulum! O scelestum Parmenonem, qui istum huc adduxit!' Dies ist die einzige Stelle bei Terenz, in der das salbungsvolle, wiederholte "o" scherzhaft motiviert ist. Sie unterscheidet sich nicht von den ernstesten Stellen. . . ." *Foedus* is nowhere else in Terence applied to a thing (at *Eun.* 684, its only other occurrence in Terence, it is used of the eunuch). The interjection *pro* is almost exclusively a masculine preserve in Terence—so *pro Iuppiter* always. Only once (*Ph.* 1008) is *pro* + vocative spoken by a woman (Nausistrata: *pro di immortales, facinus miserandum et malum!*), and all examples of *pro* + accusative (mostly in the phrase *pro deum [atque hominum] fidem*) are spoken by men, apart from the present instance, spoken by Pythias. For *o* + accusative cf. 531n. and McGlynn, *Lexicon Terentianum*, s.v. II (1) and (2).

From 947 Parmeno and Pythias join in dialogue, continued to the end of the scene at 970 in trochaic septenarii; here it is the tone of Pythias' language rather than any striking individuality in her vocabulary that heightens the pretended concern she declares for Chaerea's impending punishment. So her use of superlatives at 948 and 954 is designed to enhance the enormity of Parmeno's crime and the uncontrollable temper of Pamphila's brother as he seeks vengeance for the rape of his sister. Otherwise the only word that perhaps deserves comment in this scene is the Greek loan-word *moechus*, which Pythias introduces at 957. Although it is the *mot juste* for the situation in which Pythias pictures Chaerea to be, it is clearly designed to have its effect on Parmeno; and that indeed it does, as can be seen from the fact that Parmeno picks the word up at 960, and is so impressed by it that he repeats it to Chaerea's father at 992. The only other occurrence of the word in Terence is at *Andria* 316 in the Terentian insert of Charinus and Byrria. Pythias' use of the word may therefore be assumed to have been chosen to emphasize the sadistic horror of the punishment that she desires Parmeno to imagine to be in store for Chaerea. The bait for her trap is laid, and the next scene sees the trap being sprung. Then at 1002 Pythias comes out of Thais' house to savor her delight at Parmeno's discomfiture. Her pleasure is all the greater, because she alone of those inside the house is in a position to see the joke. This is her final appearance, and though it is not marked by the linguistic brilliance of her first meeting with Chremes (531–38), the following words may be noted:

1002 edepol: see 916n.

1004 ridiculo: this predicative dative seems to be *hapax* in all Latin literature; Plautus has *deridiculo* at *Miles Gloriosus* 92 (it also occurs at Tacitus *Annales* 3.57.2; contrast *Hautontimorumenos* 952 *pro deridiculo*). Whether or not the unique predicative dative is to be considered a specific feature of Pythias' idiolect, it helps to underline the point that Parmeno has been made a laughingstock (1007 *quid rides?* 1008 *ridendo*; 1017 *etiam rides?* 1018 *inridere?*).

1021–22 nobilitas flagitiis: Pythias has already told Parmeno that Pamphila's brother is *adprime nobilem* (952),²⁹ as the audience has already heard from Thais at 204. *Nobilitate* is *hapax* in

29. It is difficult to determine what meaning Terence expects his listeners to attach to *nobilis* and its derivatives when applied, within the play, to an Athenian citizen—its connotation in the prologue at *Ad.* 15 is another matter—but at least it implies "well known" or "notable" and also indicates that the person so described comes of a family of some social standing; some further indication of its meaning can be inferred from *Hec.* 797, where *nobilitas* is coordinated with *gloria*.

Terence, and its only other occurrence in early Latin seems to be Pacuvius 120 (= Loeb 134), where it is glossed by Nonius as *notificare*. That may be its meaning here (so Eugraphius ad loc.), but that would imply that *nobilitas flagitiis* and *eundem indicas* are virtually synonymous. It is preferable to see a deliberate oxymoron in the phrase, "you make him famous by his misdeeds, and then show him up to his father" (1014 *etiam patri indicares?*). That fits in well with Pythias' next (and concluding) remark, *hic pro illo munere tibi honos est habitus*, where, as Donatus comments, *honos* is used εἰρωνικῶς et μεταφορικῶς. So Pythias takes her leave of Parmeno and the audience with a stinging jibe at the initiator of the *facinus foedum*.

The argument and evidence offered on the preceding pages has sought to establish two main points: (1) that the role of the *ancilla* Pythias in the *Eunuchus* is both substantial and important; (2) that the liveliness of her character is significantly enhanced by a marked individuality in her speech. As regards the first assertion, the fact that Pythias does not appear until halfway through the play does not lessen the importance of her role. Indeed, there is a sense in which all that takes place until Thais leaves at 506 to dine with Thraso is only preparatory to the main action of the play. Similarly at the end. Clearly the scenes from 1025 that bring Thraso and Gnatho back on stage (5.7 to 5.9) did not appear in Menander's *Eunouchos*. I make no attempt to guess what may have stood in Menander's play at this point, but once Pythias has had her revenge on Parmeno, she has no further part to play and her final word *abeo* (1023) is likely to correspond to a similar final exit in the Greek original.

The question of Pythias' manner of speaking is more complex. For though the lexical details listed above show that Pythias has at her disposal her own distinctive speech, she does not sustain that distinctiveness uniformly; she speaks differently to different people and on different occasions, and there is a tendency for her speech to be more distinctive on the first occasion when she meets a given person (compare the difference between her language during her first and second meetings with Chremes [3.3 and 4.5] and with Parmeno [5.4 and 5.6]). Moreover, the situations she finds herself in vis-à-vis the other main characters in the play repeatedly occur at critical junctures in the action and also, on many occasions, elicit from the other person language that is more than usually lively and distinctive (e.g., Chremes on his first meeting with her at the end of 3.3 and Thais in 5.1).

To one further question it is possible to suggest only a very tentative answer: how far are we to imagine that in his *Eunouchos* Menander may have emphasized the role of his "Pythias" by comparable linguistic means? Though there is less than a single line (see above on 687–88) where we can make a direct comparison between Pythias' words in Terence and her Menandrian counterpart, there are at least two areas where one can say with some certainty that the tone and emphasis of Terence's Latin must be different from their equivalent in Menander: (1) the use of continuous passages of longer lines, accompanied by a significant heightening of language, is foreign to Menander's normal practice. In two scenes involving Pythias (643–67 [*mutatis modis canticum?*] and 943–70 [trochaic septenarii]) the dramatic impact is palpably heightened in this way; (2) though Menander, like Plautus and Terence, uses language as a "gender marker," there are discernible differences between the Greek and Latin usages and, within the Terentian corpus, in Pythias' employment of such markers. Some of the evidence has been given in the preceding pages: oaths are extensively used by both sexes in both Greek and Latin, but there are important differences both in the frequency with which either sex resorts to oaths and, of course, in the names of the gods they swear by; though Greek can use the equivalents

of *o* + vocative and *mi/mea* + vocative, it does not do so within a clearly defined social register in the way that Latin does; for the ubiquitous Latin *amabo* there is no exact Greek equivalent,³⁰ while the exclusively female exclamation *au* not only has no effective Greek equivalent,³¹ but is overwhelmingly a Terentian usage (there being only one example in the whole of Plautus). In all the above cases Pythias' use of the idioms needs to be seen against both the Menandrian norm and the practice of other female speakers in Terence. We must then add instances where Pythias uses words or phrases that are otherwise male gender markers (e.g., *furcifer* [862], *apage* [904], *pro deum fidem* [943]). In most, if not all, of the foregoing cases we can be reasonably sure that Terence has given to Pythias' utterances an emphasis that was not present in Menander's Greek.³²

R. H. MARTIN

University of Leeds

30. Menander's use of ἰκετεύω shows some degree of overlap, but (unlike *amabo* in Terence) is not confined to women speakers only.

31. There is some similarity between *au* and Greek αἶ as a female utterance of distress or dismay, but neither in manner nor in frequency is Menander's usage comparable with that of Terence; for αἶ in Menander cf. Bain, "Female Speech in Menander," 35–36.

32. I am grateful to Mr. P. G. McC. Brown and my Leeds colleagues Professor W. G. Arnott and Dr. Robert Maltby for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper; I have also profited from the comments of the two anonymous readers for *CP*.

POSTUMUS, CURTIUS POSTUMUS, AND RABIRIUS POSTUMUS

Commentators seeking to identify the recipient of Horace's *Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume* (*Carm.* 2.14) complain about the unhelpfulness of the man's name and the blandness of the portrait Horace draws of him. But they have usually ventured an identification all the same: Horace's Postumus is the Postumus whom Propertius addresses in elegy 3.12, and Propertius' friend in turn can be identified with a senator C. Propertius Postumus known from an Augustan inscription (*ILS* 914). I will argue that this identification is untenable and that a better candidate has been overlooked.

It will be simplest to begin with the image of Postumus as it is inscribed in the respective poems. Like many of the men to whom the *Odes* are addressed, the Postumus of *Odes* 2.14 is established and rich. Horace draws attention to his fine house with its arboreal plantings (21–23) and its reserve of wines "choicer than the banquets of priests" (25–28). Postumus is also married, to a lady characterized as "a congenial wife" (*placens uxor*, 21–22).¹ But he is apparently both childless and expected to remain so, since at the end of the poem Horace alludes pointedly to the prospect of an

In working out this argument I benefited greatly from comments by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Jerzy Linderski, T. P. Wiseman, and a referee for the journal, none of whom would want me to leave an impression here that all their reservations had been overcome.

1. Unremarkable as it is, this detail is sometimes dismissed as window-dressing of no relevance to the life of Postumus, but casually appropriated from Lucretius' set piece on the man who bids goodbye to life at 3.894–96. No doubt Horace had the Lucretian exemplar in mind, but he has not simply appropriated it.