his abjectness to win a favorable hearing for his proposal. But he unintentionally suggests Hippolytus' closeness to divinity and the vast gulf that separates him from the servant. Hippolytus is fittingly addressed as divine since that is the sphere to which he belongs.[21]

DAVID KOVACS
University of Virginia

21. Before leaving this scene, I would like to argue for a transposition of lines in 101–9. This transposition does not affect the preceding argument about the meaning of the scene; it merely makes the dialogue tidier. As Barrett ("*Hippolytos*," p. 180) points out, 105 is intended to end the conversation but does not, while 107 is not intended to but does. Gomperz, cited by Barrett, proposed to have the couplets 104–5 and 106–7 change places. This is simple and easily accounted for, especially in stichomythy where every other line begins with the same symbol. And it restores excellent sense to the argument as a whole, as a paraphrase makes clear: *Ser.* (101): You do not address Aphrodite. *Hipp.* (102): I greet her from afar for I am pure. *Ser.* (103): But she is a great goddess. *Hipp.* (106): I don't like gods who are worshiped at night. *Ser.* (107): That makes no difference. You've got to worship (all) the gods. *Hipp.* (104): Not so; as with mortal companions, I must make a choice. *Ser.* (105): Good luck to you—and more sense. *Hipp.* (108): Servants, proceed, etc.

Barrett's objections are flimsy: "104 is the answer to 103." But 106 is just as good an answer to 103, and 104 is a far better answer to 107. "The more out-spoken 106 must come later than 104." Only if you imagine Hippolytus getting progressively angrier. But there is nothing in the text to suggest this. Gomperz' order deserves to be printed as the text.

WORDPLAY AT *AMPHITRUO* 327–30

ME. illic homo a me sibi malam rem arcessit iumento suo.
SO. non equidem ullum habeo iumentum. ME. onerandus est pugnis probe.
SO. lassus sum hercle e naui, ut uectus huc sum: etiam nunc nauseo;
uix incedo inanis, ne ire posse cum onere existumes.

[Plaut. *Amph.* 327–30]

These lines are spoken in the midst of a series of wordplays in which Sosia interprets the metaphorical expressions of Mercury literally.[1] The wordplays on *iumento–iumentum* (327, 328) and *onerandus–onere* (328, 330) have been noted previously, but it has gone unnoticed that the frame of reference has changed from an animal of burden in line 328 to a ship of burden in line 330. Mercury's metaphorical use of *iumento suo* (327) is picked up by Sosia's literal disclaimer that he has no beast of burden (328). When Mercury attempts to continue the *iumentum* metaphor on the basis of Sosia's reply, the literal-minded Sosia switches Mercury's use of *onerandus* (328) to refer to the loading of ships. Overhearing the word, *onerandus*, Sosia is suddenly reminded of how tired he is after his voyage and how seasick he still feels. Sosia is thus "empty" because he has vomited his food, and this sense of *inanis* is combined with the antithesis of *inanis* and *cum onere* to suggest the loaded and unloaded cargo ship.[2] *Inanis*, then, in line 330 has

1. See P. Siewert, *Plautus in "Amphitruone" fabula quomodo exemplar Graecum transtulerit* (Berlin, 1894), pp. 15–18, esp. p. 15: "Nec vero minus affabre artificioseque nec minus libere Plautus ipse plerisque eorum locorum orationem conformavit, quibus uni vocabulo duplex vis tribuitur aut quolibet modo in nominibus propriis vel vocabulis aliis luditur." Cf. also W. B. Sedgwick, *Plautus: "Amphitruo"* (Manchester, 1960), p. 85.

2. I would like to thank the anonymous referee for drawing my attention to the connection between *etiam nunc nauseo* and *inanis*.

a double frame of reference, but neither refers to a pack animal.[3] It is indicative of the wordplays in this scene that Sosia continues to invert the tenor of Mercury's remarks.

JOHN R. CLARK
University of Pennsylvania

3. Indeed, *TLL* cites no clear examples of *inanis* used to describe an unladen animal. For the use of *inanis* to describe an unladen, as opposed to an unmanned, ship, *TLL* (7.1: 822.15–17) cites two later examples, both contrasting empty with laden ships: Cic. 2 *Verr.* 5. 46 *inanem te navem (onerariam) esse illam in Italiam adducturum* and Pliny *Pan.* 31. 4 *navigia inania et vacua* (opp. *plena et onusta*).

NICANDER *THERIACA* 811: A NOTE

One of the most puzzling animals in Nicander's *Theriaca* is called ἴουλος (811). Following LSJ, A. S. F. Gow and A. F. Scholfield translate "woodlouse" (in the United States, "sowbug" or "pillbug").[1] An animal in Isopoda, however, has little relationship to the passages of the *Theriaca* (669–814), which describe nine kinds of scorpions,[2] two kinds of wasps, and a centipede;[3] and a "sowbug" does not fit the context of these passages.

Part of the problem may be that British English appears to make little distinction between given myriapods and isopods,[4] perhaps because some of the creatures under consideration look quite similar on casual observation and because many of them curl up into balls when disturbed. By contrast, scholars on the continent have long recognized that ὁ ἴουλος quite often designates a myriapod,[5] even though ancient Greek also did not make a clear distinction between myriapods and isopods in many cases.[6]

Ὁ ἴουλος appears in Aristotle *Historia animalium* 523b18 (ἔστι δ' ἔντομα καὶ ἄπτερα, οἷον ἴουλος καὶ σκολόπενδρα) and *De partibus animalium* 682b3 (καὶ μάλιστα πολύποδα τὰ μάλιστα κατεψυγμένα διὰ τὸ μῆκος οἷον τὸ τῶν ἰούλων γένος) and 682a5 (καθάπερ τοῖς ἰουλώδεσι καὶ μακροῖς), and it is clear that the creature is usually larger and longer than sowbugs or woodlice. Galen *De usu partium* 3. 2 restates *De partibus ani-*

1. For the text, see Gow and Scholfield's edition, *Nicander. The Poems and Poetical Fragments* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 83. LSJ[9], s.v. ἴουλος IV, state that the animal is "probably the woodlouse." The initial word suggests that Jones may have recognized the problem. Gow in his introductory remarks to *Nicander* (p. 23) writes that "Nicander mentions . . . two myriopods, ἴουλος and σκολόπενδρα, classed as insects by Aristotle . . . ," but in his note on the passage (pp. 186–87) says, "ἴουλος and σκολόπενδρα are mentioned together as wingless insects at Arist. *HA* 523b18. The first, glossed ὄνος in Hsch. (cf. Plin. *HN* 29. 136), is no doubt a woodlouse of one or more species; the second a centipede. . . . The woodlouse is of course harmless, but the bite of some centipedes is poisonous." This means that Gow presumes "woodlouse" to be a myriapod, and "woodlouse" becomes Scholfield's translation of ἴουλος. Gow seems to be confused by the vagueness of his native language; cf. n. 4 below. For American and British English equivalents, see S. Sutton, *Woodlice* (London, 1972), passim.

2. See my "Nicander's Toxicology, II: Spiders, Scorpions, Insects and Myriapods. Part I," *Pharmacy in History* 21 (1979): 15–18.

3. *Ther.* 812 ἀμφικαρὴς σκολόπενδρα.

4. E.g., *NED*, s.v. "woodlouse," esp. [2]; *OED*, s.v. "woodlouse," esp. 2a, e.

5. E.g., O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, vol. 2 (Hildesheim, 1963), pp. 481–82; L. Fernandez, *Nombres de insectos en griego antiguo* (Madrid, 1959), p. 39.

6. Byzantine scholars noted variance of onomastic usage, best seen in schol. Aratus *Phaen.* 957 Martin: ἴουλοι: οἱ μὲν ὁμοίους εἶναι σκολοπένδραις, οἳ δὲ αὐτὰς τὰς σκολοπένδρας, ἄλλοι δὲ τὸν σκώληκα τὸν μυρίοις ποσὶ χρώμενον. Cf. Hsch., s.v. ἴουλος.