THE SOPHISTICATED ΠΑΡΑ ΠΡΟΣΔΟΚΙΑΝ IN PLAUTUS

BY

MICHAEL SCOTT FONTAINE

B.A., MILLSAPS COLLEGE, 1998

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

MAY 2003

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

This dissertation by Michael Scott Fontaine is accepted in its present form by the Department of Classics as satisfying the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date 5-5-03

Adele Scafuro, Ph.D., Advisor

Recommended to the Graduate Council

Date 5 May 03

David Konstan, Ph.D., Reader

Date 5 May 03

Michael Putnam, Ph.D., Reader

Approved by the Graduate Council

Date 5/13/03

Karen Newman
Dean of the Graduate School

VITA

I, Michael Scott Fontaine, was born in New Orleans, Louisiana, on August 17, 1976, the second of four children to Richard and Maryanne Fontaine. After graduating from Pope John Paul II High School in Slidell, Louisiana, I earned a bachelor's degree *summa cum laude* from Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi, and was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa. During that time I spent a semester studying at the Centro in Rome and the following summer attending the classes of Fr. Reginald Foster, O. C. D. In 1999-2000 I enrolled at the Università Gregoriana in Rome as the holder of a Rotary Club Ambassadorial Scholarship, completing all five of Reginald Foster's Latin experiences. In 2001 I was awarded a scholarship to attend the summer session of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. In the spring of 2003 I began teaching in the Department of Classics at Amherst College.

* * *

For Reginald Foster, who taught me Latin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Primary thanks go to Professor Adele Scafuro, who undertook to direct this project and offered innumerous helpful suggestions, corrections, and improvements, both in substance and in style. I gratefully acknowledge also the guidance and support of Professors Michael Putnam and David Konstan, who served as readers for the dissertation and who offered many valuable insights. I owe warm thanks to Dr. Malcolm Hyman for a number of key conversations relating to obscenity in Latin. A scholarship provided by the Università di Urbino made it possible for me to attend the *Giornate Plautine* convention in October 2002, where I had the opportunity to discuss my thoughts with Roberto Danese, Cesare Questa, and Walter Stockert. Thanks also go to the Watson Institute at Brown University for the use of their facilities.

In a special way I would like to express my gratitude to my undergraduate professor, Dr. Nona Olivia, who introduced me to the world of Classics and mentored me throughout my four years. I will be grateful always to my parents, Dr. Richard Fontaine and Maryanne Fontaine, for their encouragement, support, and love.

Nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae: Alyssa, I hope soon to be able to return the patience, tolerance, and love that you have shown me throughout.

CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE

Since questions will arise, let me begin by defining, and differentiating, three terms that I will employ throughout this dissertation: (1) wordplay, (2) soundplay, and (3) pun. In none of the three groups do I consider humor essential. "Wordplay" (*παρονομασία*) is the broadest categorization, by which I mean any type of banter involving two or more words, whether related by etymology (*figura etymologica*), or not. The second two terms are a subset of wordplay: "soundplay" is much the same thing as wordplay, but involves rather an emphasis on individual sounds which are either similar in everyday speech or manipulated by actors in order to sound more alike; I treat the notion of manipulated pronunciation in detail below. By the term "pun" I mean to indicate the use of a word in such a way as to suggest that it carries another meaning, or the use of two or more words of similar sound in such a way that the juxtaposition creates an unexpected relationship or third level of meaning between them. Of the former variety, we may point to the parasite's explanation of his nickname in *Capt.* 69-70, where Ergasilus informs the audience that the young men call him "Scortum," because he is accustomed to go to a party *invocatus*, by which word the parasite means both "uninvited" and "summoned." The latter type of pun, consisting of two words, is illustrated by *Capt.* 860, where the same parasite tells Hegio *non enim es in senticeto, eo non sentis*: "You're not in a briar patch; that's why you don't feel anything." The pun in

Latin is on the noun *senticetum* "briar patch" and the verb *sentire* "to feel," two words which share the common sound *senti-*, but which are otherwise unrelated.

Although puns are often funny, they need not be: thus the dying words of Shakespeare's Mercutio, *aske for me to morrow, and you shall finde me a graue man* (*Romeo and Juliet* 1531-2) are ironic, but the pun on "grave" can scarcely be deemed funny in a strictly comic sense; and yet the latest edition of Fowler's *Modern English Usage* (1996) provides this very example under the heading *pun*.

For the text of Plautus I have usually followed the editions of Lindsay and Leo, and for the report of the manuscript readings I have had constant recourse to the fuller apparatuses of Goetz-Schoell and Ernout. Citations of Plautus are generally given according to Lindsay; where I have preferred the reading of another editor I say so in the footnotes. Fragments are cited according to the numeration of Lindsay.

* * *

nam multa praeter spem scio multis bona evenisse...
qui speraverint spem decepisse multos.

—*Rud.* 400-1

insperata accidunt magi' saepe quam quae speres.

—*Most.* 197

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

I. A.: The *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* Joke

In modern understanding the ancient term *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, "counter to expectation," or "surprise turn," denotes a type of joke in which a speaker appears as though he will continue his speech by expressing a certain idea and then suddenly adds a twist to the expression by saying something opposite to, or incongruous with, what the listener had expected.[1] In the comedy of Plautus this type of humor is especially frequent. The joke sometimes takes its point of departure from familiar conversational formulae, wherein a second character deliberately misunderstands or reverses the meaning that the first character had intended; this application of the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* includes instances in which the second character offers a literal answer to questions such as the Plautine

[1] The term *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is the ancient technical expression that appears in the *Tractatus* contained in the *Codex Coislianus*, which may represent Aristotelian comic theory. In modern literature the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is sometimes also called *ἀπροσδόκητον* "unexpected," but the latter is not an ancient term. In Latin, which lacks a proper term for "surprise," the phrase *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* was variously rendered as *praeter exspectationem* (Cicero *de Orat.* 2. 255, 284, 285; cf. *exspectationibus decipiendis*, ibid. 289) or *inopinatum* (Quintilian *Inst.* 9. 2. 23, translating the term *paradoxon*). In Plautus, the phrase *praeter spem* at *Rud.* 400 (cf. the epigraph on the preceding page) seems to express this idea. (The definition given in the text above is indebted to Duckworth 1952 p. 356.)

The *Tractatus* classifies humor as arising from either *diction* (*ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως*) or *action* (*ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων*), and considers *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* as a subdivison of the latter category. Modern application of the term, however, generally treats *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* as a form of verbal humor.

formula of greeting, *quid agis?* intended as "how are you," but understood literally as "what are you doing?" (e.g. *Men.* 138, *Most.* 719); of departure, *numquid vis?* "Nothing further, is there?," usually a rhetorical question meant merely to signal a character's departure, but answered with an actual request (e.g. *Epid.* 513, *Men.* 328, *M.G.* 575, 1086); or of attracting another's attention, *quid ais* usually "listen up!," or "I say," understood literally as "what are you saying?" (e.g. *Men.* 603, et saep.).

A "true" *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is that in which the surprise turn is limited to the utterance of a single character.[2] In these instances, the joke frequently develops naturally as the speaker's words unfold. A convenient modern illustration may be found in the words of Henny Youngman, whose famous line "Take my wife — please!," surprises the listener expecting the comedian to have said, "Take my wife, *for example.*" In *Poen.* 1228 the young man Agorastocles vows his revenge upon the prostitute Adelphasium in the following way:

AGOR. nunc pol ego te ulciscar probe, nam faxo — mea eris sponsa.

AGOR. Now, by god, I'll get you back good, for I'll – marry you!

Here both the context and the beginning of the line had raised the expectation that the *adulescens* was going to threaten actual punishment, but he surprises both Adelphasium and the audience by revealing that his revenge will consist of ...matrimony. Similar to this type of joke are, e.g., *Capt.* 868, *Cas.* 279-80, *Epid.* 23-4, *Men.* 189, 328, *M.G.* 286, et saep.

Although jokes *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* are frequent in the Old Comedy of Aristophanes[3],

---

[2] Duckworth p. 357: "[A] true surprise turn involves, not an unexpected response to another's speech, but a sudden shift in the sense of a [sc. *single*] speaker's words."

[3] Starkie p. lxvii catalogs the Aristophanic examples.

they are quite rare in our surviving fragments of Greek New Comedy. Terence, whose *vorsiones* of New Comedy are more faithful to his Greek originals than those of Plautus, has only a single example (*H. T.* 981) in his entire corpus. Since, however, they are a remarkably common feature in most of the plays of Plautus irrespective of the author of the Greek original, it is probable that the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke was a predilection of Plautus himself, and that he is responsible for inserting these jokes into his *vorsiones*.[4]

In modern printed editions of Plautus, editors usually, but not universally, indicate the presence of a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke by inserting a long dash or a series of dots between words. More often the dash is used, and marking in every case is at the discretion of the editor. As the choice to punctuate or not is as important as marking a sentence declarative or interrogative, and furnishes evidence of the editor's understanding of the delivery of a given line, its impact on the dramatic effect cannot be overestimated. [5]

---

[4] In at least one case we can be certain that Plautus added the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes to his model. This can be illustrated by a comparison of the papyrus of Menander's Δίς Ἐξαπατῶν with the corresponding lines in the *Bacchides* (500-511). It has been widely recognized by editors that the ends of vv. 505, 507, and 508 are *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, but the case for v. 503 (*ne illa illud hercle cum malo fecit suo*) was rather more hazardous in the transmission: both *suo* and *meo* are preserved in P, showing that both variants go back to antiquity (A reads *suo*); but *meo* is now printed by Barsby1986, Zwierlein, and Gratwick 1995, and most recently Gratwick 1995 has punctuated and explained the remaining lines as "*παρὰ προσδοκίαν* schizophrenia," arguing that we have in Plautus an indecisive lover wavering between love and hate. While several of these verses appear to correspond to lines in the papyrus (500-1 and Δίς 99-102; 503 and Δίς 19; 504 and Δίς 22-3; 505 and Δίς 24 and 91-2), vv. 506-511 have no correspondence whatsoever. Zwierlein (vol. 1. pp. 32-3; cf. pp. 30-40, and vol. 4. pp. 22, 261 n. 68) took this as evidence of later interpolation in the Plautine text, but Gratwick 1995 convincingly refutes this theory and attributes the *adulescens* Mnesilochus' (lack of) logic and *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* exclamations to Plautus' farcical handling of the scene.

[5] The inaccessibility of many early printed editions has precluded my determining who first introduced the convention of marking with a dash. As with punctuation more generally, it is absent in the manuscripts. The earliest occurrence that I have found is in the edition of Bothe (1810); it was not used by Camerarius (1552), Lambinus (1576), or Gronovius (1760).

Although strictly speaking the dash is not a form of "punctuation," for the sake of convenience, in this dissertation I will refer to the insertion of the dash as "punctuating."

I. B.: The Sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* Joke

In our modern texts of Plautus, however, the current method of punctuating what an editor considers a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke—that is, with a dash between words—may be masking from us jokes that the Roman spectator watching a performance would have clearly understood from the actors' staging and delivery. Some of Plautus' *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes do not just depend on a sentence break, but, as I will argue, a break *mid-word*, and the identification of these is essential for our understanding of a dimension of Plautine humor. I will put forth the view here that, in its simplest definition, what I call here a "sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*" is *a wordplay in which the pun appears on the tail of the word.* In this dissertation, then, sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes will be indicated by a dash mid-word.[6]

A brief example is in order. In the *Truculentus*, the scene beginning at v. 95 stars the young man Diniarchus and the handmaid Astaphium. As the young man eavesdrops nearby, Astaphium sings a solo piece; concluding her song, the handmaid moves to depart, and from the other side of the stage, Diniarchus suddenly reveals his presence by shouting out to her, asking her to wait up. The line (115) runs:

DIN. Heus, manedum, Astapium, priu' quam abis![7]

DIN. Hey there! Wait, Astaphium, before you leave!

Nothing seems immediately unusual in the line, and it has consequently escaped

[6] This punctuation is helpful in illustrating the joke, and follows the precedent set by Gratwick's punctuation at *Men.* 1076 and 1077, and earlier, Fraenkel on fr. 47 Lindsay. (On this, see section I. C. below.)

[7] On the spelling *Astapium* for *Astaphium*, see section I. H.: "Orthography" below.

comment from scholars. But on a closer examination, the line is arresting for a number of reasons. First is that, more frequently than not, when one Plautine character emphatically exhorts a second to "stop!," he doubles or repeats the command. Thus we find the doubling *mane, mane!* in *Amph.* 765; *Aul.* 655; *Men.* 179; *Merc.* 474; *Merc.* 928; *Pseud.* 240; (cf. also Terence *Eun.* 763/4; *H.T.* 613; 736; *Hec.* 494/5). The context and language at *Asin.* 229-32 are quite similar to that of our own passage: *mane, mane.../...prius quam abis!*; but there we find the imperative doubled. Moreover, akin to the tendency toward doubling we find another group of exhortations in which the character expresses the same idea through *variatio* by using the synonymous words *manere* and *astare*. The collocation of the two appears in the imperative form at *Cas.* 737 *mane atque asta!*, and similarly *Men.* 696-7 *mane!/...etiamne astas?*, where the impatient question *etiamne astas?* ("*will* you stop?!?") is equivalent to an imperative. Similar, too, is the expression at *Most.* 885 *mane tu atque adsiste ilico!*, and the collocation of the imperatives also occurs in a dramatic setting in Pacuvius fr. Tr. 202R *age, asta! mane! audi!*.

Returning now to our line from the *Truculentus*, we may now see that it does not conform to Plautus' practice elsewhere – that is, unless we recognize a bilingual wordplay mid-word on the handmaid's Greek name. The name *Astaphium* has no etymological connection with the Latin verb *astare* (ἀστάφιον means "raisinette"[8]), but Diniarchus is evidently meant to perform the line as a sophisticated παρὰ προσδοκίαν that can be illustrated as:

DIN. Heus, manedum!, asta!—pium, prius quam abis!

DIN. Hey there, wait! Uh, stop!—phium, before you leave!

[8] Cf. Schmidt p. 179.

A final consideration might supplement the argument for the presence of the wordplay: the scribe of manuscript B may have inadvertently caught the joke when he miscopied the line as HEVSMANEDVMADSTAPHIVS. In the later Latin usage familiar to the scribe, the proper form of the imperative was not the Plautine *asta!* but *adsta!*; evidently the scribe mistook the beginning of the word for the verb before noticing that the ASTA- of his exemplar was supposed to be the beginning of the handmaid's name. Thus he instinctively discerned a joke that in performance the actor playing Diniarchus made clear by pausing briefly midway through the word *Astapium* and motioning frantically in order to try to catch the maid's attention.

In the foregoing example, nothing in our text of Plautus indicates that the line must be delivered as I have suggested; we have no independent stage directions, nor does Astaphium's response—she asks merely *qui revocat* "who's calling me?"—indicate that Diniarchus had made a pun on her name. My interpretation is at most a hypothesis based on context, word order, and Plautine practice in similar situations, but the accumulation of similar examples strongly suggests that Plautus intended our line to be delivered as I have suggested.

I hope to demonstrate in a similar way that the Plautine corpus holds a great number of such sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes and that their presence cannot be purely coincidental.

I. C.: Review of Literature

This dissertation marks the first systematic attempt to identify the sophisticated

παρὰ προσδοκίαν jokes in Plautus. My investigation joins studies of Plautus that deal primarily with puns, soundplay, and wordplay. Two lengthy studies have been dedicated exclusively to the collection and categorization of wordplay in Plautus. Both Mendelsohn's *Studies in the Wordplay of Plautus* and Brinkhoff's *Woortspeling bij Plautus* purport to be exhaustive catalogues of wordplay in Plautus, but in most cases the wordplays that I will discuss have not been dealt with in them. Where I give a reference to one or the other, it indicates that the wordplay under discussion is listed there.[9] Somewhat different from these two, but more valuable for my purpose, is Spencer's *Adnominatio in the Plays of Plautus*, which treats alliteration and wordplay in Plautus as a basis for determining standard pronunciation and spelling of words in the time of Plautus. Although I disagree with Spenser's premise that a pun indicates the regular or usual pronunciation of the two words on which the pun is made, I have found his collections of parallel material helpful, and I will deal more specifically with his arguments below. Ahl's *Metaformations*, a more general work dealing with soundplay and wordplay in Latin, has been useful, but as Ahl approaches Latin poetry synchronically rather than diachronically, I have modified slightly some of his views, and everywhere attempted to draw evidence for Plautine wordplay specifically from Plautine evidence rather than resorting to later authors.[10]

---

[9] Brinkhoff imposes a great number of classifications on the Plautine wordplays, all of which I have disregarded in this study except the category that he calls the *schijn-ambiguum* or *quasi-ambiguum*, which is discussed in detail in section I. E. a. below.

[10] Ahl pp. 54-60 has given a very competent set of principles regarding the legitimate bounds of wordplay in Latin authors. Since, however, many of Ahl's examples range indiscriminately through time and are intended to cover Latin authors of much later periods as well, it will be beneficial to illustrate the principles relevant to Plautine sound- and wordplay by drawing examples exclusively from Plautus himself; see section I. D. "Manipulated Pronunciation".

Two brief scholarly observations have been of more immediate application for my thesis.[11] The first is that made by Fraenkel in the addenda to his *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*: Fraenkel knew that it was folk wisdom among the Romans that *viscus* or *viscum* "mistletoe," grew from the dung of the *turdela*, an unidentified type of bird probably related to the thrush (*turdus*).[12] The berries of the mistletoe plant were then used for birdlime, and as this meant, according to folk-logic, that the bird was producing the very material that would ultimately lead to its own doom, there arose the proverbial expression (preserved in Isidore 12. 7. 71) *malum sibi avem cacare*, "the bird shits out trouble for itself." Thus when Plautus (fr. inc. 47 Lindsay) says *ipsa sibi avis mortem creat*, Fraenkel (p. 440) rightly understood that *c-reat*, an iambic word of the same shape and beginning with the same initial consonant sound, was a soundplay mid-word for *c-acat.*[13] In this way Plautus skirted the vulgar word while still getting his point across, and appropriately so, for as Fraenkel rightly remarked in his discussion of this fragment, openly obscene words had no place in the palliata.

The second observation along these same lines was made by Gratwick in a note to v. 1077 of his edition of the *Menaechmi.*[14] In the text (punctuated as follows by

---

[11] Apart from these observations, indications that Plautine *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes occasionally skirted the anticipated word can be detected in rudimentary form as early as the work of Lindsay. At *Curc.* 334 *quod tibist, item sibi esse, magnam argenti—inopiam* ("That he has the same as you do, a great big – lack of cash!") Lindsay noted that the word *inopiam* appeared "ex *ἀπροσδοκήτου* for *copiam*" (*Capt.* p. 55; cf. his apparatus to *Curc.* ad loc.); but this is not quite the same as detecting a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke mid-word.

[12] Cf. Pliny *N. H.* 16. 247; Servius ad *Aen.* 6. 205; Athenaeus 9. 394e.

[13] Rightly understood against Burmann, who wanted to use the proverb as grounds for actually emending the Plautine line to read *cacat.* The mid-word punctuation of *c-acat* and *c-reat* is Fraenkel's own.

[14] Expanding his earlier note "Quis erus est," (= Gratwick 1973a).

Gratwick),

MESS. hunc ego esse aio Me—naecmum.

MESS. I say that this man is my—naechmus.

Gratwick recognized in this line a play on the traditional Roman formula for *vindicatio* and the first half of a ritual for formal purchase, *hunc ego (hominem) meum esse aio ex iure Quiritum*, "I assert that this man is mine according to Roman custom." Gratwick realized that the actor should pause after the initial *Me-* element of *Menaechmum* as though Messenio were going to say *hunc ego esse aio me—um*, and that this would lead to a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* dependent on both verbal and situational context.[15] He adduced the parallel *Capt.* 577-8, where the indignant question *Tun* (i.e. *tu-ne*?) is a setup for the defeated expectation of the name *Tun—dare*, "Tyndarus":

ARIST. Quid ais, furcifer? *tun* te gnatum <esse> memoras liberum?
TVND. Non equidem me Liberum, sed Pilocratem esse aio.

A. What are you saying, you devil? That you were born free?
T. No no, I'm not saying I'm Father Liber, but Philocrates!

The jokes that Fraenkel and Gratwick identified both rely on information external to the plays to detect: respectively, a Roman proverb and a legal formula. My approach is slightly different, as I employ different clues to spot jokes of this type, most of which are internal to the text: for example, a departure from customary Plautine practice (e.g. the doubling of the exhoration to wait, as we saw above in our example from the *Truculentus*) may signal a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke. In other instances, indications that an unusual pronunciation, such as the assimilation of a verbal prefix that is not normally assimilated, is required, point to a mid-word *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play. Other signals include

[15] Improbable, however, is his supplement of v. 1078: ***SOS.*** *Tu es Menaechmus?*
MEN. *<m—>me esse dico, <M—>Mosco prognatum patre.* "**S.** You're Menaechmus? **M.** That's m-me, son of M-Moschus."

strange or awkwardly constructed grammar, such as the intentional postponement of a modifier from its noun that may result in the listener's temporary disorientation; repeated use of a word in the same *sedes* of the line that is suddenly followed by the appearance of a different word similar to the first in that same *sedes*; or the response of a second character to a question or remark of the first character that does not otherwise square well with the context.

Thus my main criteria for detecting a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke are: 1.) a departure from customary Plautine practice; 2.) manipulated pronunciation of a word; 3.) strange or awkward grammar; 4.) the sudden appearance in the same line-*sedes* of a word similar to the anticipated word; and 5.) an illogical or puzzling reply of a second character.

My approach is primarily a philological study of the Plautine corpus, but it is also indebted more generally to the approaches of performance criticism, typified by works such as Slater's *Plautus in Performance*, an approach which has done Plautine studies the service of reminding us that the text represents an actual play happening in real time, rather than a play script to be read in silence. Naturally, in dealing with a text that lacks independent stage directions, any inference as to how an actor delivered a line involves an element of speculation; but this need not invalidate the inference. Nor is the situation completely desperate, for the language itself can often provide clues to the action. One way that we can trace actors' movements, for example, is by observing a character's shifting usage of a pronoun when referring to the same object: thus *hoc* will indicate proximity of an object to the speaker, and *istuc* will point to the proximity of the object to the character being addressed; and *illuc* will indicate distance from both the speaker and

the character being addressed. At *Bacch.* 728-9,

> **CRVS.** Cape stilum propere et tabellas tu *has* tibi. **MNES.** Quid postea?
> **CRVS.** Quod iubebo scribito *istic*.
>
> **CHRYS.** Quickly, take a pen and these tablets. **MNES.** Then what?
> **CHRYS.** Write down there what I tell you to.

Chrysalus' shift of pronoun from *has* in v. 728 to *istic* in v. 729 indicates that he must hand the *tabellae* to Mnesilochus precisely in v. 728.

Thus we can sometimes be reasonably certain as to gesture or movement onstage. When it comes to *verbal* delivery, however, there is rarely anything in the text so explicit that will indicate the manner in which a line is to be presented; particularly if, as I argue, the enunciation of a word or word was frequently unusual or manipulated by the actor. Lindsay showed a cautious conservativism when, speaking of this very matter, he said (*Captivi* p. 52),

> There is a danger of being over-fanciful in these matters [sc. *of inferring the verbal delivery*], and of attributing modern stage-conventions of enunciation to the ancient delivery of quantitative verse with or without musical accompaniment.

Quite right; but as we will see, already in antiquity scholars struggled with these same questions of delivery, and in general seem to have come to many of the same conclusions as we do today. For, as is the case with many jokes in Plautus, in order for a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke to be effective, proper delivery is essential. A momentary pause in breath, a manipulated pronunciation, or an attendant gesture, is often required to suggest the word or line of thought that the audience had expected—or not expected. The remainder of this Introduction will be dedicated to examining how the delivery of a Plautine line contributes to a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke. Delivery is

here divided into the two aspects of verbal delivery (enunciation and pronunciation) and gesture. Let us begin with the verbal aspect.

I. D.: Manipulated Pronunciation

The sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* depends on the actor's enunciation, for a pause in breath or a manipulation of sound is often required to suggest another word. Thus in our example from the *Truculentus*, the wordplay demands that the short *–a-* of *Astăpium* be treated as a long vowel in the imperative *astā!*. In fact, although the contrary has often been asserted, Plautus frequently plays between long and short vowels, a practice that I will illustrate more fully below. In addition to wordplay between long and short vowels, there are indications in our texts of Plautus that often enough a character is meant to pronounce a word differently than he customarily would pronounce that word in Latin: these ways include pronunciations that were archaic, vulgar, rustic, or in non-Roman dialect; or in other cases, by slurring, stuttering, chattering, lisping, or the like. This type of wordplay is only very rarely an explicit, organic part of the action, but in many cases it appears that some form of manipulated pronunciation must be employed to bring out a wordplay or joke, particularly those that act *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. But how can we tell in what way a word printed in our texts was (mis-)pronounced in performance at the time of Plautus? This next section will be dedicated to illustrating as far as possible Plautine practice in regard to pronunciation that deviates from the standard, even when the pronunciation is not guaranteed by the reading of the manuscripts or character response.

I. D. a.: Manipulation of Long and Short Vowels

It is often said that the Romans drew so sharp a distinction between long and short vowels that any apparent wordplay between a word with a long vowel and a word with a short vowel is specious. This position is false, and so it will be beneficial to lay out a table illustrating Plautus' indiscriminate treatment of vowel quantities for the purpose of wordplay; the examples in which a change of vowel quantity is evident are categorized below according to the vowel type: first, examples in which the natural vowel quantity is known; and second, examples in which the vowel is lengthened by position only. The following table illustrates wordplays that involve vowels differing in length by nature:

ă vs. ā:

Amph. 315: ferire *mālum mălе* discit manus;
Poen. 1214: pol istum *mālim* quam *mălum.*
Merc. 643: edepol ne ille oblongis *mālis* mihi dedit magnum *mălum*
Poen. 8: qui non edistis, saturi fite—*fābulis* (*παρὰ προσδοκίαν* for *făbulis*, "beans")

ĕ vs.ē:

M.G. 1423: ne quid *spēres*, non *fĕres.*
Boeotia 6L: nunc etiam quod *ĕst* non *ēstur*;
Capt. 70: invocatus soleo *esse* in convivio. (ambiguous; cf. also *Capt.* 849f.; *Curc.* 316; *Most.* 889)

ĭ vs. ī:

Rud. 1225: Hercules istum *infelīcet* cum sua *lĭcentia*!
(*licet* repeated 16 times in the preceding 13 lines, and once in the following line.)
Rud. 1305: *medĭcus...mendīcus*
M.G. 723: huic homini dignum est *diuĭtias* esse et *diu uītam* dari
Bacch. 767: tam *frictum* ego illum reddam quam *frictum* est cicer. (ambiguous; the first from *frĭcare*, "to rub down," in an obscene sense (cf. *Pseud.* 1190), the second from *frīgĕre*, "to roast."

ŏ vs. ō:

Amph. 383-4: Amphitruonis te esse aiebas *Sōsiam.* :: Amphitruonis *sŏcium*....

Poen. 509: metui meo *amōri mŏram*

ŭ vs. ū:

Aul. 491: quo *lŭbeant nūbant*
Capt. 904: quanta *sūmini apsŭmedo*

ў vs. ŷ:

Strictly speaking, in the case of Plautus this letter does not apply, since the vowel *y* was not introduced into Latin until the time of Varro[16]; in Plautus' time *u* was employed to represent the Greek υ, and our modern editions are thus misleading in printing it. These plays may be considered a subset of the previous category (ŭ vs. ū), and puns between the Latin *u* and the Greek υ are found, indiscriminately whether long or short:

Epid. 233: *cūmatile* aut *plūmatile* (both long, but the former from κῦμα)
Bacch. 129: non omnis aetas, *Lŷde*, *lūdo* convenit.
Bacch. 362: facietque extemplo *Crŭcisalum* me ex *Chrŷsalo.* (cf. *Bacch.* 687, 1183.)

The conclusion is self evident that Plautus frequently disregarded a difference between naturally long and short vowels for the purpose of wordplay.

Nor does lengthening of a vowel by position preclude wordplay. Whether or not Plautus actually wrote a doubled consonant with two letters or one cannot be known, for ancient grammarians frequently say that the earliest Latin writers had written one consonant where later writers would write two.[17] Ennius, following Hellenic practice, is credited with introducing the practice of consonantal gemination (Fest. p. 374L), and inscriptional evidence appears to support this contention.[18] But as regards wordplay in

---

[16] Cf. section I. H. below.

[17] Cf., e.g., Fest. p. 222 Lindsay: *Polet, pollet: quia nondum geminabant antiqui consonantis*; and p. 484 Lindsay: *Torum, ut significet torridum, aridum, per unum quidem r antiqua consuetudine scribitur; sed quasi per duo r scribatur, pronuntiari oportet. Nam antiqui nec mutas, nec semivocales litteras geminabant.*

[18] Cf. Enk *Truculentus* pp. 35-36. The decree of Aemilius Paulus (189 B.C.) shows some forms with consonantal doubling, others not. Forms in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* (186 B.C.) show only one consonant.

performance, which involves a play on similar sounds of words rather than on the appearance of printed words, the question is irrelevant; the distinction is merely one of orthography and not of linguistic value. Later writers merely began writing consonants doubled where they had already heard them. The following examples show this:

ll:

Bacch. 953: *Ilio...illi*;
Capt. 904: *callo calamitas*;
Cas. 851-2: *vallum...valentulast*
Rud. 887-8: *columbum...columbari collum*;

mm:

Pers. 613: *immo i modo*;
Stich. 72: *summo...possumus*;

nn:

Asin. 142: *pane...pannis*;

ss:

Amph. 318: *exossatum os* (cf. *Amph.* 342);
Cist. 383: *scisso atque excisatis*;
Truc. 670: *redisse nisi*;

tt:

M.G. 1424: *mittis mitis*;

Again, the evidence shows decisively that Plautus does indeed play on words of differing vowel quantities; and after all, this disregard of vowel quantity is not really surprising, since we see similar tendencies both in the puns of later authors (e.g. Cicero's *mōles mŏlestiarum* (*de Orat.* 1.2) as well as in the etymologizing practice of Varro throughout the *De Lingua Latina.*

I. D. b.: Consonantal Manipulated Pronunciation in Plautus

The pronunciation of some words in the time of Plautus probably differed from pronunciations in the classical Latin of the time of Cicero. Scholars know, for example, that Plautus stressed a word such as *mŭlĭĕrēs* on the first syllable (*múlieres*), not, by the law of the penult that was to apply in later times, on the antepenult (*mulíeres*).[19] But other questions of pronunciation in Plautus' time also bear on the issue of wordplay, particularly the question of prefix assimilation of compound verbs: e.g., whether Plautus said *adsimilatio* or *assimilatio*. The question has been studied in detail in two fundamental works, Dorsch's *Assimilation in den Compositis bei Plautus und Terentius*, and Spencer's *Adnominatio in the Plays of Plautus, with Special Reference to Questions of Pronunciation and Orthography*. The former work examines the manuscript evidence of Plautus alongside epigraphical sources to determine the relative frequency of assimilation of various prefixes at the time, and the latter relies on the thesis that cases of *adnominatio* (alliteration and puns between two words) guarantee regular *assimilatio*. Both scholars rightly recognized that the orthography of the manuscripts is in general not trustworthy in reporting what Plautus actually wrote. The issue of spelling will be dealt with shortly, but it is our concern here to determine how Plautine actors actually said, pronounced, and heard a given word, and how this will affect their ability to set up a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke.

Spencer (evidently writing in ignorance of Dorsch) used the frequent cases of *adnominatio* to determine how Plautus and Plautine actors pronounced certain phonemes, and consequently would have spelled them. Like most scholars before him, Spencer

[19] This question has been fully dealt with by, e.g., the introduction to Lindsay's *Captivi*, and need not be addressed here.

assumed, incorrectly in my view, that Plautine pronunciation was always rigidly fixed, and that if a case of *adnominatio* illustrates that a prefix was assimilated, then the assimilation was the way that Plautus (sc. always or normally) pronounced the word. Spenser concludes (p. 5):

> Consequently, the strongest argument that can be fairly employed in any given case is that, an example of adnominatio being intended by the author, he would wish it to be as effective as possible, and it would be the more effective by just so much as the two words might be more nearly alike. Therefore we are warranted in expecting that words employed in an example of adnominatio shall have as nearly the same pronunciation as the laws of the language allow.

While I agree with his premise that Plautus intended the two words to sound as nearly alike as possible, my examination of the evidence points rather to a different conclusion: actors manipulated the pronunciation of one word in order to make it sound more like a second, not because the two words always sounded alike. To do so required 'fudging' standard pronunciation. How can we know this? Where the substance of the text—the situation, or the response of a second character—guarantees an unusual pronunciation, it provides the greatest clues for determining pronunciation that deviates from the norm elsewhere.

Let us now consider some examples that demonstrate that this is the case. We will see immediately that the manuscripts are frequently not to be trusted on so fine a point as unusual pronunciation. They have often bungled the transmission of the joke, and at other times, where some of them actually do preserve it, scholars have mistaken it for an error of transmission, and "corrected" it, inadvertently obscuring the pronunciation.

I. D. c.: Evidence for Manipulated Pronunciation Guaranteed by the Narrative

The palliata are interpretations of Greek plays set in Greek settings, but, as is widely recognized, Plautus contributed a number of distinctly Roman and Italian elements to the plays, such as Italian names, localized allusions, and unusual pronunciation of Latin words. As these elements are necessarily additions to, or substitutions for, the Greek models, they are frequently inorganic to the dramatic development, and consequently their appearance is usually unexpected and has the effect of disrupting or temporarily slowing down the action of the play. An unusual (mis-) pronunciation of Latin words is particularly arresting since, where it is explicitly part of the dramatic action, it was evidently a great source of humor for the audience. In *Truc.* 682-691, Truculentus returns from the "city," (nominally Athens, an amusing incongruity in light of the following), and informs Astaphium that he is now an eloquent (*dicax*) man. He tries to demonstrate his glibness with a few choice words that he unintentionally mispronounces:

TR. Heus tu, iam postquam in urbem crebro commeo,
dicax sum factus. iam sum *caullator* probus.
AST. Quid id est, amabo? istaec ridicularia,
cavillationes, vis opinor dicere? 685
TR. Istud pauxillum differt a *cavillibus*. **AST.** Sequere intro, amabo, mea voluptas. **TR.** Tene hoc tibi:
rabonem habeto, ut mecum hanc noctem sies.
AST. Perii, rabonem? quam esse dicam hanc beluam?
quin tu *arrabonem* dicis? **TR.** 'A' facio lucri, 690
ut Praenestinis *conia* est *ciconia*.

TR. Hey you, since I've been traveling to the city a lot,
I've become eloquent. Now I'm a good *caullator*.
AST. What is that, pray tell? That nonsense—
I think you mean to say *cavillations*! 685
TR. That's a teeny bit different from *cavilles*. **AST.** Follow me in, dearie.

TR. Here, take this:
Take a *rabo*, so you'll be with me tonight.
AST. I'm done for! a *rabo*? What sort of beast could that be?
Wait, do you mean an *arrabo*? **TR.** I'm saving the "a,"
As Praenestians say *conia* instead of *ciconia.*

Here the "Praenestian" pronunciation of the words *arrabonem* as *rabonem* and *ciconia* as *conia* are organic to, and so guaranteed by, the dialogue, and the manuscripts have succeeded in preserving the wordplay. That they have done so, however, is the exception, not the rule: at v. 683 all of the manuscripts illogically read *cavillator* instead of the nonce word *caullator* that is required by both the meter and the joke.[20] The untrustworthiness of the manuscripts in preserving an unusual pronunciation is a chronic problem, even where the wordplay is guaranteed by the context.

In *Truc.* 262-4, Truculentus misunderstands Astaphium's words *comprime sis eiram*, "restrain your anger, please!" as *comprime sis eram*, "rape your mistress, please!," a wordplay on the two meanings of the verb *comprimere* "to check," and "to rape," and a soundplay that evidently requires an unusual pronunciation of the word *(e)iram* "anger" so that it would sound as close as possible to *eram* "mistress" (262-4):[21]

AST. Comprime sis *eiram.* **TRVC.** Eam quidem hercle tu, quae solita es, comprime,
impudens, quae per ridiculum rustico suades stuprum!
AST. *Eiram* dixi: ut decepisti! dempsisti unam litteram.

AST. Please, restrain your (anger)! **TRUC.** You rape (her) yourself!, you who're used to it, you brash woman, using a joke to persuade a simple country man on to a crime!

---

[20] Corrected by Weise and universally adopted by editors. *Caullator*, not otherwise a word in Latin, is Truculentus' "refined" pronunciation of the word *cavillator.*

[21] Gurlitt pp. 94-5, however, thought that Truculentus understands *comprime sis iram* as *comprime sisuram* or *sisyram* (=σίσυρα, "wool garment" supposed by Gurlitt to mean Astaphium's "hairy genitals,") but his interpretation requires treating *dempsisti* as "you took out one letter (and replaced it with a new one)," a meaning not attested for *demere.*

AST. I said "anger," you trickster—you took out a letter!

Again, although the joke is guaranteed by the context of the dialogue, the manuscripts have botched the transmission of the joke. The error may be due to very early copyists who, not understanding that an unusual pronunciation was required, misunderstood the joke.[22]

Sometimes the manuscripts do seem to have correctly transmitted an unusual pronunciation. At *Curc.* 416-7 the wordplay on the words *summano* "I leak underneath," (or "a bit") and *Summanum* "the god Summanus" demands the assimilation of the prefix *sub-* before *–mano*:

> **CVRC.** Quia vestimenta, ubi obdormivi ebrius,
> *summano*; ob eam rem me omnes *Summanum* vocant.
>
> **CURC.** Because my clothes—[*fussing with them*] when I'm drunk and sleeping it off, I wet them a little; that's why everyone calls me Underpants.

Here, the manuscripts agree (correctly) in reading *summano*, not *submano*. More generally, however, the manuscripts indicate that the assimilation of *sub-* before an initial letter *m* is contrary to normal Plautine practice: at *Stich.* 273 the codices agree in reading *submerus*, and at *Epid.* 232 they read *subminia*, with the prefix unassimilated in both cases. [23] Thus Curculio's assimilated pronunciation of *summano* was probably manipulated to bring out the joke.

In other instances a wordplay that is guaranteed by the context has been obscured by the manuscript reading. At *Poen.* 279, in a passing wordplay exchanged by the slave

---

[22] The Ambrosianus alone preserves a trace of the joke, and not even correctly spelled there: *comprime sis iram*; B, C, and D read *comprime* (*conprime* B) *spero*. *Eiram*, the conjecture of Geppert, is approved by Leo, Lindsay, and Enk.

[23] Cf. Dorsch p. 16. He does, however, think that *summoveo*, the assimilated form, was regular in Plautus.

Milphio and the young man Agorastocles, the manuscripts present us with a problem:

> **AGORAST.** Milphio, heus, ubi *es*? **MILP.** *Assum* apud te, eccum. **AGOR.** At ego *elixus sis* volo.
>
> **AGORAST.** Milphio, hey, where are you? **MILP.** Here I ham. **AGOR.** I'd have preferred turkey (*literally*: "roasted"..."boiled").

The wordplay turns on Milphio's pronunciation of the word *adsum*, "here I am" as *assum*, "roasted;" Agorastocles' response, contrasting *elixus* with *assum*, guarantees that in pronunciation, even if not in orthography, the prefix *ad-* is assimilated. The difficulty that we face is that here the manuscripts unanimously read *adsum*; *assum* is an editorial restoration. Many scholars have taken this line as evidence that in everyday speech *adsum* and *assum* were homonymous, but all the evidence from contemporary inscriptions and elsewhere in the Plautine manuscripts indicates that such was not the case; in every other case the prefix *ad-* did not assimilate before an initial *s-*, and indeed, in classical Latin, the specific verb *adsum* was never reduced to *assum*.[24] Thus our line indicates precisely that this pronunciation of *adsum* as *assum* was not the normal practice, and that Milphio must rather slur the pronunciation of the word for the sake of the joke. [25]

And so we face a dilemma; and though not unexpected, it illustrates an important principle. Either (a) Plautus actually wrote *adsum* with the joke in mind, and the actors understood that an unusual pronunciation was intended, and so our manuscripts do not record an unusual pronunciation where Plautus had intended one; or (b) Plautus actually wrote *assum*, and our manuscripts have changed what Plautus wrote, and are therefore not a reliable guide to the unusual pronunciation that Plautus had intended. Either way,

---

[24] Full evidence is gathered in Dorsch p. 23.

[25] This view finds some support from the fact that the joke does not recur in extant Plautus, who frequently repeats a good wordplay; compare with this, e.g., the repetition of the pun on *Epidamnum* and *damnum* at *Men.* 264 and 267.

the fact must be faced that our manuscripts cannot be relied on to indicate an unusual pronunciation, even when that pronunciation is obviously and explicitly part of a joke.

The foregoing examples demonstrate that, even when making a wordplay that requires an unusual pronunciation, Plautus may not always have expressly indicated in writing the unusual pronunciation, even when the wordplay was integral to the narrative; or at the least, the manuscripts do not now indicate when he might have done so, and there are a great many places that suggest that he probably did not. When, therefore, we deal with a wordplay that seems to require an unusual pronunciation that is not expressly part of the narrative, the conclusion seems inevitable that any indication of an unusual pronunciation will have long since disappeared from the manuscripts, and will probably not be visible today. Nevertheless, these unusual pronunciations of Latin words did exist.[26]

I. D. d.: Evidence not Guaranteed by the Narrative

For the sake of convenience, we will examine different tendencies toward unusual pronunciation by grouping them into categories.

I. D. d. 1.: Archaizing Pronunciation

Just as Plautus uses inflected forms that were archaic already in his own day for

[26] Frequently these unusual pronunciations are used to skirt obscenity. We saw earlier that Plautus had skirted the obscene word *cacat* by replacing it with *creat*. Although the prologue in *Capt.* 56 claims that in that play *neque spurcidici insunt versus*, the reality is that purely obscene words, as has been observed before, are remarkably absent from the *palliata* altogether, although a number of scenes do feature obscene action.

metrical reasons (e.g. *siet*, *curarier* for *sit*, *curari*) or for the purpose of wordplay (e.g. *duelli*, *duellatores*, for *belli*, *bellatores* [cf. *Capt.* 67]), so too he probably occasionally uses archaic pronunciation to effect a heroic, solemn tone or for other wordplay effects.[27] The transformation in Classical Latin whereby the *oe*-diphthong was reduced to *ū* in many words (in which it stood for an I.-E. *oi*, e.g. *curo*, *munus*, *munio*, *murus*, *muto*, *punio*, *punicus*, *unus*, *utor*, etc.) had already taken place in Plautus' time.[28] Yet there are several passages in which the older diphthongal pronunciation, if not orthography, is guaranteed by the alliteration, because the diphthong in the prior word was never reduced to *ū* in classical Latin: *Pseud.* 229 *cras Poenicium poeniceo corio invises pergulam* (classical, *puniceo*); *Poen.* 990, 991 *Nullus me est hodie Poenus Poenior* (Bothe; codd. *punior*, the classical form). These examples, as well as others (*Amph.* 697, *Cas.* 76) that will be examined in the following chapters, indicate that, contrary to the normal pronunciation, Plautus here invoked the older, archaic pronunciation of the *oe*-diphthong for a soundplay effect with a word that was always pronounced with the diphthong.

I. D. d. 2.: Rustic or Dialectical Pronunciation

We have already considered passages in the *Truculentus* in which a rusticated or Praenestian pronunciation of Latin is made explicit by the dialogue, but there is at least one other passage in that same play in which a wordplay is lurking undetected precisely because it is *not* made explicit by the dialogue. This wordplay also probably demands a rustic pronunciation. Varro (*L. L.* 5. 9) states that in rustic registers of Latin, the *ae-*

[27] Anderson pp. 294-299, adducing *Cist.* 540, *Pers.* 554, 559, *M.G.* 228, *Pseud.* 384, 585a (= 384).

[28] Ibid. p. 293.

diphthong was pronounced simply as *ē* (thus anticipating the shift that was later to take place in the Romance languages): *...in Latio rure "hedus," qui in urbe ut in multis, a addito, "haedus."* Occasionally Plautus' characters may have momentarily adopted this pronunciation for a passing joke; if so, it would account for a joke at *Truc.* 518, in which the *meretrix* Phronesium, feigning recent childbirth, bitterly greets the soldier Stratophanes upon his arrival:

> **STRAT.** Mars peregre adveniens salutat Nerienem uxorem suam. 515
> quom tu recte provenisti quomque es aucta liberis,
> gratulor, quom mihi tibique magnum peperisti decus.
> **PRON.** Salve, qui me interfecisti *paene*—vita et lumine
> quique mihi magni doloris per voluptatem tuam
> condidisti in corpus, quo nunc etiam morbo misera sum. 520
>
> **STRAT.** (*pompously indicating himself*) Mars returning from abroad hails Neriene, his wife. Since you have prospered and have been blessed with children, I congratulate you, since you have born a great glory for myself and you.
> **PHRON.** (*angrily*) Well, well, well, hello, you who (*pointing at his crotch*) deprived me, ...almost, of light and life, and who hid in my body a great pain in your pleasure, a sickness from which I'm still miserable even now.

Phronesium's response may be a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* in which she adopts a rustic pronunciation of *paene* "nearly" in order to make the word sound like *pēne*, the ablative of *penis* "with your penis."[29] After a pause in breath, the girl continues with her sentence *–vita et lumine...*, at once skirting the obscenity and conveying her intended

---

[29] Cf. LS s.v. *paene* and Ahl pp. 135; cf. also Ahl pp. 20-1, where he adduces a pseudo-Virgilian priapean couplet quoted by Gerald of Wales (13th c.): *dum dubitet Natura marem faceretve puellam, / natus es, o pulcher, pene puella, puer.* "While Mother Nature was uncertain whether she should make you a male or a girl, You were born, you beautiful boy—almost a girl."
The medieval Latin spelling of *paene* as *pene* brings out the double entendre intended between the adverb and the ablative of *penis*.

Ahl states (p. 58) that for the purpose of wordplay Latin poets play upon the *ae*-diphthong with either the letter *a* or *e*. That is certainly true with Augustan poets, as his examples show, and there is some limited support for that in Plautus (*si astes, aestu calefacit, Epid.* 674, is a singular example), but in the case of Plautus, however, the rarity of these wordplays, combined with the other jokes that require rusticated pronunciation in the *Truculentus*, point to a rustic pronunciation here as well.

farcical meaning to the audience. The rustic pronunciation of the diphthong would guarantee her joke and give her, at least temporarily, an amusing country drawl.

In addition to the unusual pronunciations of Latin that we have just seen (Praenestian syncopation in *Truc.* 680-90 and rustic in *Truc.* 518), it appears that Plautus occasionally had his characters pronounce certain words with an "Umbrian accent" in order to make a joke. Ancient testimony tells us that Plautus was from the town of Sarsina in Umbria,[30] and several indications in our scripts point to an Umbrian pronunciation in wordplay.

Were it not for the attestation of the following lines in Nonius (9. 22, who misunderstood the joke himself), the following joke at *M.G.* 1407-8 would have been completely lost.[31] Periplectomenus, threatening the soldier Pyrgopolynices with the punishment of castration, turns to his slaves and barks out the following order (1407-8):

> **PER.** Vbi lubet: dispennite hominem — divorsum et distennite.
> **PVRG.** Obsecro hercle te, ut mea verba audias prius quam secat!
>
> **PER.** When you will: spread the man out and stretch him.
> **PYRG:** Please, I beg you—hear my words before (*frantically looking at his crotch*) he cuts me!

The forms *dispennite* (= *dispandite*, "spread out,") and *distennite* (= *distendite* "stretch out") are probably examples of Umbrian pronunciation, in which the sound *–nn-* corresponds to the sound *–nd-* in Latin.[32] Nonius guessed that *dispennite* was derived

---

[30] The identification has been unpersuasively attacked by Gratwick 1973b.

[31] For our lines, only Nonius preserves the true reading *dispennite*; the manuscripts offer various regularizations as *dispendite* or *distendite*; for *distennite* (a likely conjecture of Muersius) we find *distendite* or *dispendite*. On the form of the word cf. OLD s.v. *dispando*.

[32] Cf. Buck pp. 84-5 and Poultney p. 81. Buck's account is clearer: "*nd* becomes *nn*, usually written *n* in Umbrian [sc. *because double consonants in Umbrian are not always indicated in writing, although they are in Oscan*]. So the Gerundives...U[mbrian] *pihaner*, *anferener*,

from *pennae* (*dispennere est expandere, tractum a pennis et volatu avium*). On this interpretation, Periplectomenus' order would mean "clip his wings," which does not quite square with the context. Nevertheless, Naudet (ad loc.) properly detected the pun, though he needlessly wanted to emend the text: "quid vero, si *dispenite* scribendum? Si qua causa est cur conjectura omittatur, Plauti verecundia profecto non est." As Naudet correctly divined, the pronunciation of the word *dispandite* as *dispennite* is deliberately intended to make Periplectomenus sound as though he were saying, "de-penis him!,"—a comic nonce coinage equivalent to "castrate him," the very punishment with which he is being threatened.[33] The desperate interpretation of Nonius, as well as our manuscripts' reading *dispendite* ("rack and stretch"), fail to take due account of Pyrgopolynices' reply with *prius quam secat* "before he cuts me!" and so will not work; the line is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* that requires the Umbrian pronunciation *dispennite* so that the panicking soldier may deliberately misunderstand what Periplectomenus had intended, *dispendite*, "stretch him out."

There is further evidence for Umbrian pronunciation in *Amph.* 384, where there is a pun on the name of the slave Sosia:

---

etc.;...U[mbrian]. *ponne, pone,...*from **pomde* as if L[atin] **quomde* like *quamde*; U[mbrian] *ostendu...*from **ostennetoōd* : L[atin] *ostendito...*; similarly *...endendu* 'intendito', etc.

The note of Donatus ad *Phorm.* 330 implies, however, that the slurred pronunciation of /nd/ as /nn/ in the word *dispandite* as *dispennite* is vulgar Latin: QVIA NON RECTE ACCIPITRI TENDITVR: legitur et *tennitur*: habet enim N littera cum D communionem. Both interpretations of the word—Umbrian as well as vulgar—may be simultaneously true.

There seems to be no proper linguistic basis for the vocalic shift from the *–a-* of *dispandite* to the *–e-* of *dispennite*; the wordplay alone may perhaps account for its presence here.

[33] Naudet might have adduced as strong support the explicit wordplay on *intestabilis* "intestate" and "testicle-less" that follows shortly afterward in vv. 1416-7 (the joke is repeated at *Curc.* 30ff); cf. also v. 1420 *salvis testibus.*

On the castration in this scene, cf. Lowe pp. 83-84, who, though he misses the pun in v. 1407, discusses more fully the legal probability of castration as punishment, with helpful parallels.

> **MERC.** Amphitruonis te esse aiebas *Sosiam.* **SOS.** Peccaveram,
> nam Amphitruonis *socium* sane me esse volui dicere.
>
> **MERC.** You kept saying that you were Amphitryon's *Sosia.* **SOS.** I made a mistake—I certainly meant to say I was Amphitryon's *associate*![34]

Naudet (ad v. 228), however, seems to have been the first to make this proposal:

> Quamquam veteres grammatici docent omnes consonantem *c* solitam apud Latinos pronuntiari sempter tamquam *k.* Sed potuit h. l. paulo emolliri ab histrione quo minus *socium* differret a *Sosiam.*

This suggestion, rather arbitrary in itself, was taken up and developed by Sedgwick (ad loc.) in a more scientific way: in the native Umbrian alphabet the letter now transcribed as *ç* or *s* was used to denote a palatalized sibilant derived from *k*, sounding as English /sh/ or simply /s/. The palatalized sound was unique to Umbrian (not shared either by Oscan or Latin); and the sound in the Roman alphabet was indicated by the letter Ś, transcribed ś. In the Roman alphabet, however, the mark over the *s* was not consistently applied, and in some inscriptions we find the simple letter *s* used without the bar superimposed, used to represent the Umbrian letter *ç*.[35] Sedgwick argued that, as in the Umbrian language current in Sarsina an intervocalic letter *c* was pronounced soft before the front vowels *e* and *i*, sounding at least roughly identical to Latin *s*, the actor here might have slipped into a heavy "Umbrian accent" in pronouncing *socium* as *soçium.* Not all scholars will permit the Umbrian pronunciation here[36], but as we have already seen that Plautus elsewhere uses Umbrian pronunciation for a joke, it seems to me more likely than not that he did so

---

[34] Translation after Nixon. I print here Palmer's *sane* for *ne*, the easiest emendation; his apparatus gives a complete register of earlier conjectures.

[35] Cf. Buck pp. 24, 89-91 and Poultney pp. 62-3.

[36] Christenson, the most recent editor, rejected it.

here as well.[37] Brinkhoff (pp. 81-2) compares *Poen.* 530, in which Agorastocles addresses the *Advocati*, saying:

AGOR. Vinceretis *cervom* cursu vel grallatorem gradu.

AGOR. You'd surpass a deer in running or a stilt walker in his step.

Brinkhoff understands the word *cervom* as a pun on *servom* and as a reference to the Plautine *servus fugitivus*, which, if right, must also be considered an Umbrianism.

I. D. d. 2.: Chattering, Stammering, or Slurring

The Umbrian pronunciations of *–nn-* for Latin *–nd-* and the palatalized letter *–c-* as -/sh/- or /s/ for *–ci-* and *–ce-* in Latin must have sounded to the Roman ear similar to a slurred pronunciation of Latin words. Slurred pronunciation was evidently a source of great humor for the audience, for at other times Plautus has his characters deliberately slur words, especially when they feign drunkenness. The manuscripts sometimes guarantee the slurring by preserving it in written form. In *Most.* 313ff, where the intoxicated young man Callidamates slurs a number of words, the manuscripts have preserved it: cf. 319 *ecquid tibi videor ma-ma-madere*?; 325 *o-o-ocellu's meus.* In vv. 331-2, in which the drunken *adulescens* hiccups his question to Delphium, the word that appears in our manuscripts, *mammamadere*, is evidently a drunken slur that picks up on

[37] An additional consideration that may bear on Plautus' use of Umbrian in his otherwise Roman plays is his use of a specifically Umbrian term in place of a native Latin one. A gloss preserved in Festus (p. 410L, and Paulus p. 411L) indicates that at least once ancient scholars detected Plautus using an Umbrian word: *"strebula" Vmbrico nomine Plautus appellat coxendices hostiarum.* If, as it appears, the note serves as a corrective to Varro (*L.L.* 7.67, following Opilius), who had tried to connect *strebula* with a Greek word, the note must go back to another ancient scholar, though we have no way of guessing the ultimate source of the information.

Similarly Giacomelli pp. 249-257 demonstrates that Plautus' use of the unparalleled Latin adjective *sācres* in the phrase *sacres porci* (*Men.* 289) is an Umbrianism.

Delphium's *madet homo*:

DEL. Madet homo. **CALL.** Tun me ais *mammamadere*?

DEL. He's drunk! **CALL.** (*lurching at her*) Ar' yoo sayin' I'm dr-dr-drunk?

Mendelsohn (p. 118) suspected from both the form of the slurred word and Delphium's response that there was a pun here on the drunken utterance *mammamadēre* ("...I'm dr-dr-drunk?!?"), pronounced so as to suggest *mammam adīre* (...I'm approaching your breast?), i.e., a joke in which Callidamates tries to grope the chest of Delphium, who then slaps Callidamates' hand.[38]

When at *M.G.* 813-73 the slave Lucrio unsuccessfully tries to hide his drunkenness from his *conservus* Palaestrio, the manuscripts evince an extraordinarily great confusion of the letter *v* for *b*. Although confusion of the letters *v* and *b* is frequent in medieval manuscripts[39], the confusion here is probably not to be attributed to medieval copyist error, but rather to Lucrio's drunkenly slurred pronunciation of particularly significant words: (832) *exvivit* for *exbibit*; (833) *bivisti* for *bibisti*; (833) *bivi* for *bibi*; (835) *calevat* for *calebat*; (835) *amburevat* for *amburebat*; (849) *imperavat* for *imperabat*; (851) *cassavant* for *cassabant*; (853) *vilibris* for *bilibris*; (854) *complevatur* for *complebatur*; (859) *excruciavit* for *excruciabit*; (860) *scivit* for *scibit*. In each case it is *v* that replaces *b*, and there is no case in which *b* replaces *v*. P. Stadter[40] makes a persuasive argument that, against the decision of all modern editors, the manuscripts' readings are to be retained here, for the replacement of *b* with *v* occurs here statistically

---

[38] An example of schijn-ambiguum wordplay (cf. section I. E. a. below) in which the context leads us to believe that the word spoken suggests a second, unspoken, word.

[39] Unfortunately the 5th c. Ambrosianus is illegible here.

[40] Cf. pp. 146-7.

thirty-five times more frequently than elsewhere in the *M.G.*; moreover, it is the drunken Lucrio who speaks ten of the eleven mispronunciations, and the remaining erroneous word is said by Palaestrio, who in that case (833) sarcastically echoes Lucrio. The mispronounced words all deal with Lucrio's drinking, thirst, wine jugs, or his fear of punishment.

As expected, we have other examples in which the manuscripts give no indication that slurring or stammering is intended. Stadter notes (p. 147) that in other scenes in which the words mimic drunken speech (*Stich.* 641-775; *Curc.* 96-109; *Cist.* 120-48;), "no departure from normal pronunciation is indicated." Nevertheless, at times the context and, in some cases, hiatus, indicate that something more is happening in the dramatic action than appears in our text. Such seems to explain *Rud.* 528-538, in which ten lines show six cases of hiatus:

> **LABR.** Edepol, Neptune, es balineator frigidus:
> cum vestimentis postquam aps te abii, algeo.
> **CARM.** Ne thermipolium quidem ullum | instruit,
> ita salsam praehibet potionem et frigidam.
> **LABR.** Vt fortunati sunt fabri ferrarii,
> qui apud carbones adsident: semper calent.
> **CARM.** Vtinam fortuna nunc anetina | uterer,
> ut quom exiissem | ex aqua, arerem tamen.
> **LABR.** Quid si aliquo ad ludos me pro manduco locem?
> **CARM.** Quapropter? **LABR.** Quia pol clare crepito dentibus.
> **CARM.** Iure optumo me | lavisse arbitror.
> **L.** Qui? **CH.** Quia | auderem tecum in navem ascendere,
> qui a fundamento mi usque movisti mare.

Since hiatus occurs in a line spoken by a person shivering with cold in vv. 528, 529, 533, 534, 537, and 538, Seyffert suggested that the space was meant to be filled out by a chattering of the teeth and stuttering of the words as *al-algeo*, *in-instruit*, *ut-uterer*, *ex*

aqu-aqu-aqua [41] *ar-arerem, la-la-lavisse, qui-quia.* This provides an excellent explanation for the presence of the hiatus.[42]

Analogous to the slurred speech of a drunken character, or the stammered speech of a character chattering with cold, are speech defects such as stammering or lisping. These were undoubtedly a source of popular humor, as we find, e.g., that the emperor Claudius' stammering became a treasure trove of humor in the *Apocolocyntosis.*[43] Mockery of lisping finds precedent in Aristophanes at *Vesp.* 44-52, which makes fun of Alcibiades' lisp, a confusion of the sounds /l/ and /r/, and at *Eq.* 79 the phrase *ἐν* Κλωπιδῶν seems to stand for Κρωπιδῶν, if that is an example of lisping and not *παρὰ προσδοκίαν.* We might speculate that characters in Plautus resorted to lisping in performance if it would help the joke. We have no explicit manuscript evidence—nor can any be expected[44]—in Plautus for a character's lisping, but in some instances (e.g. *Men.* 78, discussed in Chapter II below), a character's deliberate confusion of /s/ and /th/ seems to have been intended.

The foregoing examples have all been intended to show that Plautine characters

---

[41] Sonnenschein (ad loc.) suggests that this may be in imitation of a duck.

[42] When Diabolus dictates the terms of a contract to the parasite in *Asin.* 756-60, the multiple instances of hiatus in the text seem to indicate the repeated pauses that the parasite requires to write in the additional terms. Cf. Lindsay *Ancient Editions* p. 128

[43] Cf. 4. 2, 11.3 et passim. Specifically, the emperor's dying words *vae me, puto, concacavi me* look like a mockery of a stuttering man trying to say something else (i.e. *con-ca-ca-vi*).

[44] If Plautus ever wrote indications of lisping into his text, the indications were no doubt "corrected" already in antiquity by the earliest editors; but the poet may not have even bothered to try to represent the lisp in writing, leaving it instead to his actors to understand that a lisp was intended; cf. Quintilian *Inst.* 1.5.32, who remarks on the difficulty of representing in written texts an unusual pronunciation—specifically, speech defects: Et illa per sonos accidunt, quae demonstrari scripto non possunt, vitia oris et linguae: iotacismus et labdacismus et ischnotetas et plateasmus feliciores fingendis nominibus Graeci vocant, sicut coelostomian, cum vox quasi in recessu oris auditur.

frequently manipulate pronunciation in pursuit of a laugh. We now find scarcely a trace of where, and if, Plautus would have originally indicated this unusual pronunciation in his scripts by special markings or spellings. In those instances where no indication remains, scholars must rely on perceptive readings, consideration of the context, character response, and Plautine practice in similar situations to try to determine the poet's intended delivery of the line.

I. E.: Two Related Types of Plautine Wordplay: *schijn-ambiguum* and *κακέμφατον*

I. E. a.: The *schijn-ambiguum*

Let us now consider a specific sort of Plautine wordplay that is closely analogous to the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. Plautus uses a number of different methods for playing on words that range from the more simplistic techniques of assonance, alliteration, and *figura etymologica* to more sophisticated types based not merely on sound but also on puns that imply a semantic connection and intentionally misunderstood grammar. Various classifications may by found in either Mendelsohn or Brinkhoff, but for the purposes of this study, one category alone will be referred to with any frequency. This is a phenomenon that Mendelsohn calls "*adnominationes* or *paronomasiae* with the second word implied and not expressed," and Brinkhoff, the *schijn-ambiguum*, from the Dutch for "evidently ambiguous." Both designations describe the same phenomenon, but as Brinkhoff's term is more concise, I have preferred to adopt it in this study.

The term schijn-ambiguum indicates the phenomenon whereby a character intentionally misunderstands one word for another, so that a word simultaneously skirts

and suggests the meaning of the skirted word.[45] At *Men.* 141 the parasite seems deliberately to mistake *luculentus*, "brilliant, splendid," for *lucuntulus* "tyropita:"[46]

MEN. Vin tu facinus *luculentum* inspicere? **PEN.** Quis id coxit coquos?

M. Do you want to see a splendid thing? **P.** What cook cooked it?

The interpretation of this type of wordplay is necessarily somewhat subjective, since there is no specific indication of the skirted word in the text; the presence of the wordplay must be inferred from the surrounding context or another character's reply. In this respect, the schijn-ambiguum has an affinity with the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. In both cases, the scholar must envision the actual performance and try to infer from the context a joke that in performance would have been immediately clear to spectators, from the actor's delivery in pronunciation, the actor's gesture(s), or a combination of the two. As the two concepts are related, then, I will refer to the schijn-ambiguum occasionally.

I. E. b.: The *κακέμφατον*

Here a word should be said on a phenomenon of Plautine humor related to the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* but one which I will largely not discuss. The ancient term *κακέμφατον* lumps together two separate but related phenomena: the first occurs when an obscene word can be heard within an otherwise innocuous word or word group; the second occurs when an obscene sense (not intended by the author) is understood by the

[45] Cf. Brinkhoff pp. 80-6 for the fullest account.

[46] Cf. Gratwick's note ad loc.; less satisfactorily Gronovius ad loc., who explains the joke as an *ambiguum* on *facinus luculentum inspicere*, which Menaechmus means as "do you want to see something splendid," and the parasite takes (says Gronovius) as "do you want to try out, taste something made in a glowing oven."

listener. The phenomenon is largely subliterary, but Cicero *ad Fam.* 9. 22 and Quintilian 8. 3. 44-7 discuss *κακέμφατον* in some depth, informing us that the Roman who was so inclined heard the obscene words *cunnos*, *caca*, *pedo* in, respectively, *cum nos*, *dorica castra*[47], *intercapedo*, and so on. Most importantly, in hearing the obscenity, a syntactic connection with the surrounding words was not felt to be necessary.[48] Similarly, the Roman so inclined understood *in malam partem* phrases such as Sallust's *ductare exercitus* and *patrare bella*, or Virgil's *incipiunt agitata tumescere*. Diminutives such as **mentula* from *ment(h)a* or **pavimentula* from *pavimenta* could not be readily used, Cicero says, because they sounded like the obscene *mentula*. Cicero states that the offense could be bilingual as well, citing *bini* as a word acceptable in Latin but not in Greek (=*βίνει*), and the Greek name Κόννος as sounding obscene in Latin.

The whole subject of *κακέμφατον* in its relationship to Plautus has been ably studied by Gurlitt in his *Erotica Plautina* (cf. esp. pp. 32-5). In order to illustrate how his method differs from my own, a brief example of Gurlitt's approach is in order. The opening lines of the *Persa* read (in Leo's text, which retains the manuscripts' unmetrical *Herculi*; Lindsay, followed by Woytek, supplements as *Hercul<e>i*) (1-2):

> **TOX.** Qui amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias
> Superavit aerumnis suis aerumnas Herculi...
>
> **TOX.** The lover who first entered into the ways of Love as a poor man
> Surpassed with his hardships the hardships of Hercules...

Gurlitt (p. 158) interprets these lines in the following manner:

---

[47] Virgil *Aen.* 2.27; Austin's note ad loc., thinking that the offense lies merely in the (stylistically awkward) repetition of the sound *ca*, misunderstands what is meant by *κακέμφατον*.

[48] Although a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke often skirts an obscene word, as we saw above in the puns in fr. inc. 47 Lindsay (*c-reat* for *c-acat*) and in *Truc.* 518 (*paene* pronounced as *pene*), I distinguish it from *κακέμφατον* precisely because the latter phenomenon lacks any syntactic connection with the surrounding words.

> "Ich habe erkannt, dass Plautus da eine Zoterei beabsichtigt mit den "Wegen des Amor" (*Amoris vias*) und mit dem Wort *Herculi*, das er sich gesprochen wuenscht als (*H*) *eri culi*. Dann heisst es: des "Herren-Arsches" und ist ein Sklavenwitz, der in Rom gewiss tausendfach gehoert wurde, auch bei Plautus mehrfach vorkommt."

The interpretation is ingenious; but how may we know whether speakers of a language as highly inflected as Latin would have supplied, mentally, a genitive ending to *Her-* as *(H)eri*? Although I will occasionally have recourse to *κακέμφατον* when discussing a passage (e.g. *Men.* 78), on the whole my approach is rather different from Gurlitt's, for my readings are more securely tied to the dramatic context[49] and syntax[50] in which they appear.

I. F.: Staging and Delivery of the Sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* Joke

In the preceding pages we have examined unusual pronunciations in the delivery of a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay, and we have seen that much depends on how the actor verbally delivered the line. But what if the punchline of the joke lies not only in verbal wit but also in the actor's gesture? I have already suggested above that at

[49] For all the merits of his work, Gurlitt many times saw a latent sexual double-entendre in the most unlikely of contexts; for example, he (p. 110) understood the familiar expression at *Rud.* 1306 *tetigisti acu* ("you touched it with a needle," corresponding to our "you hit the nail on the head,") as " 'Du hast es mit deiner Spitze getroffen' (= richtig vermutet)," listing nine "parallels" and proclaiming (happily aware that he was overstating his case) "Alles Obszönitäten!" Cf. Brinkhoff's introduction, which is devoted to refuting some of Gurlitt's more improbable proposals.

[50] The examples of Cicero and Quintilian suffice to show that by definition the *κακέμφατον* need not have a syntactic connection with its surrounding words; thus Gurlitt is probably right in arguing (pp. 99ff.) that at least some members of the audience would have heard the words *culus* and *indere* in the name *Culindrus*; *penis* and *culus* in *Peniculus*; and *cura* and *culus* in *Curculio*. The syntactic relationship between each word in the alleged compound is left for the audience to supply.

Truc. 518, where Phronesium pronounced *paene* as *pene*, she may have supported her joke with a gesture toward the soldier's crotch, or again, that Periplectomenus may have used a similar gesture in *M.G.* 1407 when he says *dispennite*. Our texts lack independent stage directions, so where the gesture is not clear from the narrative or from the response of a second character, we must infer the action onstage, and indeed, in some instances, the lack of further development of a joke may indicate that the actor's correct gesture provided the punchline.

As we saw earlier (section I. C.), although Lindsay (*Captivi* p. 52) had cautioned against our imputing to the ancients the stage conventions of modern theatre by saying that "there is a danger of ... attributing modern stage-conventions of enunciation to the ancient delivery of quantitative verse with or without musical accompaniment," we can see that already scholars in antiquity dealing with the dramatic texts of Roman comedy struggled with these same problems. Although studies of Aelius Donatus' commentary on Terence in terms of its content and literary remarks have recently appeared[51], the commentary is not usually discussed in conjunction with remarks on Plautus' wordplay. Nevertheless, Donatus' commentary raises an interesting issue as to actors' pronunciation and delivery of jokes onstage, as well as proper gesture that ought to be used by an actor. Donatus (*fl.* 353 AD)[52] lived over 500 years after the death of Plautus and clearly the production of drama had changed somewhat by his time; [53] nevertheless, as a

---

[51] Jakobi 1996; Barsby 2000.

[52] If the date from Jerome's *Chronology* is correct, as many scholars believe it is, as Jerome was the student of Donatus. Testimony to Donatus' life is collected in Wessner pp. vi-vii.

[53] For instance, he envisions the comedies peformed by unmasked actors, counter to what many scholars believe to have been the situation in Plautus' time. Cf. Barsby 2000 p. 512.

grammaticus of Latin with a professional interest in Terence, his commentary may substantially preserve the ideas and attitudes of much earlier scholars toward understanding and explicating Roman comedy. Scholarly interest in the text of Plautus began soon after the poet's death, at least by the time of Accius; there seems to have been an unbroken chain of scholarly interest in Plautus' plays from the earliest times, and although most of this earlier work is lost, since commentaries in antiquity emerged more often as the product of continual addition and selection by many *grammatici* over time rather than as an isolated original creation, it is plausible that Donatus' remarks reflect much older schools of thought.[54]

Donatus' commentary is devoted primarily to grammatical questions, but some remarks reveal his interest in the actors' delivery of lines. Moreover, these remarks show that Donatus understood that many jokes must be delivered in a particular way for them to have their proper significance. This is implicit in comments containing the expression *pronuntiatur* or *pronuntiandum est.*[55] Such remarks show the scholar trying to extrapolate stage directions, actors' gestures, and (most importantly for the present study) actors' delivery of lines from the bare text. Thus Donatus anticipates "modern" performance criticism by many centuries. If this attitude is not original with Donatus himself, it probably preserves earlier scholars' work and reveals scholastic tendencies that recognized that pronunciation and delivery of lines could be and were manipulated to

---

[54] For what is known about earlier ancient commentaries, cf. Lindsay *Ancient Editions* pp. 19-21, where he discusses briefly the sources of Verrius Flaccus (Sinnius Capito, Opilius, etc.,) that may also lie behind Donatus' training in analyzing Roman comedy.

[55] In addition to the gerundive *pronuntiandum est* Donatus many times uses the indicative form *pronuntia(n)tur.* But indicative and gerundive here have little difference between them here, since Donatus had no more authority to say something "is pronounced" than that it "must be pronounced." Both are inferences from context.

maximize humor.

Comments dealing with matters of pronunciation are rather frequent. For the *Eunuchus* alone there are 80 such entries.[56] The following examples are representative:

> ARCHIDEMIDEM hoc sic *pronuntiandum est*, ut appareat ex ipso nomine statim odiosum nescioquem occurrisse ac permolestum. (*Eun.* 327)
>
> "Archidemidem": This has to be pronounced in such a way that it is clear from the very name immediately that some annoying and burdensome fellow has bumped into him.
>
> TIBI EQVIDEM DICO <MANE> *singillatim ista pronuntianda sunt*, ex quibus intellegatur non cessare Chaeream... (*Eun.* 397. 4)
>
> "Tibi equidem dico <mane>": those words must be pronounced individually, so that it may be understood from them that Chaereas isn't fooling around...
>
> HEVS HEVS ECQVIS HIC EST *haec separatim pronuntianda sunt*, nam apparet inter haec verba pulsatam ianuam personare. (*Eun.* 530)
>
> "Heus Heus, ecquis hic est?": Each of these must be pronounced individually, since it's clear that between these words the door echoes back when it's been struck.
>
> QVIS FVIT IGITVR *haec cunctative pronuntianda sunt*, quia aut invita indicat aut dubitat de nomine ignoti aut trepidat per timorem... (*Eun.* 823)
>
> "Quis fuit igitur?": these words have to be pronounced hesitantly, because she unwillingly indicates, or she hesitates about the name of an unknown person or he's shaking in fear...

Comments on verbal delivery like this are present for all the plays. For example,

> SED QVID TV ES TRISTIS hic admonemur omnem ab initio sermonem Getae quasi satagentis et anxii *pronuntiari* accomodatis praesertim ad vultum verbis. (*Phorm.* 57. 1)
>
> "Sed quid tu es tristis?": Here we are reminded that from the beginning the whole speech of Geta, as if he were fed up, is pronounced with words fitted especially appropriately for the expression on his face.
>
> 'Davus' *cum admiratione pronuntiandum.* (*And.* 663. 1)

[56] Barsby 2000 p. 511.

"Davus" should be pronounced with admiration.

cum odio hoc pronuntiandum est.[57] (*And.* 667. 3)

This should be said with hatred.

In each case, the purpose clause (*ex quibus intellegatur*) or explanatory word following (*nam, quia*) shows that Donatus inferred from the text how the delivery must, or should, have been performed. Delivery is conceived of as essential for conveying meaning properly, as e.g. the *ut* clause (whether purpose or result is not clear) in *Eun.* 327 shows.

Of even greater immediacy for the present study, however, are Donatus' remarks on pronunciation of individual words: *singillatim, separatim, cunctative.* These comments may be our cue to assume that Plautus and Plautine actors felt free to exploit similarly the delivery of a given word, to stretch out or shorten the delivery, as we saw above in the preceding section.

In addition to his comments on verbal delivery, Donatus remarks occasionally that he believes that a particular gesture is proper or necessary in a given situation to complete the meaning. In some cases, he explicitly says what he thinks the gesture is.[58]

MANE hoc *gestu* iam adiuvatur. (*Eun.* 765. 2)

"Mane!" this is helped out by a gesture.

PROFUNDAT PERDAT haec sic pronuntianda sunt, ut ostendatur *gestu* nolle quod loquitur. (*Adel.* 134. 2)

"Profundat perdat" this must be prounounced in such a way that he is revealed by his gesture to be unwilling to do what he says.

'huius' autem δεικτικόν: aut enim stipulam aut floccum moverat aut summum digitum. (*Adel.* 163. 2)

---

[57] The foregoing examples have been culled from Barsby and Jakobi, who discuss them at length.

[58] Cf. Jakobi pp. 10-11.

> The word "huius" is deictic, for he had either moved the stipula or the tuft of wool or the tip of his finger.
>
> 'hic' *gestu scaenico* melius commendatur, nam haec magis spectatoribus quam lectori scripta sunt. (*And.* 310. 1)
>
> "hic" is improved by a stage gesture, for these words were written for spectators rather than a reader.

This final comment is particularly instructive for modern scholars as we try to reconstruct the meaning that is not explicit in our texts of Plautus. In the absence of both independent stage directions and consistent punctuation in our manuscripts, what would have been immediately clear to spectators is not easily perceptible today. Ancient scholars dealt with these same problems, and we moderns see that the ancient attitude toward inferring meaning is the same as that which is espoused in the present study.

I. G.: Metrical Interruption, Syllabification, and *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*

As *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes require a brief pause in breath to be effective, so too the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* requires a pause in delivery. How a pause can be made to fit into the rhythmical flow of a verse is an issue that will be largely ignored in this thesis. Scholars have yet to reach a consensus regarding the degree to which Plautine performers were bound to, and the audience expected, a perceptible rhythm capable of being anticipated by the audience. Since the comic meters are so varied and admit so many substitutions, scholars agree that at least now no such rhythm can be detected.[59] In comic

[59] Gratwick 1993 p. 60 has argued convincingly against those scholars who claim the presence of an isochronous beat, urging that there is too much evidence to impose on Plautine verse a chain of rhythmical beats that alternate between long and short units, such as (says Gratwick) would be

meters there is certainly no repetitive, pervasive rhythm analogous to that of the dactylic hexameter, the elegiac, or even the most flexible Horatian lyric meters. We also have the express negative testimony of Cicero who, though nearly 150 years later than Plautus, was both an enthusiast of comedy and a poet himself. According to him, comic meter was barely perceptible and in most respects indistinguishable from everyday spoken language:

> comicorum senarii propter similitudinem sermonis sic saepe sunt abiecti ut nonnumquam vix in eis numerus et versus intellegi possit. (*Orat.* 55. 184)
>
> The senarii of comic poets, on account of their similarity to everyday language, are often so low that sometimes the meter and versification in them can scarcely be understood.
>
> apud quos (*sc. comicos poetas*) nisi quod versiculi sunt, nihil est aliud quotidiani dissimile sermonis. (*Orat.* 20. 67)
>
> Among the comic poets, except for the fact that there are little verses, there is nothing else dissimilar to everyday speech.

Cicero's view expressed in *Orat.* 55. 184 is particularly damning for those who would argue that the rhythm of comic meters was readily perceptible to the audience. But on any view of rhythm, it is universally acknowledged that Plautus made *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes, and these lines necessarily assume a pause in breath during performance.

In this dissertation, I illustrate a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay by inserting a dash between word elements where it most easily will indicate the wordplay. It should be noted that the dash is not intended to indicate a syllabic break, although the two breaks coincide more often than not. In so marking the text, I follow the precedent

---

nearly the case for Seneca. Scholars continue to debate the existence of ictus in Plautine verse. Cf. Gratwick 1993 pp. 40-63 for a convenient short doxography.

set by Fraenkel on fr. 47 inc. Lindsay *ipsa sibi avis mortem c-reat*, who illustrated the wordplay by splitting the word as *c-reat* (for *c-acat*), not syllabically (*cre-at*).[60]

I. H.: Orthography

It seems fairly clear that at least by the time of Gellius, and possibly that of Cicero, there had been some sort of change made to texts of Plautus to bring the spelling more in line with the then-contemporary usage.[61] Fortunately the exact spelling of most words is inconsequential for their meaning, and we need not overly concern ourselves with it here. It will be enough to look only at those changes that are misleading in our modern editions; in practical terms, this means the spelling and pronunciation of Greek words, since Plautus has a special penchant for making jokes based on these.

I. H. a.: Aspiration (*ch, ph, rh, th*)

In taking Greek names over into Latin, Plautus did not make an orthographical distinction between aspirated and unaspirated consonants (*c* vs. *ch*, *p* vs. *ph*, *t* vs. *th*), nor would Romans of his time do so in their own speech.[62] Where the manuscripts show the

[60] On Plautine syllabification, see Lindsay *Captivi* pp. 12-55, and Gratwick 1993 pp. 48-52.

[61] Questa 2001 pp. 68-73, and earlier, Redard 73-9. Questa, under whose direction the new *Editiones Sarsinatis* are in preparation, adopts the principle in his new edition of the *Casina* (2001) of preserving the spelling transmitted in the manuscripts; where variation occurs, as it very frequently does, he prefers to print the older form, on the grounds that it cannot be known how Plautus spelled the word.

[62] Cf. Leumann-Hofmann p. 130, and especially Allen pp. 26-7, 119. The aspirated forms (*ch, ph, th*) make their first appearance in inscriptions only around the middle of the 2nd century B.C., where they are used initially to transcribe Greek words. Prior to this time, in which Plautus lived and wrote, the simple *c, p, t* were used, and some survivals of Greek loan words from this period thus spelled remained conventional: *purpura* = πορφύρα, *tus* = θύς, *calx* = χάλιξ. The most

aspiration they are not simply wrong, they are misleading, since they quite often present names such as *Charmides*, *Astaphium*, or *Theopropides* with the *–h-* inserted, the convention familiar to us. The manuscripts in a few places do actually preserve the correct, unaspirated form, but only sporadically,[63] and editors, in deference to tradition, have for the most part been reluctant to restore it everywhere.

Aside from these few traces in the manuscripts, evidence for the absence of aspiration comes in part from Plautus himself, in part from contemporary inscriptions. The wordplay on *Thalem* and *talento* at *Capt.* 274,

TVND. *Thalem talento* non emam Milesium

TYND. I wouldn't buy Milesian Thales for a talent!

has been taken as evidence that there was not much, if any, difference between *t* aspirated or unaspirated. Similarly, *Pseud.* 229—

---

persuasive evidence against an earlier distinction between aspirate and non-aspirate, however, is the subsequent application of the aspirate mark (-h-) to native Latin words where none had previously existed; some of these (*pulcher*, *triumphus*) were accepted, others (*chorona*, *centhurio*) rejected.

> Had the digraphs not been introduced to represent the Greek aspirates in the first place, Latin would have had no need to indicate the aspiration of *pulc(h)er*, etc., in writing, since it was merely an automatic variant on the normal voiceless stops (just as we do not need to indicate the aspiration of initial voiceless stops in English). But once the digraphs had been introduced in order more accurately to represent the pronunciation of loan-words from Greek, it would be natural enough to employ them also for writing similar sounds in Latin (Allen p. 27).

That the average Latin speaker had difficulty understanding where aspiration belonged (telling both of aural and oral capabilities) is clear from e.g. Catullus' poem 84 to Arrius, who proudly but mistakenly says *chommoda*, *hinsidias*, *Hionios*, for *commoda*, *insidias*, *Ionios*. Quintilian *Inst.* 12. 10. 57 (discussed by Allen, p. 119) relates the story of a bumpkin who did not recognize the name of *Amphion* until the word's aspiration had been suppressed to *Ampion*.

[63] Forms of *Pronesium* are found in *Truc.* 77, 188, 358, 504, 881, 35 B, 447B; *Astapium* in *Truc.* 95 B; *Stratopanes* in *Truc.* 514 BD, 929 BCD; *Diniarcus* in *Truc.* 825B. *Rudens* 570 ACD has *baratrum* and in *M.G.* 88 some manuscripts have *Epesum* (cf. Enk 1953 pp. 38-9).

BALL. cras, Phoenicium, poeniceo corio invises pergulam

BALL. Tomorrow, Phoenicium, you will head to the brothel with a red hide!—

shows the similarity in Latin of the two sounds *ph* and *p* that were distinguished in Greek. The paronomasia at *Truc.* 130—

DIN. quis est quem *arcessis*? **AST.** *Archilinem.*

DIN. Who is it that you're summoning? **AST.** Archilis.—

attests to the lack of aspiration of *c*.[64]

Inscriptional evidence for lack of aspiration appears in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 B.C., the bronze tablet which dates from two years prior to the traditional date of Plautus' death.

I assume from the foregoing that like *c*, *p*, and *t*, the letter *r* before a vowel (e.g. *Rodia*, not *Rhodia*, *Curc.* 444) was most likely unaspirated in Latin at this time, but the paucity of evidence precludes certainty.

I. H. b.: The vowel *y*

The letter *y* used to represent Greek upsilon was not used in Plautus' time. In its place the simple letter *u* was written in transcription and was presumably close enough in sound to ease Roman pronunciation of the foreign sound.[65] In Plautus the eponymous

[64] Cf. Brinkhoff p. 178 on *Pseud.* 736: **PS.** *Di immortales, non Charinus mihi hic quidem, sed Copiast!* "Good god, he's no Charinus for me, he's Abundance!," where the slave's jest seems to associate the name *Charinus* with *carere* (i.e., having nothing at all); the contrast with *Copia* seems to support this.

[65] Aside from the Plautine evidence, a number of words written with the Greek upsilon remained fossilized with the letter *u* in Latin: *bucina*, *bursa*, *cubus*, *mus*, etc. According to Cicero (*Orat.* 48. 160), Ennius wrote *Burrus* for *Pyrrhus* and *Bruges* for *Phryges*.

character in the *Amphitruo* has the fossilized remains of the original Latin spelling and sound of his name, whereas the spellings *Lydus* and *Lycus* are not original with Plautus, who wrote *Ludus*, *Lucus*, etc. The puns in *Bacch.* 129 (*non omnis aetas, Lude, ludo convenit*) and *Bacch.* 362 (*Crucisalum me ex Crusalo*) strongly suggest that in Plautus' time the sounds *u* and *y* were roughly equivalent to the Roman ear. As with aspiration, it must be kept in mind that in each case Plautus wrote *u*, not *y*, for these names, and in a very small number of places the manuscripts preserve a trace of this.[66]

In light of the foregoing, I have accordingly removed all marks of aspiration from my citations of Plautus in this dissertation, and everywhere replaced the vowel *y* with the vowel *u*. In so doing, I follow the example set by several recent editors, including Bertini, Enk, and now Questa in the new *Editiones Sarsinates*.

I. H. c.: *Mihi* and *mi*

Mihi is normally monosyllabic in Plautus[67], and was probably indistinguishable from *mi* in pronunciation. In this respect the manuscripts are not a reliable guide to what Plautus actually wrote. In at least one case (*Trin.* 970, cf. 973) the monosyllabic spelling and pronunciation of *mihi* as *mi* is relevant.

Furthermore, though *y* was later written by the educated, there is evidence that it was still pronounced as *u* in colloquial speech: the form *crupta* for *crypta* is attested by a republican inscription and is supported by Italian *grotta* (Allen p. 53). In the case of this vowel, as in aspiration, there was a good deal of hypercorrection among the educated classes, who said *gyla* for *gula*, *inclytus* for *inclutus*, etc. (ibid.).

[66] *Pseud.* 716 A, 717 A, 1216 A *sumbolum*; *Merc.* 292 B, 304 B *Lusimache*.

[67] Though not always; see Questa 2001 p. 70. Questa's principle is to write *mi* and not *mihi* in every case where bisyllabicity is not guaranteed by the meter.

I. I.: Distribution of Material

The remainder of the dissertation is divided as follows:

Chapter II:	Latin Plays on Latin(-ized) Names.
Chapter III:	Greek Plays on Greek Names.
Chapter IV:	Latin Plays on Greek Names.
Chapter V:	Plays on Common Nouns.

I have thought it preferable to treat wordplays on proper names, whether of characters or otherwise, separately from wordplays on common words because the former are so numerous in Plautus. The division is made solely for the convenience of the reader, and the distinction between wordplays made on proper and common nouns should not be taken to indicate that I consider the two types of wordplay materially different from one another. The arrangement that I have adopted has rather proven useful in keeping parallels in expression as near one another as possible.

* * *

CHAPTER II:

LATIN PLAYS ON LATIN(-IZED) NAMES

This chapter deals with sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays involving a Latin word (e.g. *veneror*) and a proper name that is either Latin (e.g. *Venus*) or Latinized, viz. a name from a foreign language that has been fully adopted into Latin (e.g. *Persa*).

II. A.: The Proper Name Play Illustrated

II. A. a.: Accidental Misunderstanding

Let us first look to Cicero in order to demonstrate succinctly the technique of the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* based on a Latin, or Latinized, name. His testimony gives evidence that the type of misunderstanding in which a portion of a word is mistaken grammatically for another unrelated word, occurred in everyday life. This happened unintentionally at times, and, as was the case in the following story from Cicero's *De Divinatione*, the mistake was sometimes taken as indicative of a supernatural relationship (2. 84. 3):

> Cum M. Crassus exercitum Brundisii inponeret, quidam in portu caricas Cauno advectas vendens "*Cauneas!*" clamitabat. Dicamus, si placet, monitum ab eo Crassum, *caveret ne iret*; non fuisse periturum, si omini paruisset.

> When M. Crassus was stationing the army at Brindisi, a certain man in the port who was selling imported Caunean figs was going about shouting, "Cauneas!" Let us say, if you will, that Crassus was warned by him not to go: had he obeyed the omen, he would not have perished.

Cicero interpreted the fig seller's cry of *Cauneas!* "Caunians" as a warning to Crassus in the form *cave ne eas*!, "Don't go!" Both adjective and warning evidently sounded more or less the same in pronunciation[1], and a grammatical ambiguity between the accusative *Cauneas* and the warning *cave ne eas* resulted from the fig seller's terse expression: the bare adjective *Cauneas* stands for a fuller expression such as *Emite Cauneas caricas*, "Buy Caunian figs!" The ambiguous termination *–as* of the accusative adjective *Cauneas* together with the sight of the man with a bag of figs in his hand prevented Crassus—as Cicero explains it—from recognizing the other words (*cave*, *ne*, *eas*) and correctly understanding the omen.[2]

---

[1] As they likewise did in the time of Plautus; cf. the wordplay (discussed in Chapter I above) at *Truc.* 883-5 between *caullator* and *cavillationes*, taken there as evidence of the character's refined urban pronunciation.

[2] The Romans themselves were well aware that the limited number of inflections in Latin created ambiguity, and particularly between noun and verb. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4. 21) lists the following three examples as arising from *exornatio*:

1. cur eam rem tam studiose *curas*, quae tibi multas dabit *curas*?
   Why are you so concerned with that thing that will give you so many concerns?

2. nam *amarei* iucundumst, si curetur ne quid insit *amari*.
   For being loved is better, provided nothing be bitter.

3. *veniam* ad vos, si mihi senatus det *veniam*.
   I would leave and come to you, if the senate were to give me leave.

The ambiguity in the first of these examples (*curas* used as both noun and verb) is closest to that in *Cauneas*. It is also important to note that structurally in each example the word containing the humor is placed last in the sentence.

Plautus was well aware of the opportunities for grammatical ambiguity inherent in Latin inflection[3], and he understood that with proper timing in delivery, he could exploit these opportunities in order to raise a laugh from the audience. The proper timing came midway through the word: by changing the final syllable of the word from what he knew the audience would expect, with or without the use of props onstage, Plautus changed the banal into something unusual or surprising, and thereby funny.

II. A. b.: Deliberate Ambiguity

Humor based on inflectional ambiguity persists in Latin literature, and Cicero, himself an inveterate punster, furnishes evidence. According to Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 6. 3. 48), Cicero famously addressed the son of a cook with a pun, treating the adverb *quoque* as though it were the vocative of *cocus*:

> ne illa quidem quae Ciceroni aliquando sed non in agendo exciderunt, ut dixit, cum is candidatus qui coci filius habebatur coram eo suffragium ab alio peteret: *'ego quoque tibi fauebo'*; non quia excludenda sint omnino uerba duos sensus significantia, sed quia raro belle respondeant, nisi cum prorsus rebus ipsis adiuuantur.
>
> [I do not approve of] even that sort of jest which slipped out from Cicero occasionally, though he was not in court at the time. Once when a candidate who was thought to be the son of a cook (*coci*) sought a vote from another in his presence, Cicero said, "I will support you (too)/(o cook) (*quoque*)." I do not criticize this because I think that all wordplay *per ambiguum* ought to be excluded, but because the jokes rarely come out well, unless the circumstances of the situation absolutely support the play on sound.

[3] Cf. Brinkhoff pp. 59-60, 73-76, 100-5, and 115-9 on grammatical *ambiguum*.

As Quintilian argues, these puns usually do not come out nicely unless circumstances favor them, but "favorable circumstances"—i.e., situation, gesture, delivery, and intonation—are precisely what drama adds to a written script.

II. B.: Methodology

The examples discussed in this and the following two chapters are grouped under the rubric "wordplays on proper names" not because they are plays of a different nature than wordplays made on common nouns, but because it is everywhere apparent that plays made on proper names were a favorite device of Plautus. Since these wordplays involve a Latin name and another Latin word, they cannot derive from Plautus' Greek models, and so must be original with Plautus himself. It may be debatable in a few instances whether credit for the joke is due to Plautus or a later reviser writing for a revival performance[4], but for the most part questions of interpolation will be left aside. Where there is serious doubt as to the authenticity of a line or passage in which a joke is contained, a brief mention will be made of prevailing opinions.

I will give due notice to the specific comedy in which each joke appears. My working hypothesis is that, in the hierarchy of complexity, a Latin play made on a Latin name is less sophisticated than a Greek play made on a Greek word; that is, it is easier for a poet to pun in his native language than in a foreign one, and it is easier for the members of a largely monolingual audience to understand a pun in their own language than in a

[4] As Zwierlein 1990, 1991 (a), 1991 (b), 1992 passim contends.

foreign one.[5] In the case of Greek plays on Greek words, many instances (but certainly not all) may go back to Plautus' Greek original, so that credit for them is due not to Plautus but to his model. These Greek-Greek wordplays represent a slightly lesser degree of sophistication than a Latin wordplay made on a Greek name, since the latter type—the Latin-Greek wordplay—presupposes a fairly sophisticated understanding of Greek—and a sensitivity to his audience's comprehension of Greek—in addition to a thorough facility with Latin. An appropriate analogy is that of the modern Anglophone writer, for whom making a pun on two words is easiest if both are English; if both words are French, the writer might simply borrow this from a French source; but a pun that involves an English word and a French word requires a high degree of fluency in both languages.

II. C.: The Parasite's Nickname Formula

Plautus took over[6], altered[7], and greatly improved the humor of a formula that had become standard in Greek comedy whereby the parasite character comes onstage and

[5] Plautus' "audience"—by which I mean the majority of the people who made up the audience—clearly knew at least some rudimentary colloquial Greek (Hough 1934; Shipp 1953); some audience members undoubtedly will have known more, and some may have known some Carthaginian, as Hanno's speech in that language in the *Poenulus* may lead us to believe. I take it, however (*pace* Handley 1975), that the very existence of Plautus' *vorsiones* in Latin presupposes an audience not sufficiently fluent in Greek to enjoy the originals.

[6] Leo 1912 p. 106 first adduced several Greek parallels to the nickname formula, to which Arnott 1968 pp. 161-168 added two more (cf. Arnott 1996 pp. 543-4). Arnott, who first compared all the parallels, demonstrated the first usage in Greek of the name παράσιτος for the character.

It is my argument here that Plautus changed the nature of the formula, and improved the humor by making sophisticated παρὰ προσδοκίαν puns on the parasites' names. More recently Maltby 1999 argues that parasites in Plautus show a marked interest in verbal humor and demonstrate characteristics of the professional jester.

[7] Benz 1998 p. 57f argues more specifically that Plautus' alteration of this Greek model is evidence for his predilection for improvisational drama.

introduces himself (or is introduced) by a nickname indicative of his voracious appetite. Among the surviving fragments of middle and new comedy we have four examples of this. It will be beneficial to lay them out here so that we may see more easily how Plautus changed the formula in order to create verbal ambiguities specific to Latin including two sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes based on these ambiguities. Here are the examples[8]:

Alexis *Parasitus* 183 1-2:

καλοῦσι δ' αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ νεώτεροι
Παράσιτον ὑποκόρισμα
But all the youngsters call him by the nickname "Friar."[9]

Anaxippus *Ceraunus* 3 3-4:

τοῦτον οἱ φίλοι καλοῦσι σοι
νυνὶ δι' ἀνδρείαν Κεραυνόν
Your friends call him "Thunderbolt" now because of his bravery.

Antiphanes *Progoni* 193 10-11:

καὶ καλοῦσί μ' οἱ νεώτεροι
διὰ ταῦτα πάντα Σκηπτόν
And the youngsters call me "Hurricane" because of all this.

Aristophon 5 2-3:

ἄν τις ἑστιᾷ, πάρειμι πρῶτος ὥστ' ἤδη πάλαι
...Ζωμὸς καλοῦμαι
If anyone throws a party, I'm the first one there, so that for a long time now I have been called "Soup."

The fragments have been quoted without context in order to illustrate the formula more easily. In each case the parasite explains that his behavior has earned him an appropriate nickname, but that the nickname does not bother him. Likewise in each case the name is merely a silly nickname given to emphasize the bearer's voracious appetite or constant

[8] Cited according to the edition of Kassel-Austin.

[9] "Friar" is an attempt to capture the meaning of "parasite," which, as explained by Arnott, was originally the name of a religious official; its occurrence in this fragment marks the first application of the word in the meaning "parasite" as it was used in later comedy.

attempts to secure food, so that a parasite such as that in the *Progoni* who sweeps through the room like a whirlwind consuming everything in his path is called by the nickname "Thunderbolt." These characteristics, then, merely explain the nickname, and the lines do not make wordplay based on it. To a Greek audience the name itself was apparently a sufficient joke. As the introductory formula has a Homeric precedent[10], so too these comic examples are analogous to Homeric simile, which so often likens a phenomenon from the world of nature to human behavior in order to increase the vividness of an illustration.

There are four instances in Plautus of wordplay on a parasite's nickname, three of which will be treated here.[11] Each of them shows a marked advance over the Greek type

---

[10] Cf. Odyssey 18. 5-8:

Ἀρναῖος δ' ὄνομ' ἔσκε· τὸ γὰρ θέτο πότνια μήτηρ
ἐκ γενετῆς· Ἶρον δὲ νέοι κίκλησκον ἅπαντες,
οὕνεκ' ἀπαγγέλλεσκε κιών, ὅτε πού τις ἀνώγοι.

Arnaeus was his name, for that was what his dear mother gave him
from birth. But all the youngsters called him Irus,
because he would go as messenger-boy, whever someone bade him.

The parallels in both situation and the expression in Greek between these lines and those in the comic fragments are clear; it is not known, however, which poet first introduced the formula into comedy.

[11] Aside from *Capt.* 69-70, *Men.* 77-8, and *Curc.* 413-7, to be discussed presently, the fourth instance is that of Gelasimus in *Stich.* 174-7:

> Gelasimo nomen mi indidit parvo pater
> quia inde iam a pusillo puero ridiculus fui;
> propterea pauperiem hoc adeo nomen repperi,
> eo quia paupertas fecit ridiculus forem.
>
> When I was small my father gave me the name Gelasimus,
> because already from when I was a tiny boy I was a jokester;
> On account of poverty I got this name,
> Because poverty made me ridiculous.

illustrated above. For ease of comparison, they will be quoted here in briefest form with general remarks, and each will be then taken up individually for discussion. They are here for the first time punctuated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* as I understand each one:

Capt. 69-70: **ERGASILVS** Iuventus nomen indidit Scorto mihi,
eo quia — invocatus soleo esse in convivio.

The youngsters have given me the name "Courtesan"
because – (though uncalled)/(when called on) I am accustomed to be
at the party.

Men. 77-8: **PENICVLVS** Iuventus nomen fecit Peniculo mihi,
ideo quia men—sam, quando edo, detergeo.

The youngsters have given me the name "Peniculus"
because [*grabbing his crotch*] – when I eat, I clean off the table.

Curc. 413-7: **LVC.** Quis tu homo es?
CVRC. Libertus illius, quem omnes Summanum vocant.
LVC. Summane, salve. qui Summanu's? fac sciam.
CVRC. Quia vestimenta, ubi obdormivi ebrius,
summa—no, ob eam rem me omnes Summanum vocant.

LYC. Who are you?
CURC. His freedman, whom they all call "Summanus."
LYC. Hail, Summanus. Why are you Summanus? Tell me.
CURC. Because my clothes—[*fussing with them*] when I'm drunk
and sleeping it off, I wet them a little; that's why everyone calls me
Underpants.

In each case both the formula and the parallels in structure are clear. A group of people, either the "youngsters" (in Greek context, these are presumably young aristocrats who

---

But the situation presented here is unlike that of the former three. The parasitical formula has been adapted here in a way less sophisticated than in the *Captivi*, *Menaechmi*, and *Curculio*; here it is intended simply to explain the name Gelasimus (whether invented by Plautus or present already in the original and retained by Plautus). "Gelasimus" is a childhood nickname (*a pusillo puero* in v. 175) given by a father, not a nickname given by others as in the Greek examples (the context makes it clear that Peniculus is a nickname). Furthermore, there is no joke made on the parasite's name as in the other Latin examples: *Gelasimus* is simply Greek for *ridiculus*. In this sense it is closer to the Greek formulae, which offer explanations of the nicknames but not jokes made on them.

attend symposia) or "everyone," calls the parasite by a nickname. In the Greek examples, each name is indicative of no more than the parasite's appetite: Friar, Thunderbolt, and Soup are simple hyperbolic nicknames, and once they are given, the joke stops there.

Plautus changes the method, and the above three examples show how: the Greek names are supplanted by Latin nicknames, each of which involves at least one thoroughly Latin pun, impossible in Greek, which serves to defeat expectation. As I will discuss below, the wordplay in the *Captivi*, long recognized by scholars, centers on the ambiguous word *invocatus*, meaning both "uncalled" and "called in," i.e., "summoned." In the *Menaechmi*, as I will argue, the play involves a mid-word play on *mensam* for *mentulam*, made clear by a rude gesture; and in the *Curculio*, my contention will be that the play between the Roman deity *Summanus* and the verb *summano* (i.e. *submano*, "I drip a little,") is improved by a similar gesture.

Let us consider the example from the *Captivi* first. The parasite Ergasilus makes his first appearance onstage and begins his monologue with the joking couplet. Scholars have long recognized that the pun here turns on the ambiguous meaning of *invocatus*. This wordplay is impossible in Greek, since the common Greek parasitical epithet ἄκλητος can only mean "uncalled," not "summoned."[12] The pun is abstruse, and Plautus apparently felt that some further explanation of it was necessary for the slower members of the audience to catch it. The full context of the opening of Ergasilus' monolgue is this (69-74):

> **ERGASILVS** Iuventus nomen indidit Scorto mihi,
> eo quia — invocatus soleo esse in convivio. 70
> scio apsurde dictum hoc derisores dicere,
> at ego aio recte. nam scortum in convivio

[12] The infinitive verb in v. 70 is a further wordplay on *esse* "to be" and *ēsse* "to eat; cf. Brinkhoff pp. 76-7.

sibi amator, talos quom iacit, scortum *invocat.*
estne *invocatum* <scortum> an non? planissume;

ERG. The youngsters have given me the name "Courtesan"
because – (though uncalled)/(when called on) I am accustomed to be at the party.
I know that the wags say that this is an absurd name,
but I say it's right, because it's his courtesan at a party that he ... a loverboy,
when he's playing dice, he calls on his courtesan!
Is a Courtesan "called on" or not? He most obviously is!

As we saw with the fig seller's cry of *Cauneas* above, the verbal ambiguity inherent in *invocatus*, which involves the same adjective used in diametrically opposite meanings, requires some support for the audience to correctly understand it. But Ergasilus has no prop with which he visibly could clarify his joke; yet Plautus wanted to make sure the audience appreciated the wordplay. His solution was to add four lines (vv. 71-4) in which the parasite explains his pun to the audience at length, thereby effectively telling the joke three times over (vv. 70, 73, 74).

It is surprising, therefore, to find no such verbal development of Peniculus' joke in the *Menaechmi.* The dramatic circumstances here are precisely parallel to those of Ergasilus in the *Captivi*: each parasite walks onstage for his first appearance and begins his monologue; each addresses to the audience a couplet, otherwise irrelevant to the plot, that serves to explain his nickname. The language used by the two parasites is nearly identical in expression, but whereas Ergasilus goes on to explain his joke over several lines, Peniculus proceeds in an entirely different direction (77-9):

PENICVLVS Iuventus nomen fecit Peniculo mihi,
ideo quia men—sam, quando edo, detergeo.
homines captivos qui catenis vinciunt...

PEN. The youngsters have given me the name "Peniculus"
because [*grabbing his crotch*] – when I eat, I clean off the table.
Prisoners who use chains to hold people captive...

Gratwick, who printed the lines with the dash between words as *ideo quia—mensam quando edo, detergeo*, correctly saw[13] that Peniculus is here defeating the audience's natural expectation of a salacious pun, since *peniculus*, conventionally "brush,"[14] is obviously a diminutive form of *penis*.[15]

There is a difficulty here, however. Peniculus takes no trouble to explain his joke, and Plautus is not one to let a good joke slip by; in the similar scene in the *Captivi*, Ergasilus drags his joke out for six lines, capitalizing on the fun and presumably maximizing the audience's laughter. If we are on the right track in seeing a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke in the *Menaechmi*, then something more is required to bring it out. The similarity in language and structure to the example of Ergasilus in the *Captivi* suggests that if we look for a similar joke here, it is the word *mensam* that contains the joke. I propose that by pausing mid-word after the first element *men-*, Peniculus adjusts his crotch knowingly toward the audience, who expect him to continue along the lines – *tulam perparvam habeo...* "...I have a very tiny *mentula*," or something similar.[16]

---

[13] He was the first to do so. LS, however, s.v. *peniculus* IV rather guardedly says "Perh., in an ambiguous sense, = *membrum virile*, Plaut. *Men.* 2,2,12. (= 286, ***MESS.*** *Peniculum eccum in vidulo salvom fero.* "Look, I've got a brush here in my backpack.") This is certainly possible, though the context renders the joke less probable there than the joke here.

[14] Or "sponge;" so Damon p. 57 n. 44.

[15] The word *penis* does not actually occur in Plautus' corpus, although it does appear in the works of Cato. Cf. however the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay in *Truc.* 518, with the rustic pronunciation of *paene* as *pene*, discussed in Chapter I.

It should be no problem that Plautus puns on the meaning of *Peniculus* as "little brush" later in the *Menaechmi*, since the *Bacchides* furnishes proof, with its different plays on the name of the slave Chrysalus (240 *cruso*; 362 *Crucisalum*; 687 *Cruciatum*; and the assonance in v. 691 *curandumst, Crusale*; all are Plautine, since the slave is named Syrus, not Chrysalus, in the Δὶς Ἐξαπατῶν.) that Plautus enjoyed playing on multiple meanings and senses of the name.

[16] That Gratwick did not understand the joke as I do here is evident from his mid-word punctuation of the name *Me-naechmus* at 1077 (cf. 1161), on which see Chapter 3 below.

Understanding this line as an example of a *Schijn-ambiguum* much improves the richness of the joke, and surely must be what Plautus meant.[17]

This interpretation of the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on Peniculus' name helps us appreciate a verbal joke lying in the words of the eponymous parasite of the *Curculio* in his formal (though fictional) introduction (413-7).

LVC. Quis tu homo es?
CVRC. Libertus illius, quem omnes Summanum vocant.
LVC. Summane, salve. qui Summanu's? fac sciam. 415
CVRC. Quia vestimenta, ubi obdormivi ebrius,
summa—no, ob eam rem me omnes Summanum vocant.

---

[17] This much seems certain, but we may speculate further that there is an element of *κακέμφατον* in the word *mensam*. (On *κακέμφατον* in Plautus, cf. Chapter I. E. b.). Priscian preserves for us in his comment for *Most.* 308 the rare (otherwise only in Petronius and Apuleius) word *mensulam* which has been ousted from our texts of Plautus and replaced there with the unmetrical *mensam*. We might suspect that the word was displaced from its location owing to its similarity in form and sound to the more vulgar *mentulam*. This should not be taken as evidence that the word has likewise been displaced here in the *Menaechmi*, but it raises further considerations.

Earlier in the *Menaechmi* (85) the word *anus* appears in the meaning "[big] ring," or "big *anulus*," a sense apparently otherwise unique in Latin literature. Plautus treats *anulus* "finger ring" as though it were a diminutive form, which it is not. This mattered little for Plautus: if an *anulus* is worn on a finger, obviously a larger ring required a larger-sounding word, and so an augmentative (the technical term for the opposite of a diminutive) was employed. Since there seems to be no deliberate or apparent pun on the other meanings of *anus* "old lady" or "anus," we must infer that this is either a nonce coinage, though it does not seem to be funny, or the sole surviving fossil of an otherwise subliterary word.

Taking this together, we might infer that a natural way of creating an augmentative of *mentula* would be *menta*. It should be no hindrance that *ment(h)a* was already a word in Latin with the meaning "mint," since by the analogy we have just seen, the two everyday words whose accusative is *anum* have already the meanings "old lady," and "anus," and that did not prevent the meaning "big ring" from being properly understood in the present passage. (To complicate matters even further, Cato [*R. R.* 159] once uses *anulus* in the sense of "[small] buttocks.") If ever such a word as *menta* in the meaning "big *mentula*" existed—even as a nonce formation—we admittedly have no trace of it in our literature. If it did, however, Peniculus' joke might be even richer than we expect. In that event, *mensam* and *mentam* would be different by only a single letter, not a syllable, and 'Peniculus' would then be a nickname *per ἀντίφρασιν* (cf. Donatus on *Adel.* 1. 1. 1, discussed in the text below), such as 'Misargyrides' is the name of the *danista* in the *Mostellaria*. Remembering that Ergasilus' *Scortum* joke, couched in such uniquely similar terms, involves a word that is actually a single homonym (*invocatus*) understood in two senses, we might speculate that such is the case here.

Finally, were the parasite to lisp the word *mensam* so as to sound like *men/th/am*, his word would approach almost perfectly the nonce-augmentative *mentam*.

LYC. Who are you?
CURC. His freedman, whom they all call "Summanus."
LYC. Hail, Summanus. Why are you Summanus? Tell me. 415
CURC. Because my clothes—[*fussing with them*] when I fall asleep drunk, I dribble on them—that's why they all call me "Summanus."

The wordplay between *Summanus*, a native Italian deity[18], and Curculio's *summano* (i.e. *sub-mano*, "I drip a little,") has been properly understood since the time of Ussing.[19] As popular etymology derived *Summanus* from *summus,* the named conveyed a notion of superiority or supremacy.[20] But in addition to the verbal wordplay between *summanus* and *summano*, there is another joke here that depends upon a pause midway through *summano* that results in a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* made clear by a gesture. Since names of divinities are particularly liable to become sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes,[21] it is probable that there is another joke here. I suspect that a Roman audience, hearing the parasite Curculio speak, may have taken *summa-* with *vestimenta*, understanding in the phrase "the top of my clothes," and thus expected a bombastic explanation of the parasite's facial good looks or divine stature. Compare the following passage from the *Menaechmi* (165-7), in which Menaechmus tries to get Peniculus to

---

[18] Originally a Sabine god (Varro *L.L.* 5. 74), at a later unspecified date he became assimilated with an aspect of Jupiter (Cicero *de Div.*, 1. 16). From the invocation to Summanus in *Bacch.* 895, where he is flanked by *Mercurius* and *Sol*, it would appear that he was conceived of as a powerful deity.

[19] Thus rightly Ussing (and Geppert independently) ad loc.; Turnebus thought *summanare* meant "to steal greedily in the manner of Summanus;" Muersius, approved of by Naudet, thought *submanare* meant *ὑποχείριον ποιεῖν*. On the unusual assimilation *sub* + *m-* cf. Dorsch p. 14 and Chapter I above.

[20] Cf. the etymology for the name of the god given by Martianus Capella (2. 161): Summanus dicitur quasi *summus Manium.* "He is called 'Summanus' as if he were the greatest of the Manes."

[21] As I discuss more fully below (II. G.) on wordplays involving the names of Venus, Lucina, Mars, and Jupiter.

smell the *palla* that he has stolen from his wife to give his girlfriend, using our same phrase *summum vestimentum*:

> **MEN.** Agedum odorare hanc quam ego habeo pallam. quid olet? apstines? 165
> **PEN.** *Summum* olfactare oportet *vestimentum* muliebre,
> nam ex istoc loco spurcatur nasum odore inlucido.
>
> **MEN.** Hey, smell this *palla* that I have. How does it smell? You're holding it away?!? 165
> **PEN.** You're supposed to smell the *top* of a woman's dress,
> because from *that* place your nose gets dirty from the filthy smell!

Here the expression *summum vestimentum* refers specifically to the top of the *palla*, the exact opposite of the garment's bottom, referred to as *istoc* [sc. "the crotch that you are sniffing"] *loco*. The context and the wording of this scene in the *Menaechmi*, which draws an explicit distinction both through language and action between the *summum vestimentum* and the crotch of the garment, provides a basis for interpreting the audience's natural expectation in our scene in the *Curculio*. Curculio's gestures, a pause in breath, and perhaps a pompous tone, would support this interpretation, and he might act the lines in the following manner: "When I sleep drunk," (the parasite comically touches the top of his clothes, and thereby his head, then points to his crotch with resignation), "I...drip a little."

II. C. a.: The Parasite's Nickname Formula: Conclusions and Summary

Gratwick's argument from context and meaning that in the *Menaechmi* Peniculus' opening lines about his name contained a scurrilous pun *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* provided a satisfactory interpretation of the lines, but we now see that this was not a unique kind of joke: we have a formula standardized in Greek comedy that, among our extant fragments,

appears in the works of four separate poets, and in nearly the same form that Homer had used as well. Plautus adopted this formula, improved it, and made it his own by using Latin jokes that rely on wordplay *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. But we can go still further than this.

Donatus makes the following observation concerning proper names of characters in comedy in his note to *Adel.* 1. 1. 1:

> nomina personarum, in comoediis dumtaxat, habere debent rationem et etymologiam. Etenim absurdum est comicum, <cum> apte argumenta confingat, vel nomen personae incongruum dare vel officium, quod sit a nomine diversum.
>
> Character names, at least in comedy, should have a rationale and (appropriate) etymology, since it is mad that a comic poet, though he forms his plots appropriately, assign a character an ill-fitting name or a role contrary to his name.

After giving a series of examples, Donatus addresses those cases in which the etymology of the name is not appropriate to the character. His note continues thus:

> ...summum poetae vitium est, siquid e contrario repugnans contrarium diversumque protulerit, nisi per *ἀντίφρασιν* ioculariter nomen imponit, ut Misargyrides in Plauto dicitur trapezita.
>
> It is the greatest fault for a poet to assign something contrary or different, unless he assigns as a joke an opposite name, as in Plautus a moneylender is called Misargyrides.

Scholars have usually fixed on the first part of Donatus' note, namely, the point that names should be appropriate to the character. But the second half—that a comic name often intimates the opposite quality in its bearer, is important. Setting together our three examples of the Plautine parasites (under their aliases of Scortum, Peniculus, and Summanus) whose names act to defeat expectation *per ἀντίφρασιν*, we see the following pattern emerge: when a Roman audience hears a Plautine parasite introduce himself and explain his nickname, the audience's expectation is that a joke will follow immediately,

explaining the nickname that is not etymologically appropriate (*habens rationem et etymologiam*), but rather as the opposite of the name (*contrarium diversumque*).

Let us look at each parasite in turn. When effecting his deception, Curculio calls himself *Summanus* to suggest the notion of superiority or supremacy, and so is used in clear irony when it is adopted by a humble parasite; the name comes not from *summus*, but *per ἀντίφρασιν* from a deliberate consonantal assimilation[22] of the prefix *sub-*, and the parasite is exposed as merely an enuretic mortal. Ergasilus in the *Captivi* explains that he is called Scortum not from any sort of scurrilous behavior (as he says in 71, *scio absurde dictum hoc derisores dicere* "I know the wags say that this is an absurd name"), but because he shows up at every meal *invocatus*. This brings us back to the case of Peniculus. By corollary, when Peniculus introduces himself by name, members of the audience who were famliar with Plautus' work must have expected a joke *per ἀντίφρασιν*, namely, that the parasite got his name by having not a small, but a huge penis—an expectation that Plautus further plays on with the word *mensam*. In each case the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* works on a sophisticated mid-word play; this is certain in the case of *invocatus* and *mensam*, probable in that of *summanus*.

The skeptic may immediately raise the objection presented by the case of the parasite Gelasimus in the *Stichus*, whose introduction to the audience is sometimes viewed as parallel to those of Peniculus and Ergasilus. But there is a difference. In the case of Gelasimus the parasite's name (a childhood nickname given by his father, not a nickname earned by his parasitical behavior) means exactly what it says, and is translated by the Latin *ridiculus*. Unlike our other three examples, this case involves neither *παρὰ*

[22] Cf. Chapter I. D., "Manipulated Pronunciation".

προσδοκίαν nor *per ἀντίφρασιν* wordplay; I have already listed my objections to arguing for parallelism between this and the other instances of the parasites' nickname-formula.[23]

Although the case of Gelasimus is not similar to the others in substance (*ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων*), it is nevertheless similar in its Latin expression (*ἀπὸ τῆς λεξέως*), and is consequently an important and valuable indicator of the technique that Plautus used in adopting from his Greek models the introductory formula for the parasite. Unlike the names Summanus, Curculio, and Peniculus, which are Latin, Gelasimus' name is Greek, and Gelasimus' joke is merely an explanation of the meaning of his Greek name; and unlike the cases of the other three, the name of the parasite is not given *per ἀντίφρασιν*, it is rather entirely appropriate to the character. Since in substance, then, the nickname formula used by Gelasimus in the *Stichus* is furthest from our three other, more sophisticated examples, and closest to those examples surviving from Greek comedy, we may speculate that it is an early version of what Plautus later developed. This tentative hypothesis receives some support from the independent production notice attached to our texts of the *Stichus*, since that notice dates the play securely to 200 B.C., and thus quite early in Plautus' career.[24]

---

[23] For text and discussion, see n. 11 above.

[24] The only other *didascalia* extant is that preserved for the *Pseudolus*, which dates that play to 191. If Plautus' died (or retired) in 184, that would put the *Stichus* early in his career (though not earlier than the *Miles Gloriosus*, fairly securely dated to 205, if the allusion to Naevius at v. 211 is accepted). On Plautus' life see Leo pp. 54-76, particularly 68-71 on chronology, and *CHCL* 2 pp. 808-10.

II. D.: Names of Foreign Peoples and Places

It is a Plautine mannerism to have a character bombastically tick off an extended list of exotic-sounding places or foreign nations.[25] These lists appear throughout the corpus, and they often appear in the context of a dialogue involving a *miles gloriosus* and another character; frequently they involve wordplay based on the names. In *Capt.* 159-163 Hegio lists for Ergasilus the proper conscripts required for an *edendi exercitus*. The names of these conscripts are Latinized versions of native Italian tribes, and the puns based on them are possible only in Latin:

HEG. multis et multigeneribus opus est tibi
militibus: primumdum opus est Pistorensibus;
eorum sunt aliquot genera Pistorensium:
opus Paniceis est, opus Placentinis quoque;
opus Turdetanis, opust Ficedulensibus.

HEG. You need many and manifold soldiers:
first you need Pistoreans;
there are several types of these Pistoreans:
you need Panicians, and Placentinians too;
you need Turdetanians, and Ficedulians.

I will discuss this passage in greater depth presently (section II. G), but for now it is enough to recognize that this list cannot have stood in the Greek original and must therefore be original with Plautus. It involves the names of Italian nations that would have been hopelessly obscure to a Greek audience, and these names, which suggest to the Latin ear *pistor*, *panis*, *placenta*, *turdus*, and *ficus* (and *edulia*), have no such resonance in Greek.

We also have evidence that even when a list may go back to the Greek model, Plautus chose to retain it in his version, and his intention in doing so seems to be for the

[25] E.g. *Men.* 235ff, *Merc.* 646-7, *Curc.* 537-52. I will discuss the last of these at length below.

purpose of wordplay on the Latinized form of the name or names. To his model for the *Menaechmi* Plautus added a pair of puns on the *–damn-* element of Epidamnus, since to the Latin ear the word suggests a connection with *damnum*, "loss".[26] The first of these occurs in Messenio's diatribe against the people of Epidamnus (258-264):

> **MESS.** nam ita est haec hominum natio: in Epidamnieis
> voluptarii atque potatores maxumi;
> tum sucopantae et palpatores plurumi
> in urbe hac habitant; tum meretrices mulieres
> nusquam perhibentur blandiores gentium.
> propterea huic urbi nomen *Epidamno* inditumst,
> quia nemo ferme huc sine *damno* devortitur.[27]
>
> **MESS.** For this nation of people is like that: among the Epidamnians are
> the most extreme pleasure lovers and drunkards;
> then a huge number of swindlers and wheedlers
> live in this city; then there are the prostitutes,
> reputedly more flattering than anywhere on earth.
> That's why the name Epidamnus has been given to this city,
> because almost no one stays here without paying damages.

And since Plautus often repeats a good joke, Menaechmus picks up the pun and repeats it (265-267):

> **MEN.** Ego istuc cavebo. cedo dum huc mihi marsuppium.
> **MESS.** Quid eo vis? **MEN.** Iam aps te metuo de verbis tuis.
> **MESS.** Quid metuis? **MEN.** Ne mihi *damnum* in *Epidamno* duis.
>
> **MEN.** I'll be careful of what you say. Give me the moneybag.

---

[26] Cf. with the present passage the wordplay at *Bacch.* 284-5 on the *–dem-* element shared by the Greek name *Archidemides* and the Latin participle *dempturum*, treated in Chapter IV. D. below.

[27] The language and phrasing of the last two lines in which the wordplay is contained are remarkably similar to that of the formula used by the Plautine parasite to introduce himself (discussed above):

(*Men.* 263-4): propterea...nomen Epidamno inditumst / quia...damno...
(*Capt.* 69-70): ...nomen indidit Scorto mihi / eo quia invocatus...
(*Men.* 77-8): ...nomen fecit Peniculo mihi / ideo quia mensam...

> **MESS.** What do you want with it? **MEN.** Now I'm afraid of you, because of your words.
> **MESS.** What are you afraid of? **MEN.** That you'll make me incur damages in Epidamnus.

To a Roman audience the wordplay between *Epidamnus* and *damnum* was as much ominous as funny; we should envision this popular etymologizing of local names to be as much a part of everyday Roman superstition as of humorous intent; indeed, the story is twice told of the Romans' renaming of the Samnite *Malventum* to the more auspicious-sounding *Beneventum.*[28]

Beyond mere popular association, Plautus developed into an art form punning on the Latinized form of the name of a foreign place. When these puns act as sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays, delivery was largely responsible for conveying the meaning. Since these puns are only rarely made as explicitly in the text as, e.g., the pun on *Epidamnum* and *damnum* is, scholars have frequently missed them.[29] An excellent example comes in the *Pers.* 783-4, where there is a remarkably sophisticated double *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play on the name *Persa.*[30] Dordalus soliloquizes on his misfortune at having been tricked by Toxilus in these words (777-8; 782-84):

---

[28] Velleius Paterculus 1. 14 and Festus p. 25L.

[29] A notable exception is found in Brinkhoff p. 85, following Gurlitt, who in a brief comment records as an example of the *Schijn-ambiguum Pseud.* 77: *genu' nostrum semper siccoculum fuit,* "our family always has been dry-eyed," suggesting that *genu' siccoculum* is a play on *genus Siculum.* This seems right to me, since jokes about Sicily evidently had some special significance (cf. *sicilicissat* in *Men.* 12; the Sicilian *logei* in *Pers.* 394-5; and the pun in *Capt.* 888 *at Siculus non est, Boius est: Boiam terit.*

The joke in *Pseud.* 77 would be much improved by understanding it as *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* with an accompanying gesture (Pseudolus perhaps rubbing his eyes as he raises his voice to insert the middle syllable?): *genu' nostrum semper sic—coc—ulum fuit.*

[30] By a "double" *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* I refer not just to the wordplay on *personas* (which has been generally recognized) but also to the play on *perdant,* which has eluded comment, but which seems just as certainly a part of the wordplay. With the adaptation of a curse for the sake of a

> **DOR.** Qui sunt, qui erunt quique fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac,
> solus ego omnibus antideo facile, miserrumus hominum ut vivam.
> ...
> vehiclum argenti miser eieci, amisi, neque quam ob rem eieci, habeo.
> qui illum *Persam* atque omnis *Persas* atque etiam omnis *pers—on—as*!
> male di omnes *per—d—ant*...
>
> **D.** Of all those who are, who will be, and who were, and who are going to be afterward—I alone beat them all, I, the most miserable man alive.
> ...
> I pathetically threw out and lost a boatload of cash, and I don't have anything to show for it! May that Persian, and all Persians, and even all pers—ons somehow per—ish at the hands of the gods...

Here the comic assonance is enhanced by rhetorical flourish: Dordalus prepares for the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* on the word *personas* in v. 783 (which is expressed in a tricolon crescendo) with the quadruple comparison crescendo (*qui sunt, qui erunt, qui fuerunt, qui futuri sunt*) that opens the monologue; the addition of the intermediary syllable *–on-* to *personas* in the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* surprises the audience: for, in filling out his tricon (*qui illum Persam atque omnis Persas atque etiam omnis*...) what word could Dordalus have said to top *omnis Persas*?[31] And yet, following this *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, he does not stop: his very next sentence, *male di omnes per—dant!* is another spectacular surprise turn for *per—sas*, and adds the fourth element in his Persian wordplay to correspond with the four generations of people whose misery he surpasses, perhaps

---

wordplay, cf. *Rud.* 1225, *Hercules istum infelicet* "Hercules damn him!," involving a wordplay on *licet* with a difference in vowel quantity as well.

Here, as there, Plautus' choice of the word *perdere*, the subjunctive mood, and the third person singular form have all been employed in order to bring the verb's inflection (*perdat*) as close as possible in sound to *Persam* and *Persas*. Though it is generally idle to speculate on the lost remains of the Greek original, we might suppose Plautus to have been inspired here by a wordplay in Greek on *πέρθω*, aorist *ἔπερσον*, since this wordplay is possible in Greek as well as Latin.

[31] A superlative adjective might have been expected, and *pessumos* would be the obvious choice. Cf. the wordplay just before the present lines in v. 740: ***DORD.*** *Ei, Persa me pessum dedit.* "Ah, the Persian sent me down the tubes!"

lisping on this last word *perdant* as *per/th/ant* in order to bring the sound more in line with *persas* and *personas* (or *per/th/as*, *per/th/onas*, if those two words are lisped as well).

II. E.: Foreign Names and Forensic Speech

We might expect to find a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on the name *Poenus* in the *Poenulus*, but there does not seem to be any such case. We do, however, find one in the *Casina*. Toward the end of his speech[32], Prologus explains that there will be a wedding between slaves. Since the phenomenon is unheard of in Rome, he says, he is afraid that the audience will not believe him. He quotes an imaginary skeptic, and then meets the objection in these words (68-72):

> **PROLOGVS** "Quaeso hercle, quid istuc est? serviles nuptiae?
> Servin uxorem ducent aut poscent sibi?
> Novom attulerunt, quod fit nusquam gentium."
> At ego aio id fieri in Graecia et Carthagini
> Et hic in nostra terra, in Apulia:
>
> **PROLOGUS** "Excuse me, what is that you say? Slave marriages?
> He's saying that slaves can get married?
> It's a strange thing, it doesn't happen anywhere on Earth!"
> But I tell you it does happen, in Greece and Carthage,
> And here in our land, in Apulia!

In order to prove his point and earn their trust, Prologus offers the spectators a proposition: He'll bet anyone who wishes a jug of wine, if it can be proved that he's not telling the truth. Scholars have rightly understood that Prologus' bet in the following lines is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* (75-6):

> Id ni fit, mecum pignus, si quis uolt, dato
> In urnam mulsi – Poenus dum iudex siet.

[32] At least part of the *Casina* prologue is manifestly post-Plautine. I do not propose to take up here the interesting and extensive questions of authenticity over any given line, but only to discuss and clarify some of the jokes in this section.

If that's not the case, if anyone wants to, he shalt bet me 75
a jug of wine – provided that the judge is a Carthaginian!

A clause of proviso added onto the end of a sentence lends itself naturally to a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke, since by delaying it to the end Prologus deceitfully adds a condition to a deal that has already been closed. But the joke is probably better even than this. The joke appears to be more specifically tied to the word *Poenus*, and thus v. 76 is an example of a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.[33] We can see this by looking more closely at Prologus' choice of phrasing and its linguistic context.

The couplet uses legal terminology and patterns.[34] *Si quis volt* sets up the vague condition, and *dato*, the archaic 3rd person imperative, is properly at home in the sphere

---

[33] *Poenus* was normally pronounced *punus* in Plautus; cf. Anderson pp. 294-9, and Chapter I. D. d. 1. above. In the present passage the manuscripts agree in reading *poenus*, which may signify that the archaic pronunciation is deliberately intended, as is the archaic 3rd person imperative. If so, this undoubtedly assisted the wordplay with *poena*, which was always pronounced in Latin with the diphthong.

[34] This way of expressing a bet as *ni..pignus dare in aliquid* recurs several times in Plautus.

Epid. 699-701: **EP.** ...vel da pignus, ni ea sit filia.
PER. Quam negat novisse mater? **EP.** Ni ergo matris filia est,
in meum nummum, in tuom talentum pignus da.

E....or bet me that she's not her daughter.
P. Whom her mother say she doesn't know? **E.** So if she's not her
Mother's daughter, bet me a coin to your talent.

Pers. 186: **PAEG.** Da hercle pignus, ni omnia memini et scio...

P. Bet me that I don't know and remember everything...

Poen. 1243: **AGOR.** Da pignus, ni nunc perieres, in savium, uter utri det.

A. Bet me a kiss, one apiece, if you aren't finished now.

Truc. 276: **TRVC.** pignus da ni ligneae haec sunt quas habes Victorias.

T. Bet me that these aren't wooden victories that you have.

of technical legal terminology.[35] Prologus' expression of the condition is parallel to phrasing familiar from the remnants of the Twelve Tables.[36]

> Si in ius vocat, <*ito*>. ni it, *antestamino*. igitur em *capito*. (I. 1)
>
> If plaintiff summons defendant to court, he shalt go. If he does not go, plaintiff shalt call witness thereto. Then only shall he take defendant by force.
>
> Adsiduo vindex adsiduus *esto*. Proletario [iam civi cui] quis volet vindex *esto*. (I. 4)

It is to be noticed, however, that all of these examples conform to "Bet me that x is not the case...". The instance in the *Casina*, however, is different, since it blends both the formal bet *id ni fit, mecum pignus (dato) in urnam mulsi* with the "legal" imperative of the third person expression of *si quis volt, dato* reinforced by the *dum* clause and its reference to the *iudex* (and, as is argued here, the implicit play on *poena*).

[35] Future *second* person imperatives such as *dato* are of course ubiquitious in Plautus, but the *third* person use (often identical in form) is extremely rare. Lindsay (*Syntax of Plautus*) does not deal with the legal imperative, and by my count the only parallel in all of Plautus is in *Men.* 52:

> **PROLOGVS** nunc in Epidamnum pedibus redeundum est mihi,
> ut hanc rem vobis examussim disputem. 50
> si quis quid vestrum Epidamnum curari sibi
> velit, audacter *imperato et dicito*,
> —sed ita ut det unde curari id possit sibi.
> nam nisi qui argentum dederit, nugas egerit;
> qui dederit—magis maiores nugas egerit. 55
>
> **PROLOGUS** Now I have to go back to Epidamnus on foot,
> So that I can explain this thing to you all exactly. 50
> If any of you would like anything taken care of there,
> He shalt give me the command and speak up boldly!
> —so long as he gives me the wherewithal to do it!
> For if he doesn't give me the cash, he's a fool;
> And he who does—is even more of a fool! 55

The parallelism in both situation and phrasing between this passage and the *Casina* prologue is remarkable. Here as there it is the Prologus speaking, who, standing outside of the plot, jokes with the spectators in a grandiose way, and here he twice employs a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke (the second of these jokes, that in v. 55, is used again in a prologue speech in v. 82 of the *Poenulus*.)

As the legal imperative is used in a specific condition here where classical Latin would have used a jussive subjunctive, the phrasing seems to have a more authoritative point: "If anyone wishes, he shalt...".

[36] Text, numeration, and translation (slightly modified) are given according to the edition of Warmington.

> For landowner, landowner shalt be protector; for proletarian person let any one who shall be willing be protector.
>
> Manu fustive si os fregit <collisitve> libero, CCC, si servo, CL *poenam* subito [sestertiorum]. Si iniuriam [alteri] faxsit, XXV [aeris] *poenae* sunto. (VIII. 3-4)
>
> If he has broken or bruised freeman's bone with hand or club, he shalt undergo penalty of 300 pieces; if slave's, 150. If he has done simple harm [to another], penalties shalt be 25 pieces.

A "legal" pattern of expression can be discerned in the Tables' phrasing that is remarkably parallel to the expression in our lines from the *Casina*: first, a condition is introduced, which is then followed by third-person imperatives in the apodosis, and, as in Table VIII. 3, the penalty is expressed with the word *poena*. In light of this, we should probably understand then Prologus' lines as (75-6):

> Id ni fit, mecum pignus, si quis volt, dato 75
> in urnam mulsi, Poen—us dum iudex siet!
>
> If that's not the case, if anyone wants, he shalt bet me
> a jug of wine, on Pun—ic terms, of course!

Although not a rare phenomenon in Plautus, the prolepsis of the word *Poenus* outside of the *dum* clause appears to be a direct manipulation of word order, and so has special point here. Given the legalistic phrasing that Prologus has used, the audience had reason to expect his next word to be some form of *poena* or *poenam*, "on penalty of" or "on punishment of," based on the various inflections of *poena* found in Table VIII. 3. So with an archaic pronunciation and a dramatic pause midway through *Poenus*, Prologus defeats the audience's expectation with a slur against Carthaginians.

The presence in Plautus of wordplay between Roman legal or quasi-legalistic formulae and proper names can be paralleled by the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play in *Men.* 1077, *hunc ego esse ego aio Me—naecmum*, "I assert that this man is

my—naechmus." In a parody of the ritualistic formula for *vindicatio*,[37] the word *me-um* is replaced with *Me-naecmus*. As further corroborating evidence for the wordplay in the *Casina*, we may adduce from *Cist.* 202 the Plautine jingle linking *Poenus* with *poena* in which, as in the *Casina*, the speaker of the prologue (here the goddess Auxilium) affects an archaic tone with the word *perduelles* and the archaic pronunciation of *Poeni* as she directly addresses the audience (201-2):

> **AVX.** perdite perduelles, parite laudem et lauream,
> ut vobis victi *Poeni poenas* sufferant.
>
> **AUX.** Vanquish ye thy foes, beget ye praise and laurels,
> that ye may punish the Punics!

The pun in *Pseud.* 229, in which Ballio threatens Phoenicium, has a similar jingling sound:

> **BALL.** Cras, *Poenicium, poeniceo* corio invises pergulam.
>
> **BALL.** Tomorrow, Phoenicium, you will head to the brothel with a red hide!

II. F.: Lists of Place Names and Food Puns

Let us now return for a more thorough analysis to *Capt.* 160-3, which we examined only cursorily above. Here Hegio puns on the names of Italian places and similar-sounding Latin words for different types of food. The puns in these lines combine two separate and characteristically Plautine techniques: the first, of providing an extended list of names of places; and the second, of punning in Latin on proper

[37] On this play see Gratwick 1993 ad loc. and earlier Gratwick 1973b, discussed briefly in Chapter I. C. For the phrasing of the *vindicatio* formula, cf. Gaius 4.16.

names.[38] Scholars have long recognized the puns implied in the names, but they have not commented on how the lines are to be delivered. I propose that they would benefit in a performance from a brief pause mid-word in each case, and that the lines are examples of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.

Let us examine the dramatic context. The dialogue had begun (v. 133) on a pathetic note, but quickly takes on a lighter tone. The parasite raises a lament for his—lack of food. Ergasilus tells Hegio that he sympathizes with the old man over the loss of his son; not merely out of magnanimity, as he reveals, but for a more specific reason: since Philocrates has been away, he explains, the *edendi exercitus* "an eating army" has been disbanded, and the parasite is out of his free meals (133-153). Ergasilus' final words in v. 153—specifically, the curious phrase *edendi exercitus*—quickly turn the scene farcical. The dramatic action is interrupted, and Hegio explains to the parasite that he is not surprised that no one else is interested in maintaining that particular "army" (152-8):

ERG. Eheu, huic illud dolet,
quia nunc remissus est *edendi exercitus.*
HEG. Nullumne interea nactu's, qui posset tibi
remissum quem dixti imperare exercitum?
ERG. Quid credis? fugitant omnes hanc provinciam,[39]
quoi optigerat postquam captust Pilopolemus tuos.
HEG. Non pol mirandum est fugitare hanc provinciam:

ERG. Oh—your words hurt me here [*indicating his belly*],

[38] The puns are roughly equivalent to an English speaker discussing a trip to "Bologna, Turkey, Chile, Frankfurt, and Hamburg." The puns on the names in the lines discussed here, as well as names in the *Captivi* in general, have been favorites among scholars and the literature on them is extensive. Bianco 1999 pp. 3-10, the most recent article to deal with the puns, gives full references to earlier work.

[39] If, like *huic* in v. 152, *hanc* is taken deictically so that Hegio points to Ergasilus' stomach, there is also a Latin pun here on *provinciam* in the two senses "duty" and "province."

because now the eating army has been discharged.
HEG. Haven't you found anyone in the meantime to command
that discharged army? 155
ERG. Could you believe it? Everyone has been steering clear of this province,
after your son Philopolemus, the army's prior commander, was captured.
HEG. I'm not surprised that they're steering clear of this province:

Hegio's final line (v. 158) serves as preparation for the puns on the names of the soldiers. The lines containing these jokes are here punctuated with the dash to illustrate how they are improved by a slight pause in breath mid-word in each case (159-63):

HEG. multis et multigeneribus opus est tibi
militibus: primumdum opus est Pistor—ens—ibus; 160
eorum sunt aliquot genera Pistorensium:
opus Pan—iceis est, opus Placenti—nis quoque;
opus Turd—etanis, opust Ficedul—ensibus.[40]

HEG. you need many and manifold soldiers:
first you need Pistoreans; 160
there are several types of these Pistoreans:
you need Panicians, and Placentinians too;
you need Turdetanians, and Ficedulians.

In each case the audience's expectation is defeated mid-word, since Ergasilus' *edendi exercitus* should have led the audience to anticipate that Hegio would discuss foods. By interpolating a syllable midway through his first word, Hegio changes the expected word *pistoribus* "millers"[41] to *Pistor-ens-ibus*, "citizens of Pistoria," a town in Etruria; with its Italian reference, the sudden joke must have surprised the Roman audience watching the "Greek" Hegio. He continues the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes when he next extends the expected word *pan—e* "bread" (the *vox propria* for the product that *pistores*

[40] This last word might be broken up as *Fic—edul—ensibus*, understood as a pun both on *ficus* and *edulia.*

[41] Or "bakers." According to Pliny *H. N.* 18. 11. 28, there were no bakers in Rome in Plautus' lifetime, and instead each Roman made his own bread. Some scholars see this as evidence for the post-Plautinity of v. 161, but *Asin.* 200 *quom a pistore panem petimus* would seem to argue against Pliny and in favor of the authenticity of v. 161. (Havet, however, considers *Asin.* 200 an indication that the *Asinaria* is not Plautine.)

make) into another ethnicity, *Pan-iceis*.[42] Similarly the word *Placentinis*, by the addition of the *–in-* element, surprises by taking the place of the expected word *placentis*, "cakes." By pausing after the *turd-* of *Turdetanis* Hegio makes a pun on *turdis*, "thrushes," and the *Turdetani* (a Spanish tribe), and by hesitating mid-word in *Ficedulensibus* he defeats the expectation of *ficedula*, "beccafico."[43]

The quick succession of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* puns on place names and foods here may shed light on a heretofore puzzling passage of the *Curculio*. In vv. 437-452, the parasite narrates a list of places through which he and the soldier have passed through before their arrival in Epidaurus, where the action of the play takes place (437-52):[44]

> **LVC.** ubi ipsus? cur non venit? **CVRC.** Ego dicam tibi:
> quia nudiusquartus venimus in Cariam
> ex India; ibi nunc statuam volt dare auream

---

[42] The exact town referred to is unclear, but if we may judge from the other puns, probably a town either in Italy or Spain (so Lindsay ad loc.).

[43] As with *Paniceis*, it is not known what people is meant. To obviate this Spengel suggested changing the manuscripts to *Fideculensibus* to conform with the *Fideculae* of Valerius Maximus 7. 6, on the assumption that *fideculae*, "lyre strings," might have been the name of a pastry.

[44] The text is presented without aspiration or the vowel *y*; cf. Chapter I. H., "Orthography.".

The setting of the play is unusual, since the action takes place in a residential district of Epidaurus, information withheld from the audience until v. 341 where it is only casually revealed. Leo p. 201, not followed by all scholars, deduced from this that an expository prologue had been lost. Zwierlein 1990 p. 226 thinks that v. 14 *hoc Aesculapi fanum est* "this is the shrine of Aesculapius" was sufficient information for the audience to identify the setting. That may have been true for the original Greek audience, but can we presume such knowledge among Plautus' Roman audience? Usually when the setting of a Plautine play is not explicitly stated at the outset, it turns out to be Athens.

There are further difficulties: Epidaurus is presented as being not far (three days' journey, according to v. 438) from Caria, in Asia Minor, and if the temple of Aesculapius is visible onstage, it must be inside the city, which Leo proclaimed an "impossibility for an Attic play" (201 n. 2). Wilamowitz' solution, approved of and discussed by Leo, was that the scene of the original had been the settlement around the temple and that Curculio was sent to Epidaurus, not Caria, to get the money; Plautus, fearing that this was confusing for his public, altered all of this and invented the city of Caria. Obviously this is all speculative and we can at most say *non liquet*.

solidam faciundam ex auro Pilippo, quae siet
septempedalis, factis monumentum suis.
LVC. Quam ob rem istuc? **CVRC.** Dicam. quia enim *Persas, Paplagones,*
Sinopes, Arabes, Cares, Cretanos, Suros,
Rodiam atque Luciam, Perediam et Perbibesiam,
Centauromaciam et Classiam Vnomammiam,
Libuamque oram omnem Conterebromniam,
dimidiam partem nationum usque omnium
subegit solus intra viginti dies.
LVC. Vah. **CVRC.** Quid mirare? **LVC.** Quia enim in cavea si forent
conclusi, itidem ut pulli gallinacei,
ita non potuere uno anno circumirier.
credo hercle te esse ab illo, *ita nugas blatis.*

LYC. Where is the soldier? Why doesn't he come? **C**. I'll tell you:
Three days ago we came to Caria
from India; he wants a gold statue to be made there now,
solid gold of Philip, seven feet high, a monument to his deeds.
LYC. Why does he want that? **C**. I'll tell you: because the Persians,
Paphlagonians,
Sinopians, Arabs, Carians, Cretans, Syrians,
Rhodes and Lycia, Gobbleland and Guzzleland,
Centaurbattleland and the Isle of the UniBreast,
And the Libyan shore and all of Grapesquashingland
half of all the nations in the world
were subdued by him single handedly, in under 20 days.
LYC. Wow! **C**. What are you surprised for? **LYC**. Because if you closed up all
those nations in a cage just like chickens,
even then you couldn't walk around them in a whole year.
By god, I do believe that you come from him, you talk such nonsense.

The parasite offers an exotic list of places and nations that his soldier has just subdued in the preceding twenty days. While the first nations that he names are real enough (*Persae*, *Paplagones*, *Sinopes*, *Arabes*, *Cares*, *Cretani*, *Suri*, *Rodia*, *Lucia*), the parasite changes midway through his list to names of fantastical places: *Peredia* "Gobbleland," *Perbibesia* "Guzzleland," *Centauromacia* "Centaurbattleland," *Classia Vnomammia* "The Isle of the Uni-Breast," and *Conterobromnia* "Grapesquashingland." Curculio's intent in giving the list here is humor through bombast, usually the province of the soldier

in the palliata. Yet there are several oddities here that invite suspicion that something more is implicit in these lines than just a bombastic list for its own sake.

The concerns are both literary and linguistic. Literary, that amid the names of these fantasy lands appears the name of Libya, a real place set among the fantastical; neither artistic nor humorous reason accounts for its presence here.[45] While this is puzzling, it is not in itself sufficient to warrant serious concern; but the linguistic oddities demand further explanation. The forms of the names that Curculio gives are all highly unusual. The words *Sinopes*, *Cretanos*, and *Rhodiam* are all irregular formations: the nominative plural form *Sinopes* is the plural of the name of *Sinope*, the Greek colony situated on the Black Sea. Commentators[46] explain the form as equivalent to *Sinopenses*, "residents of Sinope," but this is strange Latin, equivalent to our saying, e.g., "Italies" instead of "Italians." The adjective *Cretanus* that Curculio uses is elsewhere unattested in Latin; it is a unique replacement for *Cretenses*. If the form *Rodia*, which seems to be modeled on local designations such as *Ind-ia* or *Car-ia*, refers to the island Rhodes, it is ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in Latin for what is normally called *R(h)odos* or *R(h)odus*.[47] Lyco's response in vv. 449-52, which amounts to "bah! you're talking nonsense," might simply indicate that the last names in the list taper off into made-up places, but it may more specifically indicate a joke. In listing off the names of the real places, Curculio is reminded of how much they sound like different types of food; this effects and explains his change from the names of real places to that of the fantastic *Peredia* and *Perbibesia*.

---

[45] Leo consequently daggered *Libyamque* in his text, at a loss to account for its presence.

[46] As does Ussing ad loc.

[47] An alternative suggestion (cf. OLD s.v. *Caria*) is that Rhodia designates an otherwise unknown town in Lycia, but this is mere speculation.

In the list in the *Captivi*, the scene features a parasite obsessed with food,[48] and one so fixated on food that he prompts a series of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays based on (real) place names that bring to mind various foods. In Plautus, the parasite's hunger is an eternal condition,[49] and there is evidence elsewhere that the parasite hears words as they want: as the list of names in the *Captivi* plays with Ergasilus' expectations of food, so too in *Men.* 141 it seems clear that the parasite Peniculus misunderstands *luculentum* ("splendid") as *lucuntulum* ("tyropita")[50].

In other lists of names of places given by Plautine characters where no parasites are involved, we find neither linguistic oddities such as those in Curculio's list, nor any probable wordplay inherent in the names. When Messenio gives a detailed list of the voyages that he and Sosicles have undertaken in *Men.* 235-8, the names seem to be given merely for their exotic sound:

> **MES.** Histros, Hispanos, Massiliensis, Hilurios, 235
> mare superum omne Graeciamque exoticam
> orasque Italicas omnis, qua adgreditur mare,
> sumus circumvecti.
>
> **MES.** The Histrians, Spaniards, Massilians, Illyrians, 235
> the whole Adriatic and Magna Graecia
> and all the Italian shores that the sea touches,
> we have gone around.

Likewise, when Charinus plans his love-induced exile in *Merc.* 646-7, no wordplays seem probable:

---

[48] Ergasilus' opening monologue is an exposition of the professional difficulties of being a parasite.

[49] Cf. Damon pp. 45ff. Of all of Plautus' parasites, the appetite of Curculio and his obsession with food may be the most voracious.

[50] Cf. Chapter I. E. a, "*schijn-ambiguum*".

CAR. sed quam capiam civitatem cogito potissumum:
Megares, Eretriam, Corintum, Calcidem, Cretam, Cuprum,
Sicuonem, Cnidum, Zacuntum, Lesbiam, Boeotiam. 645

CAR. But I'm thinking of what city in particular I should choose:
Megara, Eretria, Corinth, Chalcis, Crete, Cyprus,
Sicyon, Cnidus, Zacynthus, Lesbia, Boeotia. 645

Unlike the characters who provide the lists that appear in these two passages, however, Curculio is constantly obsessed with food, both in giving his own list (as the strengthened *per-* elements of both *Peredia* and *Perbibesia* attest) and at two points earlier in the play the parasite either hears or gives a tantalizing list of foods. The first appears in vv. 321-5:

PAL. Immo si scias, reliquiae quae sint! **CVRC**. Scire nimis lubet
ubi sient, nam illis conventis sane opus est meis dentibus.
PAE. *Pernam*, abdomen, *sumen sueris*, *glandium*–**CVRC**. Ain tu omnia haec?
in *carnario* fortasse dicis. **PAE**. Immo in lancibus,
quae tibi sunt parata, postquam scimus venturum. 325

PAL. Oh, if you only knew what leftovers there are! **C**. I'm dying to know where they are, for they really need to meet—my teeth.
PH. *Ham, tripe, sow's udder, sweetbreads*— **C**. All that, eh?
Maybe in the *pantry*, you mean. **PH**. No, no, on platters
that were prepared for you after we found out that you were coming.

The second occurs just afterward, in vv. 366-9:

CVRC. Atque aliquid prius obstrudamus, *pernam*, *sumen*, *glandium*,
haec sunt ventris stabilimenta, pane et assa bubula,
poculum grande, aula magna, ut satis consilia suppetant.
tu tabellas consignato; hic ministrabit; ego — edam.[51]

C. And let's push something down first, *ham, sow's udder, sweetbreads*. These are the nourishments of the stomach, bread and roast beef, a big cup, a large crock, so that we may have clear plans.
You sign the letter, he'll wait on us, and I'll — get started eating!

Particularly significant among the foods that Curculio names here are those that occur twice: namely, *pernam* "ham," which appears in v. 323 and v. 366, and *sumen* "sow's

[51] Vv. 367-8 are deleted, possibly rightly, by Guyet, who has been followed by Zwierlein 1990 p. 250-1; the latter attributes them to a later reviser. This does not, however, affect v. 366, which lists the foods under question.

udder," in v. 323 and v. 366. Curculio's mention of the *carnario*, "larder," is also pointed, since it suggests by its sound *caro*, "meat". Thus the parasite seems to name his favorite foods, and these three terms—*per-na*, *su-men*, *car-o*—are the very sounds that Curculio suggests in naming three of the nations on his list—*Per-sas*, *Su-ros*, *Car-es*.

I do not propose that Plautus intended his audience to make a direct connection specifically among Curculio's three lists; that expects too much from an audience watching a play. But an audience familiar with Plautine parasites knew that foods such as those named by Curculio (and particularly meat, which seems to have been expensive) were perpetually on the mind of a parasite; thus it is easy to imagine that Curculio was thinking of them in narrating his travels. Let us again examine the list, now punctuating the name of each nationality as sophisticated παρὰ προσδοκίαν jokes (442-4, 446):

> **LVC.** Quam ob rem istuc? **CVRC.** Dicam: quia enim Per—sas, Pa—pl—agones,
> Sin—o—pes, Arabes, Car—es, Creta—nos, Su—ros,
> Rod—iam atque Luc—iam, Perediam et Perbibesiam...
> ...
> Lib—uamque oram omnem Conterebromniam...

With the proper delivery and gesticulation on the actor's part, the audience would have understood each of these names to be παρὰ προσδοκίαν puns on the following foods: *Persas*[52] "Persians" plays on the word *pernam* "ham" (or the plural *pernas*), the very food that Curculio had craved earlier in the play; *paplagones* "Paphlagonians" seems to the parasite to sound like the Greek *pamp(h)agos*, "all-devouring, eating everything."[53] In the word *Sinopes* "Sinopians" the parasite hears *sinapi*, "mustard," an unappetizing

---

[52] Cf. below the Plautine wordplay on the word *Persas* (*personas, perdant*) in *Pers.* 782.

[53] The Greek word *pamphagus* is not attested in Latin until Ovid, but may have been readily intelligible to the audience from its constituent parts: the root *pam-* "all" appears in the names *Pamphilus* and *Pamphilippus* (*Stich.*), and the root *phag-* "eating" appears in the compound word *pultiphagus* (*Most.* 828) and *pultiphagonides* (*Poen.* 54).

food in Plautine drama.[54] As Curculio had earlier mentioned the *carnarium* "larder," *Cares* "Carians" seems to suggest *caro*[55] "meat" or perhaps the plural *carnes* "meats," since the word occurs frequently in the plural. Likewise *Suros* "Syrians" perhaps suggests *sues* "pigs"[56], or, more likely, *sumen* "sow's udder," the Roman delicacy with which Curculio had been tempted earlier (vv. 323, 366). We can envision the parasite drooling over these place names as he pronounces each one; etymologically the names have nothing to do with food[57], but they apparently sound close enough either to his dream food (e.g. *perna*) or to his regular fare (*sinapi*) that he pauses longingly over each name in the delivery; he drags out the pronunciation of *Persas* lovingly, and spits out *Sinopes* in dejection; he rubs his belly at *Rodiam* and *Luciam* and his voice rises at *Perediam* et *Perbibesiam.*

The names *Rodia* and *Lucia* in v. 444 are used to effect the transition from the foregoing names of actual nations to the fantastical *Peredia* (from *peredere* "to eat up") and *Perbibesia* (from *perbibere* "to drink up"). Thus the two seem to suggest respectively *rodere*[58] "to gnaw," and *lucuns*,[59] a kind of pastry. Likewise *Libua* in v. 446,

---

[54] Cf. *Truc.* 315-6: Si ecastor hic homo *sinapi* victitet, non censeam 315
tam esse tristem posse!

By god, if this man lived on mustard I don't think
He could be so sad!

(cf. also *Pseud.* 817ff.).

[55] The reference in *Cretanos* is unclear but perhaps suggests the Doric Greek κρῆς "meat" (Attic κρέας) if that word were used in the southern Italian Greek-speaking areas; alternatively it may suggest the Latin *crustella*, or perhaps *creterra* "crater," a word used by Naevius (fr. Trag. 42R).

[56] There may be a play between *sues* and *Surorum* in *Trin.* 540-2.

[57] Maltby 1991 collects the ancient etymologies for most of these names.

a real name that anomalously appears among the names of fantastical places, may be explained by understanding in it a reference to *liba*, "cakes."[60]

---

[58] Cf. Ergasilus' monologue in the *Captivi* on the life of the parasite, saying (77): *quasi mures semper edimus alienum cibum.* "Like mice, we're always eating someone else's food." The parasite Saturio's similar speech in *Pers.* 55-9 produces the line (59): *quasi mures semper edere alienum cibum...* "(sc. my ancestors, parasites all) like mice always ate someone else's food..." The imagery of both of these suggests that *rodere* "to gnaw" is the proper behavior for a parasite who is, by his own admission, a rodent.

[59] *Lucia* would then sound something like "Cakeland," in Latin, an excellent transition to *Peredia.*

Alternatively, the initial of *Luc-* of *Lucia* may suggest *lig-* in *ligurrire* "to lick, daintily feed upon," since the two phonemes *lic-* and *luc-* were not widely differentiated, and *ligurrire* is the *vox propria* for a Plautine parasite. From the monologue of Ergasilus (quoted in part in the previous note), the parasite continues (*Capt.* 82-4):

> **E.** item parasiti rebus prolatis latent
> in occulto miseri, victitant suco suo,
> dum ruri rurant homines quos *ligurriant.*
>
> **E.** Likewise, at vacation time parasites hide
> miserably in the dark; they live on their own juices,
> while the people whom they daintily lick are countrying in the country.

[60] The skeptic unfamiliar with Latin methods of wordplay and etymology might object that the likeness of the words that constitute these wordplays rests in only one or two letters common to each. But this is standard for Latin wordplay, and for etymologizing in particular; Varro (incorrectly) derived the name of our parasite, *Curculio* "weevil," ultimately from *guttur* "throat," a similarity of only a single letter . (cf. Servius *ad Georg.* 1. 186).

The list of gastronomic wordplays made by Ergasilus in the *Captivi*, himself a parasite, demonstrates how little similarity between words Plautus required to make a wordplay, especially where food is concerned. In the following example particularly noteworthy are the play on *pernis / pestis*, which rests on a play of less than one full syllable and the plays on *callo / calamitas* and *laniis / lassitudo*, which involve a difference of syllable length (903-8):

> **ERG.** quanta pernis pestis veniet, quanta labes larido
> quanta sumini apsumedo, quanta callo calamitas,
> quanta laniis lassitudo, quanta porcinariis! 905
> ...
> Et quae pendent indemnatae pernae, is auxilium ut feram.
>
> **ERG.** What a plague will hit the ham, what destruction for bacon,
> What trouble for the udder, what misery for the pork,
> What sluggishness for the butchers, the pigsters! 905
> ...
> I will succor the untried hanging hams!

As further evidence that there the parasite's list of place names rests on extended wordplay, we may emphasize that Curculio is a character particularly fond of verbal misunderstandings. Thus not only does he make wordplays between his fictitious name *Summanus* and *summano* as we saw earlier (section II. C), he also plays on the grammatical ambiguity inherent in the word *ventum*, both as participle from *venire* "to come" and as the noun *ventus*, "wind," a wordplay which I have not managed to capture in the translation (314-316):

> **PAL.** Vae capiti tuo. **CVRC.** Obsecro hercle, *facite ventum ut gaudeam.*
> **PAL.** Maxume. **CVRC.** Quid facitis, quaeso? **PAL.** *Ventum.*
> **CVRC.** Nolo equidem mihi 315
> fieri *ventulum.* **PAED.** Quid igitur vis? **CVRC.** *Esse, ut ventum gaudeam.*
>
> **PAL.** Damn you! **C.** Please, make me happy that I've come back.
> **PAL.** Certainly. (*fanning him*) **C.** What are you doing? **PAL.** Making wind.
> **C.** I don't want that air to be made! **PHAED.** So what do you want?
> **C.** To eat, so that I'm glad I came back!

Curculio's tendency toward constant wordplay, coupled with his parasitical appetite, makes it likely that in performance the parasite delivered the list of places in vv. 442-6 with appropriate gestures and dramatic pauses as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes, making the list much funnier than the bare text would otherwise lead us to believe.

II. G.: Wordplays on the Names of Gods and Goddesses

II. G. a.: Venus

Plautus often plays on the names of gods and goddesses, instances of which may be found in all of his plays. Some of these rely on semantic meaning or context alone, not on a specific verbal play, as this exchange from *Casina* demonstrates, in which

Lysidamus and Cleostrata are referred to as Jupiter and Juno by their respective slaves (406-8):

> **CLE.** Quid tibi istunc tactio est? **OL.** Quia Iuppiter iussit meus.
> **CLE.** Feri malam, ut ille, rursum. **OL.** Perii! pugnis caedor, Iuppiter.
> **LV.** Quid tibi tactio hunc fuit? **CA.** Quia iussit haec Iuno mea.
>
> **CLE.** Why are you touching him? **OL.** Because my Jupiter (*indicating Lysidamus*) ordered me to. **CLE.** Strike his cheek in turn! **OL.** I'm done for: I'm being cut down with fists, Jupiter! **LY.** Why are you touching him? **CA.** Because my Juno (*indicating Cleostrata*) ordered me to.

The humor here involves the identification of master and mistress as god and goddess to their slaves. As the joke relies not on diction peculiar to Latin but rather on the situation, it may go back to the Diphilean original; nothing in the joke is specifically dependent on Latin, and nothing is present here that would have been impossible in Greek.

In the Plautine corpus, however, there are many wordplays involving the names of Roman gods that do require expression in Latin; they would be impossible in Greek. These wordplays must necessarily be original with Plautus; nothing was apparently too sacrosanct for the Roman poet, as lines such as *Curc.* 71-4 demonstrate:

> **PAED.** Nunc ara Veneris haec est ante horunc fores;
> me inferre Veneri vovi ieientaculum.
> **PAL.** Quid? tu te pones Veneri ieientaculo?
> **PAED.** Me, te atque hosce omnis. **PAL.** Tum tu *Venerem vomere vis.*
>
> **PHAED.** Now this is the altar of Venus here in front of these doors;
> I vowed that I would bring Venus breakfast myself.
> **PAL.** What? You're giving yourself to Venus for breakfast?
> **PH.** Me, you and all these people! **PAL.** You must want Venus to vomit!

The wordplay in v. 74 between *Venerem* and *vomere* is based on sound alone. Plautus' rationale here is detectable: the poet chose the accusative inflection of the goddess' name, *Venerem*, specifically for the *–m* ending in order to match the name as closely as possible with the infinitive *vomere*, in which the *–m-* is an integral part of the verb. But

besides simple wordplays based on sound alone such as these, there are several sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays made on the proper names of gods and goddesses that have thus far escaped comment from scholars. One such wordplay which occurs in *Rud.* 1341 will become clear when we have first considered Plautus' fondness for wordplays made on the name Venus in its oblique inflections. This penchant provided an endless source of linguistic fun for the poet, as did his customary technique of placing in close vicinity, often directly abutting, the inflected form of the goddess' name and a verb form. Thus he created a jingly effect, as in the following instances: *Venerem...eveniant* (*Cas.* 617-8); *Venerem venerabor* (*Poen.* 277-8); *Veneris venimus* (*Poen.* 319); *Venere si veniant* (*Poen.* 321); *venerant Venerem* (*Poen.* 1180-1); *Veneri velle* (*Rud.* 60, perhaps with a lisped confusion of /l/ and /r/?); *Veneris fanum venio* (*Rud.* 94); *Venerem hanc veneremur* (*Rud.* 305).

These last three examples show that Plautus was especially at pains to emphasize puns on Venus' name in the *Rudens*. With that in mind, let us now turn to *Rud.* 1333-41. For purposes that advance the action, an altar of Venus has been visible onstage thoughout the play. In this scene the fisherman Gripus instructs the pimp Labrax to swear an oath *per Venerem* "by Venus;" Labrax accordingly places his hand on the altar while pronouncing his oath. The setup serves in part to introduce a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play on the goddess' name at v. 1341. Here are lines 1333-1341, with *pervenerit* in v. 1341 here punctuated to reflect a sophisticated wordplay *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*:

GRIP. Tange aram hanc *Veneris*. **LABR.** Tango.
G. *Per Venerem* hanc iurandum est tibi. **L.** Quid iurem? **G.** Quod iubebo.
L. Praei verbis quidvis. id quod domi est, numquam ulli supplicabo. 1335
G. Tene aram hanc. **L.** Teneo. **G.** Deiera te mi argentum daturum
eodem die, <tui> viduli ubi sis potitus. **L.** Fiat.
G. *Venus* Curenensis, testem te testor mihi,

si vidulum illum, quem ego in navi perdidi,
cum auro atque argento salvom investigavero 1340
isque in potestatem meam perven—erit...

G. Touch this altar of Venus. **L.** I'm touching it.
G. You must swear this by Venus: **L.** What do I swear? **G.** What I tell you to.
L. Go ahead say anything. I'll never beg help for what I have at home.
G. Keep hold of the altar. **L.** I am. **G.** Swear that you will give me the cash on the same day as you get the knapsack back. **L.** Okay.
G. Venus of Cyrene, I call you to witness for me,
If I find that knapsack that I lost on the ship, with the gold and silver safe and sound
And it arrives back into my possession...

The action of the scene unfolds in the following manner: Labrax has been foiled and is ready to submit, so on Gripus' orders, the pimp touches the altar of Venus (1333), and the fisherman begins to dictate the oath that is to be recited *per Venerem*, "by Venus" (1334). Labrax evidently withdraws his hand; this prompts Gripus to warn, and thereby fix the audience's attention on, the pimp Labrax, telling him this time that he is not merely to "touch," but to *tenere* "hold on" to the altar (1336). His reluctance to hold on to the altar implies that Labrax continues to try to let go of it throughout the scene, presumably to avoid perjuring himself. At the same time, as Gripus proceeds with the main portion of the oath, he repeats the invocation to Venus (1338), and consequently focuses the audience's attention on the name of Venus. Thus, if we have interpreted the action correctly, Plautus' choice of the verb *pervenerit* in v. 1341 is an intentional setup for a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke: as Labrax slides his hand off of the altar momentarily in v. 1341, Gripus sternly raises his voice and pauses midway through the word at *perven—*, as if to remind the pimp of the sanctity of his oath *per Venerem.* The pimp speedily replaces his hand, and so Gripus continues with the verb *pervenerit* that he had intended all along.

The *Truculentus* also contains an unrecognized sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay involving the names of Venus and Lucina, the Roman goddess of birth, and consequently is a certain Plautine addition to the text. A significant portion of the play is devoted to the planning of Phronesium's deception: she will convince the soldier that she became pregnant by him and, in his absence, has since given birth to his child. An extended scene begins at v. 448 in which Phronesium gives orders for taking care of the suppositious child while she unveils the deception. It has not been noticed, however, that she slips up in her speech at v. 476:

> **PRON.** eam nunc malitiam accuratam miles inveniat volo.
> is hic haud multo post, credo, aderit; nunc prius praecaveo sciens
> sumque ornata ita ut aegra videar, quasi puerperio cubem. 475
> date mi huc stactam atque ignem in aram, ut *venerem – Lucinam* meam.
>
> **PHRON.** I'd like the soldier to find that badness taken care of!
> He'll be here soon, I believe; now I'm already on guard
> And I'm outfitted so that I'll look sick, as if I were suffering postpartum sickness.
> Give me some myrrh here and fire on the altar, so that I may venerate my Lucina.

The rare active form of the verb *venerem* in place of the normally deponent *venerer* used in v. 476 betrays the joke.[61] In Plautus, it is usual for *meretrices* to offer sacrifices specifically to Venus.[62] As she describes her plan, the *meretrix* Phronesium becomes too wrapped up in the delusion and loses herself momentarily, slipping back into her usual habit of praying to Venus. Realizing her mistake and seeking to avoid detection, she corrects herself, turning the proper name of Venus into an unusual verb: "*In aram ut Venerem*—(uh, I mean) *Lucinam meam*!...," says Phronesium. In addition to Plautus'

---

[61] The active form occurs in Plautus also at *Bacch.* 173, where a play on the goddess' name is possible but not probable in the context. *Veneror* is also very rarely treated as a passive, as e.g. Horace *Sat.* 2.2.124.

[62] As do the two sisters Anterastilis and Adelphasium in the *Poenulus*.

predilection for wordplays on the name Venus, the joke is entirely in keeping with the malignant characterization of Phronesium throughout the play. She is elsewhere prone to sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* puns dependent both on verbal ambiguity and an attendant gesture in the delivery, as we saw earlier in her wordplay between *paene* and *pene* (v. 518) when greeting the soldier upon his arrival.[63]

II. G. b.: Mars

The name of Mars is punned on in a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke in the *Poenulus*, which may be paralleled by a puzzling passage in the *Truculentus*, where the joke seems to have been repeated. In *Poen.* 594-599, the baliff Collybiscus is equipped with the money that he is to take to the pimp Lycus. The scene features a break in the dramatic illusion as the actors address the audience directly, reminding them that the money being handled onstage is not real. The audience's attention is thus fixed on the money as the dialogue unfolds over these six lines (594-9):

> **AG.** hic trecentos nummos numeratos habet.
> **ADV.** ergo nos inspicere oportet istuc aurum, Agorastocles, 595
> ut sciamus quid dicamus mox pro testimonio.
> **CO.** agite, inspicite. **ADV.** aurum est profecto hic, spectatores, comicum:
> macerato hoc pingues fiunt auro in barbaria boues;
> uerum ad hanc rem agundam Philippum est: ita nos adsimulabimus.

> **AG.** He has the three hundred coins counted out.
> **ADV.** So we should look at that gold of yours, Agorastocles, 595
> So that we'll know what to say presently for our testimony.
> **CO.** Come here, look: **ADV.** There's gold here, spectators—fool's gold:
> Cows in Italy get fat off this gold when it's ground up;
> But for acting this play it's sovereign: that's how we'll play it.

---

[63] Cf. Chapter I. D. d. 2.

Since the characters' lines do not specifically declare it, the absence of stage directions obscures here what we learn later from vv. 782 and 784: the money is here handed to Collybiscus in a *marsuppium*; this is, however, obvious to the audience watching the play, and in our lines here, the actors make a grand production of opening the bag to show the audience the contents. Thus their attention is also fixed on the *marsuppium* itself and the money stowed within.

When moments later the *Advocati* and Lycus exchange pleasantries, Lycus thanks them if they have brought him any good turn (640). They reply that they have no desire to help him, nor want him helped (641-2); to this Lycus responds that he believes them (643). The setup is clear: Lycus expects neither help nor good from the witnesses. Then this exchange follows in vv. 644-5, in which the punctuation of line 645 as *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is my own:

> **LV.** sed quid nunc voltis? **ADV.** hunc clamudatum quem vides,
> ei Mars— iratust. **CO.** capiti vostro istuc quidem! 645.
>
> **LY.** But what do you want now? **ADV.** This guy with the cloak that you see,
> Mars is angry at him! **CO.** May *that* fall on your head! 645

"Mars is angry at him," say the *Advocati.* Their point is abstruse, and commentators who have sought to explain the meaning of the anger have reached various conclusions, none of them satisfactory. Ussing claims that Mars should be rightfully angry at a military man careening into destruction;[64] Maurach says that for some reason the war is no longer paying out enough money for the soldier; this is bad news for the pimp.[65] Maurach's

---

[64] "Mars autem iure iratus dicitur militari homini in perniciem ruenti. Alia de causa *Truc.* 645 Mars Strabacis patri iratus videtur." (p. 325).

[65] "Mars ist ihm ungnädig – wieso, wird nich gesagt; es muß dem Leno (und dem Zuschauer) genügen, daß sich für ihn nun der Krieg nich mehr lohnt (p. 122)."

view seems preferable, since the *Advocati* have just expressly told Lycus that they have no intention of bringing him any good turn. But Maurach's interpretation stops short: it is essential to notice that the phrase *ei Mars iratust* is a sophisticated type of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke that not only defeats, but also reverses, the expectation. The line then makes clear the function of the dramatic setup in vv. 594-599, in which the audience's attention had been focused on Collybiscus' pretend money and the *marsuppium* in which he is carrying it. Plautine pimps are eternally greedy, and at this point, both Lycus and the audience expect the *Advocati* to tell the pimp that Collybiscus has a bulging wallet, a *marsuppium.* The arrangement of words suggests that the dative *ei* referring to Collybiscus will be followed by the nominative *marsuppium*, and that the witnesses will continue *ei mars—uppiumst magnum* (or *plenum, vel sim*), i.e., "he has a huge wallet." Thus the first "half" of the anticipated word—*Mars*—sets up the expectation that Collybiscus will be a prize catch for the pimp, but when the phrase continues to completion, that expectation is frustrated, ending in a phrase equivalent to "this guy is broke." The line, then, not only makes a play on words, it serves to develop the character of the *Advocati* as having a bit of fun at the pimp's expense.[66]

We find support for viewing v. 645 as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke in a scene in the *Truculentus*, in which the same phrase *ei Mars iratust* recurs in a similar context. Strabax, while holding onstage a money-filled *crumina*, delivers a monologue dealing with money and deception. Although the *adulescens* calls it here a *crumina* rather than a *marsuppium*, if these two moneybags can be envisioned as not terribly

[66] This play by the *Advocati* begins a scene filled with jokes that play on the name of the pimp Lycus and his character; the entire scene is discussed in Chapter V. H. b. below.

dissimilar, the same interpretation is probably valid.[67] As Strabax refers to the prop moneybag three separate times (vv. 652, 654, 655), the audience's attention is fixed on it (645-657):

> **STRAB.** Rus mane dudum hinc ire me iussit pater, 645
> ut bubus glandem prandio depromerem.
> post illoc quam veni, advenit, si dis placet,
> ad villam argentum meo qui debebat patri,
> qui ovis Tarentinas erat mercatus de patre.
> quaerit patrem. dico esse in urbe. interrogo, 650

---

[67] Both the words *crumina* and *marsuppium* are used in Plautus to designate a moneybag, but nothing in the text allows us to distinguish them one way or another, and the standard lexica do not provide enough information to make a judgement; Saunders 1909 p. 46 seems to imply a distinction but does not express what that may be, nor offers any evidence.

Support for thinking that the *crumina* and the *marsuppium* were synonymous or nearly so may come from a scene in the *Epidicus*. The eponymous slave delivers a monologue in which he outlines his plan to deceive Periphanes. Following this, Epidicus emerges from the house carrying a bag full of money taken from the *senex*. At v. 345, handing the bag to Stratippocles, the slave says *accipe hoc sis* "take this, please." The pronoun that he uses—neuter in gender—might be taken to refer to a *marsuppium*, though to insist on this would be pedantic. At v. 360 the slave relays the action in the words *ipse in meo collo tuos pater cruminam collocavit*, "your father himself put the moneybag on my shoulder." When Periphanes emerges, however, he complains (v. 511) in the words *meum exenteravit Epidicus marsuppium* "Epidicus disemboweled my moneybag!" where *exenterare*, "disembowel" is humorously metaphorical.

None of this can be decisive in determining whether Plautus routinely used two words for the same bag or the two bags were different types, perhaps in size; arguments in favor of either view can easily be excogitated. Still, the language employed in the *Epidicus* does imply that both *marsuppium* and *crumina* were moneybags similar enough in semantic meaning that one word could be used for the other.

In general jokes about moneybags seem to have been popular, and a schijn-ambiguum joke has been detected in *Epid.* 348-51:

> **EP.** dum tibi ego placeam atque obsequar, meum tergum flocci facio.
> **STR.** Nam quid ita? **EP.** Quia ego tuom patrem faciam – *perenticidam.*
> **STR.** Quid istuc est verbi? **EP.** Nil moror vetera et volgata verba; 350
> *peratum* ductarent: ego follitum ductitabo.

Mendelsohn p. 117: "Epidicus replies...playing in the last word, which is a coinage of the moment, on *parenticidam.* The meaning then is, "I will make your father cut his purse [*pera*] open," so that you may have your fill of money. The play consists in the humorous corruption of *parenticidam*; we must not seek to find a meaning here for that word also." (*Perenticidam* is the emendation of Camerarius; Lindsay and other editors read *parenticidam.*)

Catullus' *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play at 13.7-8 *nam tui Catulli / plenus sacculus est – aranearum* involving a "moneybag that is full – of spiderwebs" is a *sacculus*, not a *marsuppium*, and suggests that this was a popular jest, probably in subliterary genres, regardless of what sort of "moneybag" was used.

quid eum velit.
homo *cruminam* sibi de collo detrahit,
minas viginti mihi dat. accipio libens,
condo in *cruminam*. ille abit. ego propere minas
ovis in *crumina* hac in urbem detuli.
fuit edepol Mars — meo periratus patri,
nam oves illius hau longe absunt a lupis.

ST. A little while ago this morning father sent me to the country,
So that I could get nuts for the cows' feed.
After I came there, there arrived—hallelujah!—
At the villa a man who owed my father cash,
Who had bought some Tarantine sheep from father.
He asks for father; I say he's in town. I ask him what he wants.
He takes a wallet off of his shoulder,
He gives me twenty minae. I receive them happily,
I put them in my wallet. He leaves, I quickly brought here to the city the sheep in this moneybag here.
By god, Mars was mad at my father,
For his sheep aren't far from the wolves!

Strabax is at great pains to describe the exchange of the money as well as to show off its carrier. As the deictic use of *in crumina hac* (655) demonstrates, Strabax displays the bag to the audience and uses appropriate gestures in order to reenact his adventures as he narrates them: his meeting in the country (648-653), the exchange of the money (652-654), and the heft with which he received and carried his moneybag, now full (655). A splendid wordplay *per ambiguum* on the words *oves* and *lupis* in v. 657 rounds off his monologue.[68] Thus both Strabax' circumstances and rich wordplay suggest that there is a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke in v. 656 analogous to that in the *Poenulus*. Here, as there, *fuit edepol Mars*— is a play on the expectation that "good god, he had a huge *marsuppium* (full of money)," or in Latin something like *fuit edepol mars—uppium ei*

[68] Mendelsohn p. 113: "*Oves* and *lupis* are used in their literal meanings, "the wolves will soon get the sheep"; besides this, *oves* means the money received for the sheep, and *lupis* signifies courtesans." In light of this, the *nam* which begins the line may support the contention that there is a money-based wordplay in the preceding v. 656.

magnum. The interpretations of Ussing and Maurach discussed above tried to explain the anger of Mars in the *Poenulus* by pointing out that the god of war is concerned that it is a soldier, not some other character, who is heading into danger. But this explanation does not suffice for the present passage, since in the *Truculentus*, it is specifically Mars rather than some other god,[69] that is angry at the *senex*, and so the phrase *Mars ei iratust* in both instances is best understood as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on the character's prop moneybag.

II. G. c.: Jupiter

In *Pers.* 99 there is a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay that reduces the father of the gods to a rather more humble bowl of soup. The lines immediately preceding the wordplay serve to set up the joke. The slave Toxilus pretends not to see the parasite Saturio, whose appetite is whetted by the prospect of getting a bit of *ius colluricum*, "vermicelli soup" (92-100):

> **TOX.** Collurae facite ut madeant et colupia,
> ne mihi incocta detis. **SAT.** Rem loquitur meram.
> nihili sunt crudae, nisi quas madidas gluttias;
> tum nisi cremore crassost *ius* colluricum,
> nihilist macrum illud epicrocum pellucidum:
> quasi +*iuream*+[70] esse *ius* decet colluricum.
> nolo in vesicam quod eat, in ventrem volo.

[69] As the god of commerce, Mercury might have been expected. The god delivers the prologue speech in the *Amphitruo*, associating his name several times with *mercimonium* and money in general (cf. *mercimoniis* v. 1; *lucro* vv. 6, 12; *lucrum* v. 14).

[70] *Iuream*, the reading of B and C, is probably corrupt beyond recovery. Suggested emendations include *birreum*, *sisuram*, *loream*, *tyrium*, and others, but fortunately the point is not essential for our argument.

TOX. Prope me hic nescioquis loquitur. **SAT.** O mi Iu—ppiter
—terr—estris, coepulonus compellat tuos.[71] 100

TOX. See to it that the vermicelli and meat are boiled,
Don't give them to me uncooked. **SAT.** Straight to the point!
They're worthless raw, you can't swallow unless they're boiled.
Then too unless vermicelli soup has a thick broth,
It's worthless, that thin, transparent, yellowish stuff:
Vermicelli soup ought to be +*iuream*+.
I want food that goes to my belly, not my bladder.
TOX. Someone is talking here nearby. **SAT.** O my Jupiter
—on earth, your dinner companion accosts thee!

There seem to be several wordplays lurking in the present passage that have been missed by scholars. Saturio hears Toxilus give the orders to see to it that the vermicelli noodles

---

[71] Every editor since Ritschl has punctuated with a comma after *terrestris* in 100, taking the epithet with Iuppiter; but most recently Woytek (ad loc.) argued against this, removing the comma and understanding the lines as *...Iuppiter! terrestris te coepulonus compellat tuos.*, and has convinced some scholars. The reasoning, however, is flawed, and his argument that the alliteration in *terrestris te coepulonus compellat tuos* composes a unit is severely compromised by the (even better) alliteration in *Iuppiter/terrestris... Pace* Woytek, support for understanding the epithet *terrestris* with *Iuppiter* as an address to another human being comes from the parallel expression in *Pseud.* 335, *Iuppiter lenonius*.

Further, I do not believe that anyone has suggested that there is a play here on the resemblence of Saturio's name with that of *Saturnus*, which may account for the joke, if it is remembered that in Roman myth Saturn had devoured all of his children, including most famously his son Jupiter. "Hello my Jupiter—on earth, that is!" says Saturio, as if he were hungry enough to eat anything in sight, including "Jupiter" himself. But by the epithet enjambed in the next line, "Jupiter" becomes "...on earth, that is," a suitable bombastic title for one's patron. At this point Woytek's parallels for bombastic patron address would be more appropriate. It may be profitable to mention that just following these lines Saturio elsewhere puns on his name in a context of eating (101-3, translation after Nixon):

TOX. O Saturio, opportune advenisti mihi.
SAT. Mendacium edepol dicis, atque haud te decet:
nam essurio venio, non advenio saturio.

TOX. Saturio! You're come right on time.
SAT. You lie, and you shouldn't:
For I've come Starvurio, not Sate-urio.

Problematic for seeing a pun on Saturio and Saturnus may be that in our text the parasite has not yet been named onstage. Comparing his opening monologue to that of Ergasilus in the *Captivi*, with which there are a number of similarities, we might suspect that a couplet containing the typical parasite introductory formula has been lost, but there is admittedly no evidence for this in the manuscripts other than the weight of probability provided by lines 92-100.

are prepared and well cooked, and he responds with a diagnosis of how *ius collyricum* ought to be cooked. At this point Saturio is practically licking his chops, rubbing his belly, and when he shouts out his invocation *o mi Iuppiter* in v. 99, the audience's expectation should have been that he was going to say something about the *ius* that he has just been extolling, but he switches this mid-word.[72]

This has an interesting effect. Not only does Saturio then switch meaning midway through the name *Iuppiter* in v. 99, he continues the joke. What appears to be an invocation to Jupiter becomes, by the addition of the epithet in the next line, a bombastic manner of addressing Toxilus.[73] "Oh my Jupiter—on earth!," says Saturio.[74] The limitation imposed by the adjective *terrestris*, effectively enjambed in the following line, creates a second *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* analogous to the Prologus' offer of a bet in the *Casina* that we have already examined. There, an additional clause of proviso is added to the bargain after the bet has already been established (75-6):

---

[72] Cf. with this Agorastocles' exclamation at *Poen.* 1272, *O Apell—a, o Zeu—xis pictor*, another example of a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* exclamation to the gods (discussed more fully in Chapter III. B. below.).

[73] This is a form of bombastic address familiar from the soldiers in Plautus, e.g. Stratophanes in the *Truc.* 515: ***STRAT.*** *Mars peregre adveniens salutat Nerienem uxorem suam.* Cf. Fraenkel pp. 96f, who provides further examples.

[74] Cf. the probable parody of Ennius' translation of the *Achilles* of Aristarchus found in the prologue to the *Poenulus* (3-4):

> "sileteque et tacete atque animum advortite,
> *audire iubet vos imperator"*— histricus,
>
> 'Hush yourselves and fall silent and pay attention;
> you are commanded to listen on orders of the general' – of the troupe!

where at least *audire iubet vos imperator* appears to be a quotation from the original text; by the addition of the adjective *histricus*, the line acts *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, and the "general" of the war becomes the "general" troupe manager.

Id ni fit, mecum pignus, siquis volt, dato
In urnam mulsi, Poen—us dum iudex siet

If that's not the case, if any wishes, he shalt bet me
A jug of wine—provided the judge be a Carthaginian

Here Prologus had already established the terms of the bet, but after a short delay he limits the bet by adding qualifications as to who may serve as judge, effectively thereby impugning the Carthaginians. Similarly in the *Persa*, by delaying the addition of the adjective *terrestris*, Saturio forced a sudden change in the meaning in, and limits in an impugning way, his salutation *o mi Iuppiter*. In a society in which clients regularly addressed their patrons by the deferential term *rex*, the delayed limitation of a more humbling epithet was a good source of humor.[75]

---

[75] An analogous case which incidentally may argue for Plautine authenticity both here and in the passage in *Casina* above comes from a doubled delayed effect in the prologue to *Menaechmi*. In the course of narrating the action, Prologus has these lines (19-23):

ita forma simili pueri, ut mater sua
non internosse posset—quae mammam dabat, 20
neque adeo mater ipsa quae illos pepererat,
—ut quidem ille dixit mihi, qui pueros viderat.
(ego illos non vidi, ne quis vostrum censeat.)

The boys were so alike in appearance that their own mother
Couldn't tell them apart—their surrogate mother, that is!
But neither could their real mother, the one who bore them,
—at least, that's what I hear from someone who saw them.
I never saw them myself.

In this case, Prologus is having fun with the word *mater* "wet nurse" by delaying the explanatory relative clause *quae mammam dabat* in 20, and then continuing the fun by distancing himself from his vivid narrative in 22-3: "That's what this guy told me, anyway, since I never saw them!" Having just described the similarity of the two boys at length, Prologus steps back to disavow personal knowledge, and his goal seems to be simply to get a laugh.

There may be even more to this wordplay in the *Persa* than there appears. *Terrestris* is an unusal word in Plautus, and is quite unusual as an epithet. The word occurs only three other times in Plautus: twice in *Capt.* 189, a joke based on deliberate misunderstanding:

HEG. *Terrestris* cena est. **ERG.** Sus *terrestris* bestia est.

and once in the mouth of the cook in *Pseud.* 834-5:

That there is a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* pun on Jupiter's name in our passage of the *Persa*, then, gains some support from the form of the god's name. In Plautus, Jupiter is called by the names *Iuppiter*, *Diespiter*, or *Zeus*,[76] and so it is unlikely that the appearance here of the form *Iuppiter* is a mere accident. It seems rather more probable that Plautus chose *Iuppiter* here deliberately for the play on *ius*. This type of surprise play on *ius* appears to have been particularly dear to Plautus in the *Persa*: just after the lines examined above there are two (possibly three) more sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* plays on the word *ius* (104-7):

> **TOX.** At edes, nam iam intus ventris fumant focula.
> calefieri ius—si reliquias. **SAT.** Pernam quidem
> ius— est adponi frigidam postridie.
> **TOX.** Ita fieri ius—si.
>
> **TOX.** But you will eat, for already the ovens are smoking inside.
> I've ordered the leftovers to be heated up. **SAT.** Ham's right to
> Be served up cold the next day.
> **TOX.** So I've ordered.

> **COCVS.** haec ad Neptuni pecudes condimenta sunt:
> *terrestris* pecudes cicimalindro condio...

In each case it has the meaning "on the ground," "on land," or not (as here and regularly in later Latin) "on earth," "terrestrial," as opposed to *caelestis* (unless the cook's usage puns on both meanings?). This unusual Plautine usage makes itself suspect—not of being a spurious addition, but of containing an undetected joke.

Saturio, who is elsewhere so concerned with food, looks as though he intends a pun on the *–estris* element of the word, as though it were a separate adjective **estris* coined from for the verb *edere* (*esse*) meaning "food-, relating to eating," and so *Iuppiter terrestris*, with an appropriate pause midway through both the name of the god and the epithet, would imply a meaning like "soup father," with the connotation, "my patron, from whom I eat (three times a day, with a pun on *terr-* as *ter*?)." No such adjective *estris* is recorded in Latin, but the manuscripts at *Cas.* 778 offer the word *estrices* meaning "female gluttons," and as we have seen, nonce-formations are in keeping with Plautus' manner; *coepulonus* in this same line is probably a nonce word.

[76] The form *Iuppiter* is found 89 times in Plautus, *Diespiter* 3 times. The two forms are found side by side in *Captivi* and *Poenulus*. Respectively the numbers are *Iuppiter*, *Diespiter*: *Captivi* (4 vs. 1) and *Poenulus* (8 vs. 2). *Zeus* is used twice by Plautus, vocative in both instances.

In v. 105, the obvious expectation is that Toxilus will say, "(I've told them) to heat up the soup inside," this being the same *ius colluricum* that Saturio craves. But the slave instead changes his meaning with the addition of a syllable: "I've ordered them to heat up the – leftovers," this being in the parasite's eyes considerably better fare. Saturio replies at v. 106 in kind with a play on the other meaning of *ius*, "right." The audience naturally expects something like a list of foods often given by parasites: "ham, soup (understanding *ius* as accusative like *pernam*)" but by the surprise turn, Saturio essentially says, "Forget the soup—you ought to give me ham!" Toxilus' final reply at 107, *ita fieri ius—si*, seems to be a Plautine joke simply for the sake of the repetition, and the final syllable comes *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* for *decet* or an analogous expression.

II. H.: Conclusion

In the preceding pages we examined Plautus' methods of using ambiguous forms in Latin to suggest that a certain word will follow, only to frustrate that expectation mid-word. The various wordplays have different effects: many of these wordplays serve to undercut the pomposity of a name (e.g. *Summanus*, *Iuppiter*); others serve to pun on names of places and kinds of food; still others pun on the names of Roman deities. As we have seen, many of these wordplays enliven the action and enhance the characterization, and often impart a farcical tone to the scene. As we will see in the next chapter, Plautus uses the same techniques for sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay

even when using Greek words that he inserts into his *vorsio*.

* * *

CHAPTER III:

GREEK PLAYS ON GREEK NAMES

This chapter deals with wordplays involving a Greek word and a proper Greek name. These are relatively few in number, and this chapter is correspondingly brief.

III. A.: Plautinity of these Wordplays Guaranteed

In theory, wordplays of this type present something of a problem in assigning proper authorship, since any given case may have been taken over by Plautus from his original, and it should be then stated outright that this position must be ever kept in mind in analyzing any example of a Greek play on a Greek name. Nevertheless, in has been demonstrated that in general Greek words scattered through the Plautine corpus were probably added by the Roman poet, not retained from his original[1]; and in the specific case of wordplay, it is demonstrably certain that Plautus made wordplay between a Greek name and a common Greek noun. We know from the papyrus fragment of the Menandrian Δὶς Ἐξαπατῶν, which served as the model for Plautus' *Bacchides*, that the slave character had the stock name of "Syrus". In the *Bacchides*, however, the Roman playwright has renamed the slave "Chrysalus," a name no doubt that sounded more exotic

[1] Cf. Hough pp. 346-64, with a doxography of earlier work, and Shipp pp. 105-112.

to the Roman ear than "Syrus". The slave Chrysalus then uses his name as a springboard for several wordplays, two of which involve a Latin word, and one that involves a hybrid word of Greek and Latin. The two pure Latin wordplays are (362):

CRVS. facietque extemplo *Crucisalum* me ex *Crusalo*

CHRYS. and he's going to turn me from Chrysalus into Crossalus![2]

and (687)

CRVS. istoc dicto dedisti hodie in *cruciatum Crusalum*

CHRYS. with that word of yours today you've sent Chrysalus to the cross.[3]

More arresting still is the wordplay that the slave makes on his name at v. 240,

CRVS. opus est *cruso Crusalo*

CHRYS. Chrysalus needs "chrysus."

wherein the Greek word χρυσός, which never passed into Latin as a loanword alongside the native *aurum*, is given a Latin inflection and used in an exclusively Latin syntactical construction (ablative!).[4]

---

[2] Translation after Nixon.

[3] In the case of each wordplay the actor playing the slave (perhaps Plautus himself, as is often inferred from the metatheatrical joke at v. 214) may have slipped into his "Umbrian accent," i.e., a pronunciation of the second letter *c* of *cruci-* as */sh/* or */s/* before the front vowel *–i-* in order to approximate more nearly the sounds of *cruci-* (i.e., *cruçi*) and *crusa-*. It makes no difference that the slave is nominally "Greek," for Plautine consistency is never so rigid: "Greek" characters in Plautus frequently act Roman, and accordingly manipulate Latin pronunciation, on which Chapter I. D. d. 2.

[4] I make no claim as to how Plautus spelled the word, for we cannot know whether he wrote the word as Greek or transliterated it into Latin; *chryso*, the reading of the manuscripts, is no help because the mark of aspiration (*ch*) and vowel *y* are post-Plautine and point to an early orthographical "modernization," cf. Chapter I. H. b. What is significant, however, is that the Greek word—a common noun, not a proper name—is used in the ablative case, lacking in Greek, meaning that the word is understood as having a Latin termination.

All three of the foregoing wordplays are manifestly to be attributed to Plautus, and the last wordplay in particular demonstrates that the pun between a Greek word in a Greek name—at least in this instance—is his Roman insertion into his model.

III. B.: Plautinity not Guaranteed, nor Relevant:

Nevertheless, at other times Plautus demonstrably has retained the name of a character from his model. Again it is the *Bacchides* that furnishes proof: the Menandrian papyrus proves that the Roman poet retained the name of the paedagogus Lydus from his original. Thus when we are faced with a wordplay such as the following, in which the *adulescens* Pistoclerus addresses his tutor Lydus in these words (155),

PIST. Fiam, ut ego opinor, Hercules, tu autem *Li—nus*

PIST. I think that I'm going to become Hercules, but you'll be Ly—nus

we cannot be certain whether Plautus or his model is responsible for the wordplay, which is a schijn-ambiguum play for *Lu-dus* (*Ly-dus*). The Roman audience might have found this particular allusion—a student vaguely threatening to treat his tutor in the same manner that Hercules had treated his own, Linus (i.e., to beat him to death)—abstruse.[5] Yet the wordplay in v. 129,

PIST. Non omnis aetas, *Lude*, *ludo* convenit.

PIST. You can't go to school forever, Lydus!

which involves a pun between the Latin word *ludus* and the Greek name *Lydus*, is certainly due to the Roman poet. Thus we see that Plautus, whether changing or retaining

[5] Fraenkel p. 26 tentatively thought the allusion Menandrian; Barsby 1986 pp. 108-110, however, makes a fairly persuasive case that Plautus could have added the mythological allusion, citing inter alia the relative infrequency of mythological allusions in Menander (none in *Aspis*, two in *Dyscolus*, one in *Epitrepontes*, four in *Samia*) and Terence (only three allusions in the six plays).

the name from his Greek model, indiscriminately played on the word, whether using Latin words or Greek words.

III. C.: Apelles and Zeuxis

The names of the famed Athenian painters Apelles (4th c.) and Zeuxis (5th c.) appear twice in the Plautine corpus, each time in a separate play, and on both occasions the names of the two painters are linked as a pair. The first is *Epid.* 625-6:[6]

> **EPID.** ex tuis verbis meum futurum corium pulchrum praedicas
> Quem *Apella atque Zeuxis* duo pingent pigmentis ulmeis.
>
> **EPID.** From your words you say that my hide is going to be beautiful,
> When Apelles and Zeuxis paint me with elm pigments.

The second occurs toward the end of the *Poenulus* (1271-3):

> **AGOR.** o *Apella*, o *Zeuxis* pictor,
> Cur numero estis mortui, hoc exemplo ut pingeretis?
> Nam alios pictores nil moror huius modi tractare exempla.
>
> **AGOR.** O Apelles, o Zeuxis the painter,
> Why did you die too soon to paint from this model?
> For I don't care for other painters to handle models of this type.

If we may judge from these two passages, the names of the two painters seem to have become proverbial by Roman times for consummately great painters, much as Leonardo and Michelangelo are for us today. Following his canonical list of the Attic tragedians (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides) the two painters appear in Cicero's analogous canon

[6] The textual question as to the form of Apelles' name (*Apella* vs. *Apelles*) does not affect our discussion here. Duckworth 1940 p. 379, following Lindsay, argues for *Apelles*; contra, see TLL s.v. *Apella.*

of great painters in *De Orat.* 3. 26.[7] Fraenkel (pp. 16-8) argued persuasively that the appearance of the painters in both passages was to be attributed not to the Greek model but to Plautus himself, by demonstrating 1.) the "typically" Plautine hyperbolic expression of the punishment in *Epid.* 626 *quem Apella atque Zeuxis duo pingent pigmentis ulmeis*, "whom Apelles and Zeuxis will paint with elm pigments" and 2.) the correspondence in thought between the verse that follows ours in the *Poenulus* (1273)—

nam alios pictores nil moror huius modi tractare exempla

for I don't care for other painters to handle models like this—

and *Aul.* 702—

nam istos reges ceteros memorare nolo, hominum mendicabula

for I don't want to talk about those other kings, the liars!—

The correctness of Fraenkel's hypothesis is corroborated by the context of the *Poenulus*, where the names appear to serve as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay.

Let us examine the context of the lines in that play more closely. The names are uttered in the final moments of the play, after the various *ἀναγνώρωσεις* have taken place (Hanno as uncle of Agorastocles, and father of the two girls Anterastilis and Adelphasium), and the young man Agorastocles has pledged to marry Adelphasium.[8] The recognition scene is protracted, and the tone throughout is one of great rejoicing. Agorastocles comments on the appropriateness of the situation, and Hanno caps the moment by declaring that his dreams have been fulfilled. Then the young man follows these thoughts with an unusual and surprising exclamation :

---

[7] una est ars ratioque picturae, dissimillimique tamen inter se Zeuxis, Aglaophon, Apelles, neque eorum quisquam est, cui quicquam in arte sua deesse videatur.

[8] In a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* line: cf. 1228: nunc pol ego te ulciscar probe, nam faxo — mea eris sponsa! "Now I'll get you back good, for I'll – marry you!"

HAN. quibus nunc in terra melius est? **AGOR.** Eveniunt digna dignis. 1270
HAN. Tandem huic cupitum contigit. **AG.** O Apella, o Zeuxis pictor,
cur numero estis mortui...?

HAN. Who on earth is happier now? **AGOR.** A well deserved situation for
people who well deserve it. 1270
HAN. Finally, my wish has come true. **AG.** O Apelles, o Zeuxis the painter,
Why did you die too soon?

Agorastocles' quasi-divine invocation of two Greek painters is unparalleled in Plautus, and it is unusually odd when coming from the mouth of a young man born in Carthage. In addition to this incongruity, the final word of the line, *pictor*, hangs awkwardly at the end of verse. What is the need for Agorastocles' qualification, "o Apelles, o Zeuxis—the painter, (I mean)" as the text stands? The word order of the young man's exclamation seems rather to suggest that he was intended to deliver the line as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* that frustrates the expectation of an invocation of the gods Apollo and Zeus, which may be illustrated as:

AG. o Apell—a! o Zeu—xis! ...pictor,
cur numero estis mortui, hoc exemplo ut pingeretis?

Invocations of the supreme god under the Greek name of *Zeus* instead of the Latin *Iuppiter* are attested in two other places in Plautus (*Cas.* 731a, *Pseud.* 443). On each occasion the name appears in the invocation in the form *ὦ Ζεῦ*, and in at least one of these cases there is probably a pun on the exclamation.[9] The name of Apollo is invoked frequently on the Plautine stage: the vocative form is found in *Aul.* 394, *Bacch.* 172, *Men.* 850, 853, 862, 868, *Mer.* 678; the name is used in oaths at *Capt.* 880 and *Most.* 973; and the name Apollo appears in other cases at *Men.* 840, 871, 886, and *Mer.* 676. Thus the

[9] In the *Casina* the invocation is followed by *potin a me abeas, nisi me vis vomere hodie*? "Is it possible for you to stay away from me if you don't want me to vomit?," seems to be a pun on *ὄζευς*, as suggested by Hough 1940 p. 190 n. 8.

evidence suggests that a Roman audience scarcely would have suspected that Agorastocles, in his gratitude for a happy situation, would go on to invoke two *painters*; it would have expected the *adulescens* in rendering thanks to invoke the supreme gods.

There is further corroborating evidence to support this view. The soundplay between the vocative of the name *Apelles* and that of *Apollo* may have been even closer than our text suggests: the form 'Απέλλων is the Doric form of the Attic 'Απολλων, and as such, it is consistent with the dialect of Greek spoken in the Greek cities of Southern Italy current in the time of Plautus.[10] If the name of the god had become established in Latium before the literary hellenizing influence, the unusual form of the name *Apello* would stand in relation to *Apollo* as Plautus' *Alcumena* did to the *Alcmene* of later Latin.[11] Further support for this view comes from a remark preserved in Paulus in Fest. (p. 20L), epitomizing the note of Verrius Flaccus that *Apellinem antiqui dicebant pro 'Apollinem,'* "The ancients used to say *Apello* instead of *Apollo*." From Paulus' perspective, most classical authors were *antiqui*, so the note must be treated with some caution; but the term *antiqui* is used elsewhere in Festus to denote Plautus and the writers of his time.[12] Where the name of Apollo appears elsewhere in Plautus, the manuscripts unanimously present the name spelled in the way that later became standard in Latin, *Apo-*; but the manuscripts, ever prone to regularizing orthography, cannot be trusted on a

---

[10] Cf. Herwerden p. 164 s.v. 'Απέλλων, who gives inscriptional evidence that evinces the form at least as late as the time of Plautus: Schweizer p. 105 dates an inscription from Crete (= Schweizer 206) as *paullo ante 200*, which coincides with the acme of Plautus (*Stichus*, datable by the didascalia attached to it in the Ambrosianus, was staged in 200).

[11] On early Latin forms of Greek names, cf. Fraenkel pp. 71, 74 n. 5, and pp. 85-6.

[12] Cf. e.g. p. 182L 'nobilem' *antiqui* pro 'noto' ponebant, et quidem per g litteram, *ut Plautus* in Pseudolo...etc.

point such as this. The note that Paulus preserves must have been written by an author who had actually seen the form *Apello*, and since the temporal limit of Latin literature did not extend far beyond the time of Plautus, it is at least a possibility that this is how the Romans in Plautus' time pronounced and spelled the word, and that our texts were modernized in early antiquity; but this remains a hypothesis.

III. D.: Bacchis

A well-known wordplay occurs early in our surviving portion of the *Bacchides* that alludes to a connection between the name shared by the two sisters and Bacchants (52-3):

> **PIST.** non ego istuc facinus mihi, mulier, conducibile esse arbitror.
> **BAC.** Qui, amabo? **PIST.** Quia, *Baccis, baccas* metuo et *baccanal* tuom.
>
> **PIST.** Woman, I don't think your idea is such a good one for me.
> **BAC.** Why, pray tell? **PIST.** Because, Bacchis, I'm afraid of bacchants and your bacchanal!

Rather than seeing Pistoclerus' response in v. 53 as mere wordplay of assonance and alliteration, we may be able to infer how the actor was intended to deliver the line as an example of a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. It is rare, and therefore correspondingly significant, that the line contains a double wordplay on the same sound. The nearest parallel to our present line are the multiple wordplays *persas-persas-personas-perdant* in *Pers.* 783-4[13], but that is a "true" *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* because it is the exclamation of a single character.[14] The *Bacchides* makes the point early on that much of the action will turn on the fact that, like the two brothers Menaechmus in the *Menaechmi*, the sisters here are

[13] Discussed in Chapter II. D. above.

[14] Cf. Chapter I. 1.

"homonymous." As the two sisters converse on one side of the stage, Pistoclerus muses aloud:

> **PIST.** Quid agunt duae germanae meretrices cognomines?
>
> **PIST.** What are these two homonymous courtesan sisters planning? (39)

The *adulescens*' line line serves to focus the audience's attention on the name shared by the courtesan. Thus Plautus prepares the way for a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* which we may repunctuate and understand in a new way:

> **PIST.** Quia, Baccis, bacc—a—s metuo et bacc—anal tuom.
>
> **PIST**. Because, Bacchis, I'm afraid of Bacch—(*facing or gesturing toward the Sister*)—ants, and that (*turning to face Bacchis again*) Bacch—anal of yours!

The stage directions that I have inserted above indicate the way the line was intended to be delivered: Pistoclerus begins by facing Bacchis (*Quia, Bacchis...*), as is natural in dialogue. Courtesy demands that he address both courtesans alike, or at least acknowledge both, and so we expect the young man to then turn toward or indicate the Sister; this seems implied by the mid-word play on *bacc—a—s* for *Bacc—i—s*. As, however, Pistoclerus is ultimately addressing Bacchis (*istuc* in v. 52, *tuom* in v. 53 both indicate direct address), he turns back to face her as he completes the line with the second *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* (*...bacc—anal tuom*) that implies her name. Wordplay continues in the following lines, as Bacchis' reply to Pistoclerus sets up another retort in v. 55:

> **BAC.** Quid est? quid metuis? ne tibi *lectus* malitiam apud me suadeat?
> **PIST.** Magis *inlectum* tuom quam *lectum* metuo. 55
>
> **BAC**. What is it? What are you afraid of? That my bed will entice you to some trouble?
> **PIST**. I'm not afraid of your bed, I'm afraid of your blandishments! 55

This pun between *inlectum* "allurement, enticement" and *lectum* "bed", possible only in Latin, might offer support for attributing the play in v. 53 to Plautus, but that is by no means certain, since it is impossible to determine whether this wordplay should be attributed to Plautus himself or whether he found it in Menander. As all the elements of the wordplay (*Baccis*, *baccas*, *baccanal*) are Greek, Plautus may well have found it in his model, and it does not help us that we cannot determine from the Δὶς Ἐξαπατῶν papyrus what name the two sisters had in that play.[15] We do know, however, that Plautus altered the name of the play to *Bacchides*[16], and thus gave much greater prominence (and a different focus) to the play than Menander's title of "Double Deceiver", which emphasized rather the role of the slave Syrus and his dramatic deceptions.

III. E.: Conclusion

In the foregoing pages we examined two cases of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays involving Greek proper names. In each instance, it seems likely that Plautus himself is responsible for inserting the wordplays into his *vorsiones* of the Greek models, rather than taking them over directly from the models, although we cannot preclude the possibility that Plautus did not see, or could not have seen, the wordplays in some Greek model. The presence of the Greek wordplays in a Latin version, however, allows us to infer that the audience was familiar not only with common Greek words, but also with the

[15] So Questa 1975 pp. 5f. Although the name does not appear in extant Menander, it was common for *meretrices* both in real life (cf. Athenaeus 594 b-c) and in Terence (*H. T.* and *Hec.*); cf. Barsby 1986 p. 98.

[16] Cf. the discussion of Questa in the introduction to his *Bacchides*, which stresses that Plautus did not, as he might have, merely translate the title as e.g. *Bis Decipiens* (cf. the Plautine *Bis Compressa*), as he did for e.g. *Mercator* (Greek Ἔμπορος).

names of the Greek deities Zeus, Apollo, and Bacchus. This is not surprising, but in our example from the *Poenulus*, if, as seems likely, the audience would have anticipated the name of the god not in the form *Apollo,* but rather as *Apello*, it may explain the origin of the otherwise unexplained note of Verrius Flaccus which claims that the "ancients" used to call the god by his Doric name, *Apello*. At the same time, as the wordplay is inspired by a Doric rather than Attic form of the name, we may speculate that Plautus' inspiration for the wordplay emanated from Southern Italy and the comic performances of the Greek-speaking residents there. This remains speculative, but further investigation into the comedy of Southern Italy may corroborate the hypothesis.

* * *

CHAPTER IV:

LATIN PLAYS ON GREEK NAMES

This chapter deals with sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays involving a Latin word or words (e.g. *astare*) and a Greek proper name (e.g. *Astaphium*).

IV. A.: The Nature of the Bilingual Wordplay

Of the three categories of wordplay so far under review (Latin-Latin, Greek-Greek, and Latin-Greek), bilingual wordplay is the most sophisticated type, because it presupposes both a familiarity with the vocabulary of two languages and also a a studied manipulation of inflection of the words on which the play is constructed. Unlike a Latin-Latin wordplay such as that in *Men.* 77-8,

> Iuventus nomen fecit *Peniculo* mihi,
> ideo quia *men—sam*, quando edo, detergeo.

where the wordplay[1] is facilitated by an etymological connection in Latin between the words *peniculus* and *penis* (understood from *men-sam*, i.e., *men-tul-am*), a bilingual wordplay requires a play on a sound common to both languages, and often the poet must manipulate syntax and word inflection in such a way as to bring about the closest possible correspondence in sound between the two words.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter II. C.

In Plautus, this manipulation may be illustrated briefly.[2] In the *Poenulus* we find an extended scene of bilingual Punic-Latin puns, where the slave Milphio feigns to translate Hanno's Carthaginian speech for his master Agorastocles (990-1004):

> **HAN.** *Avo.* **MIL.** Salutat. **HAN.** *Donni.* **MIL.** *Doni* volt tibi
> dare hic nescioquid. audin pollicitarier?
> **AGOR.** Saluta hunc rursus Punice verbis meis.
> **MIL.** "Avo donni" inquit hic tibi verbis suis.
> **HAN.** *Mehar bocca.* **MIL.** Istuc tibi sit potius quam mihi.
> **AGOR.** Quid ait? **MIL.** *Miseram* esse praedicat *buccam* sibi.
> fortasse medicos nos esse arbitrarier.
>
> **H.** *Avo.* **M.** He's saying hello. **H.** *Donni.* **M.** He wants to give you
> Some gift. Do you hear him promising?
> **AG.** Greet him in reply for me in Punic.
> **M.** This young man says "*Avo donni*" to you in his own words.
> **H.** *Mehar bocca.* **M.** May that fall on you rather than me!
> **AG.** What's he saying? **M.** He says that his throat hurts.
> Maybe he thinks we're doctors.

A brief analysis of the of the Latin syntax and inflection shows that it is decidedly studied.[3] In order to play on the Punic word *donni*, Milphio frames his words in order to use the sound as though it were a partitive genitive *doni* dependent on *nescioquid.* In response to Hanno's words *mehar bocca*, Milphio treats *bocca* as though Hanno had said the Latin words *misera bucca* in the nominative case and the slave accordingly phrases the joke to mimic the construction, understanding a dative of possession with an unexpressed *est mihi.*

---

[2] In Old Comedy Aristophanes had used these same methods of bilingual wordplays in pursuit of a laugh; cf. the pidgin Greek spoken by the Persian ambassador Pseudartabas in *Ach.* 100-4 (dicussed in detail by Colvin *passim,* and especially chpt. 5) or the fake doctor in Menander's *Aspis*, who speaks in the Doric dialect.

[3] For the meaning of the Carthaginian words, often discussed by scholars, cf. Gottheil ap. Lodge vol. 1 pp. 915-7 (with references to earlier literature) from which I summarize, omitting the Hebrew transliteration: *avo* = salutandi genus 'vive!;' *donni* = pro *adoni*, 'mi domine;' *mehar* = cito venit; *bocca* = 'fletus;' Gray (quoted by Gottheil), however, understands *bocca* as *tecum* and *mehar bocca* as "the morning with thee!".

IV. B.: Greek-Latin Wordplays

The foregoing passage of Carthaginian-Latin puns is unique in Plautus, for usually bilingual puns in Plautus involve words from Greek and Latin. The Greek sounds are often ingeniously employed in a Latin context and many times the play involves a Greek proper name and a Latin word. A convenient illustration is found in a well-known wordplay that appears in the *Amphitruo* (mentioned earlier in Chapter I. D. d. 2.), where Mercury, in the guise of the slave Sosia, is in the process of divesting the slave of his (Sosia's) identity. As Mercury increasingly speaks threateningly to Sosia, the slave tries to backpedal from his earlier conviction of his identity (384-5):

> **MERC.** Amphitruonis te esse aiebas *Sosiam*. **SOS.** Peccaveram,
> nam Amphitruonis *socium* sane me esse volui dicere.[4]
>
> **M.** You kept saying that you were Amphitruo's *Sosia*. **S.** I made a mistake,
> I certainly meant to say that I'm Amphitruo's *associate!*

The frightened slave slips into an Umbrian pronunciation in an attempt to wheedle out of his earlier assertions, pronouncing the Latin word *socium* (now *soçium*) as nearly alike as possible to the Greek name *Sosiam*.[5] Plautus effected this similarity in part by using the accusative ending of each noun (*Sosiam*, *socium*), for in that inflection the termination *–am* of *Sosiam* most nearly approaches the termination *–um* of *socium*:

---

[4] Palmer's text.

[5] The part of Sosia may have been originally played by Plautus himself, giving extra point to the unusual pronunciation. Although Plautus frequently disregards vowel length in wordplay, the difference of the vowel *o* between *Sōsia* and *sŏcius* might be specially significant: the threatening god Mercury booms out "But didn't you keep saying just now that you were *Sōsia*?", stressing the long *o*; in reply, the thoroughly confused and now terrified slave squeaks out in a shrill voice, "No, I really meant to say that I was his *sŏçius*!," his fear accounting for the vowel shortening.

other inflections would have obscured the joke, for, respectively, we would have had (nominative) *Sosi-a / soci-us*; (genitive) *–ae / -i*; (dative) *–ae / -o*; and (ablative) *–a / -o*. This has influenced Sosia's choice of expression using the accusative and infinitive construction of *oratio obliqua.*

IV. C.: Bilingual Plays on the Verb *stare*

Plautus uses these bilingual puns to effect sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes that have not been heretofore noted by scholars. In Chapter I. B. we examined in detail the wordplay in *Truc.* 115,

DIN. Heus, manedum! asta!—pium, prius quam abis!

DIN. Hey there, wait! Uh, stop!—phium, before you leave!

where the *adulescens* Diniarchus must pause mid-word through his enunciation of the name *Astaphium* to suggest that the *ancilla* halt, by a wordplay on the verb *asta!*. In the *Trinummus*, there is an analogous sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on the name of the slave Stasimus.[6] *Trin.* 1007 begins a scene in which Stasimus enters onstage alone and delivers a monologue which begins with a self-address.[7] The slave exhorts himself to hurry home as fast as possible in the following words (1007-8):

> **STAS.** Stasime, fac te propere celerem, recipe te ad dominum domum,
> ne subito metus exoriatur scapulis stultitia tua.
>
> **STAS.** Stasimus, make yourself quick, go home to your master,
> So that fear for your shoulders won't suddenly arise from your stupidity!

[6] The name is the Greek *στάσιμος*, "steady," or "stable;" cf. Schmidt p. 208.

[7] Slater (chapter 1 *passim*) discusses the difficulties inherent in staging a monologue of schizophrenic self-address as we have here; as it is arguably the least realistic type of performance, we may wonder why Plautus chose to have Stasimus employ it here.

Stasimus' exhortation to himself, which begins with the vocative self-address *Stasime*, has more point than commentators have recognized. Often in Plautus, one character expressing annoyance at another character's inactivity asks the impatient question *quid stas?*, "what are you (just) standing around for?," where *stare* means the same as *cessare*, "fooling around," "wasting time," in an attempt to get the second character moving. The question is rhetorical and is equivalent to a command, "move!," "get going!" The question appears in exactly this form (*quid stas?*) in *Curc.* 251; *Epid.* 583; *M.G.* 1387; *Pers.* 600; and *Pseud.* 330; in all of these examples the verb invariably is used in the second person singular *stas.*[8] But the question is not invariably prefaced with *quid*; without the interrogative word, we find the indignant phrase *stasne etiam? i sis!* at *Cas.* 749; at *Pseud.* 1246 we find *pedes, statin an non?*, which is a self-reproach directed by the slave Pseudolus at his own feet. In the case of *Pseud.* 330, the *adulescens* Calidorus snaps impatiently at his slave Pseudolus, *propera! Quid stas?* "Hurry!—What are you just standing there for?;" the expression is remarkably similar both in locution and thought to Stasimus' self reproach, *Stasime, fac te propere celerem*!

Consequently there is added point to the opening lines of the slave's monologue if we understand his vocative *Stasime* as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* pun, as (1007):

> **STAS.** Stas?—ime, fac te propere celerem, recipe te ad dominum domum,
>
> **STAS.** (*indignantly*) Stayin'?— (*fearfully, but excitedly*)—zimus! Make yourself quick, get home to your master,

When the actor playing the slave pauses midway through the self-address, the joke implicit in his name is revealed to be an indignant self-reproach such as "just standing

[8] The 2nd person singular *stas* is by far the most common, but we also find *quid stamus?* (*Mer.* 882, *Pseud.* 756) and *quid statis?* (*Men.* 995).

around, Stasimus?," the very sort of question, and in the very same tone—as Calidorus does in the *Pseudolus*—that a master would impatiently ask his slave. And fear of his master's punishment is exactly what Stasimus has in mind here, as his following line reveals (1008):

> **STAS.** ...ne subito metus exoriatur scapulis stultitia tua.

> **STAS.** ...so that fear for your shoulders won't suddenly arise from your stupidity!

The slave reveals his thought: he'd better get home quickly, or his master will beat him. The wordplay here can scarcely be accidental, for already in the drama Plautus had made the connection between the Greek name *Stasimus* and the Latin verb *stare* explicit (vv. 716-7),

> **STAS.** Abiit [hercle] ille quidem. ecquid audis, Lusiteles? ego te volo.
> hic quoque hinc abiit. *Stasime*, *restas* solus.

> **STAS.** He's gone away. Are you listening, Lysiteles? I want to tell you something...(*looking around*) He's gone too. (*to the audience*) Stasimus, you stand alone.

where we see that Plautus, again using the schizophrenic self-address, has manipulated the expression in order to bring out the 2nd person inflection of the verb *restare*: the *–s-* element of the second person verb *restas* is the one form of the Latin verb nearest the *stas-* element of the character's Greek name *Stasimus*, in which the medial *–s-* is an integral and immutable part of the name. Thus the wordplay here furnishes support for our contention that Plautus intended the wordplay in v. 1007.

IV. D.: Plays on Greek Patronymics

To the Roman audience, the Greek termination *–ides* that denoted a patronymic was evidently familiar enough to signify a Greek name irrespective of what was prefixed

to it; as Americans might add *–ovich* in order to simulate a Russian-sounding cognomen, so for the Plautine audience the ending *–ides* guaranteed a Greek-sounding name. Latin nomenclature shared no such convention that would have been as readily recognizable to the audience, and so when Plautus coins nonce patronymics for comic effect, he uses either Greek or Latin elements prefixed to the ending *-ides*. At *M.G.* 13-15, where the soldier Pyrgopolynices is deliberately speaking bombastically, he uses Greek elements prefixed to *–ides* for the name of the *imperator summus*, *Bumbomacides Clutomistaridusarcides*. But Plautus had no qualms in forming hybrid Latin-Greek compounds to form comic nonce patronymics, as in the slave Sagaristio's boastful name in *Pers.* 700-5:

> **DOR.** Quid est tibi nomen?... 700
> ... **SAG.** Ausculta ergo, ut scias:
> Vaniloquidorus Virginesvendonides
> Nugiepiloquides Argentumexterebronides
> [Tedigniloquides Nugides Palponides]
> Quodsemelarripides Numquameripides. em tibi. 705
>
> **D.** What is your name?... 700
> ...**S.** Listen then, if you want to know:
> Idlytalking Virginsellerovich
> Publictalkingnonsenseovich Extortingmoneyexpertovich
> [Describingyouasyoudeserveovich Stupidovich Asskisserovich]
> WhatIsnatchuponceovich You'llnevergetbackovich. There you have it. 705

Each of Sagaristio's feigned names is a silly comic coinage in imitation of a long Persian name. We will return to this passage shortly, but here we may briefly acknowledge the Plautine predilection for wordplay built on the Greek patronymic termination *–ides*. Plautus does this not only in nonce coinage, but also in wordplays that pun on the regular name of a character. In *Bacch.* 283-5 the *senex* Nicobulus explodes in frustration at having been duped and exclaims:

NICO. Adeon me fuisse fungum, ut qui illi crederem,
cum mi ipsum nomen eius *Arcidemides*
clamaret *dempturum* esse, si quid crederem? 285

NICO. To think that I was such a mushroom as to believe him,
When his very name "Archidemides" kept shouting that
he would take away from me anything I trusted to him? 285

Nicobulus' wordplay is a bilingual Greek-Latin pun that turns on the *–dem-* element common to the Greek name *Archidemides* and the Latin participle *dempturum.* The Latin element of the wordplay guarantees that the wordplay cannot go back to Menander's Δίς Ἐξαπατῶν, although the name is Menandrian.[9] The *–dem-* element of *Archidemides* comes from the Greek δῆμος "nation," while in Latin, it comes from the verb *demere* "to take away," where it is due to a compound of the prefix *de-* and the simple verb *emere.* But for Plautus, this is irrelevant, for we already saw the poet twice making a similar wordplay on the *–damn-* element shared by the Latinized name *Epidamnus* and the native Latin word *damnum* in *Menaechmi.*[10] The conclusion is that Plautus disregards the meaning of the Greek word not only for a soundplay with Latin, but also in order to produce a meaning in Latin from the Greek sound.

Let us now return to Sagaristio's bombastic patronymic in *Pers.* 700-5 and analyze Plautus' technique:

DOR. Quid est tibi nomen?... 700
... **SAG.** Ausculta ergo, ut scias:
Vaniloquidorus Virginesvendonides
Nugiepiloquides Argentumexterebronides
[Tedigniloquides Nugides Palponides]
Quodsemelarripides Numquameripides. em tibi. 705

[9] The name Archidemides also appears in Terence *Eun.* 327, a contamination of Menander's *Eunuchus* and *Colax.*

[10] For text and discussion see Chapter II. D.

In response to Dordalus' question *quid est tibi nomen?*, Sagaristio replies with a monstrous Greek-style patronymic name. The first of these names that he gives (702-3) (*Vaniloquidorus*, *Virginesvendonides*, *Nugiepiloquides*, and *Argentumexterebronides*) are formed from descriptive adjectives meant to suggest certain activities. But the final two names (*Quodsemelarripides* and *Numquameripides*) have an actual syntactic connection that suggests something more: "you'll never rescue something once I get hold of it." The phrase demands that the meaning of the final name *Numquameripides* be "*you* will never get it back."[11] Plautus makes this clear by treating the Greek patronymic ending –*ides* of –*eripides* as though it were the verb *eripies*, the 2nd person future form of the verb *eripere*. Thus Plautus uses a Greek adjectival ending unrelated to Latin as though it were an equivalent sounding Latin verb termination, *-ides* for *–ies*. Although Plautus frequently disregards a difference in vowel quantity in wordplay[12], it is notable here that we have perfect metrical correspondence between the Latin verbal ending *eripĭēs* and the Greek patronymic ending *-ĭdēs* (= –ιδης). Another remarkable aspect of the wordplay is that Plautus has here deviated from his usual grammatical expression, for the question that Dordalus poses to Sagaristio in v. 700, *Quid est tibi nomen?* almost invariably elsewhere in Plautus receives an answer with the name in the dative case, not the nominative.[13] This fact may lend support to our contention that Sagaristio's reply keeps

---

[11] Woytek (ad loc.) paraphrases the final two names *Quodsemelarripides Numquameripides* as *cui, quod semel arripuerit, numquam eripietur*, "from whom, that which will have been snatched up once will never be rescued." This conveys what is meant superficially, but in explaining the final name with the passive verb *eripietur*, Woytek obscures the agent of the verb that is clear from Plautus' phrasing.

[12] Cf. Chapter I. D. a. above.

[13] In defiance of strict logic the name is in apposition to *mihi* rather than *nomen*. Examples are very numerous; cf. e.g. *Trin.* 391, 843, etc. Variations from this pattern occur only when the

the name in the nominative here in order to bring about a correspondence between *–ides* and *-ies*.

Having seen that Plautus uses the patronymic ending *–ides* to suggest the Latin verb ending *–ies*, let us now turn to a puzzling scene in the *Trinummus* that involves an elaborate and protracted exchange between the slave Syncerastus and the *senex* Charmides. Syncerastus tells Charmides that he has been instructed to distribute the two letters, one to Lesbonicus and the other to Callicles (898-900). Charmides catches on to the trick (900), and decides to retaliate. A farcical scene ensues, in which Syncerastus tries repeatedly to guess the name of the *senex* (905-922, with omissions):

> **CARM.** novistin hominem? **SVNC.** Ridicule rogitas, quicum una cibum 905
> capere soleo. **C.** Quid est ei nomen? **S.** Quod edepol homini probo.
> **C.** Lubet audire. **S.** Illi edepol — illi — illi — vae misero mihi.
> **C.** Quid est negoti? **S.** Devoravi nomen imprudens modo.
> ...
> **C.** Iam recommentatu's nomen?
> ...
> **SVNC.** litteris recomminiscar. <C> est principium nomini. 915
> **C.** Callias? **S.** Non est. **C.** Callippus? **S.** Non est. **C.** Callidemides?
> **S.** Non est. **C.** Callinicus? **S.** Non est. **C.** Callimarchus? **S.** Nil agis.
> neque adeo edepol flocci facio, quando egomet memini mihi.
> **C.** At enim multi Lesbonici sunt hic: nisi nomen patris
> dices, non monstrare istos possum homines quos tu quaeritas. 920
> quod ad exemplum est? coniectura si reperire possumus.
> **S.** Ad hoc exemplum est— **C.** An Cares? an Carmides? **S.** Enim Carmides!
> em istic erit.

> **CHARM.** Do you know the man? **SYNC.** A silly question! I often break bread with him. **C.** What's his name? **S.** It's a good man's name.
> **C.** I'd like to hear it. **S.** It's...it's...it's...dammit!
> **C.** What's the matter? **S.** I just swallowed the name when I wasn't paying attention!
> ...
> **C.** Do you remember the name now?
> ...

---

responding character varies the expression, as e.g. *Amph.* 364-5: ***MERC.*** *quid nomen tibi est? /* ***SOS.*** *Sosiam vocant Thebani...* "**M.** What is your name? / **S.** The Thebans call me Sosia..."

> I'll remember it by letters. It starts with "c".
> **C.** Callias? **S.** That's not it. **C.** Callippus? **S.** No. **C.** Callidemides?
> **S.** No. **C.** Callinicus? **S.** No. **C.** Callimarchus? **S.** No, no, no!
> and I don't give a damn, since I remember it for myself.
> **C.** But there are a lot of Lesbonicuses here; unless you say the father's
> name, I can't show you the people you're looking for.
> What sort was it? Let's see if we can find out by guessing.
> **S.** It was like this.... **C.** Chares? Charmides? **S.** Yes, Charmides!
> There you go!

The sole purpose of this farcical scene in advancing the action is to produce the name of the *senex* Charmides. The extended confusion of the scene and guessing at the name is unusually protracted in Plautus; neither the multiple cases of mistaken identity in the *Amphitruo* nor in the *Menaechmi* match this scene in the protraction of the confusion.[14] After Syncerastus remembers in v. 915 that the first letter is *c*, he proceeds to make seven incorrect guesses at the old man's name before getting it right on his eighth try (916-22). As he does so, his mistaken guesses naturally focus the audience's attention not on the first half of Charmides' name (the *Ca-* element), for that is the same each time; the audience knows that. Syncerastus' guesses of *Callias*, *Callippus*, *Callidemides*, *Callinicus*, *Callimarchus*, *Cares* all emphasize rather the second half of the name (the *–mides* element). The audience, already knowing that the *senex* is named Charmides,[15] awaits in anticipation for the moment when Syncerastus will pronounce the *–mides* element of the name. This emphasis on the name Charmides serves as the setup for two sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays that scholars have missed. The lines immediately following that in which Syncerastus finally gets the name right (922) repeat

---

[14] *Pace* Duckworth 1952 pp. 144-5, who says of the *Trinummus*, "...ignorance and deception [*sc. of identity*] are minor elements in the plot." On similar scenes in Plautus and Terence of mistaken identity and the ensuing confusion, cf. Duckworth 1952 pp. 140-75.

[15] He had already been called by name in vv. 106, 149, 359, 617, and 744.

the name Charmides twice, and in the same *sedes* each time at line end. They serve to further fix the audience's attention on the name Charmides (964-70):

> **CARM.** Haben tu id aurum quod accepisti a Carmide?
> **SVNC.** Atque etiam Pilippum, numeratum illius in mensa manu, 965
> mille nummum. **C.** Nempe ab ipso id accepisti Carmide?
> **S.** Mirum quin ab avo eius aut proavo acciperem, qui sunt mortui.
> **C.** Adulescens, cedodum istuc aurum mi. **S.** Quod ego aurum dem tibi?
> **C.** Quod a me te accepisse fassu's. **S.** Aps te accepisse? **C.** Ita loquor.
> **S.** Quis tu homo es? **C.** Qui mille nummum tibi dedi ego sum Carmides. 970

> **CHARM**. Do you have the gold that you got from Charmides?
> **SYNC**. Yes, and sovereign at that, counted from his hand on the table,
> A thousand coins. **C.** You took it from Charmides himself, of course?
> **S.** You think I got it from his dead grandfather or greatgrandfather?
> **C.** Young man, give that gold of yours to me. **S.** What gold would I give you?
> **C**. The gold that you admitted that you got from me. **S.** That I got from you? **C.** That's right.
> **S**. Who are you? **C**. I am the one who gave you the thousand coins, I'm Charmides!

Charmides' name is repeated at line end both in vv. 964 and 966. The *senex* then becomes more direct in his request for the gold. In v. 968, we have the following exchange:

C. Adulescens, *cedo*dum istuc aurum *mi.* **S.** Quod ego aurum *dem tibi*? Charmides indicates himself as, losing patience, he says, "Young man, give that gold of yours to me," using the imperative *cedo* (from *dare*) and the dative pronoun *mi.* His order prompts Syncerastus to reply, "What gold would I give you?," using the same words that Charmides had, again using a form of the verb *dare* in the subjunctive *dem*, and repeating the dative pronoun *tibi.* These buildup lines make Charmides' retort in v. 970 all the more convincing when he explodes with a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay made on his own name:

S. Quis tu homo es? **C.** Qui mille nummum tibi dedi, ego sum Car—mides!

To Syncerastus' question "Who are you?" the *senex* replies, "I'm the one who gave you all the money! I'm Char...(*losing his temper, grabbing at the gold*)...give...it...to...me!" The *senex* uses his name as though the first half (*Car-*) were merely setup for the second half (*-mides*) which, pausing mid-word, he then treats as though it were the Latin words *mi(hi) des*, i.e. "(you should) give it to me!"[16] The senex supports his subjunctive command *des* with the words in the relative clause *tibi dedi*, as though he were echoing the idea, "I gave you the money, now you give it back to me!"

We see that Plautus has manipulated syntax, case, and word order to sustain the joke: He has restored the name to the nominative case, the only case which would yield the *–des* ending equivalent to the subjunctive, and delayed the name to the final position in the line as the significant word. The audience simply expects him to repeat his name, but when he does, his name becomes coincident with his request for the return of the money. We may receive further corroboration that we have properly understood Plautus' joke from the reply that Syncerastus gives to Charmides in v. 972: *abi sis, nugator: nugari nugatori postulas*, "get out of here, you fooler; you expect to fool a fooler!"

As he often does, Plautus repeats his joke, and it comes as no surprise that moments later Charmides uses his same joke a second time in v. 973 (970-3):

> **SVNC.** Quis tu homo es? **CAR.** Qui mille nummum tibi dedi ego sum Carm—
> mides!

---

[16] *Mi* (monosyllabic) not *mihi* is regular in Plautus; cf. Chapter I. H. c.

The jussive second person singular (*des*!) is a common colloquial feature of Plautus' Latin where Classical Latin would regularly use the simple imperative (*da*!). The collocation of *mihi des* occurs in Plautus frequently: cf. *Aul.* 793, *Capt.* 340, 354, *M.G.* 927, *Most.* 926 (where, as here, the subjunctive is jussive), *Pers.* 36, *Poen* 1414 (*mihi des facito*).

SVNC. Neque edepol tu is es, neque hodie is umquam eris, auro huic quidem.[17]
abi sis, nugator: nugari nugatori postulas.
CARM. Car...mi!—des!— ego sum!

S. Who are you? **C.** I am the one who gave you the thousand coins—Charmides!
SYNC. By god, you aren't him and you'll never be him today, as far as this gold's concerned!
Be off, jokester: you expect to fool a fooler?
CHAR. I am Char...give it to me!...I am him!

In v. 973 Charmides points at his chest in growing fury and says *Car...mi des!!—ego sum*, "I'm Char...give it to me! I'm me!" As in v. 970 the *senex* had said *ego sum Charmides*, the *senex* now merely rearranges the word order slightly to produce *Charmides ego sum.* The syntax is the same in each instance, and the joke works in both cases, since the *ego sum* of v. 973 can be taken by itself to mean "It's me, I'm me," and so Charmides, by beginning his sentence, trails off after the *Car-* element to emphasize the *mi des.*

There are three pieces of corroborating evidence that suggest that the interpretation suggested above is correct. The first is Syncerastus' complaint in v. 974: *nimis argute <me> obrepsisti*, "so *glibly* did you cheat me," indicating Charmides' reliance on verbal wit. The second is the wordplay made on the name *Charmides* moments later, when Syncerastus coins two nonce verbs built off of the old man's name: *Carmidare* "to become Charmides," and *recarmidare* (or possibly *decarmidare*), which must mean "to un-Charmidize."[18] (977):

---

[17] I confine to a footnote the further possibility that there might also be a play on this final *quidem*, as though it were the subjunctive in reply: *auro huic? – qui dem?*, i.e., "as far as this gold's concerned. Why should I give it?," as though *qui-* element of *quidem* were the interrogative pronoun *qui*, "why?," and *–dem* were equivalent to *dem*, the subjunctive of *do*.

[18] The manuscripts read *recharmida*, which both Leo and Lindsay retained; Ritschl proposed *decharmidare*, "decharmidize," as the prefix *de-* is more likely than *re-* to mean "un-" charmidize; *re-* is perhaps influenced by *rursum*. The precise reading, however, does not affect the interpretation of the nonce word.

SVNC. Proind tu te, itidem ut Carmidatus es, rusum recarmida.

SYNC. So then, just as you were Charmidized, uncharmidize again!

The final pieces of evidence that suggest that we have correctly detected the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on the patronymic of the old man's name and the verb *dare* is the connection among the sounds established by two jingles. In v. 982, we find the assonance *Carmidem dedisse*, and at Rud. 568 we find *mi Charmides* (vocative) at line-end.

IV. E.: Wordplays on the Sound *lu-*

As we saw above, Plautus uses the Greek patronymic ending *–ides* to introduce sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay. The poet employs this same device to set up another sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* based on the name of the anonymous *virgo* in the *Persa*. Midway through the deception, when the slave Dordalus inquires about the girl's name, she responds that her name in her native land had been Lucris (624-5)[19]:

DOR. Quid nomen tibist?
TOX. (*to the audience*) Nunc metuo ne peccet. **VIR.** Lucridi nomen in patria fuit.

DOR. What is your name?
TOX. I'm afraid she'll make a mistake here. **V.** My name back home was Lucris.

This prompts Dordalus to focus the audience's attention in the following line on the auspicious-sounding name Lucris, when the slave exclaims (626):

TOX. *Nomen atque omen* quantivis iam est preti.[20]

---

[19] That is, her name was Λοκρίς, "the Locrian," a common sort of slave designation (so Schmidt p. 194, who compares from Middle-New Comedy the names Βοιωτίς, Δωδωνίς, Αθθίς, and Αχαιίς). The pronunciation of the Greek *o* perhaps is manipulated to sound more like Latin *ŭ*, although in the phoneme /loc/ the two vowels might have been identical anyway.

TOX. That's an ominous onomic at any price!

Toxilus then turns back to the *virgo* and looks her up and down. As he inspects her, he speaks the following line (627):

TOX. Si te emam, mihi quoque Lucridem confido fore te!

TOX. If I buy you, I believe you'll be a Lucris for me too.

Scholars have usually understood the play between the Greek name *Lucridem* as a schijn-ambiguum wordplay on the Latin word *lucrum.* But Toxilus' word order suggests that there may be something more here. As we saw above with the wordplay on the name *Carmides* understood as *Car—mi(hi) des!* in the *Trinummus*, so too here brief pauses by Toxilus both midway through and after his enunciation of the name *Lucridem* sets up the expectation that the *–dem* element of the girl's name is the subjunctive of *do*, illustrated as:

TOX. Si te emam, mihi quoque Lucri—dem (*rubbing his hands together gleefully*)...confido fore te!

T. If I (were to) buy you, I'd be giving myself a huge lucre!...

The ambiguous form of the first verb *emam*—whether future or subjunctive—gives rise to the possibility that a subjunctive form will follow *in apodosi.* Now if Toxilus were to pause immediately after the name (as punctuated above) and address the audience, his sentence would appear complete, meaning, "(*looking at the* virgo) If I buy you (*then turning to face the audience*), I would be getting myself a deal too!" Toxilus' grammar and word order will support this interpretation because the audience can understand the *Lucri-* element of the name as a "hanging" partitive genitive from *lucrum.* In the normal

---

[20] The expression *nomen omen* used here was later to become proverbial, but this occurrence is the only one in Plautus.

Plautine idiom—and indeed, it is so used just moments later in vv. 668 and 713—Plautine characters often use the genitive of *lucri* without another word to govern the genitive. In both vv. 668 and 713 we find the syntactically complete phrase *fecisti lucri*, "you enriched yourself."[21] As is normal with this elocution, the genitive is not dependent on any expressed noun and has the meaning, "to enrich oneself, to get a good deal."[22] This interpretation improves the dramatic delivery of the line, particularly if after the pause Toxilus turns back to the girl to continue his sentence, forcing the audience to realize that he is not yet done speaking; when he finishes his line, the meaning becomes "I trust you will be Lucris for me too," and the shijn-ambiguum pun remains.

There is an extended set of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays on the sound *lu-* in the *Poenulus* which, in order to maintain the integrity of the passage and thereby demonstrate the rapid succession of wordplays, are treated together in Chapter V.

IV. F.: Passing Wordplays on the Names of Characters

There are a number of places in the Plautine corpus where a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* based on the name of a character may be performed in a passing wordplay. A number of characters in the Plautine corpus have names that lend themselves easily to puns in Latin, and the possibility of a name-based *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* looks possible in

---

[21] Cf. OLD s.v. *lucrum* 2.

[22] The phrase *lucri facere* was common enough to be felt as a single word in later Latin, though not in Plautus; the "hanging" genitive of the noun was fossilized in other verbs as e.g. the verb *lucrificare*, where the short –i- is notable, as it is in the Plautine compounds *lucrifer*, *lucrificabilis*, *lucrifuga*, *lucripeta*, and as it is in the name *Lucrĭdem*. Even if we do not allow a "hanging" genitive *lucri* with *dare*, naturally the audience might have expected a word expressing supply or quantity to follow that would govern the genitive.

many cases. Among these are included the names of the characters Artamo and Pistoclerus in the *Bacchides*, Tyndarus in the *Captivi*, and Sceledrus in the *Miles Gloriosus*. As many of these are not guaranteed by the response of another character or any other unusual triggers, the interpretation remains in each case only a possibility. This next section will discuss the cases where a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* seems most likely.

IV. F. a.: Artamo

There appears to be a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay made on the name of the *lorarius* Artamo in *Bacch.* 799. The name was probably originally connected with Artemis, but the choice here is no doubt intended to recollect the common Greek noun *ἀρτάμος*, which means "butcher" not only in the literal sense, but also with the ancillary undertone of "brutalizer, punisher, murderer."[23] When the slave Chrysalus knows that he has been caught and awaits punishment for his crimes, he announces to the audience that the slaves will soon arrive to tie him up (796-8):

> **CRVS.** servos arcessit intus qui me vinciant.
> ...
> sed conticiscam, nam audio aperiri fores.
>
> **CHRYS.** He's calling his slaves outside to tie me up.
> ...
> But I'll hush up; I hear the door opening.

When the door bursts opens at v. 798, out rushes Nicobulus attended by his *lorarius* Artamo; spying Chrysalus, he turns to the *lorarius* and commands him to tie up Chrysalus in these words (799):

---

[23] Cf. LSJ s.v. *ἀρτάμος* and Schmidt p. 178.

NIC. Constringe tu illi, Artamo, actutum manus.

NIC. Tie up his hands, Artamo, right away!

The context suggests that Nicobulus' directive to the *lorarius* ought to sound more menacing than it appears in our texts, and would be better performed as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* that we may illustrate as:

NIC. Constringe tu illi art—amo, actutum manus

The word order of Nicobulus' command suggests that he is going to say to the *lorarius*, *Constringe tu illi art—e manus*, "bind his hands tightly (*arte*)." When Nicobulus, however, protracts his word to the name *Art—amo*, what had sounded to Chrysalus as though it would be mere confinement is suddenly changed to suggest a far more frightening fate, for his custodian goes by the name "Butcher."

IV. F. b.: Pistoclerus

We do not know the extent to which the *adulescens* Pistoclerus appeared onstage in the lost opening act of the *Bacchides*,[24] but we can identify a previously undetected play made on his name. The first extant portion of the is play a scene starring the sisters Bacchis and Pistoclerus. There, the sister convinces Pistoclerus that he must secure a

[24] The opening portion of the *Bacchides* is lost to us. The lacuna amounts to about 200 lines (so Barsby 1986 p. 93). We do, however, possess 21 fragments consisting of 34 lines, and Nünlist 1993 now tentatively identifies P. Mich inv. 6950, P. Köln 203 and 204 as scenes from the lost opening of Menander's Δὶς Ἐξαπατῶν. Editors have tried to arrange these in various orders and supplement what must have been said in the lacuna on the basis of what is taken for granted later in the text. As the argument to be presented in the text above maintains that the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke is based on the name of Pistoclerus, it requires the dramatic preparation of first informing the audience of the name of the *adulescens*, for it is conventional that no character in New Comedy is named in the prologue. By applying the principle in reverse, we can suppose that the name of Pistoclerus was expressly spoken in the lost opening.

sum of money if he wants to prevent his Bacchis from being taken away by the soldier. The exchange is remarkably rich in wordplay centered on swindling imagery (53-6):[25]

> **BAC.** Qui, amabo? **PIST.** Quia, Baccis, bacc—as metuo et bacc—anal tuom.
> **BAC.** Quid est? quid metuis? ne tibi lectus malitiam apud me suadeat?
> **PIST.** Magis illectum tuom quam lectum metuo. mala tu es bestia. 55
> nam huic aetati non conducit, mulier, latebrosus locus.
>
> **BAC.** Why, pray tell? **PIST.** Because, Bacchis, I fear Bacchants and your bacchanal. **BAC.** What is it? What are you afraid of? That my bed will urge you on to some trouble?
> **PIST.** I'm more afraid of your enticement than your bed. You're a wicked beast, for a shadowy place is not conducible for this age of mine, woman.

Initially Pistoclerus displays measured caution, but eventually his resolve weakens and he agrees to play a part in the scheme to deceive the soldier. The two sisters prevail on him to buy groceries for the *cena viatica* (92-9), and as he departs (100), the two celebrate their victory in the following lines (100-3):

> **BAC.** propera, amabo. **P.** Prius hic adero quam te amare desinam.— 1 00
> **SOR.** Bene me accipies advenientem, mea soror. **B.** Quid ita, obsecro?
> **SOR.** Quia piscatus meo quidem animo hic tibi hodie evenit bonus!
> **B.** Meus ille quidemst!
>
> **BAC.** Hurry back, please. **P.** I'll be here before I stop loving you. (*exit*)
> **SOR.** You'll receive me when I arrive, my sister. B. Why so, pray tell?
> **SOR.** Because as I see it, our fishing is turning out well for you today!
> **BAC.** I have him now!

The sister heralds the triumph over the young man in v. 102 with a vivid image borrowed from the vocabulary of fishing: "Our fishing (*piscatus*)," she says, "is working out wonderfully!;" but the metaphor arrives suddenly. Although imagery from hunting or fowling used to refer to deception is common in Plautus, and *piscatus* used as a metaphor for swindling is not odd Plautine imagery, the metaphor does not often recur. More

[25] The wordplays here in vv. 53 (*Baccis/Baccas*) and 55 (*lectus/illectum*) are discussed in more detail in Chapter III. D. above.

frequently we find cheating metaphors based on shearing sheep or sacking towns.[26] So why has Plautus chosen this particular metaphor in this particular place? The choice of the word *piscatus* may indicate that the line should be delivered as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on the Greek name Pistoclerus (otherwise meaning "trusting in lots," or "gambler"), which we may illustrate as:

> **SOR.** Bene me accipies advenientem, mea soror. **B.** Quid ita, obsecro?
> **SOR.** Quia pis—catus meo quidem animo hic tibi hodie evenit bonus!

In place of the sister's words *quia pis—catus...* would have been expected "because Pistoclerus is in our clutches," i.e., a line proceeding as *quia pis—toclerum tenemus...*" The sudden shortening of the name that had been expected, however, strikes a brilliant image of the young man being "hooked" like a fish.[27] This hypothesis may be corroborated by the fact that the name of the *adulescens* Pistoclerus is a Plautine change from the corresponding character in Menander's Δὶς Ἐξαπατῶν, where he had been named Moschus.[28]

---

[26] Two exceptions: at *Asin.* 178-80 the *adulescens* in love is compared to a fish, but there the image is rather different:

> **CLEAR.** quasi piscis, itidemst amator lenae: nequam est, nisi recens;
> is habet sucum, is suavitatem, eum quo vis pacto condias,
> vel patinarium vel assum, verses quo pacto lubet. 180

> **CLEAR.** To a madam, a lover is just like a fish: he's no good if he's not fresh.
> He has juice, sweetness, you can season him as you like,
> Either pan-stewed or roasted, you can turn him just as you will. 180

In Diniarchus' opening monologue (*Truc.* 22ff.), the *adulescens* muses on the similarities between a lover and a fish.

[27] Cf. *Curc.* 431 *meus hic est, hamum vorat* and *Truc.* 42 (but deleted by Leo): *adduntur noctes, interim ille hamum vorat.* (Similar too is *Most.* 1070).

[28] This is not to suggest that Plautus chose the name Pistoclerus specifically for this wordplay; indeed, it is more likely that Plautus first selected the name and added the incidental joke later.

IV. F. c.: Tyndarus

The name of Tyndarus, the slave and brother of Philocrates in the *Captivi*, was written and pronounced in Plautus' time as *Tundarus*. As the *Me-* element of *Menaechmus* facilitates a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on *meum* in *Men.* 1077, the name *Tundarus* easily lends itself to a number of jokes with the pronoun *tu*. When the *adulescens* Aristophontes and the *senex* Hegio interrogate the captive Tyndarus, the wordplay is possible several times, as for example in vv. 571-2,

> **ARIST.** Dic modo: *tun*— negas te *Tun*darum esse? **T.** Nego, inquam. **A.** *Tun* te Philocratem esse ais? **TVND.** Ego, inquam.
>
> **ARIST.** Just tell me this: You deny that you're Tyndarus? **T.** Yes, I do! **A.** You say that you're Philocrates? **TYND.** I am, I do!

where in each instance Aristophontes, acting as interrogator, grows more menacing in tone (perhaps poking Tyndarus in the chest?). There may be also be a wordplay in v. 577:

> **ARIST.** Quid ais, furcifer? *tun* te gnatum <esse> memoras liberum?[29]

The difficulty in envisioning the staging, however, precludes certainty in these cases. Other occasions in the same play seem more specifically intended as *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* puns on the name. In v. 402, Tyndarus dictates to Philocrates (who is now using the name Tyndarus) a message to his father as to how affairs stand now that he is in captivity. The tone of the line is pitiable, and gives rise to a brief anacoluthon when Tyndarus' voice falters:

> **PHIL.** Numquid aliud vis patri
> nuntiari? **TYND.** Me hic valere et tu—te audacter dicito,
> Tundare – inter nos fuisse ingenio haud discordabili…

[29] This last line was adduced by Gratwick 1993 (ad *Men.* 1077) as a parallel, but without further comment.

Previously, editors had punctuated and understood v. 402 with a dash between *et* and *tute*, as:

TYND. Me hic valere et – tute audacter dicito...,

If, however, we understand the line as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play on the name Tyndarus, the pathos of his words increases. Whereas the audience had expected him to say, "Tell him, Tyndarus, that I'm doing okay here," he breaks off the speech and changes it to, "You tell him boldly, Tyndarus, that I'm doing ok here;" the expected words then would have been *me hic valere, et Tu—ndare...*, that is, proceeding with a direct address of "Tyndarus."

IV. F. d.: Sceledrus

After the slave Sceledrus[30] reports having seen Philocomasium kissing the *adulescens* in *Miles Gloriosus*, the young woman angrily accuses the slave of lying. She in turn grows angry at the slave, and explodes (364):

PHIL. Vbi iste est bonus servos, qui probri me maxumi innocentem
falso insimulavit? **PAL.** Em tibi, hic mihi dixit tibi quae dixi. 365
PHIL. Tun me vidisse in proxumo hic, *scele—ste*, ais osculantem?

The wordplay between the name *Sceledrus* and *scelestus* is guaranteed by the multiple jingles that explicitly establish the connection elsewhere in the play. Two of these precede: v. 289

PAL. Quod ego, *Sceledre, scelus* ex te audio?

and v. 330

PAL. Nescio quae te, *Sceledre, scelera* suscitant

[30] A name of uncertain meaning; cf. Schmidt pp. 381-2.

set up the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke here. [31] By pausing mid-word Philocomasium allows her anger to grow and by transforming the penultimate letters, turns the name of the slave to a more permanent insult. This probability is confirmed when, just a few lines later, the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay is repeated: this time Palinurus abuses Sceledrus, saying (380),

PAL. Pergin, scele—ste, intendere hanc arguere?

where *Sceledre*, the name of the slave, had been expected.

IV. G.: Proverbial-Mythological Allusions

IV. G. a.: Solon

As we saw in the previous section, those wordplays which act *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* but which are spoken in passing lack any corroborating evidence to guarantee the wordplay. Our next two examples similarly take their point of departure from a passing wordplay based on a name, yet with no evidence to guarantee the play. These next two examples, beginning with a more banal word, give way to a surprising mythological allusion. With the beginning of v. 591 of the *Asinaria*, there is a lively exchange between Argyrippus and Philaenium. The two slaves Libanus and Leonida, meanwhile, watch the two lovers from a distance and offer commentary on the proceedings. Argyrippus tries to depart several times, but Philaenium repeatedly pulls him back. In desperation, the girl asks him one final time to stay, to which Argyrippus replies that he'll be only too happy to stay—the night:

PIL. Quo nunc abis? quin tu hic manes? **ARG.** Nox, si voles, manebo.
LIB. Audin hunc opera ut largus est nocturna? nunc enim esse

[31] Cf. also v. 494 (later than our line in question): **PER.** tun, *Sceledre*, hic, *scelerum* caput...

> negotiosum interdius videlicet Solonem,
> leges ut conscribat, quibus se populus teneat. 600
>
> **PHIL.** Where are you going now? Why don't you stay? **ARG.** I'll stay the night, if you want!
> **LIB.** (*to Leonida*) Do you hear how generous he is with his night time? That's because during the day he's a busy Solon,
> writing laws for the people to govern themselves. 600

Libanus' allusion to the Athenian lawgiver Solon arrives suddenly and thus quite unexpectedly in a Roman play. His prior words suggest, then, that this is a sophisticated *παρα προσδοκίαν*: *nox* (597) and *nocturna* (598) both raise considerations of night time, while *nunc* (599) and *interdius*, "during the day" (599) suggest that Libanus is going to continue saying something about Libanus' action during the day, and that he would have reinforced *interdius* by saying not *Sol—on* but *sol—e*, meaning, "now he's really busy during the day, when the sun is shining...;" that is, the first syllable *sol-* looks as though it will anticipate an inflection such as *sole*, "the sun," perhaps as an ablative absolute expressing the time. By protracting the word, however, and switching midway through the word, Libanus adds an unexpected allusion to the quasi proverbial-mythological Athenian lawgiver Solon, and a far funnier, and sarcastic, image of his young master so busy writing laws during the day that he has no time for *meretrices* other than at night.[32] The slave, then, should pause midway through the proper name *Solon*, illustrated as:

> **LIB.** Audin hunc opera ut largus est nocturna? nunc enim esse
> negotiosum interdius videlicet Sol—onem...

IV. G. b.: Autolycus

[32] Plautus may have found the allusion in his Greek original, but if the anecdote related by Livy (3. 31) of the decemvirs' embassy sent to Athens in 452 in order to copy down the Solonian code was current already in the time of Plautus, it was equally intelligible to the Roman audience.

At *Bacch.* 275 there is a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* play that serves to introduce a mythological allusion. Plautine characters in search of money frequently request a specific denomination such as *philippi* or *minae*, or simply *nummi* or *argentum* (both meaning "cash" in Plautine slang). In the *Bacchides*, however, the characters are universally occupied with getting *aurum* "gold": the word *aurum* is mentioned often in the play (e.g. at vv. 46, 104) and with incredible frequency beginning with v. 220. (A form of the word occurs in vv. 223, 229, 230, 233, 242, 250, and 269.) The talk of gold culminates in v. 269, when Nicobulus inquires from Chrysalus how things stand, saying:

NIC. Habetin aurum? id mihi dici volo.

NIC. Do you have the gold? That's what I want you to tell me.

When shortly thereafter (275) Chrysalus duly informs Nicobulus that the gold has been forfeited, Nicobulus moans with grief in these words:

NIC. deceptus sum, Autoluco hospiti aurum credidi!

NIC. I've been deceived, I trusted the gold to Autolycus!

In light, however, of the repeated mentions of *aurum*, we might understand the line as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, illustrated as:

NIC. deceptus sum, au—toluco hospiti aurum credidi!

Nicobulus' words are arranged so as to suggest that he had been going to say *deceptus sum au—ro,* "I've been cheated of the gold!," but by switching directions after the first syllable, he elaborates with an allusion to the proverbial thief Autolycus, whose name had become synonymous with thievery in Greek mythology.[33]

---

[33] Barsby 1986 pp. 122-3 leaves open the question as to whether Plautus took over the allusion to Autolycus from Menander or introduced it himself; Fraenkel p. 12 earlier had thought that it was to be attributed to Menander. Neither the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* nor the simpler wordplay within the line (*autoluco...aurum*) can be decisive either way; but as the wordplay involves the

The interpretation offered above may be corroborated by the wordplay in the line that follows it, in which Nicobulus deliberately misunderstands Chrysalus' word *audi* and *avidi* (276):

CRVS. Quin tu *audi*. **NIC.** Immo ingenium *avidi* haud pernoram hospitis.

CHRYS. Agreed. **NIC.** A greed is what I failed to see!"[34]

IV. H.: Conclusion

The numerous examples of bilingual Greek-Latin sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays that we have examined in this chapter indicate that Plautus was fully cognizant of the opportunities for ambiguity that a sound shared by the two languages offered for a sudden and surprising wordplay. The poet takes advantage of these opportunities for a variety of reasons: in order to suggest a Latin meaning appropriate to the character speaking (e.g. *Stasimus* as *stas*, *Charmides* as *mi(hi) des*); simply for passing wordplays (e.g. *scelus* and *Sceledrus*); to introduce a sudden exaggeration of the situation (e.g. the name *Artamo* for *arte*); or to introduce an allusion from history or mythology that may delight his audience (*Solon*, *Autylocus*). As Plautus' "Greeks" speak Latin onstage, the sudden introduction of a *bon mot* from Greek into their Latin discourse seems to have served to enhance the audience's surprise and enjoyment of a situation.

* * *

Latin *aurum*, that much is certainly to be attributed to Plautus, even if he had been inspired by his Greek model, as in e.g. the wordplay in Menander's *Gubernatores* fr. 301 K, v. 6 *τὰ Ταντάλου τάλαντ' ἐκεῖνα λεγόμενα* (cited by Fraenkel).

[34] Barsby's translation.

CHAPTER V:

WORDPLAYS ON COMMON NOUNS

This chapter deals with sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays that involve common nouns either from Greek or Latin. The examples in this chapter are grouped in alphabetical order according to the play in which they appear.

V. A.: *Amphitruo*

In the *Amphitruo* the slave Sosia speaks two heretofore unnoticed sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplays in rapid succession, both of which serve to suggest that his mistress Alcumena is drunk. When Amphitruo returns home following the war against the Teloboeans, he finds his wife Alcumena pregnant (654ff.). She, who had just been visited by Jupiter in the guise of her husband, is surprised to see Amphitruo return so soon; when he greets her by saying that he has not seen in her many months (676), she is confused and suspects that her husband is testing her fidelity. She grows irritated at the suspicion and accordingly acts cold and aloof toward her husband (660-3, 682ff.). Amphitruo is perplexed by this reception, and in trying to determine the cause of the problem, he discusses his concerns privately with Sosia, who hints that the root of the problem may be that Alcumena has had too much to drink (696-7):

AMP. Haec quidem deliramenta loquitur. **SOS.** Paulisper mane, 696
dum edormiscat unum somnum. **AMP.** Quaene vigilans somniat?

AMPH. (*to Sosia*): This woman is talking crazy! **SOS.** (*to Amphitruo*) Just wait a little while, until she sleeps off a certain sleep. **AMPH.** She who sleeps while awake?

As the text stands, however, there are some difficulties: in v. 697, the adjective *unum* is awkwardly attached so as to modify *somnum.*[1] The meaning that *unum* evidently must have here, equivalent to *quiddam*, "a certain sleep," is only rarely attested, and even if that interpretation is accepted, still does not give excellent sense to our lines.[2] Furthermore, although the expression *vigilans somniare* "to hallucinate" is proverbial[3], the phrasing of Amphitruo's response in the form of a connective relative (*quaene*) is puzzling, but must mean, "The same one who dreams while she's awake?"[4]

---

[1] For this reason Gertz wanted to alter the manuscripts' reading to *illum*, but this has rightly been rejected by editors.

[2] For the sense, cf. OLD s.v. *unus* II. Ussing, if I understand him correctly, explains *unum* as equivalent to *eum*, "that sleep (by which she has just been seized)," but that strains the Latin; Palmer (ad loc.) says "*unum* is used to justify *paulisper*," and translates the phrase as "till she sleeps just one sleep," but that is senseless. Lodge (s.v. *unus* III. B. γ.) likewise regards *unum* as merely equal to "one." Christenson (ad loc.) understands it as *quiddam*, as do I.

[3] It appears also at *Capt.* 848. The idiomatic expression *vigilans somniare*, like *astans somniare*, is a set phrase, "to hallucinate," "to talk wildly, daydream," (cf. OLD s.v. *somnio* 3b), equivalent to *delirare* (which Amphitruo says in v. 696; cf. also *Cist.* 291 *utrum deliras, quaeso, an astans somnias*?); at *Men.* 395 *certe haec mulier cantherino ritu astans somniat* the expression is played on literally, "stands there dreaming," as a horse sleeps while standing, glossed further by *cantherino ritu* "in nag fashion." (There is probably also a shijn-ambiguum wordplay on **cantharino ritu*, "in wine jug fashion," with a hint that Erotium is drunk; cf. v. 373 (Menaechmus II again speaking): *aut insana aut ebria est*, and the very frequent recurrence of *cantharus* as a drinking vessel in Plautus (twice already in *Men.* 177 and 187, each in a joking context.) This is given added support by the secondary meaning of the noun *cantherius* as "vine prop" or "vines." (At *M.G.* 217 the reading *+anheriatus vestis+*, in which Lindsay thought *cantheriatu's* (= "you're drunk") lurked and which would support the above interpretation, is plainly corrupt beyond recovery.)

[4] Ussing ad loc. quotes parallels for this Plautine use of the connective relative in a continuative question, but the syntax of each of his parallels is much easier than the present case.

A parallel situation in the *Menaechmi* may help to explain the exchange here. The confusion of identity in this scene among slave Sosia, master Amphitruo, and lover Alcumena is quite similar to the confusion of identity among slave Messenio, master Menaechmus II, and lover Erotium in *Men.* 351-431. In each case, the woman (Alcumena or Erotium), incorrectly thinking that she has just seen her lover (Amphitruo or Menaechmus), makes remarks that strike the master and slave as absurd. In each case, master and slave are perplexed and speak several asides concerning the woman's state of mind. In the *Menaechmi*, Menaechmus II tells Messenio that he believes that Erotium's confusion is owed either to madness or excessive drinking (373):

MEN. certo haec mulier aut insana aut ebria est.

MEN. Certainly this woman is either insane or drunk.

The similarity of the situation in this passage in the *Menaechmi*, and in particular the explanation that Menaechmus gives for Erotium's confusion—that she is drunk—may help eludicate Sosia's puzzling words and allow us to interpret them differently from the way in which they have traditionally been understood.[5] Sosia's choice of the verb *edormiscere* in v. 697 is particularly significant. It is a rare verb in Latin literature, and in its other occurrences never does it govern a cognate accusative , as evidently it must here, so that the verb means "to sleep off (one's) sleep," and then, presumably, "to awaken

[5] Drunkenness is the same charge of which Amphitruo had accused Sosia when the slave was trying to account for the confusion earlier in the play; cf. v. 574: **AMP.** *Homo hic ebrius est, ut opinor.* "This man is drunk, I think," and the ensuing lines. (Lindsay retains v. 631 **SOS.** *non ego cum vino simitu ebibi imperium tuom,* "I didn't drink up your authority along with the wine," which would corroborate the same charge of drunkenness, but Leo and Christenson, following Ussing, delete it as an interpolation.)

fully."[6] It is rather the *vox propria* used for sleeping off a hangover, as in *Rud.* 586 *abeo...ut edormiscam hanc crapulam* "I'm going to sleep off this debauchery," and even more specifically, of sleeping off the effects of *wine*, as in Terence *Adel.* 786, *aliquo abeam atque edormiscam hoc villi* "I'm going to go somewhere and drink off this sup of wine."[7] Consequently it appears that Sosia's choice of the word *edormiscat* is loaded, and perhaps belies the way that the slave had been going to finish his sentence, for it looks here as though Sosia tries to save his skin with a euphemistic *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke, illustrated as:

> **SOS.**Paulisper mane,
> dum edormiscat *οἰν*—um somnum.

That is, Sosia begins the sentence as though he were going to say to Amphitruo *dum edormiscat οἰν—ον*, "Wait a little bit until she can sleep off *ze vino*." But midway through the very word by which he is about to charge his master's wife with excessive drinking, Sosia recollects his servile station.[8] But he has already begun the word; he cannot take it back, and so he tries to change the sentiment mid-word, and adds a more agreeable Latin termination, leaving him to cobble together the odd expression *un—um somnum*, "...until she can sleep off one sleep."

---

[6] Cf. TLL s.v. *edormiscere*; the word does not appear outside of the passages listed in the text above. If by "sleeping off a sleep" one means "to wake up," i.e. "to return to one's senses," we would have expected here *expergiscatur*, as in *Asin.* 249 *Libane, nunc te meliust expergiscier.*

[7] As Christenson ad loc. correctly notes. Cf. with these examples the use of *edormire*, of which LS s.v. *edormire* says, "usually of persons who are intoxicated," citing Cicero *Ac.* 2. 17. 52: *cumque (vinolenti) edormiverunt*; ib. *Phil.* 2. 12: *edormi crapulam*; Horace *Sat.* 2. 3. 61: *Fufius ebrius olim / cum Ilionam edormit.* Of this verb used particularly of drinking off wine, note Gellius 7. 10. 5: *donec discipuli nocturum omne vinum edormiant.*

[8] Cf. Messenio's response to his master Menaechmus II in *Men.* 250-1:

> **MEN.** molestus ne sis, non tuo hoc fiet modo. **MESS.** Em
> illoc enim verbo esse me servom scio.

We saw earlier (Chapter I. D. d. 2) that the slave already may have spoken the word *socium* with an Umbrian pronunciation (v. 384). Here Sosia is apparently meant to pronounce the word *unum* as *oenum*, a pronunciation which may be regarded as simultaneously archaic and Greek.[9] This would most closely bring about the correspondence in sound between the Latin word *unum* and the accusative inflection of the Greek word *οἶνον*. Alongside the Latin word *vinum*, the Greek word for wine was already in the time of Plautus familiar in the streets of Rome, if we may judge from *Asin.* 200, where Cleareta says *a pistore panem petimus, vinum ex oenopolio*, "we get bread from the miller, wine from the *vineria*." The word *oenophorum* "winebasket," seems also to have been part of the *sermo cotidianus*, as it appears in Horace, Juvenal, Persius, and Martial, was current at least by the time of Lucilius and perhaps also in the time of Plautus.[10] Thus the passage is best explained by assuming that, like other Plautine rascals[11], Sosia slips into his Latin sentence a Greek word in a *jeu d'esprit.* Then, however, remembering the seriousness of his accusation he tries to patch up his gaffe by

---

MEN. Don't be bothersome—this will not be done your way.
MESS (*to the audience*). There—With those words I know that I am a slave.

[9] On the archaic pronunciation of the letter *u* as the older diphthong *oe* in Plautus, cf. Chapter I. D. d. 1. Although the orthography of the manuscripts is generally unreliable, the spelling *oenus* for *unus* appears at *Truc.* 102, as it does occasionally elsewhere (cf. OLD s.v. *unus*).

[10] Cf. TLL s.v. *oenophorum.*

[11] Cf. e.g. *Capt.* 880ff, where in a farcical scene the parasite Ergasilus begins swearing oaths in Greek; and *Pseud.* 712 where the slave Pseudolus unexpectedly puns in Greek on the name of the *adulescens* Charinus.

adding a Latin termination to his word, even though the resulting expression is bizarre and borders on the illogical.[12]

There is a final piece of corroborating evidence that Plautine slaves employ sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes to save themselves from a slip of the tongue. In the *Menaechmi*, the slave cook Cylindrus saves himself from a word of bad omen in much the same way at v. 329 when he says to the master Menaechmus (328-9):

> **CVL.** numquid vis? **MEN.** Vt eas maximam malam crucem.
> **CVL.** Ire hercle meliust te in—terim atque accumbere.
>
> **CYL.** Nothing else, is there? **MEN.** That you go straight to hell!
> **CYL.** Better that you go – inside, and sit down for dinner.

Here the cook was going to repeat back Menaechmus' abuse by saying *ire hercle meliust te in— malam crucem*; but remembering his station, he catches himself, switches his expression mid-word, and simply tells Menaechmus to go inside *in—terim*.[13]

The interpretation that Sosia is accusing Alcumena of drunkenness in v. 697 is also corroborated by the slave's continuing development of the idea. In vv. 703-4 he tells Amphitruo,

> **SOS.** non tu scis? Baccae baccanti si velis advorsarier,
> ex insana insaniorem facies, feriet saepius;
>
> **SOS.** Don't you know that if you oppose a bacchanting bacchant,
> You'll make her even crazier than she already is, she'll hit you even more.

---

[12] The normal Latin practice until the time of Accius was to use Latin terminations for Greek words, even for words (unlike *pallium*, *sungrapum*, etc.) that were not naturalized into Latin, as e.g. *Bacch.* 240 where Chyrsalus uses the Greek word *cruso* (= *χρύσος*) in the ablative case with a Latin termination. On the declension of Greek nouns in Plautus, cf. Hopkins.

Alternatively, Sosia's joke might be regarded as have fallen after the word *unum* (=*οἶνον*), illustrated as *dum edormiscat unum—somnum*?, in that case regarding *unum* fully as the Latinized form of the Greek word (and perhaps even what Plautus wrote here?). This remains a hypothesis.

[13] Cf. Gratwick ad loc.

Sosia's designation of Alcumena as a *baccha bacchans* is intended not only to signal her madness but serves also to hint that she has been drinking, for in Plautine terms the word *bacchari* implies heavy drinking.[14] If the foregoing interpretation is correct, the odd expression in v. 697 is due to Sosia's attempt to mitigate his charge by switching thought mid-word.

V. B.: *Asinaria*

The play opens with a discussion between the *senex* Demaenetus and the slave Libanus on the topic of the role of the father in assisting his son when the young man is in love. Demaenetus relates a vignette in which his own father had dressed up as a *nauclerus* in an effort to aid his son win over the girl that had caught Demaenetus' eye (68-72). Demaenetus now wants to do the same for his own son, Argyrippus. The old man therefore instructs the slave to find a way of securing money to help his son, in any way possible, he says, including cheating the old man himself of the money. "It doesn't matter how you get it," says Demaenetus, "just see to it that it's gotten soon" (*face id ut paratum iam sit*, v. 90). The old man's choice of word *paratum* at this point does not appear to be particularly significant, since *parare* is a common word for "getting" or "producing" money[15], but it does appear to set up a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke that Libanus makes shortly thereafter.

[14] As Christenson (ad v. 697) notes. We may compare *M.G.* 856 *ubi baccabatur aula, cassabant cadi* "when the cup was filled with Bacchus (= "wine"), the jugs were shaking."

[15] Examples in Plautus are legion; cf. Lodge s.v. *paro*.

The lines following v. 90 are taken up by jests and jokes of various types, and when the conversation returns to the topic, Demaenetus reiterates, "just get the money any way you can." The context, meanwhile, has been continually focused on the role of the father in helping his son. Thus in v. 114 Libanus appears to make a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay when he says,

> **LIB.** profecto nemo est quem iam dehinc metuam mihi
> ne quid nocere possit, cum tu mihi tua
> oratione omnem animum ostendisti tuom.
> quin te quoque ipsum facio haud magni, si hoc pa—tro. 114

> **LIB.** There's absolutely no one that I'm afraid will be able to
> Hurt me on this count, since you've shown me in your words
> Your full feelings.
> No—I'm not even worried about you yourself, if I – produce this!

As Demaenetus, in the role of father, had instructed Libanus *parare*, "to get" the money, so Libanus should have claimed that he would do that very thing; that is, in v. 114 we had expected him to say *si hoc pa—ro*, "if I get this."[16] He instead uses a word unusual in Plautine Latin, *pa—tro*, "to accomplish, pull off," but literally, "to father."[17] Given the context of paternal-filial assistance, Libanus' choice of word is surprising but wholly appropriate to the scene—the slave is going to supplant the father in the role of adjutant to his son.

---

[16] Demaenetus goes on to use the same verb just moments later in v. 123, when he says *nam ego illud argentum tam <u>paratum</u> filio / scio esse...* "for I know that that money is as gotten for my son...".

[17] According to Lodge s.v. *patro*, this is the only occurrence in Plautus. At *Merc.* 88, the scribe of MS B has inadvertently written *patra* (imperative of *patrare*) for *parata*, demonstrating the easy confusion of the two words.

V. C.: *Aulularia*

In the scene beginning with v. 537, the miser Euclio complains to the *senex* Megadorus about his various expenses. When he comes to the issue of the groceries, Megadorus cuts him off, assuring him that he's sent enough food for an army, including a lamb (561-6):

> **MEG.** etiam agnum misi. **EVCL.** Quo quidem agno sat scio
> magi' curiosam nusquam esse ullam beluam.
> **MEG.** Volo ego ex te scire qui sit agnus curio.
> **EVCL.** Quia ossa ac pellis totust, ita cura macet.
> quin exta inspicere in sole ei vivo licet: 565
> ita is pellucet quasi lanterna Punica!
>
> **M.** I even sent a lamb. **E.** I know quite well that no other animal anywhere
> is as in need of a shearing as that lamb.
> **M.** I want to know from you how the lamb is in need of a shearing.[18]
> **E.** Because it's all skin and bones, it's so starving from care.
> You can even examine its entrails in the sun when it's still alive:
> It's as transparent as a Punic lantern!

In v. 564 Euclio gripes that the lamb sent by Megadorus is nothing but skin and bones (*ossa ac pellis*).[19] He continues his complaint by saying that in the sunshine he can even see the lamb's inner parts. Euclio's expression is couched in the conundrum form, in which the first line asserts a puzzling fact to which the second line offers a solution. The solution to the riddle given in v. 566 contains an unexpected turn that involves the

[18] The joke between *curionem*, *curio*, and *cura* is unclear. Prescott 1907 (approved of by Lindsay in the addenda to his second edition) suggested that *curiosam* and *curio* are to be printed as the Greek words κουριῶσαν and κουριῶν. The verb κουριᾶν means "to need a shearing," and so the joke is evidently that Euclio is "sneering at the age and consequent emaciation of the animal sent by Megadorus," because a "lamb" that needs to be shorn must mean a "sheep." Most recently Stockert has rejected this explanation, but offers no other suitable interpretation of the words. On any interpretation, however, *curionem* and *curio* seem to prepare the way for a pun on *cura* in v. 564.

[19] A proverbial expression that recurs in Plautus at *Capt.* 135 *ossa atque pellis*.

surprise key word *pellucet*, "shines through," a form that features the assimilation of the preposition *per* + *l* to *pell-*.[20] As Euclio had set the joke up in terms of the lamb's skin and bones, the audience would have expected his words in v. 566 to continue along the lines of *ita is pell—em habuit tenem*, "it has skin so thin." We should probably then understand the line as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, illustrated as:

> **EVCL.** Quia ossa ac pellis totust, ita cura macet.
> quin exta inspicere in sole ei vivo licet: 565
> ita is pell—ucet quasi lanterna Punica!

With a pause in breath, and a switch midway through the word, Euclio magnifies the image to one of typical Plautine hyperbole: the lamb is so skinny that it "shines through," x-ray style, like a "Punic lantern."[21]

V. D.: *Bacchides*

Chrysalus, in celebrating his defeat over Nicobolus, delivers the well known monody onstage in which he likens his situation to the mythological setting of Troy.

---

[20] As often, we cannot determine whether Plautus wrote the word *pellucet* with assimilation or not. Priscian 1. 50 alone preserves the reading *pell-*; B, C, and D all offer *perl-*, but the wordplay demands (in pronunciation at least) assimilation. Whether this assimilation of *per-* before *–l* was normal in Plautus cannot be determined (cf. Dorsch pp. 40-1); at *Rud.* 102 the manuscripts all read, and editors print, the unassimilated form *perlucet*, which would suggest that in the present passage the pronunciation is manipulated. If that is so, it finds some support from a statement preserved in Velius Longus (G. L. vol. 7 p. 65), which claims that the assimilation of *per-* before *-l* was a mark of refined speech: *Per vero praepositio omnibus integra praeponitur, nisi cum incidit in l litteram, adfinem consonantem, quam elegantioris sermonis viri geminare magis voluerunt quam r litteram exprimere, ut cum "pellabor" malunt dicere quam "perlabor"; nec aliter apud Lucilium legitur:*

> in praeposito per
> pelliciendo hoc est inducendo geminato l.

If this statement can be taken as valid also in the time of Plautus, Euclio must here adopt an affected tone in making his sneer against Megadorus' lamb.

[21] An uknown type of lantern, though perhaps one with glass panels; cf. Ussing ad loc.

There is a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke in the second line of the monody which has not been properly understood, and has instead given rise to arguments concerning the text (933-4):

> **CRVS.** o Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex,
> qui misere male mulcabere quadringentis Pilippis aureis!
>
> **CHR.** O Troy, o Fatherland, o Pergamum, o Priam—you're finished, old man,
> You who will be miserably, badly fined of 400 golden Philips!

The manuscripts offer at v. 934 a choice between the words *multabere* "you will be fined" and *mulcabere* "you will be beaten up."[22] In this case, since there is certainly a pun on whichever word was originally intended, we cannot put any trust in the manuscripts either way to be decisive. Both words are equally Plautine, as e.g. *mulcare* (*Trin.* 984) and *multare* (*Trin.* 708) both appear in a single play. As Leo, Lindsay, and Barsby print it, the line is a *shijn-ambiguum* wordplay that acts *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, to be understood as: *qui misere male mulcabere—quadringentis...* "o Priam...you who will be badly (beaten up/fined) of 400 golden Philips;" that is, supposing that the actor slurs the –c- of *mulcabere*, pauses, and then continues as though he had said *multabere*, "you will be fined." This method may be quite effective, particularly if Chrysalus were to accompany his initial word *mulcabere* with appropriate shadow boxing.

But the joke may be even more effective, and more in keeping with the tone of ritual lament that pervades the passage, if we suppose that *multabere* was the original word; then there is a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* pun on the single word *multabere*, illustrated as:

---

[22] Leo, Lindsay, and Barsby print *mulcabere* with most manuscripts; manuscript D reads *multabere*, which Ussing approved.

CRVS. o Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex,
qui misere male multa—bere quadringentis Pilippis aureis!

CHR. O Troy, o Fatherland, o Pergamum, o Priam, you are lost, old man,
you who miserably, horribly, (*have suffered*) such disasters....

The lines begin as a dirge and an invocation to the ruined Priam of old, with a litany of the now-destroyed responsibilities under the king's control (*Troia, patria, Pergamum*). At this point, the audience in unsure what direction the slave's song will take, and does not yet realize that Chrysalus is likening Nicobulus to Priam for the elaborate comparison that will follow. Thus, as the word order progresses, the audience would expect the line to continue in a manner such as *...qui misere male multa— tulisti...*, "you who suffered so many (misfortunes) so badly," as Ennius described the downfall of the king Titus Tatius with his alliterative line *O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti* "O king Titus Tatius, you suffered such great (misfortunes)," in which his neuter plural *tanta* would be markedly parallel to Chrysalus' *multa*—or so the audience would think. Chrysalus, however, suddenly protracts his thought, choosing a word (*multabere*) that immediately shifts the tone to suggest at once a beating and a fine. The audience recognizes the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* and realizes that the Priam for whom Chrysalus is singing a dirge is in fact Nicobulus, who, out of sight within the house, has welcomed a Trojan horse into his home and is being sacked at that very moment.

V. E.: *Cistellaria*

The god Auxilium speaks the prologue of the play that narrates the background information: he informs the audience that a long time ago, Alcesimarchus, a young man from Lemnos, had traveled to Sicyon, where one night after drinking too much he raped a

young maiden (156ff.). Realizing his crime, he flees back to Lemnos (160-3), and ten months later, his victim gives birth to a daughter. Because the *virgo* does not know who the young man is that raped her, she informs her father's slave of the situation, and entrusts the young child to him to be exposed (164-5):

> **AVX.** quoniam reum eius facti nescit qui siet,
> paternum servom sui participat consili, 165
> dat eam puellam ei servo exponendam ad necem.
>
> **AUX.** Because (she) does not know the one responsible for that action, who he is,
> she confides in her father's servant,
> she gives that slave the girl to be exposed.

As Auxilium releases the information bit by bit, his syntax and word order in the two foregoing lines suggest that he is meant to perform them as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* in passing, which can be illustrated as (164-5):

> **AVX.** quoniam reum eius facti nescit qui siet
> pater—num servom sui participat consili... 165

Auxilium's prolepsis of the phrase *reum eius facti* before the *qui siet* clause allows for a temporary disorientation as to how the *qui siet* clause is to function in the sentence. Furthermore, by pausing midway through the word *pater—num*, Auxilium can impart briefly a heightened tone of pathos, by temporarily allowing the interpretation, "Because she doesn't know who the one responsible for that action, (namely), who the father is...," as though the word following were merely *pater*, before proceeding with the sentence. The effect is to level a charge of irresponsibility against Alcesimarchus for shirking his paternal obligations.

This interpretation can be corroborated by a similar *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay in the *Menaechmi*. There, as here, the prologue causes a temporary disorientation in the

audience by delaying the relative clause *quae mammam dabat* that modifies *mater* (19-21):

> **PROL.** ita forma simili pueri, ut mater sua
> non internosse posset – quae mammam dabat, 20
> —neque adeo mater ipsa quae illos pepererat.
>
> **PROL.** The boys looked so much alike that their own mother
> Couldn't tell them apart—their nanny-mother, I mean,
> ...but nor could their actual mother, who bore them.

The postponement of the relative clause allows Prologus to tell his joke twice: the two twins are so alike in appearance that their own mother cannot tell them apart—that is, he clarifies a moment later, either their surrogate mother (*mater sua...quae mammam dabat*, the wet nurse), or their own, actual birth mother.[23]

Plautus exploits the similarity between the two words *pater* and *paternus*, which, inasmuch as it is etymologically constructed directly from the noun (*pater-nus*), is analogous to that of *mater* in the two sense "mother" and "wet nurse," so that in each case, a surrogate relationship surprises the audience that had expected to hear the actual relationship; so in the *Cistellaria* we have not a father, but a "father—'s slave"; and in the *Menaechmi*, we have not a birth mother, but a wet nurse. In the *Cistellaria*, this imparts a note of pathos to the situation, and in the *Menaechmi*, an element of exaggeration that increases the humor.

V. F.: *Mercator*

Throughout the play Demipho is derided as the *senex hircosus*, the goatish old man who has made himself ridiculous by falling in love; the term is actually applied to him in v. 575. In his first appearance onstage, the old man narrates his dream from the

[23] Cf. Gratwick ad loc.

previous night (vv. 225-270), in which he claims that he imagined having purchased a beautiful (she-) goat. Throughout his narration Demipho repeatedly mentions the she-goat by using the word *capra* nine separate times (229, 230, 236, 238, 240, 246, 250, 253, and 268) in fewer than 40 lines. Demipho also mentions a *haedus*, a male goat, in v. 248, which he says appeared, absconded with the *capra*, and then mocked Demipho himself. The *haedus* is evidently meant to be a competitor with Demipho himself, for as the *senex* explains in v. 268, the *capra* must refer to the beautiful girl that he has just seen arrive. The imagery is highly sexualized, and serves to characterize Demipho as an excessively lusty goat himself who is in need of an appropriate behavioral check—specifically, castration.

Immediately following the conclusion of his monologue, Demipho suddenly spots Lysimachus entering onstage, and he withdraws in order to eavesdrop. Lysimachus, not noticing Demipho, turns to a slave attending him and says (272-3):

> **LVS.** Profecto ego illunc hircum *castrari* volo,
> ruri qui vobis exhibet negotium.

> **LYS.** By god, I want that goat castrated,
> The one that's giving you trouble out in the country.

As the eavesdropping Demipho hears these inauspicious words, he is prompted to turn to the audience and say:

> **DEM.** Nec omen illud mihi nec auspicium placet.
> quasi hircum metuo ne uxor me *castret* mea. 275

> **DEM.** I don't like that omen or that portent—
> I'm afraid my wife will castrate me like a goat! 275

As these lines mark the first appearance of Lysimachus onstage, and contain a direct address to the spectators, the audience may regard them as particularly memorable.

Moreover, both the repetition of the word *castrare* in vv. 272 and 275 and the imagery of goat castration serve to focus the audience's attention on that particular form of behavioral correction, and those two factors serve as the setup for a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke that follows moments later. When Demipho and Lysimachus at last notice one another and begin conversing, Demipho tells Lysimachus that he is so deeply in love that he is impervious to pain (308-11):

> **DEM.** Decide collum stanti, si falsum loquor;
> vel, ut scias me amare, cape cultrum ac seca
> digitum vel aurem vel tu nasum vel labrum:
> si movero me seu secari sensero.

> **DEM.** If I'm lying, cut off my neck as I stand here;
> Or, so you'll know I'm in love, take a knife and cut
> My finger or ear or nose or lip:
> If I flinch or even feel that I've been cut.

Demipho boasts that his deep feelings can withstand anything, and he challenges Lysimachus to put himself to the test by cutting his finger, ear, nose, or lip, in specifically vivid language: *decide* (308), *cape cultrum*, *seca* (309), and *secari* (311), all of which are undoubtedly to be accompanied by equally vivid gestures. When Lysimachus then proceeds (312-5) to deride Demipho as foolish, Demipho replies to his friend (316):

> **DEM.** Nunc tu me, credo, castigare cogitas.

> **DEM.** Now, I think, you're planning to castigate me!

This line has not heretofore been seen as *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, but the foregoing considerations make it likely that Demipho should pause after the initial syllable of castigare to suggest that he will say not *cast—ig—are* but *cast—rare*, which we may illustrate as:

> **DEM.** Nunc tu me, credo, cast—ig—are cogitas.

and render in English as:

> **DEM.** Now, I think, you're planning to ...
> cast—(*gulping, protectively covering his crotch*)—igate me.

V. G.: *Poenulus*

V. G. a.: *turba*

The occasion that prompts the two sisters Adelphasium and Anterastilis to go offstage so that Hanno and his retinue can arrive in their absence is the festival of the *Aphrodisia*, as the young man Agorastocles explains to his slave Milphio in v. 191. In conjunction with the festival that day, a *mercatus meretricius* will be held at the shrine of Venus, and consequently a great crowd of women will meet there. Because she is eager to see this crowd of women, Anterastilis urges her sister Adelphasium to hurry, so that they can arrive on time. Her choice of word *turba* in v. 265 to denote the "crowd" is the dramatic preparation for a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, that will follow soon afterward (263-5):

> **ANT.** Eamus, mea soror. **AD.** Eho amabo, quid illo nunc properas? **ANT.** Rogas? quia erus nos apud aedem Veneris mantat. **AD.** Maneat pol. mane.
> *turba* est nunc apud aram. 265

> **ANT.** Let's go, my sister. **AD.** Tell me, why are you hurrying there now? **ANT.** Do you even have to ask? Because our master is awaiting us at the shrine of Venus. **AD.** Let him wait, by god. You wait too. There's a crowd now at the altar.

When shortly thereafter Agorastocles accosts Adelphasium (330ff.), the dialogue that they share there serves as a foil to the dialogue between the two sisters in vv. 263-5. Now, however, it is Agorastocles who asks Adelphasium why she is hurrying to the temple, explaining that there is a crowd there now. In v. 336 he uses the same word for

crowd (*turba*) that Anterastilis had used, and the *adulescens* uses this word to set up the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke he makes two lines later:

> **AGOR.** Quid festinas? *turba* nunc illi est. **AD.** Scio. 336
> sunt illi aliae quas spectare ego, et me spectari volo.
> **AGOR.** Qui lubet spectare turp—es, pulchram spectandam dare?
>
> **AGOR.** Why are you rushing? There's a crowd there now. **AD.** I know.
> There are other women there that I want to look at, and I want to be looked at too.
> **AGOR.** Why do you want to look at ugly girls and present your beautiful self to be seen?

After explaining to Adelphasium that there is a *turba* at the shrine of Venus, Agorastocles begins his sentence in v. 337 as though he were going to ask her "Why do you want to look at the crowd of women?"; that is, the expected phrase should have been *qui lubet spectare turb—am...?*.[24] As he proceeds through the sentence, however, the young man decides to increase the flattering tone in his question by altering the final syllable, thus asking, "why do you want to look at – ugly girls, when you are yourself so pretty?" This interpretation may be corroborated by the fact that *turpis* is a rare word, and therefore even more surprising, in Plautus.[25]

V. G. b.: *Lu-* plays

We examined in Chapter IV. E. above the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay in the *Persa* that involved the sound *lu-* shared by the name of the otherwise anonymous maiden, *Lucris*, and the Latin word *lucrum*. In the *Poenulus* there is an extended set of

[24] The distinction in Latin between initial unvoiced /b/ and /p/ was not quite distinct in Plautus' time; thus Naevius said *Balatium* for *Palatium* (cf. Varro *L. L.* 5. 53).

[25] Outside of the *Poenulus*, where it appears in vv. 307, 306, 323, 338, *turpis* occurs only two other times, in *Most.* 288 and 291 (= *Poen.* 306), both of which Leo bracketed as spurious. (Lindsay, however, keeps them).

παρὰ προσδοκίαν wordplays similarly made on the Greek name of the pimp Lycus that serve to characterize the pimp as a wolf both in name and in fact: in Plautine terms, his *nomen* is an *omen*.[26] The characterization begins very early in the play, when Prologus, narrating the background to the action, suddenly addresses the spectators and tells them to guess what manner of human a man named "Lycus" is—the Greek word for "wolf" evidently being readily obvious to the audience (91-2):

> **PROL.** vosmet nunc facite coniecturam ceterum,
> quid id sit hominis[27], cui Luco nomen siet.[28]

> **PROL.** You spectators now make an inference,
> What sort of man someone named "Lycus" is.

Prologus' address to the audience here foreshadows a series of wordplays involving the pimp Lycus in scene 3. 3. Toward the beginning of the scene, the *Advocati* inform Lycus of the purpose of their mission in cleverly couched terms, saying (646):

> **ADV.** nunc hunc, Luce, ad te diripiundum adducimus

> **ADV.** Now, Lycus, we bring you this man for destruction.

The ambiguity of the line lies in the word *diripiundum*, which the *Advocati* intend as a gerundive in agreement with *te* (i.e., *Lycus*), meaning "We are bringing you this man so that he may tear you, Lycus, apart. Lycus, however, understands *diripiundum* in agreement with *hunc* (i.e., *Collybiscus*), meaning "We are bringing you this man, Lycus,

---

[26] Cf. *Pers.* 626.

[27] Perhaps with a schijn-ambiguum pun on the word *hominis* as *ominis*;

[28] Zwierlein would excise these two verses on the grounds that, contrary to the usual practice of New Comedy, the *leno* is called by his proper name within the prologue; but this objection may be dispensed with, for Questa 1984 p. 13 rightly notes that the name is given here not simply to identify the character but rather to suggest an aspect of the pimp's attitude and behavior.

so that you may tear him apart."[29] Both the vocative form that the *Advocati* use here (*Luce*), as well as their choice of verb (*diripiundum*), call explicit attention to the feral nature of the pimp's name and its meaning. This attention serves to set up a metaphor that the baliff Collybiscus then adopts when he speaks the next lines aside to himself, introducing a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay that develops the image (647-8):

> **CO.** cum praeda hic hodie incedet venator domum:
> canes compellunt in plagas lep—ide lupum.
>
> **CO.** This hunter will head home with booty today:
> The dogs are driving the wolf into their nets beautifully.

I have punctuated v. 648 as a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* in order to illustrate the joke as I understand it. Collybiscus likens the deception by which he and the *Advocati* will entrap Lycus to a hunt, saying, "This hunter (*indicating himself*) will head home with booty today." Thus the audience expects that the hunting metaphor will be carried to its natural conclusion; and since hunters chase into their nets hares, not wolves, the wordplay in the following line falls midway through the word *lep—ide*, which defeats the expectation of the word *lep—orem*, a "hare."[30] Although Plautus often disregards vowel quantity in making a wordplay, here the correspondence between the two words is particularly arresting (*lĕpĭde* and *lĕpŏrem*). Thus the expectation was that Collybiscus, the hunter, would return home with his booty because his dogs are driving a *leporem* into the net, but Collybiscus, mixing the metaphor, alters this at the last second to the common word *lepide* "charmingly," "prettily." The resulting paradox is that a *lupus*, recalling both the name and meaning of the pimp *Lycus*, is to be the dogs' prey.

---

[29] Cf. Brinkhoff p. 60.

[30] The very phrase *leporem venari* is found in Plautus also at *Capt.* 184, *i modo, venare leporem*, "Just go, hunt a hare." The wordplay between *lepide* and *leporem* can be paralleled also by Terence *Eun.* 426-7: *lepu' tute's, pulpamentum quaeris?... facete lepide laute.*

Lycus goes on to characterize himself as a wolf with further sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* jokes in vv. 673 and 674. In v. 673, Lycus nearly makes a Freudian slip by almost using a word that reveals the way that he truly intends to receive Collybiscus:

> **ADV.** quin hicquidem tuos est. **LV.** opsecro hercle hortamini,
> ut deuor—ta—tur ad me in hospitium optumum.
>
> **ADV.** This man (*indicating Collybiscus*) is yours! **LY.** Please, gentlemen,
> persuade him to … stay at my place for the best hospitality.

In his growing desire to profit as fully as possible from Collybiscus, Lycus begs the Advocati to encourage him to stay at the pimp's residence. Here, Lycus' choice of the deponent verb *deuor—ta—tur* in v. 673 is quite close to what seems to be his true intention, the passive verb *deuor—e—tur*; that is, the wolfish Lycus wants to "devour" the bailiff. So the pimp begins his sentence; but he checks himself mid-word and switches to a more affable word, concluding his thought merely by saying *devortatur*, "lodge".

As the dialogue progresses, the extended metaphor of hunter and prey is developed further, and Lycus himself goes on to play on his own name in a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay, which I punctuate as follows (681-3):

> **LV.** Videre equidem uos uellem, quom huic aurum darem.
> **ADV.** Illinc procul nos istuc inspectabimus.
> **COL.** Bonam dedistis mihi operam. **LV.** It ad me, Lu—crum.
>
> **LY.** I would have liked to have seen you when I was giving him the gold.
> **ADV.** We will watch from there, far off.
> **COL.** Thank you for your help. **LY.** There's a profit coming to me!

As Collybiscus heads toward the pimp, Lycus addresses a comment to the audience. He begins v. 683 as though he were going to say, "He [i.e. *Collybiscus*] is coming to me, Lycus;" that is, the audience would have expected the word that follows *me* to be *Lucum*,

the accusative form of the pimp's name resting in apposition to the pronoun, and that the unexpressed subject of the verb *it* would simply be "he." The pimp, however, changes the second syllable of his word *Lu—cum* to *lu—crum* "profit," and suddenly transforms the metaphor to mean, "A profit is coming my way!," with *lucrum* functioning as the subject of the verb *it*.[31]

Lycus, in a line that he addresses to the audience, follows this up with a final sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay which may be illustrated as follows (685):

LV. Blande hominem compell—abo! 685

LY. I'll address the man flatteringly.

The audience expects that Lycus, who by now has thoroughly shown himself to deserve his name of "wolf", will *drive on* his prey, as shortly before the *canes compellunt* in v. 648 (quoted above); that is, we expect him to say *compell—am*, "I will drive," but a sudden change of conjugation adds a syllable, and yields a sudden change in meaning: Lycus will not chase the man; he will simply speak to him (*compellabo*), as he in fact does.[32] Inasmuch as Lycus' line is addressed to the audience, the adverb *blande*, "flatteringly" or "persuasively," that precedes the verb *compellabo* does not necessarily preclude the wordplay. In celebrating his victory over the *senex* in the *Bacchides*, Chrysalus says (642-4): *callidum senem callidis dolis / compuli et perpuli, mi omnia ut crederet*, "By my clever tricks I forced and compelled the clever old man to believe me

[31] For the wordplay on the Latin word *lucrum*, cf. the wordplay in *Pers.* 627 (discussed in Chapter IV. E.).

[32] If Lindsay (*Captivi* p. 52, although not seeing the joke as I explain it here) is correct to understand the hiatus following *compellabo* | *hospes* as an indication that the pimp turns to Collybiscus, it corroborates my suggestion that *compellabo* is a particularly significant word, perhaps spoken directly to the audience.

about everything," where the phrase *callidis dolis*, which suggests the success of Chrysalus' persuasion, is analogous to *blande*. Cf. also *Epid.* 87-8, where Epidicus says *ego miser perpuli / meis dolis senem, ut censeret suam sese emere filiam*, and again the phrase *meis dolis* suggests that Epidicus has persuaded the *senex*.

The interpretation of the series of sophisticated παρὰ προσδοκίαν jokes is corroborated by the characterization of Lycus as rapacious wolf and Collybiscus as prey which is continued in the subsequent lines with two puns on the nearly homonymous words *esse* "to be" and *ēsse* "to eat."[33] The first comes in v. 687, when Lycus greets Collybiscus (686-7):

LV. Saluom te aduenire gaudeo.
CO. multa tibi di dent bona, quom me saluom *esse* uis.

LY. I'm glad that you arrived safe and sound.
CO. May the gods bless you, since you want me safe and sound.

The pun recurs in v. 696, where Lycus says to Collybiscus:

LV. Siquidem potes *esse* te pati — in lepido loco

LY. If, that is, you can allow yourself to … be in a charming place.

In each case Lycus understands the infinitive as "to eat," although Collybiscus understands it as "to be." In v. 696, the line is παρὰ προσδοκίαν for an expected subject accusative *me* following the infinitive *pati*, "If, that is, you can allow me to eat you."

V. H.: *Truculentus*

V. H. a.: *excetra*

[33] The ambiguity can be captured in pronunciation; cf. the German proverb "man ist was man ißt."

In the first scene in which he appears, the eponymous slave Truculentus opens the door upon hearing Astaphium knock (vv. 256ff). He emerges from the house in a foul mood and immediately launches into a tirade against Astaphium. He tells her that he has no interest in her greeting (v. 259), and, variously misunderstanding the handmaid's words *comprime sis eiram* (262)[34] and *truculentus* (265)[35], Truculentus' fury against the woman increases. He proceeds to insult and threaten her with ever-increasing hostility (268-80), but one of the slave's words contains a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay:

> **TRVC.** Abire hinc ni properas grandi gradu,
> iam hercle ego istos fictos compositos crispos cincinnos tuos
> unguentatos usque ex cerebro exvellam!
>
> **TRUC.** If you don't get out of here right away,
> by god, I'll tear out that fancy fashioned curlicued crimped hair of yours,
> all gelled-up from out of your brain!

Truculentus' command to Astaphium to leave at once is not unexpected, but the fury with which he delivers it, along with his threat to tear the very hair from her brain (*ex cerebro exvellam*) is perhaps surprising, especially since upon reflection that particular expression is a bit odd, since we might have expected Truculentus to threaten to pull the hair from her head, not her brain. Thus the line appears to be a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, which we may illustrate as:

> **TRVC.** Abire hinc ni properas grandi gradu,
> iam hercle ego istos fictos compositos crispos cincinnos tuos
> unguentatos usque ex ce—rebro exvellam!

---

[34] On this wordplay cf. Chapter I. C.

[35] He mistakes the word (responding with the accusative form) as *truncum lentum*, equivalent either to "blockhead" (so most commentators), or "impotent" (so Gurlitt, understanding *truncus* as a euphemism for *penis*).

Truculentus appears as though he were going to say *...ungentatos usque exce—tra tu, e capite exvellam!* "...I'll tear our that hair of yours from your head, you snake!," but as his fury gets the better of him, the slave alters his insult mid-word, and he changes his intended word *excetra* to the hyperbolic expression *ex cerebro*, "from your brain!".[36] The *vox propria* in Plautine Latin with which one character insults a female character is *excetra*, "snake," a term of abuse that is usually heaped specifically on prostitutes and female slaves, especially *ancillae.*[37] In *Pseud.* 218 the pimp Ballio, yelling at his prostitute Xystilis, angrily asks her *ain, excetra tu?* "Do you hear me, you snake?" In *Cas.* 644 Lysidamus, yelling at Pardalisca (an *ancilla*, exactly as Astaphium is here), not only uses the word *excetra* to insult her, he also threatens her with very nearly the same punishment with which Truculentus intimidates Astaphium (643-4):

> **LVS.** Nam nisi ex te scio quicquid hoc est cito, hoc
> Iam tibi istuc *cerebrum dispercutiam*, *excetra* tu,
>
> **LYS.** For unless you tell me this right away,
> I'll use this to knock our your brain, you snake![38]

The fact that in our example from the *Truculentus* the word *usque* precedes the preposition *ex* does not preclude the possibility that the audience might have expected the word *excetra* rather than the preposition to follow. Although in Classical Latin the adverb *usque* is regularly followed directly by a prepositional phrase expressing separation or degree (*ab*, *ex*, *ad*, *in*, etc.), in Plautus there are numerous examples of

---

[36] For the expression *e capite* in a violent act, cf. *Most.* 1110.

[37] Cf. Lilja p. 69, and the note of Donatus ad *Eun.* 825: aptum convitium...in ancillas...'excetra'. "An abuse appropriate for *ancillae* is *excetra.*"

[38] In this case, we might have expected *dispercutiam* to have been followed not by *excetra*, but by *ex capite.*

usque in the sense "all the way (up to) (from)" separated from its prepositional phrase. Cf. e.g. *Capt.* 645 *Pilocrates iam inde usque amicus fuit mihi a puero puer*; *Rud.* 539 *qui a fundamento mi usque movisti mare.* In addition, there are also examples in which *usque* is followed immediately by the sound *ex-* in which *ex-* is a prefix rather than a verb. Cf. *Asin.* 40 *age, age, usque exscrea* "C'mon, c'mon, keep on hawking up (phlegm)," where *usque* can only mean "continually;" *Amph.* 715 *et salutavi et valuissesne usque exquisivi simul* "I both greeted you and at the same time asked whether you had been well the whole time," where *usque* "all the while" belongs with *valuissesne*, as seen from the frequent Plautine phrase *usque valuistin?*).

V. H. b.: *taleae*

The *meretrix* Phronesium has deluded the soldier Stratophanes, and in vv. 631-4 she withdraws inside the house, leaving Stratophanes alone onstage to call after her in vain. The soldier then assesses his situation: he has lost out on the two *ancillae* that he has given as a gift to Phronesium, and now, as clearly as anything, he says, he has been shut out as a laughingstock for all (635-6). Stratophanes then turns to the door, and begins to seethe with rage, saying (636-7):

> **STRAT.** quantillo mi opere nunc persuaderi potest,
> ut ego his suffringam talos totis aedibus!
>
> **STRAT.** Ooh, how little it would take to persuade me
> to break this whole house's ankles!

Fraenkel thought that Stratophanes' vivid personification of the house as having ankles pointed to the Plautine originality of these lines.[39] The threat of ankle breaking is typical

[39] He (p. 100) compared *Asin.* 386, *Cas.* 527, *Curc.* 39, and *Pseud.* 952.

of Plautine braggadocio, and Ussing (ad loc.) compared *M. G.* 156-7, where the *senex* Periplectomenus orders his slaves to break the ankles of anyone caught on the roof. The image here, however, of the soldier breaking the ankles of the house, however, is unusually surprising, and may perhaps be indicative of a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, as:

> **STRAT.** quantillo mi opere nunc persuaderi potest,
> ut ego his suffringam tal—os totis aedibus!

The word *tal—os* "ankles," may be a schijn-ambiguum wordplay for the word that a Roman audience might have more realistically expected to hear, *tal—eas*. *Taleae* are long pieces of either wood or metal,[40] and those *taleae* that were made of olive wood seem to have served the function in antiquity that two-by-four beams serve today: in the field, they were used as slips for olive vines,[41] and in architectural terms, when framing a house they were used as something like the studs that we use to support the walls.[42] Consequently, *taleas* is precisely the sort of word that one might expect to hear from someone threatening to do damage to a house, and we might capture the pun by translating Stratophanes' words as "..how little it would take for me to break this house's *angles*."

V. I.: Conclusion

As I hope to have shown in the foregoing examples, when Plautus makes a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay on a common noun, very often the wordplay is made in passing and cannot therefore be determined securely by the response of another

[40] OLD s.v. *talea* (but cf. also LS s.v. *talea*).

[41] Cf. Cato *R. R.* 45. 1.

[42] Cf. Vitruvius 1. 5. 3.

character. As these wordplays are not dependent on proper names, which are often repeated on the Plautine stage, they can occur at any time. The wordplay in each example must be evaluated by taking account of the surrounding context and trying to infer what possible function or propriety the wordplay may have in a given situation. Yet, as we have seen, these wordplays can greatly enhance the humor (e.g. *οἰν—um*) or the pathos (e.g. *pater—nus*) of a situation, or suddenly intensify the emotional level of the expression (e.g. *excetra*, *talos*).

* * *

CONCLUSION

In the preceding pages I have sought to illustrate the phenomenon of the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* wordplay in Plautus. Through the use of examples taken from each of the twenty-one plays in the Plautine corpus, I have tried to show that in a great many places speaking characters are intended to pause midway through a word so that they may defeat the audience's expectation of the word or train of thought that it had anticipated. In order to facilitate the wordplay, the character must at times resort to a manipulation of pronunciation so that a surprising word may sound more nearly like the anticipated word. In Chapter I we examined the various ways in which the characters perform such manipulations. The remaining four chapters were dedicated to exemplifying the phenomenon of mid-word *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* and the ways in which Plautus uses this type of wordplay to enhance his drama.

Now that I have demonstrated that the phenomenon exists, it remains for me to suggest future avenues of investigation.

First and foremost, it seems likely that further readings of Plautus by scholars sensitive to this form of wordplay will unearth many more examples of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.

Secondly, the performance of a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke seems to require skillful delivery by the actor. We know very little about individual actors in

antiquity, but we do know that virtuosos such as Pellio in the time of Plautus, or Roscius in the time of Cicero, were widely hailed for their acting ability. Knowing that Plautus wrote into his text jokes that are necessarily somewhat difficult to deliver may compel us to reassess our opinion of the quality of acting in the time of Plautus.

The sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* very often imparts to a Plautine scene a farcical tone that would appear to have been out of place in the Greek original. In recent years the so-called "Freiburg school" of scholars has emphasized the debt owed by Plautine comedy to the native Italian tradition of the Atellan farce over that owed to the tradition of Greek New Comedy. While nearly all of the Atellana has been lost, a reappraisal of what remains may prove useful in strengthening the contention of those scholars. Indeed, an initial clue is provided by Cicero in his discussion of comic theory, when he credits the Atellan writer Novius with an example of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* that evidently contains a (verbal) *ambiguum* (*de Oratore* 2. 255):

> Sed scitis esse notissimum ridiculi genus, cum aliud exspectamus, aliud dicitur...quod si admixtum est etiam ambiguum, fit salsius; ut apud Novium...[1]

A further investigation into the fragments of Novius may corroborate the connection between Plautus and the Atellana.

Another avenue of pursuit that may repay study is the use of the sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* by later Latin authors, particularly when an author's intention is not necessarily comic intent, but merely surprise. For example, the opening line of the capstone to Horace's third book of *Odes* (3. 30),

Exegi monumentum aere perennius...

might well have been intended as a mid-word play, illustrated as:

---

[1] The joke, unfortunately, is somewhat obscure; cf. Leeman-Pinkster ad loc.

Exegi monumentum aere per Enniu—s...

so that Horace might suggest that the foundation for his poetical work in Latin had been laid by Ennius, the father of Roman poetry. The reader familiar with Alexandrian poetic technique encountering this final poem of Horace's book might have expected that the line would allusively conclude *per Ennium*, particularly as Lucretius had already made the pun on *perennis* and *Ennius* explicit when he said (1. 117-8):

> *Ennius* ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno
> detulit ex Helicone *perenni* fronde coronam

The reader may have been surprised to find that Horace frustrates the expectation of a mention of Ennius by rounding off the line *perenniu—s*, "more enduring."[2]

But beyond Horace, Latin writers seem to have cultivated the technique at all time periods. We find, for example, a sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* as late as the poems in the *Carmina Burana.* In an anonymous poem in which an *adulescens* sings of unrequited love, the ninth line defeats expectation mid-word:

> Sic mea fata canendo solor,
> ut nece proxima facit olor.
> Blandus heret meo corde dolor,
> roseus effugit ore color.
> Cura crescente, labore vigente,
> vigore labente, miser morior;
> tam male pectora multat amor.
> a mor—ior! a mor—ior! a mor—ior!
> dum, quod amem, cogor et non amor!

[2] The preceding *aere* need cause no difficulty, for the reader could not have known that the ablative was one of comparison to be construed with the comparative prior to hearing the final letter of *perennius*; until hearing that, any sort of ablatival construction (separation, means, origin, etc.) might have been anticipated.

The singer's choice of word *amor* in v. 8 had suggested that he would repeat it in v. 9, but upon hearing the *–ior* element, the listener discovers that *a morior* is rather a cry of grief and despair.

A heightened sensitivity to identifying puns mid-word will no doubt find many examples of sophisticated *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* not only in Plautus, but also in Latin authors of all time periods.

* * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used for the titles of the plays of Plautus:

Amph.	*Amphitruo*	*M. G.*	*Miles Gloriosus*
Asin.	*Asinaria*	*Most.*	*Mostellaria*
Aul.	*Aulularia*	*Pers.*	*Persa*
Bacch.	*Bacchides*	*Poen.*	*Poenulus*
Capt.	*Captivi*	*Pseud.*	*Pseudolus*
Cas.	*Casina*	*Rud.*	*Rudens*
Cist.	*Cistellaria*	*Stich.*	*Stichus*
Curc.	*Curculio*	*Trin.*	*Trinummus*
Epid.	*Epidicus*	*Truc.*	*Truculentus*
Men.	*Menaechmi*	*Vid.*	*Vidularia*
Merc.	*Mercator*		

For those of Terence:

And.	*Andria*	*H. T.*	*Heauton Timorumenos*
Adel.	*Adelphoe*	*Hec.*	*Hecyra*
Eun.	*Eunuchus*	*Phorm.*	*Phormio*

Other Works

CHCL	*Cambridge History of Classical Literature* vol. 2, ed. W. Clausen and E. J. Kenney, 1982, Cambridge.
Kassel-Austin	*Poetae Comici Graeci*, edd. R. Kassel and C. Austin, 1983— , Berlin.

Leumann-Hoffmann	I: M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, 1926-8, new edition 1977; II: J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, 1965; new edition rev. A. Szantyr, 1972, Munich.
LS	*A Latin Dictionary*, edd. C. T. Lewis and C. Short, 1879, Oxford.
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 1968-82, Oxford.
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 1900— , Munich.

EDITIONS OF PLAUTUS CITED BY AUTHOR NAME

Bothe, F. H. (1809-23). Berlin.

Camerarius, J. (1552). Basel.

Ernout, A. (1932-40). Paris.

Goetz, G., Schoell, F. (1892-1904). Leipzig.

Gronovius, J. F. (1664). Leyden.

Lambinus, D. (1576). Paris.

Naudet, J. (1830-2). Paris.

Leo, F. (1895-6). Berlin.

Lindsay, W. M. (1910). 2nd edition. Oxford.

Ussing, J. L. (1880). Copenhagen. Repr. 1972, ed. A. Thierfelder. Hildesheim.

OTHER WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR NAME

Ahl, F. (1985). *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca.

Allen, W. S. (1978). *Vox Latina*. 2nd edition. Cambridge.

Anderson, A. R. (1909). 'The Use of the OE-Diphthong in Plautus.' *Classical Philology* 4: 291-300.

Arnott, W. G. (1968). 'Studies in Comedy, I: Alexis and the Parasite's Name.' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 9: 161-8.

(1996). *Alexis: the Fragments. A Commentary*. Cambridge.

Austin, R. G. (1971). *Virgil: Aeneid I.* Oxford.

Barsby, J. (1986). *Plautus: Bacchides*. Warminster.

(2000). 'Donatus on Terence: the Eunuchus commentary' in Stärk, E. and G. Vogt-Spira, edd., *Dramatische Wäldchen: Festschrift für Eckard Lefevre zum 65. Geburtsdag*. Hildesheim.

Benz, L. (1998). 'Zur Metaphorik der Captivi' in Benz, L. and E. Lefèvre, edd., *Maccus Barbarus: Sechs Kapitel zur Originalität der Captivi des Plautus*. Tübingen.

Bertini, F. (1968). *Plauti Asinaria*. Genova.

Buck, C. (1928). *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Boston.

Bianco, M. M. (1999). 'Onomastica e Metafora Bellica nei Captivi di Plauto,' *Bolletino di Studi Latini* 29: 3-10.

Brinkhoff, J. (1935). *Woordspeling bij Plautus*. Nijmegen.

Christenson, D. (2000). *Plautus: Amphitruo*. Cambridge.

Colvin, S. (1999). *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.

Cooper, L. (1922). *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*. New York.

Damon, C. (1997). *The Mask of the Parasite: a Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor.

Dorsch, J. (1887). *Assimilation in den Compositis bei Plautus und Terentius*. Prague.

Duckworth (1940). *T. Macci Plauti: Epidicus*. Princeton.

(1952). *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Princeton.

Enk, P. J. (repr. 1979). *Plauti Mercator*. New York.

(repr. 1979). *Plauti Truculentus*. New York.

Ferger, G. (1889). *De vocativi usu plautino terentianoque*. Argentorati.

Fraenkel, E. (1960). *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*. Florence (= 2nd edition of *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin 1922).

Giacomelli, G. 'Il Tema Aggettivale *sakri-* in Plauto.' *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 33: 249-57.

Gratwick, A. S. (1973a). ' "Titus Maccius Plautus" ', *Classical Quarterly* 32: 124-33.

(1973b). 'Quis erus est?', *Classical Review* 23: 123.

(1993). *Plautus: Menaechmi*. Cambridge.

Gurlitt, L. (1921). *Erotica Plautina. Eine Auswahl Erotischer Szenen aus Plautus*. Munich.

Handley, E. (1975). 'Plautus and his Public. Some thoughts on new comedy in Latin.' *Dioniso* 46: 117-32.

Herwerden, H. van. (1910). *Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium et Dialecticum*. 2nd edition. 2 voll. Lugduni Batavorum.

Hopkins, H. M. (1898). 'The Declension of Greek Nouns in Plautus.' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 9: 96-101.

Hough, J. N. (1934). 'The Use of Greek Words by Plautus.' *American Journal of Philology* 55: 346-64.

(1940). 'Miscellanea Plautina: Vulgarity, Extra-Dramatic Speeches, Roman Allusions.' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 71: pp. 186-98.

Jakobi, R. (1996). *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*. New York.

Leeman, A. D., H. Pinkster, et al. (1981-96). *M. Tullius Cicero: De Oratore Libri III*. 4 voll. Heidelberg.

Leo, F. (1912). *Plautinische Forschungen*. 2nd edition. Berlin.

Lilja, S. (1965). *Terms of Abuse in Roman Comedy*. Helsinki.

Lindsay, W. M. (1900). *The Captivi of Plautus*. London.

(1904). *Ancient Editions of Plautus.* Oxford.

(1907). *Syntax of Plautus.* Oxford.

Lodge, G. (1924/33). *Lexicon Plautinum.* 2 voll. Leipzig.

Lowe, J. C. B. (1985). 'Cario—a Plautine Creation.' *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 32: 83-4.

Maltby, R. (1991). *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies.* Leeds.

(1999). 'The Language of Plautus' Parasites.' *Conference Papers of the Open University Conference on Theatre: Ancient and Modern* (published electronically).

Maurach, G. (1988). *Der Poenulus des Plautus.* Heidelberg.

Mendelsohn, C. J. (1907). *Studies in the Word-play in Plautus.* Philadelphia.

Nixon, P. (1927-38). *Plautus, with an English Translation.* New York.

Nünlist, R. (1993). 'P. Mich. Inv. 6950 (unpubliziert), P. Koln 203 und 243: Szenen aus Menanders Dis Exapaton?' *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 99: 245-78.

Palmer, A. (1890). *Plautus: Amphitruo.* London.

Poultney, J. W. (1959). *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium.* Baltimore.

Prescott (1907). 'Agnus Curio in Plautus Aulularia 562, 563.' *Classical Philology* 2: 335-6.

Questa (1975). *T. Maccius Plautus: Bacchides.* 2nd edition. Florence.

(1984). *Numeri innumeri: Richerche sui Cantica e la Tradizione manoscritta di Plauto.* Rome.

(2001). 'Per un' Edizione di Plauto.' *Giornate Filologiche "Francesco della Corte" II*: 61-83.

Redard, G. (1956). 'Le rajeunissement du texte de Plaute' in *Hommages à M. Niedermann*: 296-306.

Saunders, C. (1909). *Costume in Roman Comedy.* New York.

Schmidt, K. (1902). 'Die Griechische Personnamen bei Plautus.' *Hermes* 37: 173-211, 353-90, 608-26.

Schwyzer, E. (repr. 1960). *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora.* Hildesheim.

Sedgwick, W. B. (1925). 'The Cantica of Plautus.' *Classical Review* 39: 55-8.

(1930). 'The Dating of Plautus' Plays.' *Classical Quarterly* 24: 102-6.

(1949). 'Plautine Chronology.' *American Journal of Philology* 70: 376-83.

(1960). *Amphitruo.* Manchester.

Shipp, G. P. (1953). 'Greek in Plautus.' *American Journal of Philology*: 105-12.

Slater, N. W. (1985). *Plautus in Performance.* Princeton.

Sonnenschein, E. A. (repr. 1979). *T. Macci Plauti Rudens.* New York.

Spengel, A. (1883). *Philologus* 37: 425.

Spenser, E. B. T. (1906). *Adnominatio in the Plays of Plautus.* Rome.

Stader, P. (1968). 'Special Effects in Plautine Dialogue: Miles Gloriosus, III, ii.' *Classical Philology* 63: 146-7.

Starkie, W. J. M. (1909). *The Acharnians of Aristophanes.* London.

Stockert, W. (1983). *T. Maccius Plautus, Aulularia.* Stuttgart.

Tosi, R. (repr. 1997). *Dizionario delle Sentenze Latine e Greche.* Milan.

Warmington, E. (1935). *Remains of Old Latin.* 4 voll. Cambridge, Mass.

Wessner, P. (1902-8). *Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti. Accedunt Eugraphii Commentum et Scholia Bembina.* 3 voll. Leipzig.

Wilkins, A. S. *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Oratore Libri Tres.* Oxford.

Woytek, E. (1982). *T. Maccius Plautus, Persa: Einleitung, Text, und Kommentar.* Vienna.

Zwierlein, O. (1990-2). *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus.* 4 voll. Mainz.

INDEX LOCORVM

1.) PLAUTUS

Miles Gloriosus

13-5	p. 117
88	p. 43 n. 63
156-7	p. 164
211	p. 63 n. 24
217	p. 139 n. 3
228	p. 23 n. 27
289	p. 133
330	p. 133
380	p. 134
364-6	pp. 133-4
494	p. 134 n. 31
575	p. 2
723	p. 13
813-73	pp. 29-30
856	p. 144 n. 14
927	p. 123 n. 16
1387	p. 115
1068	p. 2
1407	p. 36
1407-8	pp. 25-7, p. 26 n. 33
1416-7	p. 26 n. 32
1420	p. 26 n. 32
1423	p. 13
1424	p. 15
286	p. 2

Mostellaria

179	epigraph
288	p. 55 n. 25
291	p. 55 n. 25
308	p. 58 n. 17
313	pp. 27-8
319	p. 29
325	p. 29
331-2	p. 29
719	p. 2
828	p. 80 n. 53
885	p. 5
926	p. 123 n. 16
973	p. 105
1110	p. 162 n. 36
1070	p. 131 n. 27

Persa

1-2	pp. 34-5
36	p. 123 n. 16
55-9	p. 82 n. 58
92-100	pp. 93-7
104-7	pp. 97-8
186	p. 69 n. 34
394-5	p. 66 n. 29
554	p. 23 n. 27
559	p. 23 n. 27
600	p. 115
613	p. 15
624-6	p. 125
626	p. 156 n. 26
627	pp. 126-7, p. 159 n. 31
668	p. 127
700-5	p. 117, pp. 118-20
713	p. 127
740	p. 67 n. 31
777-8	pp. 66-8
782-84	pp. 66-8
782	p. 80 n. 52
783-4	p. 66, p. 107

Poenulus

3-4	p. 95 n. 74
8	p. 13
54	p. 80 n. 53
82	p. 70 n. 35
91-2	p. 156
191	p. 154
263-5	p. 154
277-8	p. 85
279	p. 21
306	p. 55 n. 25
307	p. 55 n. 25
319	p. 85
321	p. 85
323	p. 55 n. 25
330ff	p. 154
336-8	pp. 154-5
338	p. 55 n. 25
509	p. 14
530	p. 28
594-9	pp. 88-90
646	p. 156
647-8	p. 157

2.) OTHER AUTHORS