

## 4 Plautus *Epidicus* – the dress catalogue

1. The introduction of the catalogue (219–228)
2. The catalogue (229–235)
  - 2.1 Grammar and structure of thought
  - 2.2 The catalogue – a *contaminatio* of Plautus?
3. The dress terms
4. Conclusion

The following chapter deals with scene II 2 of the *Epidicus* of Plautus, especially the comic catalogue of garments. The *Epidicus*, titled after the name of the main character, is the second-shortest comedy of Plautus (733 verses).<sup>1</sup> It is only half as long as, for example, the *Miles gloriosus* (1437 verses), differing in the greater conciseness of its dialogues. A reliable dating of the drama is not possible. It is usually associated with the abolition of the *lex Oppia* (A 2) in the year 195/194 BCE,<sup>2</sup> among other reasons because of the scene to be discussed here, where Epidicus gives the supposed names of women's articles of clothing.<sup>3</sup> However, there is no clear reference to luxury legislation in the play. On the contrary: purple and luxury carts, restricted by the *lex Oppia*, are not mentioned in the *Epidicus*. Gold too only plays a minor role in the comedy. Thus, it seems best to leave the question of dating open.

The *Epidicus* is an anagnorisis drama in which several stock characters are involved—a slave (*servus*), some beautiful hetaerae (*meretrices*), a young man in love (*adulescens*), and a worried father (*senex*). At the centre of the plot is the slave Epidicus, whose tricks shape the action. In scene II 2, the common comical motif of a *senex* learning of his son's inappropriate love affair is varied in so far as the love affair is largely invented. By telling it, Epidicus only wants to scare his master, the *senex* Periphanes, in order to take money from him in the interest of the son. The young man (*adulescens*) is in urgent need of money because he wants to free his young mistress, a *meretrix*. Epidicus therefore describes to Periphanes in detail how the urban hetaerae, in full apparel, welcomed the young men (*amatores*) returning from war at the city gate. He tells Periphanes that his son was also expected there by such a mistress. The young lady's fine clothing causes him to talk about the supposed 'modern' names of female garments. This leads to a comic catalogue of dress in which the many unusual terms

---

1 U. Auhagen (ed.), Studien zu Plautus' Epidicius (= Scripta Oralia 125), Tübingen 2001; J. Blänsdorf, art. Plautus, in: W. Suerbaum (ed.), Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike, 1. Band. Die Archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod. Die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr. (HAW VIII 1), Munich 2002, 200–201 for recent overviews.

2 Cf. p. 53

3 Th. Ladewig, Zum Epidicus des Plautus, ZA 8 (1841), 1081–1086; G. E. Duckworth, Titi Plauti Macci Epidicus, Princeton 1940, 239–240; K. H. E. Schutter, Quibus annis comoediae Plautinae primum actae sint quaeritur, Groningen 1952, 69–76; Blänsdorf (n. 1) 201.

(*nova nomina*) of female garments are listed. This chapter argues that these terms are mostly puns created by Plautus to seem like they might be ‘modern’ terms (at time of writing) used by fashion-conscious women. Most of them therefore do not refer to any historical garments.

The section has already been considered a key text for early female Roman garments in antiquity. It contains numerous words that are attested only once (*hapax legomena*) and are altogether obscure in meaning. Varro, following his teacher Aelius Stilo and others, tried to explain them and to make use of them for the history of primeval Roman clothing (C 1; D 3–5). The exegesis of the Plautine glosses stands at the beginning of an extensive scholarly discussion about Roman dress terms that we can still find in the dictionaries of Festus (Verrius) and Nonius. The pseudo-knowledge of antique and late antique scholars, which is mostly based on etymological guesswork, has left deep traces in modern research and has obscured the fact that many of the Plautine garments are only comedic chimaeras. Despite the warning of Wilson (1938),<sup>4</sup> many words coined by Plautus ad hoc have been taken too seriously, resulting in a veritable hodgepodge of genuine and fictitious terms in cultural history.

The following chapter has two aims: All words concerning dress will be explained as far as possible. Real and fictitious terms will be sifted through and separated. On the other hand, the passage will be examined as regards the transmission. It will be argued that the text already suffered from corruption at several points before the time of Varro, several changes of speaker being missing and a corrupt word (*\*ricam* = *tricae*) impairing the understanding.

## 4.1 The introduction of the catalogue (219–228)

In scene II 2 (181–305), the slave Epidicus (E.) begins to spin his intrigue against the *senex* Periphanes (P.).<sup>5</sup> He tells him about the beautiful young woman who supposedly awaited his son at the city gate. He is interrupted several times by Periphanes, who is curious and wants to know more about her. The humour of the scene comes from precisely the words’ meaninglessness coupled with the *senex*’s cluelessness of real dress terms.

Plaut. Epid. 221–228

**E.** *ea praestolabatur illum apud portam. P. viden veneficam!*

**E.** *sed vestita, aurata, ornata ut lepide, ut concinne, ut nove.*

**P.** *quid erat induta? an regillam induculam an mendiculam?*

**E.** *inpluviatam, ut istaec faciunt vestimentis nomina.*

<sup>4</sup> Wilson (1938) 154.

<sup>5</sup> Apart from the commentaries, see E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin 1922, 134–137; Th. Baier, *Griechisches und Römisches im Plautinischen Epidicus*, in: Auhagen (n. 1), 20–24.

**P.** *utin impluvium induta fuerit? E. quid istuc tam mirabile est?* 225  
*quasi non fundis exornatae multae incedant per vias.*  
**<P.>** *at tributus quom imperatus est, negant pendi potis:*  
*illis quibus tributus maior penditur, pendi potest.*

E. She was waiting for him at the city gate. P. What a sorceress! || E. Her dress, her jewellery, her entire outfit, how charming, how elegant, how extravagant! || P. What was she wearing? A royal robe or a beggarly robe? || E. An *impluviata*, for that is what clothes are called now! || P. You mean she was wearing an *impluvium*? || E. What's so amazing about that? || Do not many women walk the streets dressed in whole estates? || **<P.>** However, when a tax is imposed, they say 'it cannot be paid.' || To those who charge higher taxes, they can pay it.

### ***quid erat induta? regillam induculam aut mendiculam? (223)***

The first pun of Plautus and the meaning of *\*regilla* have already caused difficulties for scholars in antiquity.<sup>6</sup> The starting point is the adjective *\*regillus*, which Plautus humorously interprets as diminutive of *regius* (royal). Plautus' etymology is hardly correct, though it has made some career in both ancient and modern explanation. The gloss *\*regillus* is rather to be connected with the noun *regula*.<sup>7</sup> It is probably a technical term that has not been adopted in Latin 'high' literature—it is only discussed by grammarians. This hypothesis is supported by the way the pun is constructed. The word play needs an anchor in reality. The 'beggarly robe' (*\*mendicula*) that is the opposite of the 'royal robe' (*\*regilla*) clearly is a comical ad hoc formation.<sup>8</sup> The same is true for the word *\*inducula* that forms a word play with *\*mendicula* by means of assonance. The term *\*inducula* also only occurs here in primary use and is based on the verb *induo*, from which Plautus coined the gloss in analogy to the common term *subucula* (sc. *tunica*).<sup>9</sup> Of the three words, only *\*regilla* is therefore left as a real term that could give rise to the humorous misinterpretation.

The ancient attempts to explain the word *\*regilla* are discussed elsewhere in this book.<sup>10</sup> It is probably the Latin translation of the Greek term χιτὼν ὀρθοστάδιος, which denotes a long and fabric-rich *tunica* of Greek type. Perhaps the Greek term ὀρθοστάδιος already existed in the Greek comedy Plautus used as a model. However, as the Latin etymology shows, the word play following the *\*regilla* is certainly Plautus' own invention.

<sup>6</sup> C 1 pp. 570–571; D 3 pp. 602–606.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. D 3 p. 605.

<sup>8</sup> See Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.

<sup>9</sup> C 1 p. 571; D 3 pp. 609–610.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. n. 6.

***impluviatam, ut istaec faciunt vestimentis nomina* (224)**

When Periphanes asks him what kind of garment the girl was wearing, Epidicus responds (224) that she was dressed in an *\*impluviata*. The accusative *impluviatam* is the object of the elliptical main clause (sc. *induta est*). It is followed by a subordinate clause with *ut* + indicative (*ut istaec faciunt vestimentis nomina*). The Latin is trickier than it appears at first glance and needs more explanation than commentaries were willing to bestow on it so far. First, the conjunction *ut* seems to have causal sense (OLD s.v. 21) as it sometimes does in Plautus.<sup>11</sup> As to the form of the following pronoun, our manuscripts offer the orthographic variants *istae* (A, Nonius) and *istaec* (P). The form *istae* (from *iste*) is unequivocal in its grammar (it is nom. pl. fem.). The form *istaec* (from *istic*) is ambiguous. It is either nom. pl. fem. or nom. or acc. pl. neuter. Which case and gender do we have to choose? Does *istae(c)* refer to the subject or does it belong to the object *nomina*? Under the impression of v. 229 (*quid istae*), Fraenkel<sup>12</sup> and Wheeler<sup>13</sup> prefer the nominative (“to judge by the names *those* females give their clothes”). However, a point of reference in the immediately preceding words is missing.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, considering the expression *haec vocabula* in v. 235 (see below), it seems preferable to read *istaec* here and in v. 229, creating a similar expression. Being an attribute to *nomina*, *istaec* (‘like these,’ acc. pl. neut.) refers to the preceding *impluviatam*.<sup>15</sup> *Faciunt*, being left without indication of a specific subject, then serves to generalize the statement, as does the expression *nomina vestimentis*. We should thus translate as follows: “an *impluviata*, since they give names like these (*istaec*) to clothes (nowadays).”

The *\*impluviata* is another pun of Plautus.<sup>16</sup> In contrast to *\*regilla*, the comic effect is not produced by misunderstanding a real dress term, but by creating a funny new

11 Plaut. Amph. 329: *lassus sum hercle, navi ut vectus huc sum* [I am tired because I have travelled to this place on ship]; Most. 268: *ut speculum tenuisti, metuo ne olant argentum manus* [Since you have held the mirror, I fear that your hands will smell of silver]; KS II 364.

12 Fraenkel (n. 5) 135–136.

13 In Duckworth (n. 3).

14 Fraenkel (see n. 5) therefore argues that the players turn to the spectators.

15 Leo and Lindsay put *istaec* into the text. However, it cannot be decided what they thought because the form of the fem. nom. pl. is also *istaec* (= *istae*).

16 See Ussing: *ridiculi causa fictum videtur. non intellexit Nonius* p. 548 [21–24]. Nonius (p. 879.21–24 L.) gives us the following nonsense: *impluviatus color quasi fumato stillicidio implutus, qui est Mutinensis quem nunc dicimus. Plautus in Epidico: impluviata, ut istae faciunt vestimentis nomina* [The colour *impluviatus* like ‘rained upon (*implutus*) with grey drain water’ that we call ‘*Mutinensis*’ (= of Modena) now. Plautus in his *Epidicus*...]. Not everyone has believed Ussing, cf. Blümner I (1912) 258 n. 3: “Ebenso glaube ich nicht, dass die *vestis impluviata* bei Plaut. Epid. 224 ein schachbrettartig gemustertes Gewand war, indem die Karos den Impluvien ähneln (Becker-Göll a. a. O. [= Charikles] 257), vielmehr halte ich dies für einen dunkel gesprenkelten Stoff”; Fraenkel (n. 5) 135 n. 2: “Ussing hat den Witz vollständig mißverstanden ... Die Umdeutung in V. 225 ... hat ja eine Pointe nur, wenn *vestis* (oder *inducula*) *impluviata* eine Bezeichnung des Lebens war, sie bezieht sich auf die Musterung des Stoffs ... Was bei Nonius steht ... ist durchaus vernünftig.” Georges s.v. *impluviatus*: “I. von der Gestalt eines *impluvium*; II. wassergrau, blaugrau”; OLD s.v. “resembling an *impluvium*.”

word for a fictional garment. That the *\*impluviata* is no real garment but something ludicrous is shown by Periphanes' astonished question as to its meaning and by Epidicus' comic explanations. Plautus probably modeled the word after a genuine term taken from Latin fashion language as is suggested by the similar words *\*indusiata* and *\*patagiata* (see below).<sup>17</sup> Regarding the assonance, the word that led Plautus to his invention may have come from the semantic field *pluma* that has to do with brocade (*plumare*).<sup>18</sup>

***at tributus quom imperatus est, negant pendi potis: || illis quibus tributus maior penditur, pendi potest (227–228)***

The manuscripts and the editors of Plautus give these verses to the slave Epidicus. However, they are better fit for the *senex* Periphanes. The adversative conjunction (*at*) at the beginning shows that the remarks are a kind of interjection, as is typical for Periphanes in the whole scene. The comment is critical and contrasts with what has been said by Epidicus. After all, it is Periphanes who as a citizen has to pay the tax.<sup>19</sup> It is therefore better to assume that a change of speaker has been lost in the process of transmission.

## 4.2 The catalogue (229–235)

This exchange contains Plautus' famous catalogue of dress terms, which mixes technical words with Plautine malapropisms and inventions in a funny way. The catalogue has a long history as a literary form before Roman comedy. It is also well known in the comedic genres.<sup>20</sup> For example, a similar list of female jewellery and garments can be found in the second *Thesmophoriazusai* of Aristophanes.<sup>21</sup> The Hellenistic poet Herondas in his Mime *Shoemaker* gives a long list of shoes.<sup>22</sup>

Since the 19th century, the catalogue in the Epidicus has been discussed many times under the heading of whether it was written by Plautus or instead added later by some other author. It has been branded an 'interpolation' first by Wagner (1843).

<sup>17</sup> As is shown by the Latin nature of the puns, vv. 223–228 are additions made by Plautus to his Greek source, see Fraenkel (n. 5) 135; W. G. Arnott, *Plautus' Epidicus and Greek Comedy*, in: Auhagen (n. 1), 81.

<sup>18</sup> See on it below p. 81.

<sup>19</sup> For the discussion whether the *tributus* is a Roman tax or a Greek εἰσφορά taken over from Plautus' Greek source, see Fraenkel (n. 5) 135; Arnott (n. 17) 81.

<sup>20</sup> Arnott (n. 17) 81.

<sup>21</sup> Aristophanes F 332 K.-A.

<sup>22</sup> Herondas 756–61, cf. C 30 p. 549.

Since then, opinions as to its authenticity have been diverging.<sup>23</sup> After Fraenkel's contribution to the question (1922), no new arguments have been added. Wagner noticed a seeming contradiction in the catalogue. Epidicus extensively tells Periphanes about the luxurious garments of wives, and a little later (267) advises him to marry off his son as soon as possible.<sup>24</sup> Wagner solves this contradiction by attributing the catalogue to another writer who inserted it without regard for the entire context. In fact, the catalogue does not submit to any strict logic. Yet one may ask, like Fraenkel, whether this standard is to be applied to a comic excursus and whether the incongruities do not form part of 'situational comedy.'<sup>25</sup> After all, comedy written for stage is more free-wheeling in thought than poetry meant for books. Moreover, Wagner's argument does not prove that Plautus did not write the catalogue himself. Plautus may well have enlarged his Greek source with an intentional addition or by inserting a piece of another Greek play (*contaminatio*). As we will see below, the catalogue fits in very well when all questions as to the text are solved. Thus, it seems best to attribute the catalogue to him.

#### 4.2.1 Grammar and structure of thought

Epidicus is talking to Periphanes as before. In the end, Apocides (A.), a friend of Periphanes, intervenes and asks Epidicus to return to the matter at hand:<sup>26</sup>

Plaut. Epid. 229–237

E. *quid istae< c>, quae vesti quotannis nomina inveniunt nova?*  
*tunicam rallam, tunicam spissam, linteolam caesiciam,*<sup>27</sup> 230  
*indusiata, patagiatam, caltulam aut crocotulam,*

<sup>23</sup> For an overview of the different positions, see Duckworth (n. 3) 244. 'Interpolation' by some later author: Leo in his edition; O. Zwielerin, *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus IV. Bacchides*, Stuttgart 1992, 172 n. 380; M. Deufert, *Textgeschichte und Rezeption der plautinischen Komödien im Altertum*, Berlin 2002, 326; catalogue written by Plautus himself: C. Schredinger, *Observationes in T. Macci Plauti Epidicum*, Schweinfurt 1884, 28–38; Fraenkel (n. 5) 134–137; Arnott (n. 17) 81–82; W. Hofmann, *Die Monologe im Epidicus und Truculentus*, in: Auhagen (n. 1) 242.

<sup>24</sup> W. Wagner, *De Plauti Aulularia*, Bonn 1864, 33: "*sed mirum est, neminem adhuc animadvertisse, quam importune illa de matronarum luxu expositio hic sit intrusa: hic enim non de matronis deque earum luxu sermo est. qua igitur ratione Epidicum decet uxorem luxuriam tangere vel adeo fusius pertractare? quod si fecisset, non ea quam semper sequitur calliditate rem instituisset: nam infra (II 2,82) ut Strathippocles a meretrice abducatur, ei uxorem arbitrandam censet. quid igitur debebat Periphanis animum praeoccupare importunarum uxorum commemoratione.*"

<sup>25</sup> Vgl. Fraenkel (n. 5) 136 n. 3.

<sup>26</sup> The places where my text deviates from that of printed editions are given in bold characters. Among others, the obscure garment called *\*rica* (D 4) may be nonsense (*tricae*) in the true sense of the word. The translation attempts to reproduce the Plautinian puns as far as possible.

<sup>27</sup> *linteolam caesiciam* Radicke: *linteolum caesicium* codd.

*subparum aut subnimum ... <P.> tricae!<sup>28</sup> <E.> basilicum aut exoticum,  
 cumatile aut plumatile, carinum aut cerinum ... <P.> gerrae maxumae!  
 <E.> cani quoque etiam adeptumst nomen. P. qui? E. vocant Laconicum.  
 haec vocabula auctiones subigunt ut faciant viros. 235  
 A. quin tu ut occepisti loquere? E. occepere aliae mulieres  
 duae post me sic fabulari inter sese.*

**E.** What about these new names that are invented every year for clothing? || Thin tunic, thick tunic, a tunic made of fine linen, || *patagiata, indusiata*, ‘little marigold’ or ‘little crocus,’ || ‘not-enough-underneath’ or ‘too-much-underneath’ ... **<P.>** Nonsense! **<E.>** royal robe or exotic robe, ‘wave-dress’ or ‘cave-dress,’ ‘brown-nut’ or ‘crown-nut.’ || **<P.>** Utter nonsense! || **E.** Even a dog’s name has been stolen! **P.** What? **E.** They speak of a ‘Spaniel!’ These are the words that force men to sell their homes! || **A.** Why don’t you talk like you started? **E.** Two other women behind me started talking like this...

As to grammar, vv. 229 to 233a (*cerinum*) offer, in the transmitted form (with *\*ricam*), a long uninterrupted question. The catalogue (230–233a) consists of a series of accusatives standing in apposition to the expression *nomina nova* in v. 229. In the form in which it has been handed down to us, it contains sixteen terms in succession. However, there are several problems as to the transmitted text.<sup>29</sup>

### ***quid istae<c>, quae vesti quotannis nomina inveniunt nova? (229)***

Verse 229 offers some difficulty. The verse is linguistically similar to v. 224 (*impluviatam, ut istae/istaec faciunt vestimentis nomina*), to v. 225 (*quid istuc*), and to v. 222 (*nove*). As to grammar, the same question has to be asked as in v. 224 (see above), namely what to make of *istae/istaec* and *quae*.<sup>30</sup> In contrast to v. 224, this time the textual transmission is not split. It has only the feminine form *istae*. If we keep this, the following relative pronoun *quae* has to be understood as a nom. pl. fem. as well (“what about those women who... invent new names?”). But does this remark fit the context? The problem arises that the following catalogue of dress terms in the accusative is not sufficiently introduced. For this reason, some scholars have taken *quae* as acc. pl. neut., thus separating it from the preceding *quid istae* (“what about these women? What new names they invent!”).<sup>31</sup> This solution, however, is against the expected linguistic ductus. After *istae*, a relative pronoun (*quae*) referring to it seems more natural.

<sup>28</sup> *tricae* Radicke; *ricam* codd.

<sup>29</sup> Editors leave readers in the lurch. They usually put a question mark after v. 229. In v. 233, they separate the nominative *gerrae maxumae* from the preceding accusatives by a dash. Lindsay also puts a dash before the word *\*subnimum* in v. 232, without any obvious reason. Duckworth (n. 3) does not explain the syntax in his commentary.

<sup>30</sup> The difficulty is still to be felt in Duckworth’s comment ad loc.

<sup>31</sup> Schredinger (n. 23) 36–37.

An easy remedy for all these difficulties is to correct the fem. *istae* to the neut. *istae<c>*. This is then to be connected with the expression *nova nomina* that has been transferred from the main clause into the relative clause (“What about these new names that are invented every year for clothing?”). The following catalogue (231ff) is thus introduced in an adequate way. The question *quid istaec nova nomina* is also in tune with the *istaec nomina* of v. 224, and what is most important, with *haec (vocabula)* in v. 235 that again takes up *istaec*. The variant *istae/istaec* in v. 224 shows that the textual transmission is uncertain as to the ending of the word *istic*. One should therefore emend *istae* to *istaec* at this point to restore a proper sense.

***tunicam rallam, tunicam spissam, linteolam caesiciam (linteolum caesicium codd.) || indusiatam, patagiatam, caltulam aut crocotulam (230–231)***

The verses contain a total of seven ‘dress terms,’ all but one in the feminine and referring to different sorts of tunics (*tunica*). The expression *linteolum caesicium*, which as it stands has to be translated with ‘a cloth of some special type of linen’ (see below), intrudes into this homogenous list, interrupting the sequence of feminine forms and also breaking up the line of *tunicae*. It also makes the feminine participles *indusiatam* and *patagiatam* follow abruptly, the reference word *tunicam* being cut off. All problems are solved if we instead read *linteolam caesiciam* (sc. *tunicam*), understanding *linteolam* not as a noun, but as an adjective. This would refer to a tunic made of specially worked linen (see below). The error of the endings could have been caused by a scribe reading the rare adjective form *linteolam*, not understanding its grammatical nature, and replacing it with the more common noun *linteolum* (a piece or strip of linen). My proposed emendation *linteolam caesiciam* not only solves the syntactic knot, but also creates a nice series of tunics.

***tricae (\*ricam) – gerrae maxumae (231b–233)***

The next issue is found in verse 231b, which is marked by a change of syntax and literary technique. The asyndetic listing of terms that characterized the preceding lines comes to an end. Instead, we now always find a pair of nouns connected by *aut* (or) that are each used for a humorous play on words. In v. 232, the enumeration moves on from the *tunica* to other ‘garments.’ In total, vv. 231b–233 contain five pairs of terms. In overview, the structure of the passage is as follows:

*caltulam aut crocotulam,  
subparum aut subnimum – †ricam – basilicum aut exoticum,  
cumatile aut plumatile, carinum aut cerinum – gerrae maxumae!*

As the text of v. 232 stands, two pairs of nouns are interrupted by the incomprehensible gloss *\*ricam*. In v. 233, two pairs in the accusative precede the nominative *gerrae maxumae* (utter nonsense). Let us tackle the unexpected change of construction first.



Editors usually mark it by a dash. They, like the manuscripts, nevertheless give these words to the speaker Epidicus. But does the remark “utter nonsense” really belong to him? Syntax and content suggest that a change of speaker has been lost in the manuscripts at this point and that the words *gerrae maximae* are spoken by Periphanes. The muttering “utter nonsense” is very much in tune with the other comments made by him. In vv. 225 and 234, he also reacts to the words of Epidicus, who, in turn, surprises the *senex* with ever new and fantastical inventions, so that such a negative remark would be inappropriate in Epidicus’ mouth. Moreover, the word *gerrae* is connected with a change of speaker in Plautus’ *Trinummus* 760 and Caecilius Portitor F 1 R.<sup>2</sup> (*cur depopulator? gerrae* [Why a looter? Nonsense!]). Two fine parallels. It therefore does not appear too hazardous to correct the manuscript tradition and to indicate a change of speaker.

Under this premise, we can now again turn to the second difficulty: the word *\*rica* in v. 232. This interrupts the series of word plays without any discernible meaning. The word itself was already incomprehensible to scholars in antiquity and has remained so until today. Because of the context, ancient grammarians postulated that the *\*rica* was some kind of garment. In the following, a new hypothesis will be put forward that touches the roots of the transmission of Plautus. The complete history of the gloss *\*rica* will be discussed in chapter D 4. Here, it is only to be noted that the word is a hapax. It is attested—contrary to the impression caused by the evidence—primarily, i.e. outside the grammarians, only here. No meaningful Greek or Latin etymology can be established in its case. The word cannot be assigned to any historical garment, and there is no reason that it should have been invented by Plautus to make a pun. All this taken together makes the word *\*rica* appear very dubious. It resembles other dark glosses such as *\*ricinium* (A 1; D 1), and a similar explanation will be proposed for it here, namely that it is nothing more than an early corruption in the text of Plautus.

This begs the question: What did Plautus actually write? As in the case of *\*ricinium* (<*t*>*ric*<*b*>*inium*), emendation should respect the letters handed down to us. If we look for a word similar in orthography, the noun *tricae* (trifles, nonsense) comes close to *\*rica*. This would mean that the same combination of the letters (TR) as in *\*ricinium* would have been affected by corruption. Maybe, there was a misleading ligature. As to its sense, the word *tricae* perfectly fits into the context. It is well attested, especially in Plautus, where it is used in situations similar to the one at hand, i.e. when someone rejects or criticises the statement of another person: *Quas tu mihi tricas narras?* [What kind of nonsense do you talk about?].<sup>32</sup> In Plaut. *Rudens* 1323, it also serves as a short interjection: (A) *nummos trecentos* (threehundred sesterzes). (B) *tricas* (trifles). It is clear that ‘nonsense, trifles’ has to be another short comment of Periphanes. The word should thus be written in the nominative, and a change of speaker should be assumed.

<sup>32</sup> Curc. 613: *quas tu mihi tricas narras?* [what nonsense do you talk about?]; Most. 572: *quin tu istas mihi mittis tricas?* [Stop talking nonsense!].

The situation then is as follows: Periphanes listening to Epidicus gets increasingly annoyed. First, he says only ‘nonsense’ (*tricae*), then ‘utter nonsense’ (*gerrae maxumae*). Putting *tricae* in the text, the scene gets more dynamic and coherent. Emendations like these remain, of course, hypothetical reconstructions. However, they sharpen our view for the difficult nature of the transmission and give an idea about the fragility of our knowledge. If we think that Plautus’ comedies were transmitted in the beginning through copies owned by actors and impresarios, an emendation such as *tricae* does not seem too daring.

#### 4.2.2 The Catalogue – a *contaminatio* of Plautus?

The interpretation of the catalogue shows that it is not necessary to assume a second rate ‘redactor’ to resolve the difficulties in the text. On the contrary: The verses contain more dialogue than has been previously thought. They are carefully composed and excellently fit into the rest of the scene. One can hardly deny them to Plautus. Nevertheless, there are some more peculiarities to explain. The similarity between v. 229, the beginning of the catalogue, and vv. 223, 224 and 225 has already been noted by Wagner, who thought this to indicate that the catalogue was inserted only later.<sup>33</sup> The words are indeed similar, but offer no stylistic offence. The repetition seems quite natural. There is, however, another more striking repetition not mentioned so far. In v. 236, some remarks of *Apoecides* put an end to Epidicus’ digression and lead back to the main narrative: A. *Quin tu ut occepisti loquere?* E. *Occepere aliae mulieres* (A. why do you not speak as you began? E. Two other women began to speak behind me like this). The repetition of *occipere* in Epidicus’ answer seems somewhat clumsy. The word is used in different contexts without creating any stylistic effect. One might thus consider it a trace of interpolation by a later scribe. However, since the passage as a whole cannot be denied to Plautus, it may be Plautus himself who is at work here, putting pieces from different Greek plays together (*contaminatio*). In case of v. 236, he was stylistically less successful than at the beginning of the catalogue, where the change from one literary source to the next is hardly noticeable.

#### 4.3 The dress terms

The dress terms mentioned in the scene can be divided into three main groups according to word formation. Many are new comical inventions or funny adaptations of ‘real’ dress terms. It is sometimes difficult to assign them to exactly one category. However,

---

<sup>33</sup> Wagner (n. 24) 34.

with the exception of *\*rica*, it is possible to determine their etymology and their content to a certain extent:

1. Greek dress terms (sometimes with Latin endings): *basilicum*, *exoticum*, *Laconicum*; *\*indusiata*, *\*patagiata*, *crocotula*, *\*cumatile*, *carinum*, *cerinum*.
2. Latin dress terms: *\*ralla*, *spissa*, *linteola*, *\*caesicia*, *\*supparus*, (*\*regilla*).
3. Comic inventions: *\*subnimum*, *\*caltula*, *\*plumatile*, (*\*impluviata*, *\*inducula*, *\*mendicula*).

The first group consists of those words which are either entirely Greek words or Greek words with Latin endings. Some of them are attested in Greek literature, though they do not always refer to dress there (*basilicum*, *exoticum*). The second group contains Latin terms that denote garments or characteristics of garments. Some of them, like *\*ralla*, *\*regilla*, and *\*caesicius*, are attested only once. They might thus have been coined by Plautus, but there is no clear literary reason why he should have done so. The last group comprises the words, all hapaxes, that are used in comical puns and are likely to be inventions of Plautus.

#### ***tunicam \*rallam, tunicam spissam (230a–b)***

The catalogue begins with the *tunica* made of wool. The adjectives *\*rallus* and *spissus* form a contrasting pair. The gloss *\*rallus* is only attested here. In connection with textiles, we usually find the similar adjectives *rarus* and *rasus*. Since scholars often mix up the meaning of these words, it seems reasonable to discuss them first before turning to *\*rallus*. The term *rarus* refers to a specific type of weaving.<sup>34</sup> It describes a loosely woven fabric in which the weft thread (*subtemen*) is only lightly beaten with a batten (*spatha*).<sup>35</sup> In contrast, the term *rasus* (from *radere*, to shave) refers to a completely different process. It characterizes the way the cloth is treated during fulling. It is about the shearing (*radere*, κείρειν, ξύω) of the matted cloth, which is well documented in antiquity.<sup>36</sup> During this process, the cloth is freed from protruding wool fibres with a blade to produce a thin and soft woollen fabric. The equivalent Greek dress term is ξυστικός (from ξύω),<sup>37</sup> which is attested several times in connection with female dress in Greek comedy, for example in the dress catalogue in the second *Thesmophoriazusai* of Aristophanes. The Latin-based *\*rallus* seems to have the same meaning as *rasus*, i.e. ‘made of thin woollen cloth.’<sup>38</sup> It could well be a neologism or

<sup>34</sup> For the evidence, see OLD s.v. 1b.

<sup>35</sup> Blümner I (1912) 154, 160.

<sup>36</sup> Blümner I (1912) 181–182.

<sup>37</sup> Vgl. LSJ s.v.

<sup>38</sup> Duckworth (n. 3) 245. Sebesta (1994) 66 (“woolen loose-woven, gauzy tunic [ralla]”) and GRD (2007) 159 (“*ralla*: A thin tunic, with an open weave”) combine real facts with Nonius’ wrong etymological explanation p. 865.15 L.: *ralla vestis dicta a raritate* [*vestis ralla* called thus after its looseness].

a comical malapropism. It should be connected with *rasus* for the following three reasons: The word formation suggests that it is derived from *radere* like the noun *rallum* (a kind of scraper).<sup>39</sup> The adjective *spissus* (thick), which follows in Plautus, seems to stand in contrast to *\*rallus*.<sup>40</sup> And finally, the parallels in Greek comedies, which Plautus used as models, point to this solution. The gloss *\*rallus* is thus to be regarded as a translation of the Greek word ξυστίς.

Beginning with the contrasting adjective *spissus* (thick), we see it attested in connection with cloth several times. Again, scholarship is marred by a lack of precision. In OLD s.v. 3b, for example, *spissus* is translated as ‘thick, closely woven.’<sup>41</sup> However, *spissus* does not refer to the type of weaving but to the thickness of the fabric. A cloth in which the weft is compressed with the weaving comb is called by another name, *densus* (dense):<sup>42</sup> *densum a dentibus pectinis quibus feritur* (dense after the teeth (*dentes*) of the comb that hit it).<sup>43</sup> The weaving term *densus* (= Greek δαούς) is the opposite of *rarus*. In contrast, *spissus* again concerns the process of fulling. It is the opposite of *rasus*. The protruding pile of the felted wool is not cut off but left standing and pressed along with the fabric to form a thick cloth. The Celtic *gausapum* (B 9) was produced in this way.<sup>44</sup> The adjective *spissus* also carries the meaning ‘thick’ in a remark of Seneca that forms the closest parallel. Seneca mocks the different and often inadequate appearance which poets give to the Muses and says he will certainly find someone that makes them dressed in thick woollen tunics with belts (*spissis aut Phryxianis*).<sup>45</sup> Indeed, in Roman art, muses sometimes appear in a thick ‘*peplos*’ and girded with a wide belt. The Greek adjective that corresponds to *spissus* is παχύς. It is found in a comedy of Theopompos, cf. F 11 K.-A.: χλαῖναν <δέ> σοι || λαβὼν παχεῖαν ἐπιβαλὼ Λακωνικήν (I will take a thick Spartan cloak and dress you in it). This parallel is very interesting, because the geographical name *Laconicus* is used by Plautus for a pun later on.

### ***linteolam caesiciam* (230c)**

Now, Plautus moves from woollen *tunicae* and their make-up to a garment made of linen (*linteolum caesicium*). If my emendation is correct, he is speaking of a linen *tunica*

<sup>39</sup> Walde/Hofmann s.v. *rallum*; against LHS I 306.4 who—in contrast to the noun *rallum*—connect the word with *rarus*.

<sup>40</sup> Ussing: “contrarium huic videtur, quod sequitur, *spissa*”; Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.

<sup>41</sup> Similarly, Sebesta (1994) 66; GRD (2007) 176.

<sup>42</sup> Blümner I (1912) 159–160.

<sup>43</sup> Varro LL 5.112 giving a false etymology.

<sup>44</sup> See B 9 p. 395.

<sup>45</sup> Sen. de benef. 1.3.7: *inveniam alium poetam, apud quem praecingantur et spissis aut [aut om. M.] Phryxianis prodeant* [I will find another poet where they (sc. the Muses) wear a belt and appear in thick garments or garments made of Phryxian wool].

(*linleola*). In analogy to other diminutives like *tunicula* (χιτώνιον), the diminutive *linleola* could point to a short garment or even an undergarment.<sup>46</sup>

The adjective *\*caesicius* is attested only here. As regards its etymology, modern scholars associate the hapax in diverging ways: either with the colour term *caesius* (blue-grey)<sup>47</sup> or with the Greek adjective χαίποις (close woven);<sup>48</sup> Nonius connects it with verb *caedere* (to strike, beat).<sup>49</sup> Both modern attempts to explain the word are not satisfying. The etymological connection with the adjective *caesius* is not plausible and is also ruled out by the implicit order of the catalogue that seems to list different types of cloth first.<sup>50</sup> The connection with the word χαίποις is also not appropriate. The separation of the vertical threads (*stamen*) of the loom, which may have been brought about by the so-called χαῖρος,<sup>51</sup> is part of the basic arrangement of the loom. The adjective therefore cannot denote a special type of cloth. Nonius' guess about the etymology of *\*caesicius*, however, might well be correct. It is very likely derived from *caedere* or, to put it more precisely, from its passive perfect participle *caesus*.<sup>52</sup> There are numerous other Latin adjectives formed in this way, the suffix *-icius* transforming the participle into an adjective expressing a general quality.<sup>53</sup> The meaning of *caesicius* would thus be 'beaten.' We know from the fulling of linen sheets that the cloth was 'beaten,'<sup>54</sup> making the fabric soft using sticks.<sup>55</sup> Plautus' *linleolam caesiciam* therefore seems to refer to a high-quality short linen tunic.

### ***\*indusiatam, \*patagiata* (231a)**

Both words are attested outside the grammarians only once again and in variation. They form the basis of the *caupones* (merchants) *\*patagiarii* and the *\*indusiarii* paraded by Plautus in his funny catalogue of invented dress merchants in *Aulularia* (509), in which the catalogue of the *Epidicus* may have been used.<sup>56</sup> The meaning of both words was already uncertain in antiquity. The history of the glosses will be told in chapter D 3. We might be dealing with two real terms from the Greek-Latin fashion language,

<sup>46</sup> See, however, Wilson (1938) 154: "the *linleolum caesicium* ... was a small blue linen cloth, probably a kerchief for the head."

<sup>47</sup> Sebesta (1994) 66: "sky blue"; GRD (2007) 28: "a sky-blue colour."

<sup>48</sup> Georges s.v. *caesicius*; in the OLD s.v., the sense is left open.

<sup>49</sup> Nonius p. 866.31–32 L.: *caesicium linleolum dicitur purum et candidum, a caedendo, quod ita ad candorem perveniat* [*caesicium linleolum* is the name given to a pure and white garment, namely after beating, because this, as they say, results in a white colour].

<sup>50</sup> Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.

<sup>51</sup> For the different explanations of this difficult term, see Blümner (1912) I 145–146.

<sup>52</sup> Wheeler in Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.

<sup>53</sup> KS I 763; LHS I 301.

<sup>54</sup> Plin. NH 19.18: *textumque rursus tunditur clavis* [and the fabric is again beaten with 'nails'].

<sup>55</sup> Blümner I (1912) 196 refers to the *linleolum caesicium*.

<sup>56</sup> The connection of both catalogues has long been noticed, cf. Wagner (n. 24) 32; Fraenkel (n. 5) 137. Apart from this verse, there is another striking parallel, see p. 82 on *\*carinum*.

whose hybrid talk was imitated by Plautus in the comic adjective *\*impluviatus*. In both cases, the basis of the adjectives may have been, as scholars thought in antiquity, Greek nouns (*\*ἐνδύσιον*, *\*πατάγιον*) to which the Latin ending of PPP (-atus) was added, in the sense of ‘provided with.’ However, it is not possible to assign a definite meaning to the Latin loanwords. The Greek diminutives *\*ἐνδύσιον* and *\*πατάγιον* are not attested, and the normal forms *ἐνδυσις* and *πάταγος* do not allow a precise conclusion as to what their meaning in fashion language might have been. Plautus (or Roman fashion language) maybe distorted both Greek words beyond our ability to reconstruct them, and we might already be on the wrong track as to their derivation (see D 3). According to Festus (Verrius), the *\*patagium* was a decorative strip at the top of the *tunica*.<sup>57</sup> Yet it is uncertain whether this is genuine knowledge or only a guess of Verrius based on Plautus. It therefore seems best to leave the question as to the sense of the words open, not piling guesswork upon guesswork.

### ***\*caltulam aut crocotulam* (231b)**

Both terms refer to the colour of the *tunica*. The diminutive form *\*crocotula* occurs in Latin literature only here, in contrast to the normal form *crocota*. The Latin *\*crocotula* is the exact translation of the Greek *χροκωτίδιον*. The noun *crocota* (= *χροκωτός*) commonly denotes a red tunic.<sup>58</sup> In the Plautinian corpus, it is only found in the catalogue of merchants and in F 1 of the *Aulularia* (A 5). The *crocota* is not a genuine Roman garment, but a Greek item of dress we know mainly from Greek comedy.

Even though the second part of this expression refers to a real garment (albeit not a Roman one), the *\*caltula* turns out to be another non-garment invented for comic effect. Trying to explain it as a real dress term, modern scholarship gives various definitions.<sup>59</sup> According to Georges, it is a female dress of yellowish colour, according to OLD a short undergarment worn by women. However, one should be very sceptical as to the existence of this supposed article of clothing. Modern definitions go back to the dictionary of Nonius.<sup>60</sup> His remarks (s. v. *\*caltula*) will be the subjected to detailed

<sup>57</sup> Paulus/Festus p. 246.27–28 L.: *patagium est, quod ad summam tunicam adsui solet, quae et patagiata dicitur, et patagiarum qui eiusmodi faciunt* [The *patagium* is what is commonly sewn on the top of the kind of *tunica* that is also called *patagiata* (Epidic. 231), and *patagiarum* (Aul. 509) are those who do this].

<sup>58</sup> Cf. A 3 p. 58; A 10 pp. 205–206; B 1 p. 259; B 11 p. 417.

<sup>59</sup> Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506; Blümner I (1912) 258; Wilson (1938) 154; André (1949) 296; Potthoff (1992) 77–78; Sebesta (1994) 66; GRD (2007) 29; Olson (2002) 203; id. (2008) 52; R. B. Goldman, *Color-terms in Social and Cultural Context in Ancient Rome*, Piscataway, NJ 2013, 60.

<sup>60</sup> Nonius p. 880.24–37 L. (= Varro F 330 Salvatore = 46 Rip.): *caltulam et crocotulam, utrumque a generibus florum translatum, a calta et a croco. Vergilius in Bucolicis* (Ecl. 2.50): ... *Plautus in Epidico* (231): ... *Novius Paedio* (71) ... *Naevius Lycurgo* (43): ... *sed castulam* [!] *Varro de vita populi Romani lib. I palliolum breve voluit haberi. castula* [!] *est palliolum praecinctui, quo nuda infra papillas praecinguntur; quo mulieres nunc et eo magis utuntur, postquam subuculis desierunt* [*caltula* and *crocotula*, both words are derived from flowers, from the marigold (*calta*) and from the crocus. Virgil in the *Ecloges* ..., Plautus

scrutiny in chapter D 6.<sup>61</sup> The text of his entry suffers from several corruptions and is not a good starting point for a serious historical discussion. It is very likely that the hapax *\*caltula* was coined by Plautus himself to produce a pun. As to language and content, it fits rather well with the preceding *\*crocotula*. There is a nice alliteration and assonance between both words, and both names refer to flowers. However, the analogy between both diminutives is not exact. The word *crocotula* is a regular dress term, whereas the word *caltula* usually designates a flower<sup>62</sup> and is used metaphorically here. The dress term *caltula* is hence singular. There is no other garment called like a plant in Latin. All in all, the pun *crocotula* and *\*caltula* seems very similar to the pair *regilla* and *\*mendicula*. There, a deliberate etymological misunderstanding of an existing word (*regilla*) led to the comical coinage of an altogether new term. We may therefore assume a similar process of invention here. This means that the *\*caltula* should be banned to the world of comical fictions.

### ***supparum* aut *\*subnimium* (232)**

The following pun has not always been understood fully by scholars. In contrast to the previous pair, Plautus starts with a real garment, the *\*supparus*, which was perhaps a kind of long tunic (D 5). The following *sub-nimium* is not some sort of female underwear,<sup>63</sup> but altogether a non-word that is formed in funny contrast to the preceding *sub-parum*.<sup>64</sup> For his joke, Plautus makes use of the apparently fluent orthography of the word *supparus/subparus*, associating it in the accusative with *sub* (under) and *parum* (not enough). The opposite to *parum* (not enough) is *nimium* (too much), giving us *\*subnimium*. The ‘under-not-enough’ is followed by the ‘under-too-much.’ As in other puns, Plautus disregards the length of vowels. It does not bother him that *\*supparus* has the short vowel A (the accent therefore being on the first syllable) and that *parum* has a long A. Most famous is the pun *mala* (apples) (with a long vowel) and *mala* (evils) (with a short A). We may find a similar prosodic licence in the following *\*cumatile* aut *\*plumatile* (see below).

---

in the *Epidicus* ...; Novius in the *Paedium* ..., Naevius in the *Lycurgus* ... However, in the first book *On the Life of the Roman People*, Varro suggested identifying the *castula* [!] with a short little *pallium*. The *castula* [!] is a small *pallium* for wrapping which naked women wrap their nipples with. They use it even more nowadays that they have stopped using the undertunic (*subucula*).

<sup>61</sup> Cf. pp. 663–665.

<sup>62</sup> This is usually identified as the marigold (*Calendula officinalis*). The identification is based on Verg. Ecl. 2.50. It is not known that this flower was used as a textile dye in antiquity.

<sup>63</sup> Sebesta (1994) 66: “*subnimium* (slip?).”

<sup>64</sup> Fraenkel (n. 5) 135 n. 1; Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.; M. Fontaine, *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*, Oxford 2010, 46.

**\**basilicum* aut \**exoticum* (232b)**

The noun *vestimentum* (dress) is probably to be added to the following six adjectives in the neuter.<sup>65</sup> It is difficult to judge the extent to which the Greek loanwords *basilicum* (βασιλικόν, royal) und *exoticum* (ἐξωτικόν) reflect Roman fashion language. Both words are no new coinages and have a real touch. There are, however, no parallels in Greek or Latin in which they designate an item of clothing. If they denote real garments, we must think of Persian or Oriental fashions.

**\**cūmātilē* aut \**plūmātilē* (233a)**

Greek and Latin are mixed in these words. It is therefore difficult to determine the length of some vowels.<sup>66</sup> In case of the Greek loanword \**cūmātilis* (from χῦμα), the short vowel A is regular; in the case of \**plūmātilis*, if it is to be connected with Latin *plūmāre* and *plūmārius* (brocaded), the short A is a prosodic licence. Plautus would thus have either manipulated an existing word or—given that \**plumatilis* only occurs here—formed it as he liked, to establish a prosodic analogy to \**cumatilis*. Because of these difficulties, Stowasser (1884) proposed deriving \**plūmatilis* (with a short Y) from the Greek word πλύμα (rinsing water), thus establishing an antithesis between garments in the colour of seawater and in the colour of rinsing water.<sup>67</sup> The solution is good as regards the vowel A, but it creates more problems than it solves. One would prefer a long vowel U in *plūmatile* in analogy to *cūmatile* to strengthen the word play. As to content, the etymology is wholly implausible. What is the colour of rinsing water? Moreover, punning with two Greek terms fits better into Greek comedy than into Roman comedy. Thus, it is better to accept the metric licence in a hapax and instead connect it with the Latin word *plumare* (see below).

The meaning of the term \**cumatilis* is difficult to define, although its etymological derivation (see above) is clear. Besides Plautus, it seems to be attested once more in a Togata of Titinius called *Setina* (F 7 R.<sup>2</sup>) adduced by Nonius under the corresponding lemma. The quotation has made its way into modern Latin dictionaries s. v. *cumatilis*. However, the transmitted text points to another direction:

Nonius p. 879.10–15 L.

*cumatilis: aut marinus aut caeruleus, a graeco tractum, quasi fluctuum similis; fluctus enim graece κύματα dicuntur. Titinius Setina (F 7): quem colos cumatius (LA<sup>A</sup>BA: cumatilis C<sup>A</sup>) deceat? Plautus in Epidico (233): cumatile aut plumatile.*

*cumatilis:* either ‘belonging to the sea’ or ‘green-blue,’ from the Greek, as it were similar to waves. For the waves are called κύματα in Greek. Titinius in his *Setina* (F 7) ... Plautus in *Epidicus* (233) ...

<sup>65</sup> Wilson (1938) 154.

<sup>66</sup> Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.

<sup>67</sup> J. M. Stowasser, *Satura*, WS 6 (1884), 213–214.



Nearly all manuscripts of Titinius' *Setina* offer the form \**cumatius*, only two codices give \**cumatilis*. Editors put \**cumatilis* into the text, wishing to harmonize the quotation with the lemma. However, Nonius often adduces texts containing forms that are not equal to that of the lemma, but only similar. So, one should avoid correcting seemingly mistaken quotations after the wording of the lemma, keeping instead to the better manuscript tradition.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, there are some other reasons that the form \**cumatius* is correct in Titinius. It is not only the *lectio difficilior*, but also close to the regular Greek form \**κυμάτιος* that we find in some composite adjectives (see below). On the other hand, \**cumatilis* with the Latin ending (-*ilis*) looks very much like a Plautine coinage. It therefore seems better to keep \**cumatius* in Titinius, isolating \**cumatilis* as a funny Plautine hapax.

But what does \**cumatilis* mean? Dictionaries usually propose that it signifies the colour of the sea.<sup>69</sup> However, in this case one would rather expect a more specific word—like, for example, *thalassicus*, derived from θάλασσα (sea)<sup>70</sup>—because κύμα can be used for the water of rivers as well.<sup>71</sup> If we look at \**cumatilis* without being prejudiced by Nonius' explanation, it should denote a shape—a wave or moving water surface—as do its Greek near relatives περικυμάτιος and παρακυμάτιος. Both adjectives are used once, each in connection with garments. In the catalogue of the temple treasures of Artemis of Brauron,<sup>72</sup> a ἱμάτιον περικυμάτιον and a χιτωνίσκος παρακυμάτιος are listed among the gifts. Both words refer to the border of the garment that is decorated with a wave pattern (κύμα). Such a border is known to us also from illustrations. The different prefixes περι- (around) and παρα- (along) can be easily explained if we keep in mind the different appearance of the respective vestments.<sup>73</sup> The himation (= *pallium*) is a square piece of cloth. It is then decorated with a border all around. In the case of the closed chiton (*tunica*), the border is located at the lower end of the garment. The Greek simplex \*κυμάτιος is not attested, but must have the meaning 'provided with a wave-ornament.' Perhaps Plautus found this or a similar word in his Greek source and translated it into \**cumatile* ad hoc. The Latin equivalent of the Greek adjective is *undulatus* (*unda* = wave).<sup>74</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Cf. also A 3 p. 57; D 6 p. 664.

<sup>69</sup> Georges, OLD, ThLL IV s.v. col. 1378.37–41; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506; Blümner I (1912) 258: "die wellenfarbigen Stoffe"; Walde/Hofmann s.v.; Wilson (1938) 154: "sea blue"; André (1949) 193–194; Sebesta (1994) 66; GRD (2007) 45.

<sup>70</sup> The term *thalassicus* is in fact used twice by Plautus (Mil. 1179, 1282) in connection with a garment. The adjective *thalassinus* in Lucretius 4.1127 is to be explained differently. It means purple (A 11 p. 212). On the colour aquamarine, cf. B 11 p. 416

<sup>71</sup> LSJ s.v. κύμα.

<sup>72</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1514.17 and 46.

<sup>73</sup> LSJ s.v. παρακυμάτιος: "with a wavy border" (better: with a border ornamented with wave pattern); Cleland (2005) 122.

<sup>74</sup> We find this in Latin texts referring to the border of the *toga praetexta*, cf. Varro De vita populi Romani F 291 Salvatore (= 17 Rip.); Plin. NH 8.195.

We can now turn to *\*plumatilis*, which is likely to be derived from *pluma* or *plumare* (see above). Although it remains a hapax, the semantic group it belongs to has something to do with dress. The adjective *plumarius*, for example, refers to a sort of brocade fabric with some pattern produced by interweaving coloured or golden threads or to a maker of such garments.<sup>75</sup> The form *plumatilis* may have been coined by Plautus after it and may thus be similar in meaning. If this hypothesis is correct, both *\*cumatile* and *\*plumatile* are based on existing dress terms used for specifically ornamented garments. This meaning is highly appropriate to a list of expensive and confusingly named women's clothing

### ***carinum aut cerinum***

The list ends with a pair of colour terms, which are clearly chosen for the concluding punch: *gerrae* (nonsense)! The final *cerinum* phonetically prepares the following expression *gerrae maxumae*. The similarity of the words has led to errors in the textual transmission. In the manuscripts of Plautus, we read *carinum* (A: *garinum* P) et *gerrinum* (AP); Nonius, who quotes the half verse (p. 880.1 L.), has *cerinum aut gelinum*. The adjective *\*carinum* perhaps had already disappeared in his text of Plautus. Otherwise, it would certainly have made a fine lemma in Nonius' book on the colours of robes. Editors usually use the gloss to restore the version *carinum aut cerinum*, a version that is convincing as to paleography and content (see below).<sup>76</sup>

The adjective *\*carinus* is attested in this form in Latin only here, but *\*cariarii* or rather *cari<n>arii*, fictive dealers of the *\*carinum*, are mentioned in the catalogue of merchants in the *Aulularia* (A 5) that could be partly based on the catalogue of the *Epidicus*. The gloss *\*carinus* is nothing more than the slightly deformed version of the existing Greek loanword *caryinus* (καρύϊνος)<sup>77</sup> that denotes the colour of the κάρυον.<sup>78</sup> The general term κάρυον denotes all kinds of nuts up to the chestnut. So what kind of nut is meant here? Many scholars think of the walnut because it provides a colouring agent.<sup>79</sup> However, colour terms usually refer to the thing in nature that has the specific colour (B 11). In addition, the walnut is qualified in both Greek and Latin by the addition

<sup>75</sup> Marquardt/Mau (1886) 539; Blümner I (1912) 219. The etymological nonsense of Nonius p. 867.21 L.: *aut clavatum aut ex plumis factum* [striped or made out of plumes] has left its traces in modern scholarship, cf. Wilson (1938) 154: "downy or decorated with feathers"; Sebesta (1994) 67: "The *plumatilis* tunic may have had a soft pilelike down (*plumeus*), created by teasing the woolen fibers, or it may have been a forerunner of the tapestry cloth called *plumata* of late antiquity"; GRD (2007) 149: "downy or even made of feathers." See also OLD s.v. *plumatilis*: "feathery appearance, feathered."

<sup>76</sup> See, however, Wilson (1938) 154.

<sup>77</sup> Wilamowitz (in the apparatus of Leo's edition). The correct form *caryinus* is found in Pliny, see OLD s.v.

<sup>78</sup> Theophrast. de sensu 78: τὸ δὲ καρύϊνον (sc. χρώμα) ἐκ χλωροῦ καὶ κυανοειδοῦς [the colour of the nut is a mixture of green and black].

<sup>79</sup> Sebesta (1994) 67.

of an adjective: βασιλικός or *iuglans*. Looking for a parallel, Ovid comes to mind, who talks about clothes in the colour of the chestnut in the *Ars amatoria*.<sup>80</sup> This suggests that we should think of the same colour here.

The adjective *cerinus* also has some difficulties. According to Nonius, it is derived from the noun *cera* (wax). In fact, *cērinus* (κήρινος) and *cēreus* are used in Latin and Greek as colour terms, denoting a pale yellow (B 11).<sup>81</sup> However, the vowel E in *cēra* is long, whereas that in Plautus' *cērinum* must be short. Regarding the playfulness with which language is used elsewhere in the catalogue, the change of length nevertheless seems to be acceptable.<sup>82</sup> A similar prosodic licence can be found in the pun *\*cumatile* aut *\*plumatile* (see above). Between *gerrae* and *\*carinum*, which is also slightly modified in form, the unusual prosody of *\*cerinum* should cause no offence.

### **Laconicum (234)**

In v. 234, the episode concludes as it had begun: with a pun.<sup>83</sup> It is completely absurd to connect the dress term *Laconicum* with the name of the dog breed.<sup>84</sup> Both obviously derive from Greek Λάκων (Lacedaemonian, Spartan) referring to Sparta. The pun thus has a Greek basis.<sup>85</sup> Garments are often named after a place.<sup>86</sup> In the *Lysistrata*, for example, Aristophanes talks of Κιμμερικὰ ὀρθοστάδια (a Cimmerian chiton) that can be called in abbreviation Κιμμερικόν (a Cimmerian).<sup>87</sup> As the term *Laconicum* serves to characterize the garment, it is difficult to describe its exact outer appearance. Different clothes labelled as 'Spartan' are frequently mentioned in literature. In Aristophanes, there are several mentions of shoes (Λακωνικαὶ ἔμβαδες); the comic playwright Theopompos once talks about a 'Laconian' coat (χλαῖνα);<sup>88</sup> Plutarch refers to a 'Spartan Peplos' that seems to be a light female garment;<sup>89</sup> and finally, the Septuagint translation of Isa-

<sup>80</sup> Ovid ars. 3.183; cf. B 11 p. 419.

<sup>81</sup> Besides the dictionaries, cf. Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506; Duckworth (n. 3) ad loc.; Wilson (1938) 154: "wax color, or a shade of yellow"; André (1949) 157–158; Sebesta (1994) 67: "brownish-yellow"; s. also B 11 p. 420.

<sup>82</sup> Alternatively, one could think of a syncopated *cerasinus* (κεράσινος), in analogy to *imus/infimus*, *ditiae/divitiae* and *matus/madidus* (Petron. 41.12). The colour term is attested both in Greek, cf. LSJ s.v. κεράσινον: "cherry coloured dye," and in Latin in connection with of garments (Petron. 26.8: *cingulum*; 67.4: *tunica*). The dark red colour, cf. B 11 p. 439, forms an excellent pair with the preceding brown. A similar shade is also found in the catalogue of the *Aulularia* (510). There we hear of *\*violarii*.

<sup>83</sup> Ussing ad loc. "*ademptum: lepide, quasi vestimenti nomen, quod est Laconicum, non traductum solum a canibus sit, sed etiam eis ereptum.*"

<sup>84</sup> On the type of dog, cf. RE 8.2 (1913) s.v. Hund, col. 2550–2551 (F. Orth); DNP 5 (1998) s.v. Hund, 756.

<sup>85</sup> Arnott (n. 17) 81 against Fraenkel (n. 5) 136.

<sup>86</sup> On *Sicyonia*, cf. B 30 pp. 551–552; on *Gallicae*, cf. B 30 pp. 554–555; on *Coae vestes*, cf. B 9 pp. 386–391; on *Maltesia*, cf. B 9 pp. 384–385.

<sup>87</sup> Aristoph. Lys. 45, 52.

<sup>88</sup> Theopomp. F 11 K.-A.

<sup>89</sup> Plutarch. Lyc. 25.3 with RE 3.2 (1899) s.v. χιτών, col. 2314 (W. Amelung).

iah mentions a transparent female Spartan dress (διαφανῆ Λακωνικόν).<sup>90</sup> Something like this could be well hidden behind the *Laconicum* of Plautus, since it is all about luxurious female clothes.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

Finding out the meaning of the different dress terms in Plautus' *Epidicus* has turned out to be a quite lengthy and difficult affair. The general lesson to be taken from it is that genre and authorial style need to be carefully considered in the treatment of dress terms. Plautus, writing comedy, clearly played with language for comic effect. The word plays might not seem very sophisticated, but 'high art' was never the intent. The audience was supposed to recognize the absurdity of the terms. The mess of etymologies, translations, and prosody seen in this chapter also indicate that Plautus did not care much for the source of the pun. The point was to make funny names that sounded like they could be some term only women would know, since no serious Roman man could be asked to keep up with the world of fashion. Ultimately, just because a gloss most likely refers to the realm of clothing in the widest sense does not mean that it represents anything beyond the possibility for a laugh. It seems that Plautus has one more joke for us, placing us in the position of the confused *senex*.

---

<sup>90</sup> Is. 3.23.