

5 Plautus – the catalogue of the dress dealers in the *Aulularia*

1. Introduction
2. The catalogue of the dress dealers (505–535)
 - 2.1 Textual difficulties
 - 2.2 The text
3. Version A: the short catalogue (508)
4. Version B: the long catalogue (515, 509–521)
 - 4.1 The first group (515/509/512a)
 - 4.2 The second group (512b–514a)
 - 4.3 The third group (514b–519a)
 - 4.4 The fourth group (521/510)
 - 4.5 The fifth group (511/521)
5. Conclusion

Although focusing again on comedy, the following chapter is mainly about ‘defictionalizing’ scholars’ accounts of Roman professional culture. It concerns the catalogue of dress dealers in Plautus’ *Aulularia*. As regards Plautus, most important is again the question that has vexed scholars also in case of the dress catalogue of the *Epidicus* (B 4): Was the entire text written by Plautus himself? Or does it contain verses added as a part of a so-called actor’s interpolation? This might have been done by some later author when the play was brought to stage anew about fifty years after Plautus’ death. This time my answer is another than in the case of the *Epidicus*. It has been argued by me elsewhere that our text combines two variants: a short catalogue (A) and a long one (B). The B-version creates a fine solo for an actor to show off his skill, and it is probably the work of an ‘interpolator’ if we do not want to attribute the striking incongruities to Plautus himself. This would suppose that he rather clumsily fused different Greek models (*contaminatio*). However, it would leave us with the fact that the manuscript created by Plautus for the first production already contained surprising ‘doublets.’ Since we know of actor’s interpolations in Plautus’ oeuvre and in other plays (for example of Euripides), the hypothesis that the B-version is a later addition is preferable. That the B-version was not written by Plautus does not imply that it is bad poetry. In fact, we will see that the unknown author was a poet in his own right.

However, this chapter does not focus on these great textual problems, but rather on the structure of the catalogue in general and on the various terms of professions we find in it. It is mainly about the single words that designate or purport to designate professions. The question that must always be kept in mind is this: How did the author want his audience to understand these words, many of which are *hapax legomena*? Do they designate real professions, or are they comical coinages instead? And what was the author’s purpose for using them? Did he use them to describe an existing reality,

or did he rather want to ‘enhance’ reality for the sake of comic effect, even risking or rather wishing that some words were misunderstood or recognized as comic inventions by his audience? Careful analysis will show that the second solution is right. At least in the B-version, many terms of professions, if not all of them, are ad-hoc-creations and comic inventions, thought up on the basis of a Greek model. We find a comic, not a naturalistic approach to reality, both distorting words and things.

In terms of cultural history, a clear answer to this question is even more needed in the case of the *Aulularia* than in the case of the *Epidicus*. Again, the discussion of the words is very important because it is not only their meaning that is at stake but how we perceive Roman historical reality. The catalogue of the *Aulularia* has left fewer traces in Antiquity than that of the *Epidicus*. However, dictionaries list many of its words as if they designated real professions, without even giving a hint that many of them are comic word formations. Many scholars use the catalogue to develop a large panorama of dealers and manufacturers populating the streets and markets of Rome. Starting with Marquardt/Mau (1886),¹ there is—despite some cautionary voices²—a long tradition of scholarly fantasy nourished by the passage in question.³ Fictitious designations are often mixed up indiscriminately with those clearly known to be everyday terms. The picture of the ancient world resulting from this ‘method’ is colourful, if at times a bit bizarre. However, it frankly lacks any firm basis in reality. It is pure fantasy based on a comedic device. In contrast, the principles we find to be guiding word formation

¹ Marquardt/Mau (1886) 584–585 (comic inventions are marked by bold print): “2. Die Händler mit Rohstoffen und die Importeure fremder Waren; die Wollhändler, *negotiatores lanarii*, die Haartuchhändler, *cilicarii*, die Leinenhändler, *lintearii*, die Malvenstoffhändler, ***molochinarii***, die Seidenhändler, *sericarii*, *holosericii*. 3. Die Fabrikanten, nämlich: a) die Filzmacher, *coacitiliarii*; b. die Wollkrempler, *carminatores*, *pectinarii*; c. die Färber, *infectores*, *offectores* und zwar: Blaufärber, ***violarii***, Wachsfärber, ***cerinarii***, Saffranfärber, ***crocotarii***, Braunfärber, *spadicarii*, Purpurfärber, *purpurarii*; d. die Weber, *textores*, und zwar die Wollweber, *lanarii*, Leineweber, *linteones* oder *linarii*, Weber gemusterter Zeuge, *polymitarii*; e. die Walker, *fullones*, *lavatores*, *lotores*; f. die Sticker, *phyriones*, *plumarii*, *segmentarii*, *barbaricarii*; die Goldschläger, *bractearii*; h. die Borten- und Besatzmacher, ***limbolarii***; i. die Brustbindenmacher, ***stropharii***; die Hemdenmacher, ***indusarii***; die Schneider, *sartores*, *sarcinatores* und Scheiderinnen, *sartrices*, *sarcinatrices*; m. die *centonarii*, d. h. Verfertiger von Kleidern aus alten Flickern (*centones*)”; p. 506: “Rotfärber (***flammarii***)”; André (194) 115, 154; Sebesta (1994) 67: “Nor does *Epidicus*’ list exhaust the possible colors and styles. Elsewhere Plautus mentions the *flammarii* and the *molocinarii*, dyers of reddish orange and mauve, respectively. The *violarii*, also mentioned by Plautus, were dyers of a violet hue of purple.”

² Blümner I (1912) 208: “unter den in der plautinischen *Aulularia* genannten Garderobe- und Luxushändlern aller Art finden wir *patagiarii*, *indusarii*, *manulearii*, *limbolarii* und viel andere derartige Detailverkäufer, doch ist wohl eine solche ins kleinste gehende Arbeits- und Geschäftsteilung nicht der Wirklichkeit entnommen, sondern komische Übertreibung des Plautus.”

³ Cf. most recently R. B. Goldman, *Color-terms in Social and Cultural Context in Ancient Rome*, Piscataway, NJ 2013, 26–27: “Megadorus in *Aulularia* (Pot of Gold) gives a vivid picture of the crowd of dyers who swarm in front of a wealthy Roman’s villa, along with cloth fullers, goldsmiths, woolworkers, weavers, dealers in lingerie and balsam scented footgear, calcei makers, squatting cobblers, sandal merchants, beltmakers, girdle makers, lacemen, and cabinetmakers.”

in the catalogue show that the various terms (and professions) are very likely comic inventions, something the ancient audience would have immediately known. This chapter thus aims to separate the wheat from the chaff, drawing a clear line between ‘reality’ and ‘literary fiction.’

5.1 Introduction

The *Aulularia* (Comedy of the Little Pot) is named after a pot (*aula*) filled with gold which causes the protagonist, Euclio, to have sleepless nights.⁴ As usual, Plautus used a Greek comedy as a model. Despite agreement on this, scholars have not reached unanimity on what particular play it was or who wrote it (Menander?).⁵ There is also still discussion about what the plot of this Greek model looked like in relation to the *Aulularia*.⁶ Plautus’ play was perhaps first brought to stage in the time between the abolition of the *lex Oppia* (194 BCE) and the prohibition of the *Bacchanalia*, a festival for the god Bacchus/Dionysus, in the year 184 BCE.⁷ A rerun of the play may have taken place about fifty years later, in the second half of the second century BCE, when Terentius, the last champion of the *Palliata*, had died and there was high demand for new plays.⁸ On the occasion of the re-enactment, the *Aulularia* may have been revised. At least some passages, especially solo scenes (like the catalogue of dress dealers), suggest that a revision did take place, variants being incorporated into Plautus’ original text.⁹

Now to the play itself: At its centre is the miser Euclio, a *senex*, whose daughter both a young man (*adulescens*) and his uncle Megadorus, a rich but much older bachelor, intend to marry. Megadorus explains to his sister how he came upon this thought (120–176). He thinks that a young woman from modest circumstances (*pauper*) without dowry is less demanding than a spoiled wife (*uxor dotata*) coming from a wealthy

4 Commentaries: Wagner (1866); Ussing (1875), Nicastrì (1970); Stockert (1983); recent surveys on research: E. Lefèvre, *Plautus’ Aulularia*, 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, 191–192.

5 R. Hunter, The “*Aulularia*” of Plautus and its Greek Original, *PCPhS* 207 (1981) 37–45; Stockert (1983) 13–16; W. G. Arnott, The Greek Original of Plautus’ *Aulularia*, *WS* 101 (1988), 181–191.

6 Stockert (1983) 8–18; A. Primmer, Der ‘Geizige’ bei Menander und Plautus, *WS* 105 (1992), 69–127; Lefèvre (n. 4) 130–135; A. Primmer, Review Lefèvre, *Gnomon* 76 (2004), 27–34; L. Braun, Zu einer neuen Rekonstruktion des *Aulularia*-Originals, *Hermes* 135 (2007), 107–108.

7 Stockert (1983) 27–29; Lefèvre (n. 4) 154–156.

8 M. Deufert, *Textgeschichte und Rezeption der plautinischen Komödien im Altertum*, Berlin 2002, 29–35.

9 Cf. vv. 460–474 and 587–607. The double verses are deleted by Leo in his edition. Lindsay does not comment on them at all.

family.¹⁰ Such a *uxor dotata* would bring great influence (*magnae factiones*) and a rich dowry (*dos dapsilis*) into the marriage. Her financial demands, however, originating from her social position, would finally lead to her husband's bankruptcy.¹¹ Megadorus specifies these wishes as luxurious carts (*eburata vehicula*), precious (*pallae*), and purple tunics (*purpura*):¹²

Aul. 167–169

*istas magnas factiones, animos, dotes dapsiles,
clamores, imperia, eburata vehicla, pallas, purpuram,
nil moror, quae in servitutem sumptibus redigunt viros.*

I do not care about these great social connections, this arrogance, these rich dowries, the shouting, the commanding, the carts adorned with ivory, *pallae*, purple tunics. By their costs, these things reduce husbands to slaves.

The passage has a Roman tinge and could refer to the political discussion about the *lex Oppia*, a law that in particular regulated the possession of gold jewellery, the wearing of purple robes, and the driving in carts.¹³ Later in the play, Megadorus returns to the subject and speaks more profusely than before. In a soliloquy (475–536), overheard by the miser Euclio with great pleasure, Megadorus talks about the *uxor dotata* and her exaggerated wishes, working himself up into a real rage. His tirade picks up on his first speech, putting the very claims he himself had already formulated previously into the mouth of a fictitious rich wife:¹⁴

Aul. 498–502

*nulla igitur dicat "equidem dotem ad te adtuli
maiores multo quam tibi erat pecunia;
enim mihi quidem aequomst **purpuram** atque **aurum** dari,*

¹⁰ On the *uxor dotata*, cf. E. Schuhmann, *Der Typ der uxor dotata in den Komödien des Plautus*, *Philologus* 121 (1977), 45–65.

¹¹ On the thought that the financial demands of women make the husband poor, cf. Plaut. *Epid.* 235: *haec vocabula auctiones subigunt ut faciant viros* [These are the words that force men to sell their homes!], cf. A 4 p. 71; Plaut. *Astraba* F 2.

¹² On the scene in general, cf. Lefèvre (n. 4) 56–61.

¹³ Cf. Liv. 34.1–8; on the law, albeit in Livy's version, see especially 34.1.3: *ne qua mulier plus semunciam auri haberet neu vestimento versicolori* [i.e. *purpureo*] *uteretur neu iuncto vehiculo in urbe oppidove ... veheretur* [that a woman should possess no more than half an ounce of gold, nor wear a purple robe, nor travel in a carriage in the city of Rome or a small town]. Lefèvre (n. 4) 155–156 wants to see an allusion to Cato the Elder in the figure of Megadorus. This assumption is unlikely for literary and historical reasons, cf. B 2 p. 53 on the *lex Oppia* and Cato.

¹⁴ On the entire scene, cf. the commentaries and G. A. B. Wolff, *De Plauti Aulular. act. III, scen. V*, *Programm Schulpforta* 1843, 1–8; W. Wagner, *De Plauti Aulularia*, Bonn 1864, 15–23; A. Krieger, *De Aululariae Plautinae exemplari Graeco*, Diss. Gießen 1914, 48–49; E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin 1922, 137–140; Lefèvre (n. 4) 76–79, 101–103.

*ancillas, mulos, muliones, pedisequos,
salutigerulos pueros, vehicla qui vehar.”*

No woman shall then say to me: “I brought a dowry to you that was much greater than the fortune you had. Therefore, I have to receive purple and gold, maidservants, mules, muleteers, manservants, messengers, carts I may ride on.”

5.2 The catalogue of the dealers (505–535)

After a short remark, spoken as an aside by the hidden Euclio (503–504),¹⁵ Megadorus continues. It follows the catalogue of the dress dealers, whose services the *uxor dotata* has used and who are now besieging the troubled husband to get their payment. Within the *Aulularia*, the catalogue is unique in length and form. It is a virtuoso piece for the actor playing the character of Megadorus. Other lists in the *Aulularia* are usually no more than two verses long. In terms of content, the catalogue (at least its B-version) stands out from the rest of the play, in which there are no additional detailed descriptions.

A Greek literary model has not been preserved. The content and form of the catalogue, however, indicate that whoever wrote it was already inspired by some existing but now unknown model. This was a Greek comedy, because the Latin is strongly based on Greek and bears all signs of being a translation. On the other hand, the catalogue shows astonishing similarities with the dress catalogue in the *Epidicus*, in terms of language and content. Three parallels in particular are very remarkable: In v. 509, we hear of both *caupones* **patagiarii* and **indusiarii*, merchants that deal with exactly the obscure (*vestis*) **indusiata* and **patagiata*. These are two garments which we otherwise only know from the list in the *Epidicus* (231). In v. 510, we find dubious **carinarii*, dealers who purportedly sell clothes in the colour *carinus*, a colour that in Latin is also only attested in the dress catalogue of the *Epidicus* (233). This parallel is especially striking, since the word **carinarii* shows exactly the same orthographical peculiarity that we find also in the *Epidicus* (the correct form being *caryinus* with a Y).

5.2.1 Textual difficulties

The dealer catalogue contains numerous textual problems. Various verses have been transposed or discarded by editors without finding a convincing solution. Readers are referred to the Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft (GFA) (2022) for a detailed discussion of all problems and a new hypothesis. Here it may suffice to roughly outline

¹⁵ Plaut. Aul. 503–504: *ut matronarum hic facta pernovit probe! || moribus praefectum mulierum hunc factum velim* [How well he understands the doings of the matrons. I wish he would be made the guardian of women's morals]. O. Zwierlein, *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus IV. Bacchides*, Stuttgart 1992, 225 n. 508 argues that these verses were also not written by Plautus.

my method and its results. As to method, textual criticism has to proceed in two steps, as in case of the Twelve Table Law (A 1) and Cato (A 2): First, we must reconstruct the text of the archetype of our manuscripts—dating to Late Antiquity—and correct its mistakes. There is strong reason to believe that vv. 510–511 have been misplaced in our manuscripts, their right place being between vv. 521 and 522. A smooth progress of thought is produced if we put vv. 510–511 in there. Some textual problems connected with their dislocation can then also be solved. The meaningless *murodiabatharii*, for example, is to be emended to **murotheciarii* (see below).

Second, we have to consider this text with respect to the question outlined above, namely whether there are signs of a later (actor's) interpolation. In contrast to the garment catalogue in the *Epidicus*, two versions of different length (A and B) have been merged in the catalogue in the *Aulularia*. The opening and closing sections of the entire passage contain some inconsistencies and 'doublets.' For example, v. 508 is partly equal to v. 515 in content; v. 527 is similar to v. 528. Instead of deleting the superfluous verses, all difficulties can be solved if we assume that a longer B-version has been fused with a shorter A-version. Both versions show significant differences as to style and content. In version A, the situation is still quite realistic, there being only a few dealers (in singular) with real professions in front of the hapless husband's door. In version B, in contrast, the scenario is completely unreal, showing us myriads of fantastical merchants (all in plural). The poetical differences strongly support the view that versions were written by different authors. The short A-version of course belongs to Plautus himself, and the long B-version would therefore be an actor's interpolation created on occasion of the second performance. This differentiation between the sources assumes that we do not want to impute the incongruities to Plautus' fusing of different Greek sources (see above).

5.2.2 The text

The form of the text on which the following explanations are based is a combination of both the A- and B-versions. The preceding letters A or B denote from which version a given line comes. The letters A/B taken together denote that the line is the same in both versions. The following translation does not gloss over the incongruities that arise through the fusion of the two versions. The English translation of the A-version is marked by bold print. The hybrid text is as follows:

Aul. 505–531¹⁶

A/B	MEG. <i>nunc quoquo venias plus plaustorum in aedibus</i>	505
A/B	<i>videas quam ruri, quando ad villam veneris.</i>	506
B	<i>sed hoc etiam pulchrum est praequam ubi sumptus <u>petunt</u>.</i>	507
A	<i>stat fullo, phrygio, aurifex, lanarius;</i>	508
B	<i><u>petunt</u> fullones, sarcinatores <u>petunt</u>;</i>	515

B	<i>caupones patagiarii, indusiarii,</i>	509
B	<i>propolae linteones, calceolari;</i>	512
B	<i>sedentarii sutores, diabath< r>arii,</i>	513
B	<i>solearii astant, astant molocinarii;</i>	514
B	<i>strophiarii astant, astant simul zonarii.</i>	516
B	<i>iam hosce absolutos censeas: cedunt, petunt</i>	517
B	<i>treceni, cum stant thylacistae in atriis</i>	518
B	<i>textores limbularii, arcularii.</i>	519
B	<i>ducuntur, datur aes. iam absolutos censeas,</i>	520
B	<i>cum incedunt infectores corcotarii,</i>	521
B	<i>flamm< e>arii, violarii, carinarii,</i>	510
B	<i>aut manulearii aut myrotheciarii</i>	511
B	<i>aut aliqua mala crux semper est, quae aliquid <u>petat</u>.</i>	522
...		
B	<i>ubi nugivendis res soluta est omnibus,</i>	525
B	<i>ibi ad postremum cedit miles, aes <u>petit</u>.</i>	526
B	<i>itur, putatur ratio cum argentario;</i>	527
A/B	<i>miles inpransus astat, aes censet dari.</i>	528
A/B	<i>ubi disputata est ratio cum argentario,</i>	529
A/B	<i>etiam ipsus ultro debet argentario:</i>	530
A/B	<i>spes prorogatur militi in alium diem.</i>	531

Megadorus (A/B): **Now, wherever you go, you can see more carts in front of a townhouse than in the country when you have come to a country estate.** (B) But that is still fine if you compare it to the situation when they want their money. (A) **There stands the fuller, the tailor, the jeweller, the wool merchant.** (B) Fullers want their money, tailors, producers of *vestes patagiatae*, producers of *vestes indusiatae*, dealers in linen clothing; dealers in ladies' shoes, sitting shoemakers, producers of *diabathra*. There stand producers of sandals; there stand producers of cotton clothes; there stand producers of cords; at the same time there stand producers of belts. You think they are paid, then three hundred others (sc. dealers) come and want their money, standing like doorkeepers in the *atria*: weavers of borders, producers of boxes. You admit them, you give them money. You think they are paid now, then come dyers of *vestes crocotae*, dyers of red shawls, dyers of purple clothes, dyers of brown clothes, or producers of tunics with sleeves or producers of boxes for unguents or there is always some pain in the neck that demands some money of you ... At last, when all the merchants of useless stuff are paid, a soldier comes and wants his money. You go and make the bill with the bank. (A) **There stands a soldier not having had his morning meal and demands his pay.** (A/B) **When the master of the house has made the bill with the bank, he also owes the bank money. The soldier is put off to the next day.**

The two versions of the catalogue will be discussed separately in the following sections because they differ in content and emphasis. As noted above, version A is characterized by realism, listing real professions in sensible numbers (one person for each). Version

B relies on comical exaggeration and lists mainly fictitious or overly specialized professions (represented by multiple people). Version A shows us a Roman world (with a townhouse and a *villa*); version B mirrors the dress world of a Greek comedy. The question that must always be kept in mind in both catalogues is this: What did the audience understand the word to mean?

5.3 Version A: the short catalogue (508)

The four professions mentioned in the short catalogue are all real professions: *fullo*, *phrygio*, *aurifex*, *lanarius*. They are also designated with Latin terms taken from everyday language. Except the *phrygio*, all are recorded in inscriptions. The word *phrygio* is only found in literature, but it is not a hapax and is also a genuine term for a historical profession.

fullo (508a)

The *fullo* (fuller) produces cloth and complete garments (made of wool) and provides laundry services.¹⁷ In contrast to modern times, where the tailor is the most relevant profession as concerns the garments, the *fullo* was the most important in Antiquity—the cut of the garments (as for example the *pallium*) often being quite simple. He was also responsible for the trade and distribution of the garments. The profession is well recorded by numerous documents from the Roman world. Inscriptions show us that *fullo* was the term used for this profession in Roman everyday language. In Greek, there is the word *κναφεύς* (also meaning fuller), which is also mentioned by Aristophanes.¹⁸ We also find the noun *πλύντης/πλύντρια* (cloth-cleaner/washerwoman from *πλύνω* = to clean, wash), which could indicate that production and cleaning were more rigidly separated in Greece. The noun *fullo* in Plautus is found only here and in v. 515. In his *Asinaria* (907), there is talk of *fullonia* (fuller's trade) in an obscene sense; in his *Pseudolus* (782), the adjective *fullonius* is used similarly. In Roman comedies (i.e. the *Togata*, the *Atellan farce*, and the *Mime*), the fuller must have been a popular character. Titinius wrote a *Fullonia*,¹⁹ Pomponius an *Atellan farce* called *Decuma fullonis*. Novius also wrote several *Atellan farces* entitled *Fullones* (fullers), *Fullones feriati* (fullers on holiday), and *Fullonicum* (fuller's shop). Laberius called one of his mimes *Fullo*. The

¹⁷ Blümner I (1912) 170–190 (on the terminology and the kind of work done by a *fullo*); L. Schumacher, *Sklaverei in der Antike. Alltag und Schicksal der Unfreien*, Munich 2001, 144–147 (on the social role). On the economic function, see comprehensively, M. Flohr, *The World of the Fullo. Work, Economy and Society in Roman Italy* (Oxford Studies on the Roman Economy), Oxford 2013.

¹⁸ Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1128, *Eccl.* 415, *Plut.* 166 (together with the *χρυσόχοος* = *aurifex*).

¹⁹ On the play, cf. A 7 p. 148.

fact that the profession is so rarely mentioned in the Greek inspired Palliata perhaps reflects a difference in attitude towards this profession in Greece as opposed to Rome.

***phrygio* (508b)**

The word *phrygio* (tailor) is less well attested than the other terms found in v. 508.²⁰ It occurs only in early Latin literature. Its meaning is not as clear cut as modern dictionaries want readers to believe (on my translation, see below). Apart from our passage, it is only attested in Plautus' *Menaechmi*, where a *meretrix* is speaking to her lover:

Plaut. Men. 426–427

*pallam illam, quam dudum dederas, ad phrygionem deferas,
ut reconcinnetur atque una opera addantur quae volo.*

Please bring the *palla*, which you have given me a little while ago, to the *phrygio* so that it is adjusted and that the things I want are added at the same time.

It is also found in a Togata of Titinius called *Barbatus* (a man with beard):²¹

Titinius Barbatus F 4–5 R.

*phrygio fui primo, bene id opus scivi.
reliqui acus aciasque ero atque erae nostrae*

First, I was a phrygio. I knew my profession well. I left needles and threads to my master and mistress.

The parallel form in Titinius proves that *phrygio* is not a linguistic creation of Plautus, but a real term. However, there is no evidence for it in inscriptions or in Classical literature. In later times, we only find it in the works of grammarians (who loved old words) and in the archaist Apuleius, who shared the grammarians' linguistic interests.²² This shows that the term *phrygio* was obsolete in spoken language by Imperial times.

Like *fullo*, the word *phrygio* is a regular Latin word formation.²³ It is derived from the ethnic name *Phryx* (Phrygian) by the addition of the suffix *-io(n)*. Its formation is similar to that of the name *Cario*, deriving from *Carus* (Carian), and of the term *ludio* (stage performer).²⁴ In contrast to *Cario*, which is used as a slave name in Greek and Latin, the Latin term *phrygio* is not employed as a name in either language. The word

²⁰ Marquardt/Mau (1886) 537–540; Blümner I (1912) 218–222, giving too much credit to the ancient grammarians.

²¹ Nonius p. 6.20–21 L.

²² Apul. apol. 29.

²³ LHS I 356.

²⁴ This presupposes that *ludio* is to be connected with *Lydus* (Etruscan) and not with *ludus* (play, show).

phrygio obviously designated a ‘Phrygian,’ implying at the same time some specific quality associated with that ethnic group.

But what kind of work did a *phrygio* do? According to scholars of the Imperial period, he did artistic embroidery. If we believe them, the *phrygio* was an embroiderer who stitched ornaments on clothes.²⁵ The meaning is taken up by modern dictionaries. But were the ancient grammarians right in explaining what was probably a gloss to them? To find out, we should make a fresh start from Plautus. What did the word mean for him, and what Greek word did he translate by it? The case of the *Aulularia* is not conclusive. Plautus might have translated the Greek term ποικιλεύς/ποικιλτής (embroiderer)²⁶ or ὀκεστής (tailor).²⁷ However, in the *Menaechmi*, the sense of the word is plain. It must refer to a common tailor who mended clothes, certainly not to a sartorial artist like an embroiderer. The changes that are to be made to the *palla*—given by one of the *Menaechmi* to the *meretrix*—are very basic and simple.²⁸ Likewise, the fragment of Titinius deals with a tailor and not with an embroiderer. The entry in modern dictionaries should therefore be modified accordingly. In archaic texts, the term *phrygio* designates a tailor—whatever its early history. It is thus largely congruent with the term *sarcinator/sarcinatrix* (tailor/tailoress), which we find in v. 515. In fact, the term *sarcinator* may have replaced the somewhat unspecific *phrygio* in everyday language (terms of professions usually tell you what the profession does). This assumption would at least explain why the word *phrygio* is attested only in archaic Latin literature.

***aurifex* (508c)**

The next profession in the *Aulularia*’s list is much more straightforward. The *aurifex* (goldsmith) usually makes the gold jewellery of wealthy women.²⁹ The profession’s position in the list nonetheless raises some questions. Its mention in v. 508 stands out against the long catalogue (B). It has nothing to do with textiles, while the following professions all concern dress and shoes—other items only featuring at the end. If we

25 Plin. NH 8.196 (*pictae vestes*): *acu facere id Phryges invenerunt, ideoque Phrygioniae appellatae sunt* [(clothes embroidered in colour): the Phrygians invented doing this with a needle, and therefore these clothes have been called *Phrygioniae*]; Serv. ad Verg. Aen. 3.484: *phrygiam chlamydem*] *aut acu pictam*; *huius enim artis peritos Phrygiones dicimus secundum Plautum*; *in Phrygia enim inventa est haec ars* [a Phrygian cloak: or one embroidered with a needle; for we call those who understand this art *Phrygiones* after Plautus; for in Phrygia this art has been invented]; Varro Men. 228 (= Nonius p. 6.24–25 L.): *phrygio qui pulvinar poterat pingere* [a *phrygio*, who could decorate the couch].

26 LSJ s.v. ποικιλεύς/ποικιλτής and ποικίλλω; ποίκιμα; see especially Alexis F 329 K.-A. (= Pollux 7.34).

27 LSJ s.v. The seamstress (ὀκέστρια) was a comical stock character. A comedy of Antiphanes had this profession as its title, cf. Antiphanes F 21–24 K.-A., as well as a mime of Sophron. The Latin playwright Laberius also wrote a mime called *Belonistria* (seamstress), cf. βελόνη or βελονίς (needle). ThLL II s.v. *Belonistria* col. 1859.66.

28 On the entire story, see A 6.

29 Marquardt/Mau (1886) 157 n. 2; 700; Blümner IV (1887) 302–306.

think the entire catalogue (A+B) to be one entity, the *aurifex* disturbs the order. It thus provides an additional indication that we have two different versions on our hands.

The word *aurifex*, composed out of the words *aurum* (gold) and *facio* (to make), is the everyday Latin term for the jeweler, as numerous inscriptions and literary evidence show.³⁰ The Greek equivalent is χρυσοχόος. This profession is already mentioned in Attic comedy. We find it, for example, in the comic catalogue of crafts in Aristophanes' *Pluto* (160ff) as well as in his *Lysistrata* (408), where it stands next to the shoemaker. In Plautus, the term *aurifex* appears once again in the *Menaechmi*, in the same place that has already been mentioned for the word *phryrio*. Menaechmus did not only steal a *palla*, but also a *spinter* (bracelet) from his wife (*uxor*). The goldsmith is then asked to adapt it for the *meretrix* Erotium.³¹

lanarius (508d)

The last profession in the list is also straightforward. The *lanarius* (dealer in wool) is the first term designating professions that is formed in the way of an adjective with the suffix *-arius*. This is the word formation that is usual in the following long catalogue (B), where, however, all terms stand not in singular, but in plural. In literature, the word *lanarius* is attested only here, but numerous inscriptions show that it was an everyday term. In these inscriptions, the noun *lanarius* is often qualified by an adjective, denoting special functions.³² In general, a *lanarius* has to do with production of wool in different ways, i.e. carding, felting, and distributing the wool prepared in this way. Wool is associated with the *uxor dotata* in many other places in Plautus. We find it, for example, in *Menaechmi* 121: *tibi ancillas, penum, lanam, aurum, vestem, purpuram bene praebeo* (I provide you well with maidservants, food, wool, gold, dress, purple).³³ Wool is also mentioned as an object of the female household elsewhere in the *Menaechmi* and in the *Miles Gloriosus*.³⁴ The *lanarius* therefore fits in excellently here.

³⁰ ILS 3.2 p. 727; L. Larsson Lovén, *Women's Work. Readings beyond Marginality*, in: A. Wilson/M. Flohr (eds.), *Urban Craftsmen and Traders in the Roman World*, Oxford 2016, 212.

³¹ Plaut. Men. 525–526: *hoc ... ad aurificem deferat / iubeasque spinter novom reconcinnari* [Take this ... to the goldsmith and have him make a new bracelet]. In the same passage, Plautus lists two more pieces of jewellery that are typical for an *uxor dotata*: *armillae* and *stalagma*. On the importance of the *aurifex*, see also Lucilius F 993–995 M. (of a woman who is always not at home): *aut apud aurificem, ad matrem, cognatam, ad amicum ... lana, opus omne perit* [either to the goldsmith, to the mother, to the relatives, to the girlfriend ... the wool, all work perishes].

³² *lanarius coactor* (ILS 7557); *lanarius coactilius* (ILS 7558); *lanarius carminator* (ILS 7290); *lanarius pectinarius* (ILS 7290a); *lanarius negotians* (ILS 7559).

³³ The list is very similar to that of Plaut. Aul. 500–501, 508.

³⁴ Plaut. Men. 796–797: *dare una opera pensum postules, || inter ancillas sedere iubeas, lanam carere?* [Do you demand that he (sc. your husband) be given a workload of wool, do you want him to sit among the maidservants and card wool?]; Plautus Mil. 687–688 (about an *uxor*): *quae mihi numquam hoc dicat "eme, mi vir, lanam, unde tibi pallium || malacum et calidum conficiatur tunicaeque hibernae bonae."* [who

However, the transmission is divided as to the word itself. Even though the meaning is the very similar, the variant *linarius* is attested in the Codex Palatinus B.³⁵ This has been adopted in the text by some editors.³⁶ The term *linarius* is also attested in inscriptions and designates the linen manufacturer or linen dealer.³⁷ In Plautus, the material linen occurs only in two other places: in the following long catalogue (512: *linteones*)—if we should adopt *linarius* here, there would be another doublet—and in the dress catalogue of the *Epidicus* (230). However, linen does not fit in as well as wool does in this list. In contrast to *lana*, it is not a basic material worked on by a housewife and is never mentioned together with gold. We also have another witness from Late Antiquity that speaks against it belonging to the original list. It is very likely that the list *fullones*, *lanarios*, *phrygiones* (fullers, dealers in wool, tailors) we find in the Christian apologist Arnobius († 330 CE) is based on the *Aulularia*.³⁸ The reading *lanarius* is thus already attested before the Late Antique archetype of Plautus. Therefore, we should keep it and reject the variant reading *linarius*.

5.4 Version B: the long catalogue (515, 509–521)

The long version of the catalogue contains a total of twenty real or fictitious designations of professions. With the exception of v. 510, never more than two are combined in one verse. Only three of them (*fullo*, *sarcinator*, *solearii*) are found elsewhere in literature and in inscriptions. The absence in inscriptions, in which many professions are mentioned beyond those we find in literature, suggests that the terms are mostly comic ad hoc formations and that most if not all of the other seventeen professions are comic inventions. The formal principle underlying the word formation (see below) points in the same direction. The long enumeration of supposedly historical professions in Marquardt/Mau, in which fact and fiction are mixed, should be reduced accordingly.³⁹

The basis of the list consists of seven Latin nouns designating ‘real’ professions. These terms are known from everyday language and create a kind of ‘realism effect’ in this literary context. However, they sometimes carry another meaning in non-literary usage (see below). The list is as follows:

shall never say to me: ‘Buy me, my dear husband, wool, that I may prepare a soft and warm *pallium* and good winter tunics for you.’]

35 A similar variation between both forms is found in *Menaechmi* 121 (see above p. 95.). Servius (ad Aen. 4.373) offers the wrong reading *linum lanam praebeo* instead of the correct *penum lanam praebeo*. Obviously, the letters *lin(um)* given as a variant to *lanam*, intrude into the text, ejecting *penum*.

36 Wagner (1866); Goetz (1881); cf. also Marquardt/Mau (1886) 584 n. 6; Blümner I (1912) 195 n. 13.

37 ILS 7560; Blümner I (1912) 195.

38 Arnob. adv. nat. 2.38; cf. Stockert (1983) ad loc.

39 Cf. n. 1.

1. *fullones* (515); 2. *sarcinatores* (515); 3. *caupones* (509); 4. *propolae* (512); 5. *sedentarii sutores* (513); 6. *textores* (519); 7. *infectores* (521).

Apart from the *fullones* and the *sarcinatores*, all these nouns are connected with seventeen adjectives denoting different professions, sixteen of them being formed with the suffix *-arius*. One of them is actually a noun (*linteo*) that is being used as an adjective (for the reason, see below):

1. *patagiarum*; 2. *indusiarum*; 3. *linteo* [!]; 4. *calceolarum*; 5. *diabathrarum*; 6. *solearum*; 7. *molochinarum*; 8. *strophiarum*; 9. *zonarum*; 10. *limbularum*; 11. *arcularum*; 12. *corcotarum*; 13. *flamm<e>arum*; 14. *violarum*; 15. *carinarum*; 16. *manulearum*; 17. *myrotheciarum*.

The Latin nouns are intended as a prop for several adjectives, which are then slowly released into independence, so to speak. As to grammar, it is not always possible to exactly determine whether an adjective still belongs to the preceding noun or whether it has already assumed an independent status. In v. 509, for example, it is easy to connect the noun *caupones* to *indusiarum*; in v. 512, the *calceolarum* have already gained greater independence; and in v. 519, the *arcularum* (after the *textores limbularum*) have already gained full autonomy. In the catalogue, grammar takes a back seat to the linguistic effect, which is about the rattling off adjectives ending in *-arii*.

The simple principle underlying the formation of the adjective terms can be characterized as follows: The term for a dealer or craftsman is obtained from a specific item of clothing or only a part of it by adding the suffix *-arius*. The dress names forming the basis are partly Greek loanwords and partly Latin terms:

1. **patagiata*[?] – **patagiarum*
2. **indusiata*[?] – **indusiarum*
3. *calceolus* – **calceolarum*
4. *diabathrum* – **diabath<r>arum* (διάβαθρον)
5. *solea* – *solearum*
6. *molochinum* – **molochinarum* (μολόχινον)
7. *strophium* – **strophiarum* (στρόφιον)
8. *zona* – **zonarum* (ζώνη)
9. *limbulus* – **limbularum*
10. *arcula* – **arcularum*
11. *corcota* – **corcotarum* (χροκωτός)
12. *flammeum* – **flamm<e>arum*
13. **violare* – **violarum*
14. **carinum* – **carinarum* (καρύϊνον)
15. *manuleata* – **manulearum*
16. *myrothecium* – **myrotheciarum* (μυροθήκιον)

Although it may not seem so at first glance, the catalogue is well structured. We may distinguish five main groups: At the beginning, there are five designations that refer to the main garment: 1. *fullones*, *sarcinatores*, *caupones patagiarum*, *indusiarum*, *propolae*

linteones. Then we find four terms related to shoes: 2. *calceolarii*, *sedentarii sutores*, *diabathrarii*, *solearii*. Then come four terms that refer to accessories: 3. *molochinarii*, *stropharii*, *zonarii*, *limbularii*. In v. 519, box makers (*arcularii*) intervene, which makes for a good first pseudo-conclusion. The list then unexpectedly proceeds, listing four dyers whose names are derived from differently coloured garments: 4. *infectores cor-cotarii*, *flamm<e>arii*, *violarii*, *carinarii*. At the end, there come two more ‘professions’ which have no connection as to content. The words obviously stand together for the effect of alliteration: 5. *manulearii*, *myrothecarii*.

5.4.1 The first group (515/509/512a)

The comic invention in these verses only partially converges with the real world of dealers. Only two of five terms have some historical counterpart: the *fullo* (fuller) and the *sarcinator* (tailor), who are both placed at the beginning of the list. It is easy to see why: If the author had put fictitious terms first, he would already have taken away any believability from the start. The expression *propola linteo* (trader in linen fabrics) also refers to a real profession, but is not the regular everyday designation. In contrast, the author seems to have taken complete poetic liberty with the composite designations *caupones patagiarii* and *indusiarii*.

***sarcinator* (515)**

The term *sarcinator*, which refers to the same profession as the word *phrygio* (508), is found once more in Plautus. It designated a tailor and was the everyday word for this craft, as shown by numerous inscriptions.⁴⁰ As the connection of the term with *sarcire* indicates (see also the Greek ἀρέσκειν and ἀρέομαι), a *sarcinator* sews and also mends clothes. The connotation of the profession is sometimes negative, the mending of clothes being regarded as menial labour. It is often linked with *centones* (second-hand cloth).⁴¹ The social prestige of a *sarcinator/trix* was correspondingly low.⁴² The inscriptions show that it was a typical profession of the class of freedmen.⁴³

⁴⁰ ILS 7435a: *Attalus sarcinator*; 7345b: *Phyllis Statiliae sarcinatrix*; 7567: *Matiae J. l. [= Gaiae libertae] Primae coniugi suae sarcinatrici*; 7882b: Marquardt/Mau (1886) 156; Blümner I (1912) 212–213.

⁴¹ Plaut. Epid. 455: *alium quaeras cui centones sarcias* [Find someone else to mend his *centones*]; Lucilius F 747 M.: *sarcinatorem esse summum, suere centonem optime* [to be the best tailor, to best sew *centones*]; see also the edition of Christes/Garbugino (2015) and their comment ad loc. (F 789).

⁴² Varro Men. 363: *homines rusticos in vindemia incondita cantare, sarcinatrices in machinis* [peasants sing simple tunes at the vine harvest, seamstresses at the machines].

⁴³ Stockert (1983) ad loc.

***caupones patagiarum indusiarum* (509)**

The expression remains partly obscure. The noun *caupo*, forming a composite expression with the adjectives **patagiarum* and **indusiarum*, is found only here in Roman comedy. When we look at the parallels, the word *caupo* has a highly restricted meaning in this context. It designates a dealer or merchant here, and this meaning of the word is only found in this passage. The entry in the OLD s.v. *caupo* generalizes this meaning and is therefore highly misleading. In contrast, *caupo* designates an ‘innkeeper’ everywhere else. A *caupo* is a person leading a *caupona* (tavern/pub).⁴⁴ A dealer is not called *caupo* in Latin, but instead a *negotiator*. Why then does the text use this extended meaning? It could result from the fact that the author was translating a Greek text. He may have been looking for a Latin word that was phonetically similar to a Greek one. It is striking that the Latin *caupo* shares some letters with the Greek word for dealer, *κάπηλος*.⁴⁵

Apart from this, the connection of *caupones* with the two adjectives *patagiarum* and *indusiarum* is also very remarkable, since the word *caupo* is never qualified by an adjective elsewhere. The unique composite Latin expression *caupones patagiarum* suggests that the author wanted to imitate Greek composite nouns. In the Greek language, this kind of word formation is much more common than in Latin. For example, Greek has the words *ἱματιοκάπηλος* (dealer of cloaks), *ἱματιοπώλης* (dealer of cloaks), and *χλαμυδοπράτης* (dealer of the *chlamys*).⁴⁶ In Plautus, both Latin composite terms are thus morphologically and phonetically marked as a comic invention.⁴⁷

The meaning of the adjectives **patagiarum* and **indusiarum* themselves can no longer be determined since we do not know the meaning of the nouns underlying them.⁴⁸ It makes sense, however, to consider how the author might have proceeded in forming them. Keeping in mind how word formation works in the catalogue, the adjectives **patagiarum* and **indusiarum* could be derived from the nouns **patagium* and **indusium* (which are not attested elsewhere in other primary sources and are therefore hypothetical). Another starting point is perhaps more convincing. As noted above, the dress catalogue in the *Epidicus* has some striking parallels with our passage. It mentions two garments that fit in well with the glosses **patagiarum* and **indusiarum* found in the *Aulularia*: the (*vestis*) **patagiata* and the **indusiata*, neither of which is attested elsewhere in Latin literature. Since all four words are hapaxes, the similarity (and the parallelism) is probably due to some conscious imitation. But who imitated whom? If the B-version of the catalogue of the *Aulularia* is really a later ‘interpolation,’ it is clear that an imitation based on the *Epidicus* took place there. Word formation also points to this because the dress terms morphologically precede those that designate

⁴⁴ A *puer cauponi*, cf. Plaut. Poen. 1298, is a slave working in a tavern.

⁴⁵ LSJ s.v. 1. The evidence LSJ s.v. 2 gives for the alternative meaning ‘tavern keeper’ is not conclusive.

⁴⁶ Wolff (n. 14) 7

⁴⁷ Blümner I (1912) 208.

⁴⁸ Cf. B 4 pp. 77–78; D 3 pp. 607–614.

dress dealers. The glosses **patagiarii* and **indusiarii* should therefore be understood as individuals trading in (*vestes*) **patagiatae* and **indusiatae*. In the end, the author of version B of the *Aulularia* was probably less interested in the nature of the clothes than in imitating his model (presumably the *Epidicus*).

***propolae linteones* (512a)**

The composite expression *propolae linteones* is at least as unusual as the preceding one. It again shows that word formation in the catalogue was guided by a Greek model. This should caution us against generalizing the meaning of the words. The noun *propola* is a Greek loanword (προπώλης), which is only found here in Plautus. The OLD gives us only ‘retailer’ as its meaning, probably because of the word formation and its usage in Greek.⁴⁹ That may be correct for the passage at hand, but it is mistaken in terms of general usage. Let us first look at the Greek parallels. In Greek literature, the term προπώλης is attested once in Aristophanes.⁵⁰ In inscriptions, we also find the form προπωλητής.⁵¹ Both Greek words indeed designate a dealer. However, the usual Latin equivalent for this would be the term *negotiator*, which is often found both in literary texts and in inscriptions and belongs to everyday language. In contrast, the word *propola* is only used in a narrower sense in Latin literature, the passage at hand being an exception of the rule. It always refers specifically to the grocer who traded with victuals (*obsonium*), i.e. fish, vegetables, or fruit.⁵²

In the catalogue of dress dealers, however, the meaning ‘grocer’ does not fit. It appears that the term *propola* had a more general meaning, as is proposed in the OLD for all instances. How can we explain this extension of meaning? We have to turn to the following word *linteo* to find the reason. It goes with the word *propola* to form a single expression. The noun *linteo*, which is used as an adjective, is also found only here in Latin literature. Its formation shows that it is a regular Latin word, which is corroborated by its occasional appearances in inscriptions.⁵³ A *linteo* is defined as a person who has to do with linen cloth (*linteum*) in the broadest sense. He can be either

⁴⁹ Cf. Georges s.v. *propola*: ‘Höker.’

⁵⁰ Pollux 7.12: ὁ τοῖς πιπράσκουσι προξενῶν προπράτωρ, ὡς Δείναρχος (F 34 p. 150.17–12 Conomis) καὶ Ἰσαῖος (F 46 Thalheim) εἶρηκεν· προπώλην δ’ αὐτὸν Ἀριστοφάνης (= Aristoph. F 874 K.-A.) καλεῖ, προπωλοῦντα δὲ Πλάτων [A person that procures something for buyers, is a *proprator* (broker), as Dinarchus and Iseus said. Aristophanes calls him a *propoles* (broker); Plato says that he is brokering].

⁵¹ LSJ (+ suppl.) s.v.

⁵² Cf. Lucilius 198 M.: *cum primos ficos propola recentis || protulit* [when the *propola* (grocer) displayed the first fresh figs]; Cic. Pis. 67: *panis atque vinum a propola atque de cupa* [bread and wine from the *propola* (grocer) and from the barrel]; ILS 3624: *piscatores et propolae* [fishermen and *propolae*]; Varro res rust. 3.14.3: *ruminantes* (sc. *cochleae*) *ad propolam* (*propalam*: codd.) [snails feeding themselves at the grocer’s store].

⁵³ ILS 7561 (with further evidence): *ossa P. Postumi Felicis lintionis* [the bones of the *lintio* P. Postumus Felix].

a weaver or a dealer in linen. In our passage, the function of *linleo* is specified by the noun *propola*. This suggests that the composite word's usage in this passage does not refer to a weaver (i.e. the manufacturer), but to a trader who deals in linen cloth or robes. This fits with the rest of the list and the general content of the scene, where various merchants are seeking payment.

In the catalogue, the expression *propola linleo* stands out because it combines two nouns. The other compounds consist of a noun and an adjective with the suffix *-arius*.⁵⁴ The exceptional meaning of *propola* and the unusual form of the entire expression suggest that the author performed a linguistic creation—as with *caupones patagarii*. This creativity resulted from the decision to directly translate from Greek instead of creating a more liberal adaptation.

It is easy to see how the author proceeded when we look at the Greek equivalent. The starting point of the invention was again a Greek composite word, namely ὀθονιοπώλης (linen merchant).⁵⁵ A direct translation into Latin first faced the problem that there was no Greek loanword for ὀθόνη and ὀθόνιον in the Latin language. The author therefore used the Latin general term *linleo*: He specified its meaning by combining it with *propola*, which also mirrored the second part of the Greek composite ὀθονιοπώλης. The expression *propola linleo* thus corresponds in content to the *negotiator linlearius* we find in Latin inscriptions. It refers to a real profession, but is a 'custom built' hybrid expression, so to speak, created in order to stay as close as possible to the Greek original.

In contrast to wool (*lana*), which is found several times in Plautus, fine linen is only referred to at one other point in his oeuvre. Tellingly, this is in the dress catalogue of the *Epidicus* (230). There a *linleola caesicia* (a tunica of fine linen) is mentioned immediately before the (*tunica*) **patagiata* and **indusiata*. This could suggest that the author of the longer catalogue of the *Aulularia* was inspired by Plautus at this point as well.

5.4.2 The second group (512b–514a)

After the robe, the list turns to the shoes. The author derives four names of professions from four different types of shoes. The comic invention here is also clearly based on female shoes and not on everyday terms designating shoemakers. In contrast, there is some tension between 'real' and fictitious terms. On shoes and their Latin terms in general, see chapters B 26–30.

⁵⁴ For examples of this word formation, cf. ILS 3.2 p. 736 s.v. *negotiator*.

⁵⁵ LSJ s.v.

calceolarii* (512b) – *calceolus

The adjective **calceolarius* is derived from the noun *calceolus* (little shoe or *soccus*). If it still goes with *propolae*, the author may have imitated another Greek composite noun, like ὑποδηματορράφος, ὑποδηματοποιός, κρηπιδοποιός, or κρηπιδουργός. However, it could also have been used as a noun, like other genuine Latin terms designating various shoemakers, such as *caligarii*, *calcearii*, *solearii*, and *sandalarii*. In contrast to these names, which are attested in inscriptions, the word **calceolarius* is a hapax. The OLD gives its meaning as ‘shoemaker,’⁵⁶ but overlooks the fact that **calceolarius* derives from the diminutive form *calceolus* and not from *calceus* (shoe)—unlike the everyday terms *calceator* and *calcearius*. A *calceolus* is a small closed shoe, probably a Greek *soccus*, which was often worn by women.⁵⁷ The meaning of **calceolarius* is therefore ‘producer of female shoes or *socci*.’ The Greek word on which the Latin translation was based may have been κρηπιδοποιός or κρηπιδουργός. In any case, **calceolarius* is no regular everyday Latin term for a shoemaker, but a comic invention.⁵⁸

***sedentarii sutores, diabathrarii* (513a)**

The wording of these terms is difficult. The question is whether the expression *sedentarii sutores* (sitting cobblers) should be taken together with the following word *diabathrarii*. Sitting cobblers are a bit out of the ordinary, because they do not produce a certain shoe type. The expression however creates a fine oxymoron (sitting cobblers standing while waiting). As to style, two separate designations ending in *-arius* are preferable to one formed by two similar adjectives. We should therefore put a comma after *sutores*.⁵⁹ The meaning of *diabathrarii* is examined below.

The structure of the verse would thus correspond to that of vv. 509, 510, and 519. In each verse, a designation consisting of two words (*caupones patagiarii, propolae linteones, textores limbularii*) precedes a supposed profession consisting of one word (*indusiarii, calceolarii, arcularii*). Moreover, the list always contains at least two professions per verse. Most importantly, the irregularity of the expression *sedentarii sutores* can be easily explained. The author has his fun with the regular word formation with the suffix *-arius*, which we find in many real terms designating shoemakers (see above). He thus inserted the quite nonsensical (but linguistically appropriate) expression ‘sitting cobbler.’ The image of a cobbler sitting at this work had been already used in v. 73 of the *Aulularia*: *quasi claudus sutor domi sedet totos dies* (like a lame shoemaker sitting whole days at home). The oxymoron heightens the comedy of the B-version. Men who normally spend all day sitting made the effort to come and stand in front of the house in order to demand payment.

⁵⁶ Cf. also ThLL III s.v. *calceolarius* col. 131.70–72; Georges s.v.

⁵⁷ Cf. B 27, especially p. 537.

⁵⁸ Against Marquardt/Mau (1886) 596; Blümner I (1912) 277; Stockert (1983) ad loc.

⁵⁹ Stockert (1983) ad loc. against Leo.

diabath< r >arii (513b) – diabathrum

The profession **diabathrarius* is based on a Greek loanword, the *diabathrum* (διάβαθρον). In contrast to *calceus* and *solea*, the word *diabathrum* was not well known in the Roman world (nor was the shoe for that matter).⁶⁰ The grammarian Festus (Verrius) felt that the subject matter needed some explanation. His entry maybe owes its origin to our passage of the *Aulularia*. The little we know about the *diabathrum* comes from this one text. Festus defines the *diabathrum* as a type of sandal of Greek style: *diabathra genus solearum Graecanicarum* (the *diabathrum* is a type of Grecian sandals). We thus have an overlap of content with the *solearii* (traders of sandals), who directly follow in the list. The lack of knowledge on the *diabathrum* and this imprecision show that the **diabathrarius* must also belong to the realm of comic fiction.

solearius (514a) – solea

In contrast, fiction and reality square in the next word. The word *solearius* (sandal-maker) is based on the word *solea* (sandal) (B 28). Sandals are well attested for Roman women in literature, though statuary evidence on them is lacking. Inscriptions indicate that sandals were made by specialists. For example, we have a tombstone of *L. Braetius Litorinus solearius* (ILS 7550). We also hear of a *collegium fabrum soliarium* [!] *baxiarium* (ILS 7249). The author could thus rely on a real Latin designation when translating Greek equivalent terms like ὑποδηματογράφος and ὑποδηματοποιός.

The second group of supposed professions demonstrates the difficulties the Latin author faced in translation and the requisite invention, especially when comparing this section with the shoe catalogue given by the Greek poet Herondas in his *Mimes* (7.56–61). There are relatively few Latin terms for female shoes.⁶¹ In contrast, Herondas' Greek text lists fifteen different types. Since the catalogue in the *Aulularia* does not list special luxury items, which are usually called with names derived from places or regions, the translator's possibilities for finding equivalent Latin words were exhausted quickly. This meant that he had to resort to inventing his own. Despite these challenges, the author of version B is not yet done with his hyperbolic list of petitioners.

5.4.3 The third group (514b–519a)

The most important regular items of dress all being exploited, he moves on to the accessories. He begins his list with cotton cloth (*molochinum*), which was probably used for undergarments, continues with the cord (*strophium*) and the belt (*zona*), and ends with the lower border (*limbolus*) of the long female dress. A *limbus* is not a proper

⁶⁰ Cf. on it, B 30 p. 550.

⁶¹ Cf. B 30 p. 549.

garment, but was produced as a separate item before being sewn onto a larger garment like a dress. On this basis, the author creates four more fictitious professions.

molochinarii* (514b) – *molochinum

The meaning of the Greek loanword *molochinus* (μολόχινος), which is the basis of the **molochinarii*, is discussed in detail in chapter A 7.⁶² The author will have taken up the rare word from his Greek model, a Hellenistic comedy. The adjective *molochinus* most likely designates cotton, being equivalent in meaning to the more common term *carbasinus*. The **molochinarii* are accordingly (fictitious) traders of items made of cotton cloth (*molochinum*). The position in the catalogue (after the shoemakers and before three dealers of accessories) is noteworthy. It is perhaps to be explained by the fact that underwear was sometimes made of cotton.⁶³ The **molochinarii* are thus the first dealers that trade in accessories. However, the list is intended for comedic effect and does not have to be strictly logical.

****stropharii* (516a) – *strophium***

The professional name **stropharius* (producer of *strophia*) is based on the Greek loanword *strophium* (gr. στρόφιον). Again, the author seems to be relying on a Greek model. The **stropharius* is attested only here and is clearly a comic invention.⁶⁴ To see what the author meant by it, we have to turn to the word *strophium*. Its sense has not always been correctly understood in research, but it refers to a cord that can be used in connection with various parts of the body, functioning either as a hairband (B 15) or as a belt (B 21). In the latter function, a *strophium* comes close to a *zona* (belt), the words being sometimes used as equivalents. In our passage, the **stropharii* are usually interpreted as ‘producers of belts.’ However, the meaning ‘producers of hairbands’ fits better for two reasons. First, it clearly distinguishes between the professions of **stropharii* and **zonarii* (producers of belts). And second, the list would be based on all items of dress that are shaped like a band and would systematically go through the body from top to bottom, beginning with the hairband and ending with the border of the garment.

zonarii* (516b) – *zona

The term *zonarius* or *sonarius* (belt maker) is connected with the Greek loanword *zona* (= ζώνη). The word *zona* designates the belt of both men and women (B 20). In Latin, the male belt is usually called *cingulum*, the female one *cingillum*.⁶⁵ We again feel the influence of a Greek source here. The author uses an item of dress, the *zona*, to create the

⁶² Cf. pp. 139–141.

⁶³ A fragment from Caecilius seems to refer to an *interula* (undertunic) made of cotton (A 7 p. 138).

⁶⁴ Blümner I (1912) 208 against Marquardt/Mau (1886) 585.

⁶⁵ As in *calceolus*, the diminutive is used to denote the female garment.

name of a supposed profession. However, reality and fiction merge in the word *zonarius*, necessitating some further distinction. Like the term *solearius*, the word *zonarius* is a real Latin designation of a profession. However, a craftsman usually called *zonarius* fabricated other types of belts than those suggested by the catalogue. He produced male *zoniae* that were—as examples in Plautus already show—clearly different from female ones.⁶⁶ Male *zoniae* were very robust, consisted of leather, and served as small bags or wallets in which money was worn on the body. These were the *zoniae* made by a *zonarius*, who is reckoned among the leatherworking craftsmen.⁶⁷ The real *zonarius* should therefore be kept separate from the fictitious *zonarius* producing more delicate female *zoniae*, presumably out of other materials.⁶⁸

textores *limbolarii* (519a) – *limbolus

The *textores *limbolarii* (weavers of borders) derive their name and their profession from the word **limbolus* (a small *limbus*). As the word formation shows (see below), the word is again a comic invention.⁶⁹ In Latin, a *limbus* is a woven border that is sewn onto the bottom of a female long robe.⁷⁰ Like the preceding *strophium* and *zona*, it lies in a ring around the body. It brings the top to bottom survey of female accessories to an adequate end.

However, the composite expression *textores limbolarii* is singular.⁷¹ Its sense is clearly ‘weaver of borders.’ There is a small problem connected with the *limbolus*: Unlike the other items referred to in the catalogue, it is not a proper garment, but only an ornament. This difficulty was already felt by scholars in antiquity, as an explanation in Nonius shows:

⁶⁶ Plaut. Pers. 154–157: *cape || tunicam atque zonam, et chlamydem adfero et causeam; ... quasi sit peregrinus* [take the *tunica* and the belt, bring the cloak and the *causea* (i.e. a certain type of hat), ... as if he were a traveller]; Truc. 954–955: A: *ubi est quod tu das? solve zonam, provocator. quid times?* B: *tu peregrinu's, hic <ego> habito: non cum zona ego ambulo*. [A: Where is what you have to give? Undo your belt, challenger. What are you afraid of? B: You are a foreigner. I live here. I do not take a walk with a belt].

⁶⁷ Lucilius 1057 M.: *ancillae, pueri, zonarius, textor* [maidservants, servants, a *zonarius*, a weaver]; (with Marx ad loc.); Cic. Flac. 17: *id sutores et zonarii conclamarunt* [shoe makers and *zonarii* cried it out].

⁶⁸ Against the OLD s.v.

⁶⁹ The transmission of Plautus is not uniform at this point. Nonius quoting the verse offers the form *limbolarii*, while the manuscripts of Plautus have *limbuarii* (V) or *linbuarii* (BD). Editors rightly prefer Nonius' reading. Although the diminutive **limbolus* and the **limbolarius* are not attested elsewhere, they show a regular word formation similar to the one we find in the pair *calceolus* and **calceolarius*.

⁷⁰ Cf. B 4 p. 309.

⁷¹ Goetz (1881) separates the *limbolarii* from the *textores*. However, both words must belong together, as is shown by the parallels. The singularity of the phrase is to be explained by the fact that it is a poetic word formation.

Nonius p. 869.25–27 L.

limbus, ut adnotatum invenimus, muliebre vestimentum, quod purpuram in imo habet. Plautus in Aulularia: textores limbolarii, arcularii.

The limbus is, as we found annotated, a female garment with a purple border at the lower end. Plautus in the *Aulularia* etc.

Nonius' remarks are very interesting because they show that he did not only possess a copy of Plautus, but also some kind of commentary on it (*ut adnotatum invenimus*). There, a grammarian (mistakenly) maintained that the *limbus* was a garment with a purple border. The singular meaning given to the word *limbus*—equating it with the Greek word παρυφίς (garment with a border)—indicates that we are dealing with an ad hoc explanation of Plautus' text. The anonymous grammarian was not so much concerned with the meaning of the term *limbus* as with the explanation of the singular expression *textores limbolarii*. In contrast to him, we should resist the temptation of inventing Latin dress terms and keep to the common meaning of *limbolus* (small border), which is also a better fit for the principles underlying the catalogue. That it is an ornament and not a proper garment does not need to bother us, insofar as hems were produced separately and later sewn onto the robe. It is sufficiently related to the (confusing and overwhelming) world of fashion to not be passed up by a comic author looking for more professions to add to his list.

But how do we have to explain the singular composite expression *textores limbolarii*? We should again start with a look at word formation. The reason why the author chose the noun *textores* (weavers) as a basis becomes evident when we keep in mind his method of word formation and his Greek model. The lower border of a garment is called a παρυφή in Greek, which is derived from the verb παρυφαίνειν (to weave along)—hence the terms παρυφές and παρυφίς designating garments decorated with such a border.⁷² Imitating Greek, the author first picked the noun *textor* because it is related to the process of weaving. It was a good Latin noun and a good Roman profession, lending a touch of realism to the otherwise absurd list. Since the reference to the border and part of the Greek word were still missing, the author then added the adjective **limbolarius* (small border). In this way, he created a completely artificial Latin expression, which nonetheless conveyed the necessary meaning to his audience.

The *arcularii* (519b) – *arcula*

The **arcularius* is the first 'craftsman' in the B-version of the catalogue whose name is not derived from an article of clothing.⁷³ Already Lambinus (1576) derived the word from

⁷² They belong to everyday language, cf. Aristophanes F 322 K.-A. (a catalogue of garments); Menander F 370 K.-A.; IG II² 1514B 71; 1517B 121; 1524B 218. 220 (Brauron clothing catalogue).

⁷³ See already the *aurifex* in the A-version.

arcula (small box), the diminutive of *arca*, and understood it to mean ‘box maker.’⁷⁴ The suffix *-arius* is also strange in this context since the term *faber* is usually used indiscriminately for all sorts of carpenters. It seems that the suffix was chosen in order to continue the parallelism of the list. As to content, *arcula* and *arca* are equivalent to the Greek words κιβώτιον and κιβωτός. In general, an *arca* is made of wood, has a lid, and can have a lock. It was used for various objects.

But what kind of *arca* did the author have in mind when using the diminutive *arcula* (small box) for this container? Is it large (a chest for garments) or small (a ‘beauty case’)? An *arca* could be used to store clothes.⁷⁵ In Plautus’ *Menaechmi*, for example, a wife is complaining about her husband plundering her *arcae*.⁷⁶ Cato recommends rubbing an *arca* with a kind of olive oil to protect the clothes from being damaged by moths.⁷⁷ In Lucilius, a wife takes her *palla* from an *arca*.⁷⁸ In contrast, an *arcula* (κιβώτιον), a small box, is used to store medicines.⁷⁹ In Plautus’ *Mostellaria*, the term *arcula* refers to a make-up box.⁸⁰ Different colours (*pigmenta*) are stored in it.⁸¹ Cicero metaphorically uses the word in the same sense.⁸² Varro also keeps colours in the *arcula*.⁸³ However, the diminutive is later also used for larger chests. It is first attested in Cicero, though in a pointed sense.⁸⁴ Cicero ridicules the fact that even the smallest dress boxes of women

⁷⁴ Lambinus (1576) 179.

⁷⁵ On the chests found in Pompeii and Herculaneum, cf. E. Pernice, *Hellenistische Tische, Zisternenmündungen, Beckenuntersätze, Altäre und Truhen*, Berlin/Leipzig 1932, 71–94; S. Mols, *Wooden Furniture in Herculaneum*, Amsterdam 1999; on Greek and Roman chests, see in general G. M. A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, London 1966, 72–78, 114; E. Brümmer, *Griechische Truhenbehälter*, JdI 100 (1985), 1–168; D. Andrianou, *The Furniture and Furnishing of Ancient Greek Houses and Tombs*, Cambridge 2009.

⁷⁶ Plaut. *Men.* 803–804: *at ille suppilat mihi aurum et pallas ex arcis domo, || me despoliat, mea ornamenta clam ad meretrices degerit* [but he robs me of my gold and my *pallae* from my chests at home; he plunders me; he secretly takes my equipment to hetaeras].

⁷⁷ Cato agr. 98.1: *vestimenta ne tiniae tangant, amurcam decoquito ad dimidium, ea unguito fundum arcae et extrinsecus et pedes et angulos* [lest the moths do not touch the clothes, boil the *amurca* halfway, and oil with it the bottom of the box, its outside, feet, and corners].

⁷⁸ Lucilius F 504 M.: *cum tecum est, quidvis satis est: visuri alieni || sint homines, spiram pallas redimicula promit*. [When she is with you, anything is good enough: but if other men could be seeing her, then she takes out her *spira*, her *pallae*, and her chains]; cf. on it A 8 p. 179.

⁷⁹ Aristoph. *Plut.* 711ff.

⁸⁰ Plaut. *Most.* 248: *cedo mi speculum et cum ornamentis arculam actutum* [Pass me the mirror and the box with the make-up immediately].

⁸¹ Plaut. *Most.* 248–264.

⁸² Cic. *ad Att.* 2.1.1 (see below).

⁸³ Varro *res rust.* 3.174.

⁸⁴ Cic. *off.* 2.25: *qui scrutarentur arculas muliebres et, ne quod in vestimentis telum occultaretur, exquirere* [who are to rummage the *arculae* of the women and to examine them lest no weapon is hidden in their clothes].

are searched by soldiers. In the Imperial period, *arcula* becomes a regular designation for this type of chest.⁸⁵

The choice between both meanings is stark. The early parallels and the following term *murothecium* (see below) suggest that the author was thinking of small make-up boxes. On the other hand, a box for dresses fits well at the pseudo-end of a catalogue concerned with garments. The author also often uses diminutives to characterize female belongings. In any case, the term **arcularius* is an odd profession, though there may have been specialized box makers. It is again striking that the diminutive (*arcula*) and not the normal form (*arca*) should be the basis of the derivation. The author perhaps wanted to imitate a Greek composite word like *χιβωτοποιός*. All of this means that the question of size must remain unanswered.

Interpreting **arcularii* as a box maker unfortunately raises two new difficulties: The **arcularii* immediately follow after the *textores limbolarii*. In the catalogue, most Latin nouns seem to rule the sequence of the adjectives that follow. We should therefore connect **arcularii* with *textores* (weavers). Unlike all other articles mentioned so far, the box is also not an article of clothing. Because of these difficulties, Ussing in his commentary suggested that the noun *arcula* designates a check pattern.⁸⁶ According to him, the expression *textores arcularii* should be interpreted as ‘weavers of cloth with check patterns.’ His solution eliminates the mentioned objections, but seems too far-fetched. Unlike the word *scutula* (lozenge), the word *arcula* is not used in the sense of an abstract rectangle or square elsewhere. The traditional explanation that **arcularii* are box makers should be preferred for three reasons: We do not have any parallel for it in Greek dress terms; in the comic list, some adjectives detach themselves from the preceding nouns; and the term *arcula* otherwise always clearly designates a box. Apart from this, v. 519 forms a conclusion to the catalogue, albeit only a provisional one. A box is not an overly extravagant object at this place, all terms for garments being seemingly exhausted. The reason for its placement could be that the *uxor dotata* will purchase so many clothes that she will even need new chests in order to store them.

5.4.4 The fourth group (521/510)

After what seems like the ending of the soliloquy, the enumeration of professions suddenly takes a new start. It increases the literary effect of confusing and overwhelming the hapless husband. The author adds four kinds of dyers. He derives their designa-

⁸⁵ Sen. epist. 92.13: *quis ... umquam vestimenta aestimavit arcula* [who has ever judged clothes by the box they were stored in?]; Mart. 2.46.4: *sic micat innumeris arcula synthesibus* [so the *arcula* glitters with countless dinner suits].

⁸⁶ Ussing (1875) ad loc: “*arcularii non ii intelligendi videntur, qui arculas mulieribus faciunt ... sed potius textores arcularii, qui arculas texunt, i.e. scutulas sive rhombos, ut ait Censorinus ..., unde scutulata vestimenta dicta sunt.*”

tions from four garments in various colours. All terms are comic word formations.⁸⁷ As to grammar, the noun *infectores* (dyers) rules the following four adjectives,⁸⁸ which differentiate its meaning. Beyond the general denomination, all these specific dyers are fictitious professions. There is no evidence in inscriptions of specialist dyers in Rome apart from those using the purple snail.

***infectores corcotarii* (521) – *corcota* (*crocota*)**

The **crocotarius* is derived from the garment that is called *crocota* (sc. *vestis*) in our sources. It clearly is a fictitious profession.⁸⁹ An orthographical comment may help to avoid confusion about the form of the word. The usual spelling, which is used elsewhere in this book, is ***crocota*** (hence ****crocotarius***), the R preceding the first O. This is also the form that is transmitted in the text by all manuscripts and by Nonius.⁹⁰ Yet it does not fit in here for metrical reasons. To restore metre, Wagner (1866) created the form ****corcotarii*** by a common metathesis which is also found in *Aulularia* F 1.⁹¹

The word *crocota* is a Greek loanword based on the Greek expression *χροκωτός* (sc. *χίτων*). This designates a red coloured *tunica* (*chiton*).⁹² The garment takes its name not from the colour created by the dye, but from the colour of the stigmas of the flower *Crocus sativus* (*κρόκος*). In contrast to what we understand by saffron-coloured, the term referred to a red.⁹³ Apart from the striking red colour, the main association connected with the *crocota* was that it was made of a thin and elegant cloth.

The *crocota* is known to us especially from old Attic comedy.⁹⁴ There, it is worn by women and in travesty by men. In the archive of the temple of Artemis in Brauron, it is often registered among dress donations.⁹⁵ At the same time, it is a typical garment of Dionysus and his followers.⁹⁶ Plautus mentions a *crocota* in F 1 of the *Aulularia*; a *crocotula* is also among the garments listed in the catalogue of the *Epidicus* (231).⁹⁷ Given that the author of version B of the *Aulularia* drew on this passage, it seems likely that he was also inspired by it here. With the *crocota*, we find ourselves in the world of Greek literature. It is not a garment that is typical for a Roman woman. One may doubt

⁸⁷ Against Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506; Sebesta (1994) 67.

⁸⁸ In inscriptions, dyers are variously called *infector* (ILS 7594), *offector* (ILS 7595), *colorator* (ILS 7450, 7596), cf. Blümner I (1912) 228.

⁸⁹ Against Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506, 584; André (1949) 154: “à l’époque de Plaute l’usage en était assez implanté pour être confié à des spécialistes, les *infectores crocotarii*”; Goldman (n. 3) 27.

⁹⁰ Nonius p. 882.27 L.

⁹¹ *Aulularia* F 1 (= Nonius p. 863.13 L.): *pro illis corcotis, strophis, sumptu uxorio*.

⁹² Cf. A 3 p. 58; A 10 pp. 205–206; B 1 p. 259; B 11 p. 417.

⁹³ On the colour *croceus*, cf. B 11 p. 416.

⁹⁴ Cf. Aristoph. *Lys.* 46, *eccl.* 318, 332; Cratinus F 40 K.-A.

⁹⁵ Cleland (2005) 119.

⁹⁶ Cf. A 3 p. 58.

⁹⁷ Cf. A 4 p. 78.

that it was ever common in Rome.⁹⁸ A *crocota*-dyer (*infector crocotarius*) would be an oddly niche profession. This suggests that it belongs to the realm of comic invention.

****flamm<e>arii* (510a) – *flammeum***

The *infectores* **flammearii* are another profession made up by the author ad hoc.⁹⁹ They are mentioned in v. 510, which should also be transposed. The reasons for this are discussed in detail in my article in GFA (2022). Apart from stylistic reasons, the transposition is above all plausible because of the content of the verse, which also concerns dyed clothes. The transposition implies that the adjective **flammearii* is still ruled by the noun *infectores* (dyers).

In contrast to what dictionaries tell us, the gloss **flammearii* does not refer to ‘dyers of flame coloured garments’ in general, but to ‘dyers of the specific garment called *flammeum*,’ the adjective **flammearius* being derived from *flammeum* and not from *flamma* (flame).¹⁰⁰ A *flammeum* was a bridal scarf worn by Roman women on occasion of their wedding (B 18). Unlike a veil, it was worn over the shoulders and could be pulled up onto the head as opposed to covering the whole head (including the face). Its colour was yellow. It is noteworthy that a ritual garment is included among ordinary female clothes in our list.¹⁰¹ The author’s main concern was probably to bring together as many garments that were named after their colour as possible. So he accepted the slight inconsistency. He was perhaps yet again inspired by a Greek model. The Greek word for a scarf is κάλυμμα, as Aristophanes’ comedies and the treasury records of Artemis Brauronia show.¹⁰² It was a common part of female Greek dress. This is perhaps how it found its way into our Latin comedy.

****violarii* (510b) – *viola***

The term **violarius* is also a comic linguistic coinage (at least as it is used here).¹⁰³ Fiction and reality merge in the word **violarius* as they do in some other terms in the catalogue. The word **violarius* indeed existed, but it designated another profession. In the catalogue, its meaning must be ‘dyer of the garment called *violare*’ (see below). In contrast, its common meaning is ‘merchant of violets’ in everyday language. The

⁹⁸ Cicero’s description of Clodius’ travesty in *crocota* seems to contradict this assumption, but it has all the traits of a literary comedy scene. Significantly, Cicero replaces the term *crocota* with the term *tunica manicata* in his second account of the same event, cf. A 9 p. 206.

⁹⁹ Against Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506; Blümner I (1912) 250 n. 7; André (1949) 115; Sebesta (1994) 67; Goldman (n. 3) 27 (a circular argument): “The *flammarii*, dyers of the *flammeum* bridal veil, with its particular red-orange shade, are mentioned first; not surprisingly, as these veils were in high demand and required a whole class of specialists to produce an adequate supply.”

¹⁰⁰ Against ThLL VI 1 s.v. *flammearius* col. 870.55 and Stockert (1983) ad loc.

¹⁰¹ Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506 n. 12; Blümner I (1912) 250 n. 7.

¹⁰² LSJ s.v.; Cleland (2015) 116.

¹⁰³ Against Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506, 584; Sebesta (1994) 67.

surprising difference can be explained when we look at word formation. In everyday language, the word **violarius* goes back directly to the flower *viola* (violet). In the catalogue, as the other examples show, word formation proceeds differently. Its basis is always the designation of a garment. When coining the profession **violarius*, the author would not have had the flower *viola* in mind, but a violet garment. We should therefore take the term *violare* (sc. *vestimentum*) as the basis of his word formation, hence the difference in meaning. The translation of the comic word **violarius* thus gets rather tricky. In analogy to the words **crocotarius* and **flammearius*, we should not translate it with ‘one who dyes garments violet’ (OLD), thereby generalizing its meaning, but define it as ‘one who dyes the garment called *violare*.’

In antiquity, various flowers were called *viola*. The plant giving its name to the colour and the *violare* is the so-called *viola odorata*. It is called black or dark violet (ἴον) in Greek, as is its colour.¹⁰⁴ This passage from the *Aulularia* is the only place in Latin literature where a violet garment is designated by referring to the colour of this *viola*. Commonly, another term is used to denote this colour. The linguistic exception can be explained if we again think of a Greek model. In Greek texts, the adjective ἰάνθινος, which is equivalent to *violaceus* and *violaris*, is used several times in connection with clothing.¹⁰⁵ Although our evidence only dates to the Imperial period, it is very likely that a Greek expression like ἰάνθινον (sc. ἱμάτιον) prompted the author in his translation.¹⁰⁶

As concerns the profession **violarius*, all these irregularities show that we are in the field of poetic freedom. The merchants of the violets are as real as the dyers of the *violare* are fiction. We hear nothing of specialized dyers in inscriptions. This strongly suggests that most dyers worked with multiple plant-based colours, and there were no niche specialists in Rome (again, with the exception of those using an animal-based dye derived from purple snails). In any case, the author of the catalogue appears to not have had the one exceptional group in mind when writing this passage. He was not thinking in ‘realistic’ terms, but merely wanted to transfer Greek dress words into as long a list of professions as possible. Roman historical reality was far removed from this exaggerated list.

104 Theophrast hist. plant. 1.13.2: ἴον τὸ μέλαν [the black violet]; caus. plant. 1.13.12; Verg. ecl. 10.39: *et nigrae violae* [and dark violets] (~ Theocr. 10.18); Georg. 4.275: *in foliis violae subluceat purpura nigrae* [on the foliages of the dark violet there gleams a purple colour]. In Latin, the flower is called *viola purpurea* or with the Greek loanword *ion*: Plin. NH 21.27 (the reference should be corrected in the OLD): *purpureae ... Graeco nomine a ceteris discernuntur, appellatae ia et ab his ianthina vestis* [The purple violets... are distinguished from the others by a Greek name. They are called *ia*. The *ianthina vestis* gets its name from them]; NH 21.64: *viola ... quae ion appellatur et purpurea* [The violet ... which is called *ion* and ‘purple violet’].

105 Cf. B 11 p. 423.

106 Strab. 15.3.19 p. 734 C.: ἱμάτιον ... πορφυροῦν ἢ ἰάνθινον [a purple or violet cloak]; Plin. NH 21.27 (n. 99); Mart. 2.39.1.

***carinarii (510c) – *carinum**

The last group of dyers are the so-called **carinarii* (sc. *infectores*).¹⁰⁷ The designation is attested only here and is another comic invention. It derives from the expression **carinum* (sc. *vestimentum*), which does not denote a colour, but designates a maroon garment. Like the other terms, we should not generalize the **carinarius* in translation. Hence the meaning should not be not ‘one who dyes brown’ (OLD), but ‘a dyer who is specialized in the garment that is called *carinum*.’ The adjective **caryinus* (καρύινος) is a Greek loanword. The colour it denotes was probably that of the chestnut.¹⁰⁸ As has been stated above, the author (speaking of **carinarii*) uses the word in a slightly corrupted form (*carinus* vs. *caryinus*), the letter Y being missing.¹⁰⁹ That is also the spelling we find in the *Epidicus* (234). The parallel makes it very likely that the author was directly inspired by this play.

In conclusion, we can say that specialized guilds of **crocotarii*, **flammearii*, **violarii*, and **carinarii* did not exist in Rome. They existed only in the comic creativity of the author and later in the fantasy of scholars.¹¹⁰

5.4.5 The fifth group (511/521)

The catalogue slowly begins to dissolve in the verses after the dyers. A ‘rational’ structure based on theme or occupation can no longer be made out. It seems that the section is tied together with nothing more than the alliteration of the words **manulearii*, *myrothecarii*, and *mala crux*.

manulearii* (511a) – *manuleus/manuleata

The **manulearius* is also a fictitious profession. The difficulty of the explanation is already obvious in the dictionaries, where the **manulearii* are alternatively defined as ‘makers of long sleeves’ (Georges) or as ‘manufacturer of long-sleeved tunics’ (OLD). As with many other terms in the catalogue, ‘reality’ is less important to solving this question than the principles of comic word formation. In case of **manulearius*, it is difficult to decide whether the ‘profession’ is based on the word *manuleus* (sleeve, glove) or on the expression *manuleata* (sc. *tunica*)—which is equivalent to the Greek

¹⁰⁷ Nonius pp. 869.30, 882.29 L. twice has the form *cariarii*, differing from the manuscripts of Plautus. The letter N in him probably fell victim to an abbreviation.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. B 11 p. 419.

¹⁰⁹ The correct spelling is attested several times in Pliny.

¹¹⁰ The same applies to the profession of the **cerinarii* (“dyers of wax coloured garments”), which is found in Marquardt/Mau (1886) 506, 584. This craft owes its birth to a conjecture in the text of Plautus proposed by Bapista Pius (1500), which was subsequently accepted by many scholars, cf. Lambinus (1576) 178 ad loc.

expression χιτῶν χειριδωτός and designates a tunic with sleeves.¹¹¹ Looking back to the example of the **limbolarii*, the derivation of the word from *manuleus* (sleeve) may be slightly preferable because the joke would then be more pointed: A niche specialist for sleeves is completely absurd. In the end, the question of what exactly the **manulearii* produced is largely academic since the **manulearius* is a comic word formation.

****myrotheciarrii* (511b) – *myrothecium***

The text needs discussion at this point. Apart from the fact that v. 511 has been misplaced in our manuscripts, the transmitted composite noun **murobatharii* is nonsensical and must be corrected. The reasons for transposing the verse to this place have been given elsewhere. The following section only deals with the corrupt word **murobatharii*, although we will see that both problems are interrelated to some extent.

The emendation of **murobatharii* should start with keeping the meaningful components and rejecting the meaningless parts. We can therefore retain the beginning MYRO (*muro* = *myro*, Y being realized orthographically as either U or I in early texts) and the suffix *-arii* at the end. We only have to change the letters BATH in the middle. The sequence MURO is meaningful on its own. The suffix is also acceptable because all but one adjective in the catalogue end in it. The beginning shows that the ‘profession’ must have something to do with perfume because this is called μύρον in Greek. The Greek noun either never entered Latin or soon fell out of use, there being the common Latin word *unguentum* as an equivalent. It has, however, been preserved in some composite nouns beginning with MYRO—all of which are Greek loanwords. In the world of Plautus, the most notable is the *myropola* (seller of unguents or perfumes). Unfortunately, we cannot simply use it to fully replace the **murobatharii* in this verse since it does not fit metrically.

Let us start with the best existing solutions: **myrobrecharii* (Merula, in the *editio princeps* 1472) and **myrobaptarii* (Leo 1895). Both emendations are correct in focusing on the second part of the word, but they are not satisfactory as to content. Merula’s **myrobrecharii* is based on the adjective *myrobreches* (μυροβρεχής).¹¹² This is a Greek loanword meaning ‘wet with unguent.’ However, it is hard to see how a ‘sensible’ profession should come from it—even given our author’s low comedic standards. The same statement holds true for the word **myrobaptarii*. The Greek noun μυροβαπρία (there is no loanword in Latin) bears the meaning ‘the act of dipping into perfume,’ but there is also no ‘realistic’ profession we can connect with it. This means that we must look for something better.

The premise of both orthographical solutions is to keep as close as possible to the transmitted letters BATHARII. However, it has a flaw when we consider how the textual corruption possibly originated. To find out what could have happened, we must look

¹¹¹ B 1 pp. 257–261.

¹¹² LSJ s.v.

back to v. 513. In the manuscripts, it ends with the invented profession **diabatharii* (slightly misspelling the correct form *diabatharii*, with an additional R). The word **diabatharii* is very similar to **murobatharii* in terms of spelling, both words sharing the component BATHARII. If v. 513 preceded v. 511 in the archetype, it is easy to see how the mistake arose. The scribe's eyes must have leapt, causing him to erroneously repeat the end of a line. From *diabatharii*, the wrong component BATHARII was copied to MURO, obliterating the correct reading. This hypothesis may seem hazardous to those not familiar with textual criticism, but it is surprising how frequently this type of error occurred in the transmission of handwritten manuscripts. Assuming such a perpetuated error is to blame, we must change BATHARII to something more 'sensible' (at least in the context of a comedy). We should thus look for a meaningful composite noun beginning with MURO.

Of the Greek loanwords with MURO at the beginning, there is only one fitting as to metre and content: **myrothecarius*. The plural form, **myrothecarii*, is required in the context of the scene, where all of the petitioners come in groups. Like most designations of professions in the catalogue, it is a *hapax legomenon* formed according to the rules that guide word formation in this passage. Despite it being a hapax, we can understand its meaning through the Greek loanword *myrothecium* (μυροθήκιον) from which it derives.¹¹³ This designates a box where bottles of ointment and perfume were kept. Such boxes are attested as an article of daily use several times in Greek papyri. In Latin texts, a *myrothecium* is mentioned only once in a letter of Cicero—together with the *arcula* discussed above:

Cic. ad Att. 2.1.1

meus autem liber totum Isocratis myrothecium atque omnis eius discipulorum arculas ac non nihil etiam Aristotelia pigmenta consumpsit.

But my book has used up the entire *myrothecium* of Isocrates, all the *arculae* of his pupils, and also some Aristotelian colours.

Cicero is speaking about the rhetorical ornamentation he used in writing a monograph on his consulate. He compares the rhetorical embellishment to 'make up' contained in the 'boxes' of various masters of the art, especially of Isocrates and Aristoteles. It is very remarkable that we find the same two boxes in Cicero that we find in Plautus. A *myrothecium* is no garment, but as the mention of *arcula* in v. 519 shows, there are exceptions to this rule. Two different sections are then ended with a type of box: The *arcula* creates a pseudo-ending after the section on garments, and the *myrothecium* would end the additional section of dyes.

113 LSJ s.v.

Specialized **myrotheciarii*, producers of such boxes, should be considered a fictitious profession. They share this fate with almost all professions listed in catalogue of the *Aulularia*, or more precisely, those enumerated in its B-version.

5.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, many Roman garments, many professions, and even entire guilds have fallen victim to close textual analysis. Like with the *Epidicus*, we have a comic scene whose effects are entirely based on comic exaggeration of misogynistic stereotypes. In it, we do not find reality, but comic fantasy. Megadorus, the speaker of the soliloquy, is trying to stress that the financial risk of marrying an *uxor dotata* is that the husband cannot even imagine just how many different articles of clothing and accessories his wife might purchase. Being ignorant of the world of fashion and craftsmanship, it is overly dangerous to allow a demanding wife to go shopping. Who knows what debts she will incur? How should the husband even find out when there are so many niche professions? He can only anxiously wait for these petitioners to come out of the woodwork, so to speak, only increasing his financial uncertainty.

We have to admit that the seeming bounty of ‘historical’ professions is only a comic author showing his linguistic prowess. At the same time, this admission reveals new findings: We discover Plautus and an author adapting Plautus’ *Aulularia* for a rerun. We see how this unknown person was labouring to write a fine (and intentionally overly long) solo aria for an actor, consisting of a long catalogue (B) of dress dealers. The inventiveness of the ‘professions’ shows that he was no intellectual amateur. He knew his ‘Plautus’ (of course) and even had a Greek comedy at hand, which he tried to convert for his project. He faced many difficulties translating Greek composite nouns or creating completely new ones in Latin, a language not suited for them. All the while, he is trying to not appear as an author himself. He is hiding behind Plautus’ *persona* and hides his own traces by using some words of Plautus and by trying to write like him. Through him, we have some residue of literary history: an unknown Greek comedy and what must have been a catalogue of garments, similar to the catalogues still existent in other fragments. These new discoveries can perhaps compensate for the loss of the old (but unfortunately mistaken) ‘knowledge.’

