6 Plautus *Menaechmi* – a long robe (*palla*) and a travesty

6.1 Introduction

The following chapter concerns the *Menaechmi*, one of Plautus' best and most burlesque plays.[1] In contrast to the preceding two chapters on Plautus, this one is not about deciphering the wording on a microscopic level, but about describing some part of the dramatic plot of this comedy and about elucidating the nature of the garment that most prominently features in it: the *palla*. Up to now, research has always thought this *palla* to be a precious cloak.[2] In face of the evidence, however, this must be mistaken. The following argues for the hypothesis that (1) the term *palla* designates a long female robe ('*peplos*') worn on the skin as it does in many other places in Roman literature and that (2) the dramatic action of the play starts with a veritable travesty scene.[3]

The production date of the *Menaechmi* remains uncertain, though it is often dated to the nineties of the 2nd century BCE.[4] In contrast to other Plautine plays, there was no major reworking when the comedy was brought on stage again. Except for the prologue,[5]

1 Commentaries: Ussing (1880), Brix (1880), revised first by Niemeyer and then by Conrad (1929), Gratwick (1993); short introduction and select bibliography: J. Blänsdorf, art. Plautus, in: W. Suerbaum, Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike I (= HAW VIII.1), München 2002, 201–202; and in general: W. Steidle, Zur Komposition von Plautus' Menaechmi, RhM 114 (1971), 247–261; E. Stärk, Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original, Tübingen 1989; V. Masciadri, Die antike Verwechslungskomödie, Stuttgart 1996, 68–155; C. Questa, Sei letture Plautine. Aulularia. Casina. Menaechmi. Miles. Mostellaria. Pseudolus, Urbino 2004, 59–75; R. Raffaelli/A. Tontini, Lecturae Plautinae Sarsinates X. Menaechmi, Urbino 2007.

2 See, for example, Stärk (n. 1) 14: "Menaechmus E hat aus Überdruss an seiner reichen Gattin derselben einen Mantel, *palla*, gestohlen"; Questa (n. 1) 60: "un elegante mantello da signora (*palla*)", 70.

3 On other travesty scenes in Latin literature, cf. A 7 p. 155; A 10.

4 See on it Blänsdorf (n. 1) 202 (with further references). An allusion to the *Mostellaria* might suggest that the *Menaechmi* were written after it, cf. vv. 983–984 with Gratwick (1993) ad loc.

5 Cf. v. 3.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110711554-008

there are no verses that could be sensibly interpreted as actors' interpolations added in order to lengthen Plautus' text. The dialogues are very precise and to the point. There are no otiose repetitions as we find them in other plays, for example in the *Miles gloriosus*, but Plautus' literary mastery is always on full display. The comedy of an unknown Greek author on which the *Menaechmi* are based must have been a great work, and Plautus handled it with care when using it to create his funny Latin operetta.[6]

In short, the *Menaechmi* can be called a Comedy of Errors. The play is centred on the fate of two young twin brothers (*adulescentes*) who, by a whim of fate, even bear the same name, Menaechmus, and are constantly mistaken for one another. In addition to them, we find the usual personnel of a Palliata: a wife (*matrona*) constantly quarrelling with her husband Menaechmus I, a prostitute (*meretrix*) who is after his money, a *senex*, a parasite, a cook, a doctor, and a male and a female servant. They all know only one of the twins—mainly Menaechmus I, because Menaechmus II is a stranger to the country—and therefore mistake his brother for him. This leads to a chain of ten errors until the entanglement is dissolved at the end when both twins finally meet. Of course, the dramatic plot is not plausible in real life, but it works well within the literary framework. As in Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream, the actors (and the spectators) enter an enchanted world and only wake up at the end rubbing their eyes in wonder. Beyond the fun, the *Menaechmi* raise the question of what constitutes human identity, a question that remains with its readers when the immediate laughter is gone, and it makes the *Menaechmi* rank among the finest comedies European culture has ever produced.

In the *Menaechmi*, the garment called *palla* is important for the entire dramatic action.[7] It appears on stage and serves as a dramatic device in many acts. A short sketch of what happens to the garment will suffice for the present purpose. Originally, the *palla* belongs to the wife (*uxor*) of Menaechmus I. As we learn later on, it is a part of the regular wardrobe of a proper *matrona* a caring husband has to provide for. But Menaechmus I is no caring husband. He steals the *palla* from his wife and gives it to the prostitute Erotium for her sexual services. Erotium in turn gives it to Menaechmus II (mistaking him for Menaechmus I) in order to have the garment altered and embellished. However, the wife of Menaechmus I gets wind of the affair and orders her husband to restore her *palla* to her. He therefore tries to get it back from Erotium, who no longer possesses it. All this produces much funny despair. At the end of the play, the *palla* turns up again—in the hands of Menaechmus II. This again causes much confusion. As concerns dramatic technique, the *palla* is thus an important visual token so that the spectators can keep the otherwise identical twins apart. In the first act, it marks Menaechmus I, in the fifth act, it marks Menaechmus II. In his Comedy of Errors,

6 The question of the Greek source has vexed research for a long time, but to no avail. Stärk (n. 1) 134–146 argues that there was no Greek model.

7 Cf. also Questa (n. 1) 70–71.

Shakespeare skips the garment, but instead uses a chain as a similar distinguishing device.

6.2 The *palla* and the dramatic action

6.2.1 Act I, scene II (110–181)

The *palla* is most prominent in the first act,[8] and the three major scenes of the act focus on it. In act I, scene II, Menaechmus I (in the following only Menaechmus), one of the principal actors, makes his entrance. He is already expected by his parasite Peniculus. Menaechmus does not behave as a stern Roman husband (or even a Greek one) should. He enters on stage singing a solo aria, complaining about his wife and boasting that he has filched a *palla* from her in order to give it to the prostitute Erotium, who lives next door. Unlike the ancient Roman audience, we do not see how Menaechmus is dressed since there are no author's notes to help us. We have to infer it from the character's words and from what we generally know about dress.

The usual male costume on stage consists of a tunic and a *pallium* (cloak), and Menaechmus would likely be wearing these garments when leaving his house.[9] In addition, he tells us that he has stolen his wife's *palla* (v. 130), meaning it should be somewhere on his person. But where and how does he wear it? The commentaries are a bit evasive as to this point. Ussing thinks that Menaechmus is clad in the cloak, but does not comment on its exact nature or on the question of how Menaechmus could be dressed in two wrapped cloaks at the same time.[10] Brix/Niemeyer/Conrad seem to waver in how to imagine the scene.[11] Gratwick appears to be aware of the difficulty. He is also not very explicit about the problem, but seems to think that Menaechmus holds the *palla* in his hands (under the *pallium*).[12] Let us tackle this crucial question.

In the following exchange of words between Menaechmus and his parasite, we get the impression that Menaechmus' garb somehow looks strange. Menaechmus is in a playful mood. He speaks about the beautiful mythical young boys Ganymedes and Adonis and invites Peniculus to compare him to them:

vv. 143–146
M. *dic mi, enumquam tu vidisti tabulam pictam in pariete,*
ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum?

8 Cf. on it Stärk (n. 1) 66–75.
9 Cf., for example, Gratwick (1993) on vv. 110–137.
10 Ussing (1875) on v. 110: *meretricii enim pallam uxoris furto subreptam dono daturus erat, eamque, ne quis videret, ipse induerat suoque pallio tectam gerebat*.
11 See Brix/Niemeyer/Conrad (1929) on v. 130, 145, 196, 199.
12 Cf. Gratwick's comment on v. 196.

P. *saepe. sed quid istae picturae ad me attinent?* **M.** *age me aspice.*
ecquid adsimulo similiter? **P.** *Quis istest ornatus tuos?*

M. Tell me. Did you ever see a painted picture on the wall where an eagle abducted Ganymedes or Venus Adonis? **P.** Often, but how do these pictures matter to me? **M.** Come on. Look at me. Don't I look very much like them? **P.** What is this strange dress of yours?

How do we have to imagine the dramatic action? Menaechmus is dressed in a *pallium* so that his strange attire is not immediately apparent, but must be partially hidden under his cloak. He seems to direct Peniculus' view to it (*age aspice me*). It is only on closer inspection that the parasite gets the clue. He sees that Menaechmus is wearing a fancy attire, and his surprised question seems to imply that Menaechmus is wearing it on his person (*quis istest ornatus tuos*?).[13] As it will also appear more clearly later on, Ussing is right as to this point. Menaechmus is clad in his wife's *palla* instead of only carrying it.

The Roman audience, watching from a distance, had perhaps already wondered about what Menaechmus was getting at. The audience had been prepared for the following joke by Menaechmus' reference to Ganymedes (lat. *Catamitus*).[14] Ganymedes, the cupbearer of Zeus, is a beautiful boy (*puer delicatus*). He represents passive homosexuality—the English term 'catamite' goes back to the Latinized version of his name—and for effeminateness. It is a common trope in Latin literature that passive homosexuals like wearing female garments.[15] Hence, Menaechmus, wearing the *palla* of his wife, is implicitly compared to the mythical boy. The same idea is deepened and repeated in a more overt form in the third act when Peniculus recalls this scene to Menaechmus II (whom he mistakes for Menaechmus I). Being told that he has worn a female garment, Menaechmus II reacts harshly:

vv. 509–514
M. *neque hercle ego uxorem habeo neque ego Erotio*
dedi nec pallam surrupui. **P.** *satin sanus es?*
occisast haec res. non ego te indutum foras
exire vidi pallam? **M.** *vae capiti tuo.*
omnis cinaedos esse censes, tu quia es?
tun med indutum fuisse pallam praedicas?

M. By Hercules, I don't have a wife, and I don't have given a *palla* to Erotium, nor have I stolen it. **P.** You are mad. That crowns it all. Didn't I see you come out of the house dressed in a *palla*? **M.**

13 See also Brix/Niemeyer/Conrad (1929) on v. 146. Unfortunately, Gratwick does not comment on this line.

14 On the mythical comparisons, cf. E. Fraenkel, Plautinisches in Plautus, Berlin 1922, 75–76; Stärk (n. 1) 69.

15 Cf., for example, B 1 p. 256.

> You impertinent person! Do you think that all are fags only because you yourself are one? You contend that I have been dressed in a *palla*?

With great subtlety, Plautus exploits the comic action of the first act, which must have made a strong impression on the audience, by bringing it up again. At the same time, he varies the register of language and the perspective on the literary figures. Now it is Peniculus who looks mad by only imagining that Menaechmus has worn a female garb.

But what kind of dress is referred to by the term *palla*? As is shown in B 3, the word *palla* can designate two different garments: (1) a precious cloak and (2) a foot-long dress with shoulder straps ('*peplos*'). In this passage, all of the information squares well if we take *palla* in the second meaning and assume that Menaechmus is clad in a foot-long (female) robe. In contrast to a wrapped cloak, the long robe is something that is 'typically' feminine, and men are mocked elsewhere for wearing tunics that are too long[16] since length is the principal trait that defines female garb. As to the dramatic action in the original instance in act I, Menaechmus I may have simply pointed to his covered legs[17] (hence Peniculus' reaction). All of this is much more complicated if we take *palla* to be a second cloak that Menaechmus wears on his arms or under his own *pallium*.

The nature of the *palla* gets even clearer when we come to the next joke that is made about it. It is similar to a joke about a long tunic we find in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusai* in a famous travesty scene.[18] In both cases, the smell of the garment is exploited for a smutty gag. Here, Menaechmus invites Peniculus to smell the *palla*:

> vv. 166–170
> **M.** *Agedum odorare hanc quam ego habeo pallam. quid olet? apstines?*
> **P.** *Summum olfactare oportet vestimentum muliebre,*
> *nam ex istoc loco spurcatur nasum odore inlucido.*
> **M.** *Olfacta igitur hinc, Penicule. lepide ut fastidis.* **P.** *Decet.*
>
> **M.** Come on, smell on the *palla* that I have on! How does it smell? You do not want to? **P.** One should always smell on the upper part of a female garment. For from this part here the nose is stained by an unattractive odour. **M.** Well, then smell on this part, Peniculus. How fussy you are. **P.** As one should be.

Peniculus first refuses to smell the garment (*abstines* sc. *nasum*) because Menaechmus offers him the bottom part of the garment.[19] He excuses himself by saying that this part does not smell well, and one should rather use the upper part. Following his advice,

16 Cf. B 1 p. 256.
17 He may also have opened up his *pallium* at the front, cf. Brix/Niemeyer/Conrad (1929) on v. 145.
18 Cf. B 21 p. 502 and A 10 p. 203.
19 Against Gratwick (1993) on v. 166.

Menaechmus makes him smell that. As in Aristophanes, the joke must have something to do with the smell of the pubic area or the anus. Maybe the words were accompanied by some obscene action. Whatever it exactly was, it is clear from this that the word *palla* cannot refer to a cloak, but must refer to a long '*peplos*.' A cloak (a rectangular piece of cloth) does not have an upper and a lower part, and above all, it does not smell because it is not worn on the skin. In contrast, there is no problem if we assume the meaning '*peplos*.' Like the long tunic in Aristophanes' joke, it is worn directly on the body and has a distinctive shape. It can also acquire some smell. But let us see further and turn to the next scene.

6.2.2 Act I, scene III (182–218)

In the third scene, Peniculus and Menaechmus meet the prostitute Erotium, to whom Menaechmus wants to donate the *palla*. Again, the *palla* is not in the foreground at the beginning. It first comes into play when Peniculus jokes about Menaechmus' despising his wife, but at the same time wearing his wife's garment.[20] This all leads to a typically Plautine wordplay on *induviae* and *exuviae*.[21]

vv. 189–191
M. *ut ego uxorem, mea voluptas, ubi te aspicio, odi male.*
P. *interim nequis quin eius aliquid indutus sies.*
Erot. *quid hoc est?* **M.** *induviae tuae atque uxoris exuviae, rosa.*

M. How I hate my wife, my darling, when I see you. **P.** But at the same time you have to wear your wife's dress. **Erot.** What is this? **M.** Your new dress and my wife's ex-dress, my rose.

From Peniculus' words it is clear that Menaechmus is still dressed in the *palla*. The word *induere* is the usual word for garments that are put on over the head, whereas a cloak is usually said to be wrapped around the body.[22] It is also evident from the undressing that is going to follow. This gives occasion for a last joke:

vv. 196–199
M. *sustine hoc, Penicule. exuvias facere quas vovi volo.*
P. *cedo, sed obsecro hercle, salta sic cum palla postea.*
M. *ego saltabo? sanus hercle non es.* **P.** *egone an tu magis?*
si non saltas, exue igitur.

20 Brix/Niemeyer/Conrad (1929) ad loc. suppose that Peniculus opens up Menaechmus' *pallium* in order to show the *palla*, but this is not necessary. It suffices directing attention to Menaechmus' legs.
21 Cf. also A 4 p. 67 and M. Fontaine, Funny Words in Plautine Comedy, Oxford 2010, 76, 210.
22 Cf. C 1 p. 566.

> **M.** Hold this (sc. my cloak), Peniculus. I want to make the offering/striptease I have vowed to do. **P.** Pass it to me. But, by Hercules, please perform a dance like this in the *palla* later on. **M.** I shall dance? By Hercules, you are insane. **P.** Who is the more insane of us, you or I? If you do not dance, then put the garment off.

Again, we have to imagine what the spectators saw on stage. The dramatic action is not described in full (because it was visible) and thus involves reconstruction work. First, Menaechmus asks Peniculus to 'hold this' (*sustine hoc*).[23] We are not told what 'this' is, but since Menaechmus does not have something in his hands, the easiest solution is that the word *hoc* refers to his *pallium* (cloak). He removes it and hands it to Peniculus, who is prepared to receive it (*cedo*).[24] Menaechmus does this in order to have both hands free and to take off the *palla* that he wore underneath his *pallium*. It is the first time that the *palla* is seen in full, and Plautus uses this to insert a last joke. He makes Peniculus beg Menaechmus to dance in the long robe (*sic cum palla*) like a female dancer.[25] Dancing in a long dress again involves the insinuation of passive homosexuality. Plautus (adapting a Greek comedy) proves that this trope must already go back to Greek comedy. We find it first in the Hellenistic historian Duris of Samos, who tells us that the Macedonian commander Polysperchon dressed himself in a *crocota* (a long orange-red tunic) and Sicyonian shoes (B 30) when drunken and went about dancing.[26] In Latin literature, Cicero makes Clodius dress like a *psaltria* (a female fluteplayer), who also danced.[27] For this reason, it is no wonder that Menaechmus rejects Peniculus' wish as a mad proposal.

After this, there follows the undressing. In contrast to Aristophanes (see above), this is not commented on, and we are left with a blank space. It might have included some funny dramatic action. In any case, Menaechmus does not end up naked, but is dressed in his usual *tunica*. In v. 199, he starts handing the *palla* over to Erotium. He accompanies this act with some clownish boasting, comparing himself to Hercules.[28] Peniculus also comments on Menaechmus' behaviour (vv. 204–206). He stresses the great value of the garment and complains that great dress gifts lead men to financial ruin. Plautus thus makes him use a common trope we find in Greek comedy, Plautus, and

23 Cf. Ussing (1880) ad v. 196: *pallium meum, id enim parasito tradit, dum pallam, quam intus gerit, exuat*; Brix/Niemeyer/Conrad (1929): "*sustine*: halt einmal, *hoc*: deiktisch, das Pallium, das er eben ablegen will, um die darunter gezogene *palla* auszuziehen und der *amica* zu geben." Against Gratwick (1993) on v. 196.: "*sustine hoc*: sc. pallium; 'lift up my cloak', not entirely removing it, but revealing the stolen mantle."

24 Against Gratwick (1993) on v. 197: "*cedo* … 'give me it' (sc., the edge of the *pallium*)."

25 The deictic word *sic* might point to some lascivious gesture on Peniculus' part, cf. Fontaine (n. 20) 107.

26 FGrHist 76 F 12 (= Athen. 4.42 p. 155c): καὶ ἐνδυόμενον αὐτὸν (sc. Πολυσπέρχοντα) καὶ ὑποδούμενον Σικυώνια διατελεῖν ὀρχούμενον.

27 Cf. A 10 p. 204.

28 Cf. on it Fraenkel (n. 14) 10; Fontaine (n. 21) 45.

Lucretius.[29] After this, the travesty is over, and the focus shifts to the meal (*prandium*) Erotium is going to give her guests.

6.2.3 Act II, scene III (351–445), and act III, scene II (466–523)

In the following acts, the *palla* is less prominent than in the first. It is mentioned by Erotium in vv. 393–394 to Menaechmus II, whom she mistakes for Menaechmus I. There is no indication, such as a deictic word, that Erotium has brought the *palla* with her on stage, and she does not point to it in the ensuing discussion with Menaechmus II. In fact, this discussion makes even more sense if it is about things and persons Menaechmus II has never seen in his life. When Menaechmus II finally acquiesces to his new role as Menaechmus I, Erotium asks him to bring her new *palla* to the tailor:

> vv. 425–426
> **Erot.** *pallam illam, quam dudum dederas, ad phrygionem ut deferas,*
> *ut reconcinnetur atque ut opera addantur quae volo.*
>
> **Erot.** Please bring the *palla* you have given me a little while ago to the tailor, in order to have it fitted and to have added what I want at the same time.

It is not much that we hear about the *palla*. Nevertheless, it contains information further corroborating the hypothesis that the term *palla* does not designate a cloak in this play, but that it must refer to a long tailored robe. It seems evident that a cloak, which is basically a rectangular piece of cloth, does not need adapting (*reconcinnari*). In contrast, the words make sense in reference to a tailored garment that has to be adjusted to fit a new wearer. Moreover, adding stripes or other ornaments seems to be more in tune with tunics than with cloaks. And a tailor (*phrygio*)[30] is exactly the professional to do this.

At the end of the scene, Erotium and Menaechmus II enter Erotium's house. In act III, scene II, Menaechmus reappears with the *palla*. He is already expected by Peniculus, and it is through Peniculus' words that we know that Menaechmus II is bearing the *palla* in his hands (v. 469). In the following discussion about the *palla*, we find the deictic word (*istaec*, v. 508) that is missing in the preceding one between Erotium and Menaechmus II. Menaechmus' II reaction ('I am no passive homosexual') when Peniculus tells him that he had been dressed in the *palla* (vv. 509–515, see above) also makes it clear that he is not clad in the garment, but is carrying it in his hands. With Menaechmus II's exit from stage in v. 558, the *palla* disappears for some time. It

29 Cf. A 5 p. 88; A 11 p. 209.
30 On the term, cf. A 5 p. 93.

is, however, always present in mind, since it is repeatedly mentioned and looked for by Menaechmus I and the *matrona*.[31]

6.2.4 Act V, scene I (701–752), scene II (753–874), and scene IX (1060–1162)

In first scene of the fifth act (vv. 701–752), the *palla* reappears on stage. Menaechmus II is carrying it in his hands. The matron is glad to get back her *palla*, but, mistaking him for her husband Menaechmus I, starts chiding Menaechmus II at once:

vv. 705–709
Mat. *provisam quam mox vir meus redeat domum.*
sed eccum video. salva sum, pallam refert.
...
Mat. *adibo atque hominem accipiam quibus dictis meret.*
non te pudet prodire in conspectum meum,
flagitium hominis, cum istoc ornatu?

Mat. I will go out and see how soon my husband comes home. But there he is, I see him. I am saved. He brings back the *palla*. ... I will approach him and welcome him with the words he merits. You scoundrel, do you not feel ashamed to come into my view with these clothes?

We already know from the preceding scenes that Menaechmus II is not dressed in the *palla* (why should he?). The wording too makes this sufficiently clear. The matron says "*with* these clothes" (*cum istoc ornatu*) and not "*in* these clothes." In contrast, in v. 146, Peniculus' reaction to Menaechmus' I dress is different. He asks: "What is this strange dress of yours? (*Quis istest ornatus tuos?*). There may be some latent dress symbolism at this point, contrasting both twins. Menaechmus' I initial dressing in his wife's clothes could be taken to mean that he is in her power, while Menaechmus II, keeping off the woman's garments, is literally free. His complete freedom also appears in his response to the matron's rebukes. For he outrightly rejects them and contends (rightly) that he did not steal her belongings (vv. 729–733, 739–740). The scene also shows how the words we read rely on what spectators saw on stage. The unspecific term *ornatus* designates the *palla*, which in the following is mainly referred to by means of pronouns (*eandem*, *hanc*, vv. 730, 732). We have to imagine that both actors point at it in turn. The specific word *palla* is only used when the matron is summing up the charges she will bring up against Menaechmus before her father.

In the second scene, the matron's father, a *senex*, enters the stage. The action is somewhat repetitive at this point. Again, the matron complains, now towards her father, that Menaechmus II has stolen her belongings (803–807), and Menaechmus II rejects (vv. 813–814) her allegations. His behaviour is against all appearances, and so

31 Cf. vv. 563, 608–619, 645–660, 680–691.

the *senex* believes him to be mad. In consequence, interest in the *palla* fades out in the latter part of the scene, and the focus shifts to *Menaechmus* II's madness. At the end of the scene, Menaechmus II manages to get away to his ship.

He only returns on stage in the great finale, (vv. 1050–1162), when both twins meet and all riddles are solved. We do not learn at once what Menaechmus II's attire looks like, and it is only v. 1139 that indicates that the *palla* must still be with him. This is against all odds, but plausibility of the action is not among the primary objectives of the farcical *Menaechmi*. The last scene is about telling a complicated story in full, and the fortune of the *palla* forms a large part of it. So both twins, after their recognition, turn to the *palla* and again tell what all spectators already know:

vv. 1137–1142
M. I *namque edepol iussi hic mihi hodie prandium apparari*er,
clam meam uxorem, quoi pallam surrupui dudum domo;
eam dedi huic. **M. II** *Hanc dicis, frater, pallam, quam ego habeo?* **M. I** <*Haec east*>.
quo modo haec ad te pervenit? **M. II** *meretrix,* <*quae*> *huc ad prandium*
me abduxit, me sibi dedisse aiebat. prandi perbene,
potavi atque accubui scortum, pallam et aurum hoc <*abstuli*>.

M. I By Pollux, yes indeed, I begged her to prepare here a lunch for me today without the knowledge of my wife, from whom I had just stolen a *palla* from the house. I gave it to her. **M. II** My brother, are you talking about the *palla* that I have? **M. I** Exactly, that is it. How did it come into your possession? **M. II** The hetaera who led me hither to lunch told me that I had given it to her. I had a very good lunch, I had a drink, and I slept with the prostitute. And I received the *palla* and this golden jewellery.

The visual 'logic' of Plautus' *Menaechmi* requires that we see what we are told about. At the same time, the *palla* reminds us of the turbulent travesty scene with which the play started. The theft of the garment is essential to the plot, and so it is more than right that it should feature at its end. Roman comedy is much more 'physical' than we who only read the plays tend to imagine. The *palla* of the *Menaechmi* may remind us of that fact.

6.3 The *palla* in other Plautine comedies

The *palla* is also mentioned in three other Plautine comedies. In the *Aulularia*, the *Asinaria*, and the *Mostellaria*, it figures as a garment that is typical for rich wives (*uxores*).[32] In the *Epidicus* (A 4), which is about the dress of young *puellae*, it is missing. In the *Mostellaria*, we also find the motif that a hetaera is wearing a wife's dress. Even

32 Plaut. Aul. 168 (cf. A 5 p. 88); Asin. 885, 929–930, 935; Most. 282.

more intriguing is what we read about it in the *Asinaria*. In this play, an old husband who has fallen in love with a *meretrix* (his son's mistress) plans to rob his wife (*uxor dotata*) of a *palla* and to give it to the young woman.[33] However, he is overheard in this by his wife and is forced to 'confess his sins.'[34] It is interesting to see how the motif we know from the *Menaechmi* is varied in the *Asinaria*. In the *Menaechmi*, a young husband successfully filches a *palla* from his wife, whereas in the *Asinaria* a *senex* unsuccessfully plans to do this. It looks a bit as if both plays could be interrelated at this point and as if the *Menaechmi*, whose version is far more elaborate (including a travesty), exerted some influence on the *Asinaria*. However, this hypothesis stands in contrast to the traditional dating of both plays, which places the *Asinaria* in an early period of Plautus' work.[35] It is therefore best to leave the question open. All in all, the theft or loss of garments may have been literary motif that was more common in Roman comedies than is seen in the scarce remains that are left of it.[36]

6.4 Conclusion

The dramatic action of the *Menaechmi* and the information we find on the garment prove beyond doubt that the term *palla* in Plautus takes on the meaning 'foot-long female garment' ('*peplos*') as it does elsewhere in later texts. It is surprising that, contrary to all evidence, research has not found this for so long. Scholarly blindness certainly had to do with the established meaning of the word *palla*, which since the 15th century was thought to refer exclusively to a precious cloak. The modern 'traditional' meaning, once established, then blocked all other possible interpretations. In the case of Plautus' *Menaechmi*, it impeded understanding the first full-fledged travesty scene in Latin literature. To be fair, it was hidden to me as well for many years until very recently. In fact, I only discovered it while finishing the manuscript of this book. Suddenly, the dramatic action of the first act of the *Menaechmi*, a play that I have cherished for years, became visible to me in all its subtle art.

33 Cf. vv. 884–885: *Egon ut non domo uxori meae || subripiam in deliciis pallam quam habet, atque ad te deferam*! [How I would like to steal my wife's favourite *palla* from home and bring it to you!].

34 Cf. vv. 929–930: *Iam subrupuisti pallam, quam scorto dares*? || **Phil**. *Ecastor qui subrupturum pallam promisit tibi*. [Did you already steal my *palla* in order to give it to the slut? **Phil.** By Castor, he has promised that we would steal your *palla*].

35 On the dating of the *Asinaria*, cf. Hurka (2010) 27–28 in his commentary on this play.

36 See A 7 p. 150 on Titinius *Prilia* (or *Procilla*) F 5 R.^{2}, where a *pilatrix pallae* [female pilferer of a *palla*] is mentioned, and also Stärk (n. 1) 14; Hurka (2010) on Plaut. Asin. 884.

7 Roman Comedy – *The Shadow of Young Girls in Flower*

In contrast to Roman tragedy, references to female dress are more frequent in Roman comedy. This is mainly due to the differing conventions of the two genres. Comedy is about everyday life and its articles, whereas tragedy is about more noble figures like mythical kings and queens. In absolute reckoning, however, references to female dress in Roman comedy are still but few. With the exception of two passages in Plautus, this chapter will deal with evidence from lost plays (seventeen fragments). These give us at best a glimpse into female dress and beauty in a Graeco-Roman world long perished by now. Mirroring the mood of the author when in search of a lost time, the chapter is

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110711554-009

baptized with the melancholic subtitle *The Shadow of Young Girls in Flower*, slightly modifying a famous work title of Marcel Proust.

The chapter bridges the gap between the authors of the Pre-Classical and those of the Classical period, dealing with Roman comic drama in a time span of about a hundred and fifty years. It is structured according to the various subgenres of Roman comedy. First stands the Palliata (Naevius, Plautus, Caecilius, Turpilius), then follow the Togata (Titinius, Afranius, Atta), the Atellan farce (Novius), and finally the Mime (Laberius). These genres evolved over time, usually based on a previous form. For example, the Roman Mime is a later development of styles and motifs taken from earlier Roman comedy. The sequence of subgenres supplies the rough chronological framework for the chapter.

Even though the fragments are few in number, it is still possible to discern the changes that the motifs and scenes introduced in the Palliata underwent in the following subgenres: Beautiful women (*puellae*) enhance or conceal their charms by fine clothing; young men (*adulescentes*) fall in love with them; and old fathers (*senes*) worry that these females are no adequate partners for their sons (Turpilius, Novius). Occasionally the male lover, all too daring, disguises himself as a girl (Afranius). Respectable married women (*matronae*) complain that hetaeras (Latin *meretrices* or in modern parlance 'escorts') try to dress like them (Afranius, Atta). The literary motifs are similar throughout, but clothing in the Togata is associated with a clearer differentiation of social status than in the Palliata. The *ornatus* of the matron distinguishes her more strongly from the *meretrix* and the young girl. The Greek *palla* ('*peplos*') (B 2) is replaced by the Roman *vestis longa* or *stola* (B 4) as an insigne of married women's dress. Young unmarried girls sometimes also wear the so-called **supparus*, which might have been a typical Italian costume (D 5).

In contrast to Greek comedy, evidence on the topic of Roman comedy is only provided by very few sources. The fragments discussed in this chapter show that the file our knowledge depends on is very thin. Ten of the fragments are quoted by Nonius, three by Festus (Verrius), one by Gellius, and one by the so-called *Scholia Bobbiensia* on Cicero. One more fragment is quoted by Gellius and Nonius, and one by Festus and Nonius. This distribution roughly corresponds to that of the fragments of early Roman comedy as a whole. Almost two thirds of them are quoted by the Late Antique author Nonius, who may be called a 'sheep with a golden fleece.' However, Nonius' deficiencies as an archivist and scribe seen in other chapters are also a factor here. On the one hand, there are false explanations, misspellings, and misquotations that already go back to Nonius himself; on the other hand, there are errors due to our manuscripts of Nonius. In the case of some mistakes, it is even difficult to judge who was responsible for them. Was it Nonius or a later copyist of his work? Therefore, this chapter could just as well have been entitled *Studia Noniana*.

A modern edition of the fragments of Roman comedy in the quality of the *Poetae Comici Graeci* does not exist. The standard work is still Ribbeck's *Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, especially in its second (ed. maior, R. ^{2}1873) and third edition (ed.

minor, R. ³1898).[1] Ribbeck's work very much reflects the state of research achieved at his time. That is why his critical apparatus is now out of date. Therefore, Lindsay's two editions of Nonius and Festus (1903, 1913) always have to be consulted, which in most cases provide reliable information about the manuscript tradition.[2] Nevertheless, there was still much to be done as to the text of the respective fragments. In many cases, this chapter gives new editions differing from Ribbeck. Textual criticism has to come first to lay a basis for a correct historical understanding of the sources. As a rule, emendations by earlier scholars (from the time of the Renaissance on) are always discussed first to pay them due honour and to avoid the impression that new proposals are put forward rashly.[3] The passages which will be discussed over the course of this chapter are given below together with their respective English translations. They are then listed separately at the start of their respective section. The passages where a new form of the text is proposed—differing from previous editions—are marked by a plus sign (+). The translations aim to aid in understanding the texts and their cultural-dramatic context. The tenuous nature of our evidence should nevertheless always be kept in mind.

1. Naevius, Nautae F 1 (+)

> <*vest*>*em confec*<*tam*> *… nunc supparos* || *…* <*in*> *malam crucem.*
> a manufactured garment … now several **supparus* … go to be hanged

2. Plautus, Miles 789–792 (+)

> (A) *habeo eccillam meam clientam, meretricem adulescentulam.*
> (B) *sed quid ea usus est?* (A) *ut ad te eam iam deducas domum*
> *itaque eam huc ornatam adducas ex matronarum modo,*

1 Following the general practice, this chapter, if nothing else is noted, refers to Ribbeck's editio maior, which has a more detailed apparatus, although his editio minor offers a better text in several places. Compared to Ribbeck's editions, as already noted in the very critical reviews of the time, more recent editions of single subgenres or authors (Atellan farce: Frassinetti [1965], Mimus: Bonaria [1965]; Titinius and Atta: Guardì [1985]) do not represent any progress with regard to the text. Sometimes, like the edition of the Togata by Daviault (1981), they even fall behind Ribbeck's previously established critical standard. There are, as far as I see, only two exceptions from this rule: the edition of Turpilius by Rychlewska (1971) and the edition and commentary of Laberius by C. Panayotakis, Decimus Laberius, Cambridge 2010, which can serve as a kind of benchmarks for future undertakings.

2 On the editions, see also below pp. 148, 167; on Lindsay's edition of Festus, cf. D 5 p. 645.

3 The respective texts are often adduced as the basis for far-reaching historical hypotheses without any warnings as to the underlying difficulties. However, most of them are comprehensible only through the means of textual criticism and are usually printed with more or less extensive 'corrections.' In general, my interference begins where previous scholars seem to have gone wrong in their assumptions or where existing difficulties have been glossed over. My emendations deal with the transmission more conservatively than was done in preceding editions. They also always try to produce a text that is meaningful as to both literary topic and history.

capite compto, crinis vinctasque habeat adsimuletque se
tuam esse uxorem:

(A) Look, I have got a client of mine, a young *meretrix*. (B) What for? (A) Lead her now to your home and then back here dressed like a *matrona*, with headgear on, and she shall have her hair tied (with ribbons) and shall pretend to be || your wife.

3. Plautus, Poenulus 304

meretricem pudorem gerere magis decet quam purpuram.
A prostitute should rather 'wear' chastity than a *purpura*.

4. Caecilius, Pausimachus F 3 R. (Nonius) (+)

[*carbasina*] *molochina interula*
[made of cotton] a cotton undertunic

5. Caecilius, Synaristosae F 1 R. (Gellius, Nonius)

heri vero prospexisse eum se ex tegulis.
haec nuntiasse et flammeum expassum domi.

(he said) that he had seen him yesterday from the roof. The *flammeum*, which was exposed in the house, also gave notice of these things.

6. Sextus Turpilius, Hetaera F 1 R. (Nonius) (+)

ducit me secum. postquam ad aedem venimus,
veneratur deos. interea aspexit virginem
iniectam in capite reticulum indutam ostrina.

He took me with him. After we came to the temple, he prayed to the gods. While doing so, he saw a young girl who had put a hairnet on her head and was dressed in a crimson *tunica*.

7. Sextus Turpilius, Philopator F 13 R. (Nonius)

me miseram! quid agam? inter vias epistula excidit mi:
infelix inter tuniculam ac strofium conlocaram.

Oh, poor me! What can I do? On the way, I dropped the letter. Unlucky me, I had stuck it between my *tunica* and my belt.

8. Titinius, Fullonia F 14 R. (Festus) (+)

<sup>parum puni<ceum>
a **supparus* in crimson

9. Titinius, Procilla/Prilia F 5 R. (Nonius) (+)

qua ego hodie extorrem
domo hanc faciam, pilatricem pallae evallaro pulchre.
… in this way, I will ban this woman from my home and I will throw out this robber of a *palla* in fine style.

10. Afranius, Consobrini F 4 R. (Scholia Bob. ad Ciceronem) (+)

cum mitris calvaticis
with headscarves

11. Afranius, Epistula F 12 R. (Nonius + Festus)

tace!
puella non sum, supparo si induta sum?
Shut up! Am I not a girl since I am dressed in a **supparus*?

12. Afranius, Exceptus F 1 R. (Nonius)

(A) *meretrix cum veste longa?* (B) *peregrino in loco*
solent tutandi causa sese sumere.
(A) A hetaera in a *vestis longa*? (B) In a foreign place they commonly wear such clothes to protect themselves.

13. Afranius, Fratriae (Fratres?) F 13 R. (Nonius) (+)

mea nutrix, surge si vis, profer purpuram,
[*praeclavium contextus*]
My nurse, please get up, bring me the tunic with purple ornaments [A *praeclavium* is a woven fabric].

14. Afranius, Fratriae F 15 R. (Nonius) (+)

<…> *equidem prandere stantem nobiscum incinctum toga*
<I invite you> to have breakfast with us standing here, in the *toga*.

15. T. Quinctius Atta, Aquae caldae F 1 (Nonius) (+)

cum meretric<ul>ae lupantur nostro ornatu per vias
while little strumpets prostitute themselves on the street in our dress

16–17. Novius, Paedium F 4 + 3 R. (Nonius) (+)

(A) <...> *molliculam crocotam chiridotam reticulum,*
supparum purum Melitensem. (B) *interii, escam meram!*

(A) <She was wearing> a soft *crocota* with long sleeves, a hairnet, a **supparus*, pure Maltese stuff.
(B) I am doomed, a true bait!

18. Laberius F 2 R. (= F 40 Panayotakis) (Gellius)

induis capitium, tunicae pittacium <...>.
You put on a wrap (around the chest); <you tuck> the note into the *tunica*.

Palliata

The first genre discussed in this chapter are the *fabulae palliatae*. These are imitations of Hellenistic Greek comedies, sometimes coming close to a verbatim translation. At best, they show us real Roman life in a fractured manner, grafted as it were onto a Greek model. Reading them, it is therefore always necessary to think about which Greek words and matters might be at the bottom of the Latin text. This implies, as with Plautus, that cultural-historical inferences about Roman dress can only be drawn with utmost caution.

7.1 Naevius

Naevius, the earliest author of a Palliata to be listed here, twice mentioned the **supparus*. The term perhaps designated a kind of outer tunic (D 5), but scholars had difficulties identifying the garment already in Antiquity. Accordingly, we owe both fragments of Naevius to the grammarian Festus who quoted him in his dictionary in order to illustrate the meaning of the word **supparus*. Unfortunately, the text of Festus is in a bad shape in the respective section, and it needs much effort to extract sense from his words. Following an emendation of Scaliger, modern scholarship has attributed the first fragment to Naevius' epic poem *De bello Poenico*. However, as is argued in chapter D 5, Scaliger's conjecture is very unlikely, and we should rather assign the fragment (like the second) to a comedy. In any case, since everything of it is lost in a gap, the information we get from it is not more than that Naevius mentioned the **supparus* somewhere in his play.

Our situation is better (though only slightly) in the case of the second fragment. It comes from a comedy called *Nautae* (Sailors). In the form that has been restored by me, the text of it (probably the rest of two trochaic septenars) runs thus:

<vest >em confec<tam > … nunc supparos
… < in>malam crucem.
a manufactured garment … now several **supparus* … go to be hanged

The setting of the scene and the meaning of the words are discussed at length in chapter D 5. The dialogue seems to have evolved along the misogynistic trope that women are fond of fine clothing and demand all sorts of expensive dress articles from their partners.[4] It is likely that the words were uttered by a disillusioned husband. We cannot tell exactly what happened or who spoke to whom, but at the end some person was wished to go to hell.

7.2 Plautus

Apart from the two *loci classici* and the *Menaechmi* already dealt with in the chapters A 4–6, there are several references to specific female garments in Plautus. Almost all concern the *palla* or the *pallium*. As they do not contain any textual difficulty, they will be presented in part B. This space is reserved for the two references in Plautus that need more discussion. The first is about the headband (*vitta*). In the second, there is talk about purple clothing (*purpura*).

7.2.1 *Miles Gloriosus* 789–792

The female custom of fastening the hair with bands is referred to by Plautus in the *Miles Gloriosus*. It is thought to be the first Latin evidence for the word *vitta*. However, the text offers some difficulties and seems to be corrupted at the crucial point. The following argues that the expression *vittasque* (and headbands) should be emended to *vinctasque* (tied with), from *vincire*, to tie. The passage in question is about a hetaera dressing up as a matron. The general content of the passage is clear, keeping in mind the usual contrast between *matrona* and *meretrix*:[5]

(A) *habeo eccillam meam clientam, meretricem adulescentulam.*
(B) *sed quid ea usus est?* (A) *ut ad te eam iam deducas domum*
itaque eam huc ornatam adducas ex matronarum modo,

4 Cf. also A 4 p. 66; A 5 p. 88.
5 B 4 pp. 330–331; B 6 p. 367.

*capite compto, crinis vi**nc**tasque*[6] *habeat adsimuletque se*
tuam esse uxorem:

(A) Look, I have got a client of mine, a young *meretrix*. || (B) What for? (A) Lead her now to your home || and then back here dressed like a *matrona*, || with headgear on, and she shall have her hair tied (with ribbons) and shall pretend || to be your wife.

A prostitute is told to dress up like a regular wife (*ex matronarum modo*) and shall wear her hair like a matron would, tying it with hairbands. Nevertheless, the grammar of the transmitted text is not as easy as editors suggest. There is a change from the second person (*adducas*) to the third (*habeat, simulet*), indicating a change of grammatical subject. But where does the second part of the sentence begin, and to which part does the expression *capite compto* (with headgear) belong? In the transmitted form, the second part has to begin either before or after *capite compto* with the phrase *crinis vittasque habeat*. Wherever we make the division, there is a remarkable asyndeton, since either position would usually require a conjunction. But we also have to state a second anomaly. The expression *crinis vittasque habeat* (she shall have hair and hairbands) is very odd. As it stands, the object can only be interpreted as a hendiadyoin (= she shall have hair with hairbands). This stylistic feature, however, though suitable for high flown poetry, fits neither everyday language nor the literary genre of comedy.

Both problems are solved if we write *vinctasque* instead of *vittasque* and translate the expression *crinis vinctasque habeat* accordingly (and she shall wear her hair tied). First, the asyndeton is removed. The conjunction *que* is now forming part of a series of three *que* (and … and … and), by which one part of the sentence is added to the next. The language is not very polished. It keeps—as we should expect in comedy—rather close to normal language, the person speaking adding what comes up in his mind. Second, the expression *crines vinctas habeat*, in which *vinctas* is part of the predicate, is very easy as to its grammar. A parallel in connection with hair is found in Varro LL 7.44: *crines … quos habent velatos* (they have their hair veiled). In the cult regulations of Andania, we find a similar expression in Greek: μὴ ἐχέτω … τὰς τρίχας ἀνπεπλεγμένας (she shall not have her hairs bound up).[7] The verb *vincire* is also used by Propertius in connection with hair.[8] It semantically corresponds exactly to the Greek verb ἀναδέω,[9] which is frequently used with headbands. If this reasoning is correct, Plautus no longer offers the first evidence for the word *vitta* (the word would then be attested only from Varro onwards). That being said, the passage still refers to hair ornaments. Plautus is saying that matrons tied their hair in some special way.[10] However, his play is a Palliata,

6 *vittasque* codd.

7 IG V 1.1390.22 (= Syll.^{3} 736).

8 Prop. c. 4.11.34: *vinxit et acceptas altera vitta comas* [and another hairband received and bound her hairs].

9 LSJ s.v.

10 See also Plaut. Most. 226: *capiundas crines* [you should fasten your hairs].

which means it mirrors Roman customs only indirectly against the background of a Greek model.

7.2.2 *Poenulus* 304 and the topic of *purpura*

There are a several passages in Plautus about the *purpura*. *Poenulus* 304 paradigmatically illustrates the difficulties caused by this general term. The word *purpura* denotes purple, but its precise meaning is sometimes difficult to define. Although it often refers to purple-dyed cloth in general, it implies the notion of a specific garment or of a purple stripe in some cases.[11] As to women, the word *purpura* is used by Plautus several times in generalizing statements.[12] In *Poenulus* 304, we have the usual contrast between the attire of a *meretrix* and a *matrona*. The entire section (300–306) suffers from later intrusions or variants stressing its moralizing character. One of its verses (306) is even identical with Plautus' *Mostellaria* 291. However, the verse at hand is without blemish:

> *meretricem pudorem gerere magis decet quam purpuram*
> a prostitute should rather 'wear' chastity than *purpura*

The character speaking these words is a 'good' *meretrix*, a stock figure found in several comedies. In contrast to what prostitutes are regularly thought to do (see below), she claims that a *meretrix* should not wear purple clothes, attire usually reserved for a rich and respectable *matrona*. But what did a *purpura* look like? It is not, as we might imagine, a coat, but a *tunica*, and it is not a *tunica* made all of purple, but a *tunica* with purple stripes or ornaments sewn on it. In favour of this hypothesis, one has to say first that a coat entirely made of purple is all too costly and exceptional in daily life.[13] However, apart from the general reasoning, our evidence also points to this direction. In Plautus, *purpura*—like gold (*aurum*)—is listed several times as a separate item besides the *vestis*/*palla*. Both materials are regarded as a kind of ornament. Moreover, the Latin word *purpura* and the Greek πορφύρα for which it is a translation often denote a stripe sewn on a garment (*toga*, *tunica*).[14] In fact, both are used to denote such garments metonymically. For these reasons, the image that came to mind of the ancient spectator of Plautus and Afranius (see below) was very likely that of a *tunica* with purple stripes or trims.

---

11 OLD s.v. 3.

12 Plaut. Aul. 168: *eburata vehicula, pallas, purpuram* [carts adorned with ivory, *pallae*, *purpura*]; 500: *enim mihi quidem aequomst purpuram atque aurum dari* [it is appropriate for me to get purple and gold]; cf. A 5 p. 88; Plaut. Stich. 376: *lanam purpuramque multam* [much wool and purple]; Men. 121: *lanam, aurum, vestem, purpuram* [wool, gold, clothes, purple]; Most. 289: *pulchra mulier nuda erit quam purpurata pulchrior* [a beautiful woman will be more beautiful when naked than when clad in purple].

13 On possible restrictions as to its use, cf. A 1 and A 2.

14 OLD s.v. purpura 3 c and d; LSJ s.v. πορφύρα.

7.3 Caecilius Statius

The poet Caecilius Statius lived, if the ancient biography is to be trusted, about 230–168 BCE.[15] In the *diadoche* (succession) of the poets of the Palliata, he stands between Plautus and Terence, forming with them a triad that is often dealt with together in the history of Latin literature. In contrast to the plays of these authors, Caecilius' comedies have survived only in fragments. We know of a total of forty-two plays, of which only about three hundred verses are still extant. As to his literary model, Caecilius often used comedies of Menander. There are numerous play titles both poets have in common. Moreover, the grammarian Gellius makes a detailed comparison between the *Plocium* (necklace) of Caecilius and that of Menander, thus offering valuable information on how Caecilius used his model.[16] Judging by this example, Caecilius refrained from major changes and from *contaminatio* (combination of different sources).

7.3.1 *Pausimachus* F 3 R. – about Greek cotton underwear

The Greek model Caecilius used in his *Pausimachus* remains unknown. The play is preserved only through five quotations in Nonius. Its content was roughly this: There was a clever hetaera (*meretrix*) that made an imprudent young man (*adulescens*) fall in love with her (F 2). She seems to have been pleased with this new client: *libera essem || iam diu, habuissem ingenio si isto amatores mihi* (I would have been free long ago if I had had lovers with such a mind). The father of the young man (*senex*) apparently asks her to end her relationship with his son (F 4):[17] *hoc a te postulo || ne cum meo gnato posthac limassis caput* (I demand that you stop rubbing heads with my son from now on).

The garment at issue in F 3 must be that of the hetaera. The fragment contains the word *carbasinus* (made of linen) and is supposed to be the earliest Latin evidence for cotton. It is therefore often mentioned in cultural studies on Roman dress.[18] However, Caecilius' words cannot be taken to show when cotton was introduced in Rome, since he reproduces a Greek model at this point. This section argues that, at best, the *Pausi-*

15 Cf. in general Fr. Leo, Geschichte der römischen Literatur, Berlin 1913, 217–226; more recently DNP 2 (1997) s.v. Caecilius Statius, 895–897 (Blänsdorf); J. Blänsdorf, art. Caecilius, 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, 229–231; C. Riedweg, Menander in Rom. Beobachtungen zu Caecilius Statius Plocium fr. I (136–53 Guardì), Drama 2 (1993) 133—159; S. Boscherini, Norma e parola nelle commedie di Cecilio Stazio, SIFC 17 (1999), 99–115.

16 Gell. NA 2.23; Menander F 296–298 K.-A.

17 Cf. Guardì (1974) 158.

18 Marquardt/Mau (1886) 488; RE 3.2 (1899) s.v. carbasus, col. 1575 (F. Olck); more recently Sebesta in Sebesta/Bonfante (1994) 68.

machus gives us a glimpse of the Hellenistic Greek world, not the Roman world (see below). The word *carbasinus* is not to be attributed to Caecilius but should instead be seen as the comment of a later grammarian on the term *molochinus*.

In contrast to the impression caused by present editions, the text of F 3 is very problematic. It will take some time and patience to unravel. Unlike many others fragments, F 3 does not come from the 14th book of Nonius, which is about clothes in general (*De genere vestimentorum*), but instead from the 17th book called *De colore vestimentorum* (On the colour of clothing). This volume is very short and superficial. It causes the impression of being compiled even more hastily than the rest of Nonius' work. F 3 is quoted by Nonius under the lemma *molochinum*. He refers to the colour mallow (our modern *mauve*, a pale purple):

> Nonius p. 879.16–20 L.
> *molochinum, a graeco, color flori similis malvae. Caecilius Pausimacho* (138): *carbasina molochina*, †*amperita* (L: *amperinta* A^A: *amperina* B^AC^A). *Plautus in Aulularia* (514) *institores molochini coloris molocinarios appellavit.*
> *molochinum*, after the Greek word, a colour similar to the blossom of the mallow. Caecilius in his *Pausimachus* (see below). Plautus in his Aulularia called retailers of mallow colour *molocinarii*.

As usual, Nonius begins with his own definition and then gives some examples. These are provided by a verbatim quotation from Caecilius and a paraphrase referring to the comic catalogue in the *Aulularia* of Plautus (A 5). Nonius' explanation that the *molochinum* is a colour term is incorrect. In contrast to what he and some modern scholars thought, the word cannot denote a colour,[19] as the content of the Greek equivalent μολόχινος shows (see below). It must instead refer to some type of cloth. The Plautine **molochinarii* then are merchants who trade with such fabric (not with the colour), the word being altogether a comical coinage.[20]

The last word of Caecilius F 3 is obviously corrupt and has been transmitted in different orthographical variants: *amperita* L, *amperinta* A^A, *amperina* B^AC^A. Editors following Michael Bentinus (1526)[21] usually emend it to *ampelina*, after the Greek

19 Cf. the dictionaries: ThLL VIII s.v. *molochinus* col. 1387.33–56: "*fere i.q. e malva factus*," where Nonius' explanation is rejected, and OLD s.v. *molochinus*: "(prob.) made of mallow fibres" against Warmington (1935); E. F. Leon, Molochina and a Fragment of Caecilius, TAPhA 84 (1953), 176–180; Guardì (1974) 158; Sebesta in Sebesta/Bonfante (1994) 67 ("*molocinarii* … dyers of mauve"); R. B. Goldman, Color-terms in Social and Cultural Context in Ancient Rome, Piscataway, NJ 2013, 27, 31.

20 Cf. A 5 p. 97.

21 Bentinus printed his conjecture in the text of his edition of the *Cornucopiae* of Nicolaus Perotti (1526) 1432.36. In his commentary (*Castigationes*) on the edition, he does not comment on this. In addition to Ribbeck, cf. Caecilius, Pausimachus F 4 Bothe (1824) = F 4 L. Spengel (1829) = Caecilius F 127 Warmington (1935): "dresses of flax, mauve and wine–hued"; = Caecilius, Pausimachus F 3 Guardì (1974): "vesti fatte di lino, del color di malva, del color di vite."

adjective ἀμπέλινος.[22] However, the adjective has no parallel in ancient Latin literature. Although, in later times, Juvenal once has ***xer**ampelinus*,[23] Bentinus' suggestion causes some doubt for the following reasons: Why should Nonius have missed writing about such an interesting colour in his book *De colore vestimentorum*? More important still, restoring *ampelina*, we have to cancel the letter T in *amperita* offered by important textual witnesses (by A^A and by L, the manuscript usually closest to the archetype of Nonius).

To get an idea of what Caecilius might have written, one should keep in mind the content of the *Pausimachus* and the kind of women who appear in comedy in general. The fragment is about the clothing of a young woman or a *meretrix*.[24] It is too short to reconstruct the exact plot in detail, but, in analogy to other comedies (for example the *Epidicus* of Plautus), it might well belong to a scene where a *meretrix* is dressing or where a male is describing her beautiful dress (B 4).[25]

Another difficulty in understanding Nonius' entry is that in contrast to other descriptions, a noun is missing to which the adjectives *carbasina* and *molochina* refer. This could be hidden in the meaningless letters AMPERI(N)TA. Since Codex L[26] and the group of manuscripts A^A are closest to the archetype, this sequence should be taken as a starting point for further conjecture. The word *interula* (undertunic or inner tunic) would factually and orthographically fit as a dress term. This is not found in archaic texts, but is used twice by the archaist Apuleius.[27] The undertunic, often called *subucula*, is a normal item of female clothing.[28] An *interula* will fit very well with the adjective *molochina* (of cotton). The origin of the error could be explained as follows: Setting aside the first AM (which may be a variant of the ending of the preceding word), the abbreviation for UL in the sequence AMPERINTA was not resolved correctly. The INT, possibly written above the line, were inserted afterwards into the text at the wrong place. This veritable anagram may seem a rather hazardous guess, but a chaos like this is found elsewhere in the manuscripts of Nonius. As we will see later on in this and other chapters,[29] the abbreviation of the letters UL and mistaken transpositions of letters have sometimes caused errors, either of Nonius himself (who misunderstood

22 Georges s.v. "vom Weinstock"; OLD s.v. "vine-coloured or made of wine leaves"; ThLL I s.v. col. 1978.11–13. The entry only refers to the Greek adjective, but gives no other meaning. On the meaning of (*xer*)*ampelinus*, cf. B 11 p. 423.

23 Iuven. 6.519: *xerampelinas veteres* (sc. *vestes*) [old clothes in the colour of dry vine leaves]; the colour term *ampelinus* is found only in late antiquity, cf. ThLL in n. 22.

24 Warmington (1935): "dress of a courtesan."

25 The parallel to the *Epidicus* was already observed by Salmasius (1620) 357 in his edition of the *Historia Augusta*.

26 Cf. on this codex Lindsay's introduction to Nonius p. XIX.

27 Apul. Met. 8.9: *discissa interula* [an *interula* that was torn apart]; flor. 9: *tunicam interulam tenuissimo textu* [a *tunica interula* made of very thin cloth].

28 Cf. B 1 p. 261.

29 See below p. 166 and D 4 p. 628.

his own notes) or of later scribes who did not copy the text correctly. In a first step, we should thus read *carbasina molochina interula*. Considering the ending AM for now at the beginning of the sequence, we should put the whole line into the accusative because dress is mainly referred to as an object. This gives us *carbasinam molochinam interulam*.

But is this already what Caecilius wrote? Before answering this question, we must first find out what the adjectives *carbasinus* and *molochinus* mean and how they relate to each other. The word *carbasinus* is easy to translate. It derives from the noun *carbasus* (κάρπασος), which refers both to cotton and, especially in non-technical language, to linen.[30] In contrast, the exact meaning of the adjective *molochinus* (μολόχινος), used in Latin only once,[31] is more difficult to determine. It is a Greek loanword and derives from the noun *moloche* (μολόχη or μαλάχη), which usually denotes the common mallow.[32] The evidence in Greek for the adjective μολόχινος is also rare, but in the first century CE *Periplus Maris Erythraei* (a description of the Red Sea), we hear of cloth made of this plant fibre.[33] But what type of Malvaceae is referred to by *molochinus*? Marquardt/Mau thought it to be the common mallow (*malva sylvestris*),[34] as is suggested by the common usage of the noun *moloche*/*malva*. But this type is (and was) only used as medicine and as food.[35] However, it should be noted that mallow and cotton are quite similar plants. Today, they are both labelled as *malvaceae*. Cotton therefore fits in perfectly with clothes, especially with underwear (*interula*).[36] The slight broadening of meaning is easily explained. While the common mallow was cultivated of old in the Greek world, cotton came—as among other sources the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* shows—from the Orient and was introduced to the West only after the conquest of Alexander the Great (356–323 BCE). We may thus assume that a foreign product was first named by the Greeks with a name from their own world.

If this reasoning is right, the adjectives *carbasinus* and *molochinus* are synonyms. This causes a problem concerning the expression *carbasina molochina interula* since both adjectives cannot refer to *interula* at the same time. This would produce a tautology—a cotton undertunic made of cotton. Even if we take *carbasinus* to mean 'made of linen,' it must refer to a second garment. However, an elaborate chiastic word order (x *carbasina*, *molochina* y) does not seem plausible, given the type of scene the

30 RE 3.2 (1899) s.v. carbasus, col. 1572–1574 (F. Olck).

31 Cf. also D 4 p. 629.

32 OLD s.v. *moloche*. The Greek loanword is found in Latin language very rarely, which has for it the noun *malva* (mallow).

33 LSJ s.v. μολόχινα, μολόχινος ὀθόνιον, μολόχιναι σινδόνες.

34 Marquardt/Mau (1886) 491; Blümner I (1912) 200.

35 RE 14.1 (1928) s.v. Malve, col. 922–927 (A. Steier).

36 It is not expedient to derive the term from μαλάκιον , which is found in Aristophanes in a catalogue of female ornaments and garments (F 332.10 K.–A.) because we have no firm knowledge of it either. The definitions given by scholars of the Imperial period are very probably only conjectures.

quotation is taken from.[37] It is also very unlikely that Nonius should not have included a further garment in his book on clothing if he had found it mentioned in his source. Therefore, the riddle should be solved in another way. We must start again from the proposition that *carbasinus* and *molochinus* are synonyms, an expected occurrence in the work of an ancient grammarian seeking definitions. The Greek loanword *molochinus* was a difficult term, even for grammarians. It seems very likely that it was explained by the common word *carbasinus*. The explanation was then erroneously combined with the gloss explained by it. Nonius occasionally used annotated editions and other intermediate sources.[38] This was also the case with Caecilius' comedies, which Nonius did not know firsthand.[39] Nonius may have copied an entry from a handbook without due diligence. These changes lead to Caecilius' fragment comprising only two words. It should be edited as follows:

> [*carbasinam*] *molochinam interulam*
> [made of cotton] a cotton tunic

Caecilius wrote a *Palliata*, necessitating a search for his Greek model. In early Greek comedy and Aristophanes (fifth century BCE), we do not read about cotton garments, because cotton was still not in use at that time. Instead, Aristophanes in his *Lysistrata* makes a woman talk about ἀμόργινα χιτώνια (chemises from Amorgos), referring to fine underwear.[40] The literary motif thus goes back to Classical times. Similarly, the orator Aeschines mentions a woman who produced ἀμόργινα and sold ἔργα λεπτά (fine and thin clothes) on the market.[41] An *interula* comes very close to such a χιτώνιον. Caecilius maybe found something like the iambic expression μολόχινον χιτώνιον in the Greek model that he adapted in his *Pausimachus*. It was a Hellenistic comedy since it mentioned a fibre which had only shortly come into use in Greece with the conquest of Alexander the Great: cotton.

Taken all together, this means that we should discard the passage as evidence for Roman cultural customs, odd textile fibres and special colours, finding in it instead a cotton undertunic, later commonly called *subucula* among the Romans.

37 The difficulty is also felt in the translation of Warmington (1935) 127 "dresses of flaxe, mauve and vinehued."

38 Lindsay's introduction p. XV–XVI.

39 The presumed first evidence for the word *carbasinus* thus belongs to a later time.

40 Aristoph. Lys. 150.

41 Aeschin. 1.97.

7.3.2 *Synaristosae* F 1 R. – the *flammeum*

The respective verses, quoted by Gellius and (with an omission) by Nonius, are from Caecilius' *Synaristosae* (Women who have a luncheon together).[42] They are the only remains of this Palliata, but we roughly know what it was about. The title shows us that Caecilius had reworked in Latin a lost comedy of Menander with the same name.[43] Menander's play had already been used by Plautus in his *Cistellaria*, and this is what allows us to both reconstruct the outlines of Menander' play and to interpret Caecilius' verses with some confidence. In the *Cistellaria*, we find a pair of lovers. For dramatic convenience, they live in adjacent houses. Remember the famous Ovidian couple Pyramus and Thisbe! But the girl is a hetaera (and only later turns out to be a citizen), and this makes for the social drama. She does not qualify for a marriage, and the mutual love is impeded by many obstacles. Plautus' *Cistellaria*, following its Greek model, starts at a point of crisis: The lover is forced by his parents to marry another woman and wants to commit suicide.

But let us turn to Caecilius. He appears to have used a section of Menander's comedy that had been omitted by Plautus. However, his verses fit in well within the framework of the *Cistellaria*. As Süss (1935) has pointed out, they must belong to the exposition scene.[44] In Plautus, the heroine tells other hetaerae (real ones) she is breakfasting with the sad news: Her lover is about to marry another woman. And this is the situation we also find in Caecilius:[45]

> *heri vero prospexisse eum se ex tegulis.*
> *haec nuntiasse et flammeum expassum domi.*
>
> (he said) that he had seen him yesterday from the roof. The *flammeum*, which was exposed in the house, also gave notice of these things.

The heroine, whose name is unknown to us, obviously got to know of the imminent wedding by some other person (very likely a male slave) since she is reporting his words. He had looked—like Sceledrus in Plautus' *Miles*—from the roof in his neighbour's house and had spotted the bridegroom to be (*eum*) and the preparations for the wedding. The grammar of the second verse allows for several possibilities. Probably, *haec* is the grammatical object to *nuntiasse*, and the following *et* is equivalent in sense to *etiam* (also).[46] In this case, the pronoun *haec* refers back to the wedding that must have been mentioned before, and the *flammeum*, the yellow wedding scarf, is the sign that

42 Gellius NA 15.15.2; Nonius p. 589.17–18 L.: *heri vero prospexisse* <…> *eum* <…> *expassum domi*. It is a fine example of what kinds of omissions we have to reckon in Nonius.

43 On Menander's Συναριστῶσαι, cf. F 335–344 K.-A. with introduction.

44 W. Süss, Zur Cistellaria des Plautus, RhM 84 (1935), 186–187.

45 Gellius NA 15.15.2: *nuntiasse et* De Buxis (1469): *nuntiasset* codd.

46 Against K. K. Hersch, The Roman Wedding, Cambridge 2010, 95 n. 133.

indicates that the wedding is going to take place soon. It has been exhibited to view in the atrium of the house (*expassum domi*). Caecilius adapts the Greek comedy scene to the world of his Roman audience by introducing a Roman dress custom unknown in the Greek world. We also learn some interesting detail about the *flammeum* (B 18): It was exposed before the bride put it on and served as a visible sign in the household. This in turn shows, among other things, that the *flammeum* was probably a scarf (*palliolum*) and not a smaller headscarf or veil.

7.4 Terence

The Palliatae of the poet Terence (195/185–159 BCE), from whom we have six entire plays, contain no mentions of any specific female garment. There is one general reference to the custom of young women tying their breasts with a *fascia*.[47]

7.5 Turpilius

The *floruit* of Turpilius was in the time of the Gracchi.[48] Turpilius' death is dated by Jerome in his *Chronic* to the year 104/103 BCE.[49] He is the last in the series of poets of Palliatae of whom we know more than the mere name. Again, Nonius is our most valuable source. We have about 140 fragments of Turpilius and know thirteen play titles, all transmitted by Nonius. The titles are all Greek loanwords and show us that Turpilius followed authors of the Greek New Comedy as did Terence.[50]

7.5.1 *Hetaera* F 1 R. (= F 1 Rychlewska)

A somewhat longer fragment containing a description of a garment comes from Turpilius' Palliata with the title *Hetaera*.[51] We know this play only through eleven quotations provided by Nonius. The metre of F 1 is the iambic senarius. It could thus have been taken from the prologue. The dramatic situation in which the words were spoken was probably as follows: A slave (*servus*) reports what happened to his young master (*ad-*

47 B 22 p. 509.

48 The best introduction to the author is given by Rychlewska (1971) VII–XXXIX; see also Bardon (n. 12) 135–138; J. Blänsdorf, art. Sex. Turpilius, in: Suerbaum (n. 15), 258–259. On the *praenomen* Sextus that goes back only to the Renaissance scholar Petrus Crinitus, see Rychlewska loc. cit. The notice has escaped Blänsdorf. There this fact is not even mentioned.

49 Hier. chron. p. 148.15–16 Helm: *Turpilius comicus senex admodum Sinuessae moritur* [the comic playwright Turpilius dies at a rather high age in Sinuessa].

50 For the fragments, the excellent edition by Rychlewska (1971) should be consulted.

51 This was also the title of a *fabula Atellana* of Novius (see below).

ulescens). When praying in a temple, he saw a beautiful woman. This was very likely the woman who gave the play its title (*hetaera*).[52] The *adulescens* falls in love with her at once, as it happens, for example, to a young man in a comedy by Menander with the title *Phasma*.[53] In F 2, the slave goes on: *erus stupidus adstat, ita eius aspectus repens || cor torporavit homini amore* (My master stood there stupidly. So her sudden sight stunned his heart through love).

Let us turn to F 1 now. The edition and interpretation of it raises numerous difficulties. These are discussed in detail in chapter D 4 (**rica*).[54] In my version, which differs significantly from the traditional one established by Carrion (1583), the text reads as follows:[55]

> *ducit me secum. postquam ad aedem venimus,*
> *veneratur deos. interea aspexit virginem*
> *iniectam in capite reticulum, indutam ostrina.*
>
> He led me with him. After we came to the temple, || he prayed to the gods. On that occasion, he saw a young girl || who had put a hairnet on her head and was wearing a crimson tunic.

Turpilius, or rather the speaker of the words, focuses on two garments of the young woman (*virgo*). Over her hair, she has thrown (*iniecta*) a hairnet (*reticulum*, B 12). Greek and Roman women could wear this kind of headdress in different forms in everyday life.[56] It appears often in comedy. The hairnet (κεκρύφαλος) is mentioned several times by Aristophanes and other playwrights,[57] and a play of Menander got its title from it.[58] In addition, the girl is wearing a *tunica* (*chiton*) (B 1), which is metonymically called *ostrina* after its colour (as with the *purpura*). This is the colour of the *tunica* that Cynthia

52 L. Carrion, Emendationes et observationes, Paris 1583, vol. 1 p. 5; recently Rychleswka (1973) on F 1 and her introduction p. XV. If F 3 (*Rhodiensist, sed istuc conmigravit iam diu* [she is from Rhodes, but moved here a long time ago]) refers to the *hetaera*, her life resembled that of Chrysis in the *Andria* of Terence, cf. esp. vv. 69–70*: interea mulier quaedam abhinc triennium || ex Andro commigravit huc viciniae*] [in the meantime a certain woman moved here from Andros into the neighbourhood three years ago], and that of Moschis in the *Exceptus* of Afranius (see below).

53 Rychleswka (1973) on F 1.

54 See pp. 634–636.

55 Difficulties arise above all in v. 3, which has been transmitted in two different forms (*instantem*, *iniectam*) by Nonius. The variant could be due to the fact that Nonius excerpted Turpilius not only directly, but also took up quotations of him from other sources, cf. Rychlewska (1971) XXXVI. At the centre of the problem is the misunderstanding of the gloss **riculam*. This is probably a corruption of the word *reticulum* (= hairnet), cf. D 4 p. 636.

56 IG II² 1522.18, 1523.195–196 with Cleland (2005) 118.

57 Aristoph. Thesm. 138, 257 (with Austin/Olson [2004]); Aristoph. F 332.6 K.-A.; Antiphanes F 115, 187 K.-A.; Eupolis F 170 K.-A.

58 Menander F 208–217 K.-A.

wears on festive occasions.[59] In a similar way, the young girl described by Turpilius clad herself in festive attire when visiting the temple.

The specific shade denoted by *ostrinus* is difficult to determine.[60] The adjective (scanned here, if transmission of the text is correct, with a short I)[61] is attested only rarely.[62] It derives from the Latin noun *ostrum*. This word denotes either the colour or the dye extracted from a certain type of aquatic snails (commonly called 'purple'), or a garment of that colour.[63] However, the shade of 'purple' could vary between purple in its proper sense and carmine red. The erotic content of our evidence suggests that we should rather think of this type of dark red. This colour is more appropriate for an erotic situation than a regal purple. This means that the word *ostrinus* is probably to be regarded as synonymous to the adjectives *puniceus* or *coccinus*.[64] The Greek word that Turpilius translated with *ostrina* (sc. *tunica*) is likely to be φοινικίς (*puniceus*), which also designates a dark red robe.[65]

In general, it should be noted that carmine red is a signal colour that had a double social connotation in the eyes of the ancient observer.[66] On the one hand, as a red shade, it was an erotic colour. On the other hand, it was the colour of insignia and is therefore associated with 'exquisiteness.'[67] Thus, the young woman (*virgo*) is not presented as a vulgar person. She is wearing an attractive but also dignified dark red *tunica*.

7.5.2 *Philopator* F 13 R. (= F 13 Rychlewska)

Another fragment of Turpilius in which a piece of clothing is mentioned comes from a comedy entitled *Philopator* (Loving one's father). Like many others, this play is known

59 Prop. 2.29.25–26: *non illa formosior umquam || visa, neque ostrina cum fuit in tunica* [she never seemed more beautiful to me, not even when she was dressed in a crimson tunic].

60 See B 11 p. 440.

61 In Properz, it is measured with a long I. Ribbeck's transposition thus seems very attractive.

62 Rychlewska (1973) on F 1. The evidence shows that the adjective is a fancy word used by authors to display their erudition.

63 ThLL IX s.v. *ostrum* col. 1161.27–1163.16; OLD s.v. *ostrum*. The Greek word ὄστρειον originally denoted an oyster or some kind of sea snail, see LSJ s.v. The fact that the purple was extracted from it led to the transfer of meaning, see Vitruvius 7.5.8: *quod ex concharum marinarum testis eximitur, ideo ostrum est vocitatum* [because it is extracted from the shell of the purple snails, it is called *ostrum*]. For the the terminology and the technical process, see ThLL IX s.v. *ostrum*; Blümner I (1912) 233–248.

64 The translation in the dictionaries (Georges "purpurn"; OLD "purple") should be modified accordingly.

65 LSJ s. v. φοινικίς. In contrast, the Greek adjective ὀστρέϊνος in Classical times does not denote a colour but means 'living in a shell.' See, however, POxy 109.5 (3rd-4th century BCE): ὀστρῖνος (= *ostrinus*).

66 See B 11 p. 436.

67 ThLL IX s.v. *coccus* col. 1162.6–7: "*plerumque insigne est condicionis alicuius nobilioris*."

to us only through Nonius, who gives us a total of thirteen fragments. Greek comedies of the same name were written by Antiphanes (fourth century BCE) and Poseidippos (third century BCE). Turpilius maybe used the play of Antiphanes as a model.[68] The plot cannot be reconstructed with certainty. It was about a forbidden love and a resulting pregnancy (F 3): *disperii misera! uterum cruciatur mihi* (Poor me, I am lost! My womb is giving me pain). In connection with the love affair, a letter is lost. This was deplored in F 13:[69]

> *me miseram! quid agam? inter vias epistula excidit mi!*
> *infelix inter tuniculam ac strofium conlocaram.*
>
> Oh, poor me! What am I going to do? I have lost the letter on the way. || Unlucky me, I had stuck it between my *tunica* and my belt.

The despair shown by the female speaker about the loss of the letter is great. This can be seen from the sentence structure and the choice of words (*misera*, *infelix*).[70] The letter in question was a billet-doux carried on the body by a young girl or, more likely, a female servant. She had put the letter between her short tunic (*tunicula*, χιτώνιον)—this is a garment typical for a female servant—and her belt/cord (*strophium*, στρόφιον).[71] There are two parallels for the motif of the lost letter in comic Latin literature: in a mime (*mimus*) of Laberius (see below) and in Ovid's *Ars amatoria*.[72] In F 13, the letter was found by a third person.[73] It is very likely that this resulted in dramatic consequences.[74]

Taken together, the fragments of Palliata contain mentions of six specific female articles of clothing: a **supparus*, a carmine red tunica (*ostrina*), a short tunic (*tunicula*), an undertunic (*interula*) made of cotton, a hairnet (*reticulum*), and a belt/cord (*strophium*). There is also a reference to tying the breasts (with a *fascia*). This brings us to the next genre, the Togata.

---

68 Rychlewska (1973) pp. X–XI; Antiphanes F 220 K.-A.

69 Cf. Nonius p. 863.9–10 L. Rychleswka (1971) rightly preserves the tradition and produces two iambic septenaries, as do Buecheler and Lindsay. For the use of this metre in Turpilius, see Rychlewska, p. XVIII; for abbreviated forms (*conlocaram*) p. XXV. Earlier editors, as Bothe (1824), P. Grautoff, Turpilii comoediarum reliquiae, Diss. Bonn 1853, Ribbeck^{2+3}, restored two iambic octonaries (v. 1: *mihi*; v. 2 *conlocaveram*). In v. 2, against Grautoff and Ribbeck^{2} (differently R.^{3}) hiatus before *ac* is permissible, since we have a middle caesura, cf. Rychlewska (1971) p. XVIII.

70 On the stylistic device of the exclamatio in Turpilius, see Rychlewska (1971) XXXI.

71 See B 21 p. 500.

72 Cf. B 22 p. 508.

73 *Philopator* F 12: *simul cirumspectat: ubi praeter se neminem || videt esse, tollit aufert: ego clam consequor* [At the same time he/she looks around. As soon as he/she sees that no one is present except him/herself, he/she picks it up and carries it away. I secretly follow him/her]. Rychleswka (1971) ad loc. points out that there is a similar motif in the *Cistellaria* of Plautus 617ff. There, however, the servant loses a *cistella*.

74 See Ribbeck on the play *Philopator* in general: "*epistula amissa et ab alio clam sublata* (XII. XIII) *facile fieri potuit ut magni in res vel intricandas vel expediendas momenti esset*."

Togata

In contrast to the Palliata, the Togata is located in Roman-Italian everyday life.[75] Its fragments are therefore of particular value for Roman cultural history.[76] This also applies to the garments mentioned in the fragments. They show social distinctions by which Roman society was more strongly marked than Greek society. Among other things, we hear of a purple *tunica* worn by a young girl from the upper class as well as of the *vestis longa* of the Roman matrons. The literary description of everyday life nevertheless takes place along the lines established in the Palliata and thus in Greek New Comedy (at least indirectly). Dramatic plots and motifs remain similar, but small variations can be detected.

7.6 Titinius

Titinius is generally thought to be the earliest author of the Togata.[77] But his exact *floruit* is uncertain. Most scholars place it in the first half of the second century BCE. Although Titinius' dates of life cannot be established, he seems to have lived earlier than Afranius (second half second century BCE). We have titles of fifteen of his plays and about 125 fragments, most of which have been transmitted by Festus and by Nonius.[78] One of them concerns a female garment.

7.6.1 *Fullonia* F 14 R. (= F14 Daviault)

The Togata with the title *Fullonia* (A Fullers' story) is very important as regards Roman clothing.[79] A dispute between weavers (*textores*) and cloth manufacturers (*fullones*) seems to have been presented on stage.[80] We know little else about the plot. As in the

75 For an introduction to the genre, see Leo (n. 15) 374–384; E. Stärk, art. Togata, in: Suerbaum (n. 15), 259–261; J. T. Welsh, The Grammarian C. Iulius Romanus and the Fabula Togata, HSCPh 105 (2010), 255–285; id., The Dates of the Dramatists of the "Fabula Togata", HSCPh 106 (2011), 125–153.

76 For the Togata, the editions of Ribbeck are still to be consulted. The edition of Daviault (1981) has been reviewed very negatively by A. S. Gratwick, Gnomon 54 (1982), 725–733 and H.D. Jocelyn, CR 32 (1982), 154–157. It does not meet the standard of a modern critical edition.

77 Bardon I (n. 43) 39–43; Guardì (1985) 18–19; Stärk (n. 75) 261–262; most recently Welsh (n. 75) 126–138.

78 The fragments of Titinius and Atta were last edited separately by Guardì (1985). However, his edition does not bring any progress to the text compared to Ribbeck's, cf. the negative review by H. D. Jocelyn, Gnomom 58 (1986), 608–611.

79 On the title, cf. Leo (n. 15) 376 n. 1. It is very likely that the noun *fabula* is to be added to the adjective *Fullonia*; see also Guardì (1985) 110–112. On the transmission of this play in Nonius and in Festus, cf. Jocelyn (n. 78) 609.

80 Titinius, Fullonia F 4–10.

Menaechmi of Plautus, there is an *uxor dotata* who lives with her husband in mutual dislike.[81] In contrast to the housewife in Plautus, this woman is pretty and young. F 14 discussed here exemplarily shows all difficulties by which the understanding of fragmentary texts is impeded. It has been handed down in the dictionary of Festus under the lemma of the dress gloss **supparus*, the meaning of which was discussed extensively by ancient antiquarians. The shape of the **supparus* is uncertain. Perhaps it had the form of a *tunica*.[82] The section of Festus where Titinius is quoted is badly damaged in the Codex Farnesianus.[83] Although it is certain that the term **supparus* was mentioned in the *Fullonia*, we do not know exactly (1) which words were taken from Titinius, (2) whether he was quoted directly or only paraphrased by Festus in the traces that remain (*omne quod* <...> <*sup*>*parum puni*<...>),[84] (3) whether these words belong to Titinius at all or instead to Naevius, the author quoted next to him. At present, both the editors of Titinius and those of Naevius claim the remaining word *supparum* for their author.[85] As regards Naevius, following a conjecture of Joseph Scaliger (1575), the fragment is usually assigned to Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*, but Scaliger's guess is almost certainly not correct.[86] The form of the text will be discussed in detail later on. Chapter D 5 attributes the garment mentioned to the *Fullonia* of Titinius. In the version proposed there, the fragment reads as follows: <*sup*>*parum puni*<*ceum*> (*supparus* in *crimson*).

The term **supparus* indicates that F 14 is about the clothing of a woman, especially that of a young and attractive woman, because according to our other evidence a **supparus* is worn by this female group.[87] The same applies to the carmine red colour (*puniceus*, φοινίκεος). This shade is often used by young women and like its rare synonym *ostrinus*, it has an erotic signal effect.[88] In the *Fullonia*, this group is represented by the moody young wife. In F 3, her husband describes her appearance when he got to know her like this: *videram ego te virginem* || *formosam esse sponso* [*esse*] *superbam*, || *forma ferocem* (I had seen that you were a beautiful girl, haughty against your fiancé, wild because of your beauty).[89] In F 4, the woman herself seems to judge her beauty

81 F 1: *ego me mandatam meo viro male arbitror,* || *qui rem disperdit et meam dotem comest* [I think that I have been badly handed over to my husband, who wastes my fortune and squanders my dowry], F 3, F 6.

82 See D 5 p. 656.

83 Festus p. 406.8–21 L.

84 Ribbeck on Fullonia F 14: "*itaque de auctoris nomine non constat, nec verba* omne quod *decerni potest utrum grammatici sint an poetae*"; Guardì (1985) 121.

85 Titinius, Fullonia F 14 R.^{2}: *omne quod … supparum* = F 14 Guardì (1985); Naevius, Bellum Poenicum F 27 Marmorale: *supparus … parum punic … cat nevius*.

86 Cf. above p. 134.

87 Cf. D 5 p. 647.

88 Cf. above p. 146.

89 On the form of the text, see Leo (n. 15) 383 n. 1, who wants to find in it rests of a lyrical passage ("Jamben, Bakcheen, Reizianum"). In contrast, Ribbeck^2 tries to restore trochaics: *videram ego te*

likewise (F 5): *specta formam <meam> atque os contempla meum* (watch my handsome appearance, look at my face). A crimson *tunica* would go well with such a woman as it does with the *virgo formosa* described in Turpilius' *Hetaera* F 1.[90]

7.6.2 *Procilla/Prilia* F 5 R. (= F 12 Daviault)

The title of the play remains uncertain. The transmission variously offers *Prilla* (Festus) and *Proelia* and *Prilia* (Nonius).[91] In Priscianus, we also find *Proclia* as a variant.[92] The form of the title (ending in A) shows that it must refer to a woman or girl. *Prilla* and *Proelia* are senseless. *Prilia* could be based on a toponym, referring to the little Etruscan lake *Prilius* (Padule). It is often taken to mean 'The girl from lake Prilius,'[93] but this solution is not as easy as it seems.[94] There are several similar titles of plays of Titinius, like *Insubra* (The Insubrian woman), *Ferentinatis* (The woman from Ferentium), *Setina* (The woman from Setia), *Veliterna* (The woman from Velitrae). However, Setia (Sezzo), Ferentinum (Ferentino), and Velitrae (Velletri) are little towns, and the *Insubri* are a people of Cisalpine Gaul. The parallel is thus not exact, and one might well ask whether a small lake could denote the origin of a person. The names of the great Italian lakes, *lacus Benacus* (lake Garda), the *lacus Larius* (lake Como), and the *lacus Trasumennus* (lake Trasimeno) are not used in this way, and one may have some doubts as to the *lacus Prilius*. The codices of Nonius have both *Prilia* and *Proelia*, and there might be some further reaching corruption. Some play titles of Titinius are personal names (*Hortensius*, *Quintus*, *Varus*). Hence, *Perilla*,[95] *Pr<oc>illa*,[96] and *Pyrria*[97] have been suggested. We will never know for certain what the title was, but Ribbeck's *Procilla* seems to make the best of the corrupted transmission.

---

virginem || formosam, forma ferocem, <mihi> esse sponso <tuo> superbam; see, however, his self-criticism in Ribbeck[3]: "*temptata varia sunt, sed audaciora, cum a me tum ab aliis.*" On the different editions of Ribbeck in general, cf. Gratwick (n. 76) 730.

90 Cf. above p. 146.

91 Cf. *Prilla*: Festus p. 448.8 L.; Nonius p. 100.1 L. (*Proelia*), 145.2 (*Prilia*), 263.18 (*Proelia*), 426.30 (*Proelia*), 448.8 (Proelia), 558.6, (*Prilia, Proelia*), 597.2 (*Praelia*), 832.10 (*Prilia*). The apparatus criticus of Lindsay's edition of Nonius is unreliable and misleading. Lindsay sometimes corrects the transmission to *Prilia* without telling his readers. I have checked the references against the editions of Lucian Mueller and, as far as possible, against the new edition of Paolo Gatti et al.

92 Prisc. inst. 15.13, GL 3 p. 70.17–19 (*Prilia*, *Proclia*, *Proelia*).

93 Cf. Ribbeck[3] in his edition, who changed his views on the issue. In his second edition, he recommended *Procilla*; see also Daviault in his edition p. 111.

94 Cf. RE 6.2 A (1937) s.v. Titinnius, col. 1544 (St. Weinstock).

95 F. Corssen, Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der Lateinischen Sprache, vol. I, Leipzig [2]1868, 474.

96 For the reasons, see Ribbeck[2] on the play. He also restored the long form of the name (*Proculeia*) in F 4.

97 J. H. Neukirch, De Fabula Togata Romanorum, Leipzig 1833, 126.

It is impossible to reconstruct the plot of the entire play out of eleven short fragments, but we may confidently say that some theft happens. In F 5 (see below), we hear of a *pilatrix* (female robber) who is threatened to be banned from the house. Moreover, the Scholia of Pseudo-Acro on Horace tell us that Titinius in some play introduced a maidservant who has stolen a ball of wool and is detected.[98] This could be a reference to our play, although not all details square. In general, the quality of the scholia is very low, and they often give us only a shadow of reality.[99] They may have slightly distorted Titinius' plot to suit Horace's poem that refers to a drunken maidservant who has stolen some wool.[100] In any case, if F 5 is at the core of the play, the real or (supposed) theft and its consequences may have formed the backbone of the dramatic action. Was it a comedy about an innocent girl that was wrongly accused?

F 5 is transmitted in Nonius and needs some repair. The general run of the sentence is clear: Someone accuses a female person of having stolen something and threatens to ban her from the house. The form of the text I am going to argue for is this:[101]

> *qua ego hodie extorrem*
> *domo hanc faciam, pilatricem pallae evallaro pulchre.*
> … in this way, I will ban this woman from my home and I will throw out this robber of a *palla* in fine style.

Before discussing the emendations, let us see how far we get without them. The accused person is an *ancilla* because no one would throw his/her own daughter out of his/her house (nor would she steal something). The speaker has the power to do this. Hence, he must be either the *patronus* or his wife. For several reasons, however, it must be the *matrona*. In Roman comedy, no man ever would threaten a maidservant in this way. It is always the *uxor* that is getting angry and berates other people (especially her husband). We find this common trope also in Plautus' comedy *Menaechmi*, which has some other parallels with Titinius' play.[102] In addition, F 3 and F 6 of the *Procilla* perfectly fit with the hypothesis of a dominant and angry housewife. In F 3, we hear

98 Ps.-Acro ad Hor. epist. 1.13.14 p. 250.23–25 Keller (Γ′ bfV): *apud Titinium in quadam fabula inducitur ancilla, quae lanae glomus furatur et deprehenditur. … Pyrria autem nomen ancillae in fabula* [In Titinius, in some play a maidservant is brought onto the stage who steals a ball of wool and is caught red-handed. … In the play, the maidservant is called Pyrria].

99 Cf. on them, B 6 p. 367.

100 Hor. epist. 1.13.14: *ut vinosa glomus furtivae Pyrria lanae* [like the vinous Pyrria a ball of stolen wool].

101 *domo hanc* Radicke: *hanc domo* codd.; *pallae* Buecheler: *paliae codd.*; *evallaro* Radicke (*evallavero* iam Lipsius): *evallavito* codd.

102 See A 6.

about husbands who are subservient to their wives (*uxores dotatae*) because of their rich dowry,[103] and in F 6, a woman is said to be angry (*iracunda*).[104]

We can now turn to the details. There are several difficulties concerning the exact form of the texts, the interpunction, and the metre. The fragment has first been discussed by Justus Lipsius in his *Antiquae Lectiones* (1575) and his *Epistolicae Quaestiones* (1577).[105] His text has been reprinted by Daviault in his fragments of the *fabula togata* (1981). Lipsius indeed paved the way, though his solutions need some modification. Most important for the content is the sequence PALIAEVALLAVIT O PULCHRE, which Lipsius changed to *palli evallavero pulchre*. However, the garment that is at stake is very likely a *palla*, and not a *pallium*. The female *pallium* (cloak) is mentioned in comedy only rarely (B 2), while the *palla* (in the sense of long robe) (B 3) is the garment usually worn by matrons. In Plautus' *Menaechmi*, it is the *palla* that is stolen from a *matrona*, and it is very likely that Titinius used the same motif. We should hence follow Neukirch (1833) and Buecheler and write *pilatricem pallae*.

As to *evallavero*, Lipsius is certainly right in restoring the first person of the future perfect. But should we read *evallaro* or *evallavero*? There are two reasons suggesting that the contracted form *evallaro* is correct. For this, we must first make a detour into metrics. As regards the metre, Neukirch thought the verses to contain remains of trochaics and Buecheler (in Ribbeck^2) assumed them to be anapaests. However, their analyses imply some metrical licences. Other editors (like Daviault) are altogether reticent on this issue. There is, however, a better solution than those proposed. If we make a small change in word order, the second verse is a complete and perfect iambic septenarius, and the preceding words *qua ego hodie extorrem* are the end of one. Since errors in word order are common in Nonius, the metre should be restored accordingly. This solution necessitates changing the expression *hanc domo* to *domo hanc* and to reading the contracted form *evallaro* instead of the full form *evallavero*. But there is a second reason for reading *evallaro*. The lemma of Nonius offers the contracted form *evallaro*, too (later corrupted to *evallare*). This points to that Titinius had *evallaro* in his text, since Nonius usually takes up the form of his lemma from the sources he adduces. As elsewhere in Nonius, a variant, which was originally written (*ve*) above the text, probably intruded into the main text of his quotation of Titinius and caused the mess.

The first word of the fragment is *qua* (abl. sg. fem. of *qui*). Since Lipsius, all editors have found fault with it. The following argues that the transmission makes perfect sense. The discussion will lead us to a hypothesis on how we have to understand the sentence structure. But let us first look at what the other editors have to offer. Lipsius proposed

103 F 3 R.^{2} (= 2 Daviault): *verum enim dotibus deleniti ultro etiam uxoribus ancillantur* [for in truth, they get bewitched by the dowry and even by their own will become maidservants of their wives].

104 F 6 R.^{2} (= 11 Daviault): *date illi biber, iracunda haec est* [give her something to drink! She is angry].

105 J. Lipsius, Antiquarum lectionum commentarius, Antwerp 1575, V 22 p. 146, and Epistolicarum quaestionum libri V, Antwerp 1577, IV 20 p. 164.

reading *quia* (because); Bothe (1824) suggested correcting it to *quam*.[106] Both solutions have found adherents. Lipsius assumed that *quia* introduced a subordinate sentence ending with the word *palli* that would depend on the following *evallaro pulchre* as the main clause. He therefore put a comma before *evallaro*. However, the construction with a preceding causal clause is very awkward (especially in a lively speech). The parallelism in structure and content suggests that we should put a comma (as Ribbeck) after *faciam*. In this way, we get two parallel sentences: *extorrem hanc domo faciam* (I will ban her from my home), ***p**ilatricem **p**allae evallaro **p**ulchre* (I will expel the robber of my *palla* in fine style). The style suits the speaker. The matron is very angry. The alliteration underlines her excited angry state of mind. In her wrath, she is repeating the same thing in other words ("I will ban her; I will throw her out"). Lipsius' solution disturbs this natural flow of thought and should hence be excluded.

In a similar way, this holds true for Bothe's proposal *quam* (taken up by Ribbeck). Bothe thought this to be a relative pronoun (acc. sg. fem.) and made it the object of *extorrem faciam* (I will ban her). This is fine for itself, but causes a problem because we already have a grammatical object (*hanc*) in this clause. Bothe (and Ribbeck) therefore also changed *hanc* to *hac* in order to create the expression *hac domo* (from this house). As to method, this looks rather complicated. Moreover, the word *domo* is often used alone elsewhere in comedy in the meaning 'from my house.' For this reason, we should remember the lex Youtie ('*iuxta lacunam ne conieceris*') and look if we can do something with the transmitted *qua* (abl. sg. fem.). In theory, this can be either an interrogative pronoun (how?) or a relative pronoun (the manner in which). The interrogative pronoun (in direct questions) is quite rare, and so we should opt for the relative pronoun. Remember that we are dealing with a fragment! The sense of the sentence would then be: '… in which way I will expel her from my house.' We do not know what preceded. Perhaps it was simply something like 'that is the way in which … .' If we retain the transmitted *qua*, the adverb *pulchre* (in fine style) at the end of the sentence also makes good sense. We may paraphrase: 'That is the way how I will throw her out in fine style.' We do not know what preceded. All we can tell is that the matron is very angry. But was her wrath justified? If we believe her words, she is missing a valuable garment, a *palla*. If the scholia on Horace tell us the truth (see above), she might be exaggerating, and it was perhaps just a minor offence that caused her anger. The negative trope of the *uxor dotata* might point in this direction. But we will never know for certain what really happened.

106 Cf. F 2: *quam hodie hac domo pilatricem palli pulcre evallavero*. Bothe's text implies too many changes to be plausible.

7.7 Afranius

L. Afranius is the most important among the poets of the Togata.[107] About three hundred fragments and forty-three titles have been preserved of him. His life is to be dated approximately to the second half of the second century BCE.[108] A *terminus post quem* for his plays is perhaps provided by the comedies of Terentius (†159 BCE), which were much admired by Afranius. Apart from Terentius, Afranius used the Greek comic playwright Menander as a model, but he also drew on other Greek and Latin comedies.[109]

7.7.1 *Consobrini* F 4 R. (= F 4 Daviault)

The first fragment is taken from a comedy that is usually called *Consobrini* (male cousins). However, it has to be said that the title has only been transmitted in the ablative (*in consobrinis*). Editors usually choose the masculine form in analogy to a corresponding title of Menander (ἀνεψιοί, male cousins).[110] Perhaps Afranius—their argument goes—used Menander's play as a basis. We know that Afranius knew it because he seems to have also used it in another of his comedies, the *Vopiscus*.[111] Nevertheless, the question of gender must remain open. The ablative title could equally refer to female *consobrinae* (female cousins). This is even more likely, since many Togatae are named after female relatives.[112] For once, the fragment is not transmitted by Nonius (though he also mentions the play), but by the unknown learned scholiast on Cicero's speech *In Clodium et Curionem* (Against Clodius and Curio).[113] It is extremely short and runs as follows: *cum mitris calvaticis* (with headscarves).

The expression *mitra calvatica* denotes, if my explanation is correct,[114] a headscarf worn by Greek and Roman women of every age. The adjective *calvaticus*—to be spelled thus from *calva* (skull) and not, as editors usually do, *calauticus*—was perhaps added to the noun *mitra* to avoid confusion with other types of headdress likewise called *mitra*. In

107 Bardon (n. 12) 138–143; Stärk (n. 75) 263–264.

108 On his time of life date, see most recently Welsh (n. 75) 138–145.

109 Afranius, Compitalia F 1–2.

110 Menander F 57–62 K.-A.; for another example, see also Com. Adesp. 4 K.-A.

111 Afranius, Vopiscus F 3.2; see also the introduction and commentary on Menander Ἀνεψιοί F 1 K.-A.

112 For example, *gemina* (female twin) (Titinius), *martera/ae* (aunt/s) (Afranius, Atta), *nurus* (daughter in law) (Atta), *privigna* (step daughter) (Titinius), *socrus* (mother in law) (Atta), *sorores* (sisters) (Afranius). On the male side, in Latin there is only the *privignus* (step son) (Afranius). In Greek comedy too, gender varies in titles denoting a relationship. There are brothers (ἀδελφοί) (Menander), but also sisters (ἀδελφαί) (Antiphanes and others) and so on. For an overview, cf. Alkaios com. F 1 K.-A. However, for the title ἀνεψιά, the Greek equivalent to *consobrina*, is not attested.

113 Cf. on this speech, A 10.

114 See B 13 p. 462.

any case, the expression refers only to one and not to two different headdresses.[115] The context of the fragment is uncertain. Taking the hairnet (*reticulum*) and its occurrences in literature as an example, one may safely assume that the reference to the *mitra* was part of a more extensive description of the female costume mentioning at least one other garment. The plural further indicates that the statement was about several women. As the example of the *Epidicus* shows, this could have formed part of a collective description of young women.[116] However, it could also be about two individual women wearing this type of bonnet. Could these be two *consobrinae* and their headwear?

7.7.2 *Epistula* F 12 R. (= F 12 Daviault)

The second fragment of Afranius is found in a Togata called *Epistula* (Letter).[117] We have a total of nineteen fragments from it, which have all been transmitted by Festus and Nonius. F 12 is the only quotation that has been handed down to us twice, both in Festus and in Nonius.[118] A young man, as far as we can see, sneaks into the house of his sweetheart in female clothing[119] and is detected by the girl's mother.[120] Perhaps the encounter happens in front of his lover, who has to burst out laughing (F 15): *ego misera risu clandestino rumpier || torpere mater, amens ira fervere* (But I, poor me, had to burst with secret laughter; the mother was baffled; she was foaming with rage). F 12 is spoken either by the young man dressed in female clothing, who is discussing with the girl's mother, or, a bit more complicated, spoken by the girl herself reporting the scene to someone else:[121]

115 Against Daviault "avec des mitres et des coiffures à voile."

116 Plaut. Epid. 213–235.

117 Comedies with similar titles were written by Alexis (ἐπιστολή) F 81 K.-A.; Euthykles (ἄσωτοι ἢ ἐπιστολή) F 1 K.-A.; Machon (ἐπιστολή) F 2 K.-A.; Timokles (ἐπιστολαί) F 9–10 K.-A.; Caecilius (*epistula*) whose play may be based on the comedy of Alexis with the same title, cf. Alexis T 11 K.-A.

118 Festus p. 406.20–21 L.; Nonius p. 866.14–15 L. On the slightly diverging transmission, see D 5 p. 654.

119 A similar motif is perhaps found in Titinius inc. F 10: *feminina fabulare succrotilla vocula* [speak with a trembling female voice], see Leo (n. 15) 378.

120 See Ribbeck's introduction on the play: "*supparo indutus* (XII), *id est puellam mentiens* (XIV) *adulescens in amatae domum irrepsit, ubi sero nescio quibus turbis intercedentibus agnoscitur a matre irata. id enim narrat filia fr.* XV."

121 If Epistula F 1 relates to his outfit, he also wore sandals: *quis tu es ventoso in loco || soleatus, intempesta noctu sub Iove || aperto capite, silices cum findat gelus?* [Who are you in this windy place in sandals, in the dark night under the open sky with nothing on your head, although the cold splits the stones]. On this fragment and its possible connections with Menander, see P. G. McBrown, Two Notes on Menander's Misoumenos, ZPE 41 (1981) 25–26.

tace!
puella non sum, supparo si induta sum?[122]
Shut up! Am I not a girl since I am dressed in a **supparus*?

For Roman scholars, the word **supparus* was a gloss. It probably denoted, as passages like this show, a long dress worn exclusively by women and considered inappropriate for men. The motif of transvestism is already found in the *Thesmophoriazusai* of Aristophanes. There, *Mnesilochos*, disguised as a woman, unsuccessfully tries to take part in a meeting of Athenian ladies.[123]

7.7.3 *Exceptus* F 1 R. (= F 11 Daviault)

The third fragment from Afranius comes from a Togata with the title *Exceptus* (The Rescued Man). It is very important for the history of Roman dress. Fifteen pieces of the *Exceptus* have been preserved by Nonius altogether. Although the plot of the play cannot be reconstructed completely, various details are clear enough. A young man (*adulescens*) has been rescued from the sea by a fisherman. Perhaps he had attempted suicide out of unhappy love. In any case, a reconciliation with his sweetheart is brought about by the woman's intentionally dramatic lamenting for the allegedly deceased lover, knowing that he was listening to it (F 10–12).[124] A good hetaera (*meretrix*) named Moschis, who came from Naples, is somehow involved in the trick.[125] Judging by similar comic plots, she was not the lover herself, but a friend of hers. For example, in the *Andria* of Terence, the *meretrix* Chrysis is a friend of the blameless girl *Glycerium*. In his *Eunuchus*, the hetaera Thais is a friend of the girl Philumena. F 1 seems to refer to the clothing of the *meretrix*:

(A) *meretrix cum veste longa?* (B) *peregrino in loco*
solent tutandi causa sese sumere.

(A) A hetaera in a *vestis longa*? (B) In a foreign place they commonly wear such clothes to protect themselves.

122 On the rather rare 'causal' meaning of *si*, cf. KS II 427.

123 See A 10 p. 203; B 21 pp. 502–504.

124 On the plot, see Ribbeck: "*exceptus ex mari a piscatore* (IV–VIII) *fortasse amoris miseriis ad consilium mortem sibi contrahendi adactus fuerat. Potest autem amica eius fuisse Moschis, de qua* I–III, *quaeque, ut reconciliaret desperantem, quasi de mortuo viro lamentari subauscultante eodem simulaverit* (X–XII)."

125 See F 3: *ubi hice Moschis, quaeso, habet meretrix Neapolitis*? [Where does Moschis, the hetaera of Naples, live here?]. The fragment is quoted by Nonius p. 497.5–6 L. as evidence that *habere* can be used intransitively in the sense of *habitare*. For parallels, see Plaut. Aul. 5 (also quoted by Nonius): *qui hic habet*; Bacch. 114: *quid huc? qui istic habet*? Men. 69: *geminus, qui Syracusis habet*; Trin. 193: *ubi nunc adulescens habet*? 390: *haec sunt aedes, hic habet*.

The text contains a part of a dialogue.[126] Perhaps the context was as follows: Like in Terence's *Andria*, a man (from Naples?) has come to a foreign city in search of a girl and asks where the house of the *meretrix* Moschis is, since he knew her address.[127] As the preserved words show, this leads to a general conversation about how hetaeras dressed when not in their own city (*in peregrino loco*): They try to appear as decent women.[128] The fragment is very important for the history of Roman dress because it contains the earliest evidence for the Roman *vestis longa*,[129] the long dress generally associated with Roman matrons (B 4).[130] Thus, the fragment illustrates everyday Roman fashion and social categories, as it is to be expected in a Togata. In contrast, in the Palliata, matrons usually wear another garment, the *palla* (B 3). The fragment therefore illustrates that (1) the *vestis longa* was a real Roman female garment and that (2) it had clear social associations, since the fact that a *meretrix* was wearing one was noteworthy.

7.7.4 *Fratriae* (*Fratres*?) F 13 R. (= F 14 Daviault)

Afranius' comedy that is usually called *Fratriae* (Sisters-in-Law) is left to us through twenty-one fragments. Again, we owe almost all of them to Nonius.[131] The word *fratria* is rare and is otherwise only found in the dictionary of Festus/Paulus, who defines the meaning of the word as *uxor fratris* (a brother's wife).[132] In spite of the large number of fragments, a reconstruction of the plot has not yet been achieved, not even to a

126 On the interpunction, see Bothe (1824) on F 15: "*vulgo: – longa, peregr. etc. ut haec ab una persona pronuntientur; quod manifesto falsum: nam miranti cuidam, meretricem dici, quae veste longa seu stola induta sit, cum scorta veste succinctiore uterentur, ut monet Nonius, respondet alter, eo illam habitu prodire in publicum inter peregrinos, ne condicioni suae insultent*."

127 The situation of Moschis was probably similar to that of the 'good' hetaera Chrysis we meet in the *Andria* of Terence. Chrysis had left her homeland Andros out of necessity and had moved to Athens, where she first tried to lead a decent life (Andr. 75: *lana ac tela victum quaeritans* [trying to make a living with wool and loom]), but then slipped into prostitution. From the point of view of a male observer, her career is described thus (796–798): *in hac habitasse platea dictumst Chrysidem,* || *quae sese inhoneste optavit parere hic ditias* || *potius quam honeste in patria pauper viveret* [It was told to me that Chrysis lived in this street. She preferred obtaining wealth dishonourably rather than living honourably in modest circumstances in her native city].

128 In F 2, the behaviour of the prostitutes seems to have been further described: *consimili grassantur via, quibus hic est omnis cultus* [they behave very much like those who possess all esteem here].

129 The fragment is quoted by Nonius p. 868.7–10 L. without lemma referring to a specific dress term. This is singular in this book. The entry begins with the words *meretrices apud veteres subcinctiore veste utebantur* [in ancient times, prostitutes wore their dress more gathered up]. The remarks from Afranius are introduced to prove this point *e contrario*. It is not clear what prompted Nonius to unexpectedly insert the entire section. Perhaps he still had in mind the prostitutes' garb (*toga*) he had been talking about in the preceding section.

130 Cf. especially B 4 p. 330.

131 F 13 is preserved in both Nonius and Priscianus.

132 Festus p. 80.8 L.

small extent. This is partly due to the fact that none of the fragments fit in with the complicated title that seems to require at least two brothers with their respective wives. Before discussing the content of F 13, a new proposal as to reconstructing the plot will therefore be made.

First of all, our sources also refer to the play by the alternative title *Fratres*.[133] The plural of the Latin male term *frater* (brother) can also be used for siblings like a brother and sister. So far, the editors have chosen the title *Fratriae* as the *lectio difficilior*. A number of reasons, however, suggests that the title may have been *Fratres*. In the fragments, we do not find the slightest trace of two brothers and their wives (*fratriae*), while they fit perfectly with a brother and a sister. This is especially true of F 3, in which a person speaks scornfully or indignantly about the marriage of a young woman: *pistori nubat cur non scriblitario,* || *ut mittat fratris filio lucuntulos?* (Why shouldn't she marry a baker? In this way she could send cookies to her brother's son).[134] The connection between the marriage of a sister and the son of her brother (*filius fratris*) is very striking. It can best be explained if the play describes a close relationship between two siblings, as illustrated by the title *Fratres*.

The *Figurenkonstellation* (the *dramatis personae* and their relationships) resulting from the fragments would then be the following: The main characters are a sister and a brother who, like in the *Aulularia* of Plautus, suffer from their father's stinginess. They face various difficulties and, like in the *Adelphoe* (Brothers) of Terence, help each other; at least the sister supports her brother. Because of the father's stinginess, the sister is apparently to marry a man below her station (F 1–3); the brother could not

133 Nonius quotes the play mostly as *in fratris* (*fratri<bu>s*?) or *fratris*. Once he speaks of it as *fratres* and twice as *fratribus*. Priscian gives the title *in fratribus*, cf. J. H. Neukirch, De fabula togata, Leipzig 1833, 213. Starting with Ribbeck, the alternative title *Fratres* has been lost in research.

134 Nonius p. 191.25–26 L. The attribution of the words to one person, so Lipsius in his *Antiquarum lectionum commentarius* (1575) 47, Neukirch (1833) and Ribbeck, is preferable to the assumption of two speakers, as in Bothe (1824) and most recently Daviault (1981). Neukirch (1833) and Ribbeck put a question mark after *nubat* and thus create two questions. However, it is easier, so Lipsius (1575) 47, to refer the adjective *scribilitario* to *pistori* and to make the verse one single question. (1) *nubat* (*novat* codd.): Confusion of B and V is frequent in the manuscripts of Nonius. The obvious emendation of Lipsius is already found in the Codex G of Nonius. (2) *scribilitario*: The reading of the important manuscript L (*scribitario*) again shows the difficulty the syllable IL or UL caused in the transmission of Nonius. It reappears as a superfluous UL in the following misspelling *lic*[*ul*]*entulus* (= *lucuntulus*). For an overview of the different spellings of *scribilita*, see Leo on Plautus, Poenulus 43; on the formation LHS 188, 344; Walde/Hofmann s.v. However, it may be a Greek loanword, cf. Athen. 15.57 p. 647d: ἐκ τυροῦ δέ. φησί, γίνεται πλακουνηρὰ τάδε. ἔγχυτος, σκριβλίτης (corr. Casaubonus: σκριβαίτης A), σουβίτυλλος. (3) The correct spelling of the second biscuit is *lucuntulus*, deminutive of *lucuns*, see LHS 187; Walde/Hofmann s.v. In OLD s.v., the misleading reference to the variant *luculentaster* (Titinius F inc. 7) should be deleted, since it is an orthographic corruption of Nonius. Cf. also Athen. 14.57 p. 467d: λούκουντλοι. (4) The connection to F 2 is obvious due to its content: †*da* (codd.: *da<re>* Radicke: *det* Lipsius (1575): *dat* Bothe [1824]) *rustico nesciocui, vicino suo,* || *perpauperi, cui dicat dotis paululum* [to marry her to some farmer, his neighbour, a very poor man, to whom he can give very little dowry].

marry a beloved woman whom he has obviously already impregnated (F 3, F 6). He too is lacking money. In the end, of course, things turn out well. The money is somehow raised (F 7, F 9). At least the brother can take the beloved girl (*puella*) as his wife (F 11).[135] Apart from this, we do not know how the plot unfolds in detail, since much of the sister's fate remains in the dark. We hear of other standard characters, a nurse (*nutrix*) (F 13) and a slave (*servus*) (F 18).

A highly intriguing character is a woman bearing the allusive name of Castalia, who is called upon by the speaker, perhaps by the brother or a servant of his, to take an active part in the intrigue (F 7).[136] Castalia is a Greek name. The famous fountain on the poetic mountain Parnassus shares the same name. In general, this name would fit well with either a female servant or a hetaera (*meretrix*).[137] However, its artistic implications make it especially suitable for a hetaera, as is also shown by later parallels (Cynthia, Delia).[138] Since Castalia plays a leading role in the intrigue, she ws probably a good hetaera, playing a role similar to that of the hetaera we find, for example, in the *Miles Gloriosus* (The Braggard Soldier) of Plautus. Castalia perhaps uses her seductive tricks in the interest of the young hero by turning the head of his mean father.

We can now turn to the two fragments of the play (F 13 and F 15) that deal with articles of Roman clothing, either female or male. In F 13, the carelessness of Nonius (or some scribe) causes a difficult problem. The fragment of Afranius is quoted by Nonius under the lemma *praeclavium*. Stephanus (1564) and all editors after him consider the fragment to comprise two verses. In contrast, the following argues that the second

135 Nonius p. 257.34–35 L.: *curre et nuntia* || *venire <me> et mecum speratam adducere.* || *vide ut puellam curent, conforment iube* [Hurry and tell them that I am coming and bring the woman I hoped for. See that they take care of the girl; tell them to dress her up]. The word *me* that is the subject of the AcI is most likely to have fallen out. The correct version was restored by Lipsius (1575). As to the text, Ribbeck's 3rd edition should be consulted, where the exaggerations of his 2nd edition are revoked.

136 Nonius p. 482.17–18 L.: *<...> nunc vide hoc quo pacto ego aurum in medium proferam.* || *tu, Castalia, cogita, tu finge, fabricare uti libet* [Now see how I will raise the money. Castalia think about it, contrive something, devise something as you want]. *hoc* is to be taken with *aurum* (Ribbeck and Lindsay) or interpreted as *huc*. Apparently, the question of money had already been discussed.

137 F. Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit, Halle 1917, 567 (Καστάλια τὸ γένος Σύρα [Kastalia, Syrian by origin]); A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names I; III A, IV s.v. Καστᾰλία; II s.v. Καστάλιος. Ribbeck's scepticism concerning the transmitted name is inappropriate. It is unlikely that scribes would have come upon this relatively rare name, which is to be considered a *lectio difficilior*, instead of Bücheler's emendation *cavilla* or any one of the suggestions made by Ribbeck in the apparatus. Ribbeck's assertion that Greek names are suspect in the Togata is a *petitio principii* not backed by the evidence. One should rather remember the *meretrix* named with the Greek name Moschis (see above).

138 Daviault (1982) 187 thinks that *Castalia* could be a satiric nick name: "Cognomen satirique? Une servante … portée sur le vin … pourrait par antiphrase être appelée du nom d'une source d'eau pure." However, such an allusion does not seem likely given the name and the literary motif.

verse (given below) does not belong to Afranius, but is a comment of Nonius or some later scribe.[139] The fragment at issue runs as follows:

> *mea nutrix, surge si vis, profer purpuram,*
> [*praeclavium contextus*].
>
> My nurse, please get up, bring me the *purpura* [A *praeclavium* is a woven fabric].

The first verse is, as it stands, metrically without fault. If we put a line end after *purpuram*, as all editors do, it is an iambic senarius. It contains two twofold alliterations. As to its content, a trusted elderly female servant addressed after her former role as wet-nurse (*nutrix*) is asked politely (*si vis*) to bring a fine *tunica*, certainly from the laundry chest (*arca*) where such clothing was usually stored. The words are very likely spoken by the sister dressing up for an unknown occasion—maybe forming part of a dressing scene (common in comedy). She asks for a *purpura*. Female garments of or at least with this colour are mentioned elsewhere in comedy. As we have seen above (Plautus, Poenulus 304),[140] a *purpura* was not all purple, but had only a striking purple ornament, most likely a stripe or a border, that led to its name. The word *purpura* needs no further qualification by an adjective, but is clear in itself. Like *ostrina* (see above), it describes a well-known type of *tunica*. We should keep this in mind before turning to the second part of the fragment. In general, the reference to the *purpura* shows that the social status of the family is not low, since the sister can afford expensive clothes. A garment with such a purple ornament serves to indicate wealth and status, and it does not stress sexual attractiveness (unlike the carmine tunic of the girl in the temple). For this reason, the sister clearly does not dress up for a lover, but rather for paying an official visit to someone (for example a household of dignitaries) or, less likely, for receiving a visit from them. If this reconstruction of the plot is sound, she acts as her brother's emissary going to the house of his bride (F 10, 11, 14). Up to *purpuram*, the transmitted text itself is completely unproblematic.

Difficulties begin only with the next two words (*praeclavium contextus*). They are sufficiently clear for themselves. We do not know exactly what a *praeclavium* is, but since it has something to do with the *clavus* (stripe), it should be a kind of woven stripe or trimming that was sewn onto the front of the garment (*prae*). If we take *contextus* as a noun and make it a part of the predicate, we get the simple explanatory statement: *praeclavium contextus* <*est*> (a *praeclavium* is a woven textile). However, this statement does not fit in with the preceding context. Bothe ([2]1834) and Ribbeck (1873) therefore suggest changing the text either to *praeclavio contextam* (a *tunica* with a *praeclavium* woven onto it) or to *praeclavium contextumst* (a *praeclavium* is woven on it), taking *contextum*/*contextam* to be the PPP of *contexere* (OLD: to make

139 Nonius pp. 89.23–90.28 L.
140 Cf. p. 137.

by weaving, joining, etc., together). This implies multiple difficult ending changes. As to content, it produces a mistaken statement. A *clavus*,[141] though a woven piece of cloth, is sewn and not woven onto a *tunica*.[142] If we assume that a *clavus* was connected with the *tunica*, we would expect a compound of *suere* (to sew) and not of *texere* (to weave).[143] Moreover, it is hard to see why the *purpura* (which implies a purple ornament) should be qualified so meticulously in the given situation of speech. Similar scenes usually describe the garment with only a simple noun. For these reasons, Bothe's and Ribbeck's emendations are to be rejected, and we should look for another solution. We first have to turn to the question of why editors wanted to attribute the words to Afranius at any cost. Their rationale is that the fragment of Afranius is adduced by Nonius under the entry of *praeclavium* and hence must contain the word. However, this assumption is wrong. As can be seen in other cases, references in Nonius are not always to the point. Sometimes fragments quoted by him pertain to the topics discussed in the respective entry only superficially. This could well be the case here since a *purpura* may be regarded as a *tunica* with a (purple) *praeclavium*. Moreover, F 13 is only the second example adduced by Nonius, the first one also coming from Afranius. We may thus assume that both quotations taken from Afranius formed a kind of cluster in Nonius' notes. A similar process is to be seen in Nonius' entry **rica*.[144] In any case, connecting the words *praeclavium contextus* with the fragment of Afranius is overly complicated. An easier and more likely explanation is attributing them to Nonius or isolating them as a later intrusion into the text. No matter the final attribution, Nonius' F 13 of Afranius' *Fratriae* gives us the *purpura* as a definitively attested female Roman garment.

7.7.5 *Fratriae* (*Fratres*?) F 15 R. (= F 20 Daviault)

F 15 is often adduced in cultural histories. It is quoted by Nonius as evidence for his view that in primeval times Roman women also wore the *toga*.[145] Nonius is certainly wrong about this, since in the historical times to which the comedy of Afranius must refer, the *toga* was worn only by prostitutes of the lowest social status (*scorta*) (B 6). Moreover, the content of the fragment raises strong doubts about whether Nonius' version of F 15 is correct at all. The following argues that the words of F 15 refer to a

141 Cf. also A 1 p. 33.

142 This is shown by the first fragment (F 8) quoted by Nonius (p. 89.25 L.) from the *Omen* of Afranius as evidence for the meaning of the word: *tertium* (*totum* Buecheler apud Ribbeck) *diem praeclavium unum texere* [to weave (only) one *praeclavium* in three days]. Here a woman is probably rebuked for her low productivity.

143 Cf. Ulpian. Digest. 34.2.19.5: *clavi aurei et purpurae pars sunt vestimentorum, etsi non sunt clavi vestimentis consuti* [Golden *clavi* and purple ornaments are part of the clothing, even if the *clavi* are not actually sewn to the clothing].

144 Cf. D 4 p. 631.

145 Cf. C 2 p. 579.

man and that significant corruption took place during textual transmission. In the form handed down to us by the manuscripts, the text reads as follows:[146]

> <…> *equidem prandere stantem nobiscum incinctam togam*
> (for a translation, see below)

As to its text, F 15 presents two obvious problems.[147] The metre is a trochaic septenarius; a long syllable is thus required at the beginning. Yet the first syllable of the word *equidem* is short. To make up for the missing quantity, Lindsay in his edition of Nonius emends it to *et quidem*. This is also found in two isolated manuscripts (E and P), where it appears to be an attempt to restore a complete septenarius. The same may hold true for the mistaken *equidem*. Perhaps this really was Nonius' version, but it is not satisfying as regards Afranius. Let us now first look at *quidem*. The particle serves to emphasize the preceding word; the expression *et quidem* (and what is more) has no point in this position. Ribbeck therefore rightly marks a lacuna in his editions of Afranius. As his critical apparatus indicates, there is no easy solution for the problem. In any case, the words offered by F 15 could form part of an AcI with the accusative subject missing. There are then two ways of tackling the question: (1) adding the subject at the beginning of the verse. Because of metre and grammar, it must then be a pronoun like *te*, *me*, *eam*, *se*. Lucian Müller (1888) in his edition of Nonius added *se* (*me* is excluded in any case because of the following *nobiscum*, 'I with ourselves' being nonsense), but the result looks rather complicated. In this case, character A reports to C that a female B has invited herself to have lunch (*prandium*) with them (she says that she has lunch with us). However, this is an all too rude self-invitation if spoken by a female. We would also expect a future form of *prandere*. Adding *te* is much easier. In this case, A would either invite B directly: "It would be nice if you (*te*) have lunch with us (*nobiscum*)."

146 Nonius p. 867.35 L. Lindsay puts *toga*, a conjecture of Bothe, into the text and corrects unmetrical *equidem* to *et quidem*, as do some of the manuscripts. This shows the difficulties editors of Nonius have to face. Presumably, Nonius is responsible for the metrical and grammatical errors. From Ribbeck onwards, F 15 is thought to refer to the same context as F 14 (Nonius p. 103.29 L.): *dimittitit adsestricem, me ad sese vocat* [She dismisses her *assestrix* (the woman that sat at her side) and calls me to her]. However, the situation of F 14 seems to be different. Everything hinges on the correct interpretation of the word *assestrix* that is only attested here. Scholars since Bothe understand this in the sense of 'female counsellor, adviser', cf. Bothe (1824) on F 3: "*consiliatricem intelligam potius quam obstetricem cum quibusdam lexicographis*"; OLD s.v. 'fem. of assessor'. In F 6, however, there is talk of a pregnancy. The verb *assidere* is often used for persons who are sitting at the bed of some ill person, see OLD s.v. 1 c. The word *assestrix* may thus denote a nurse, cf. Neukirch (1833), in the literal sense of 'a woman that sits beside an ill person's bed.' It is then much easier to reconstruct the scene in this way: A female tells a male person how she was admitted to the bedroom of a pregnant woman. She sends her nurse away so that they can both talk undisturbed. This would fit in well with the plot of the comedy. Perhaps we are listening to the sister reporting to her brother. In any case, F 14 and F 15 do not form part of the same context.

147 Against Daviault (1981).

Another option is that B tells C about this: "They said: it is nice, if you (*te*) etc." Only the letter T would then have to be added (*<t>e quidem*). However, it is not necessary that the subject of the AcI stood in the transmitted verse. It could have been mentioned in the preceding line.

There is, however, an alternative solution: (2) supplementing *hic* at the beginning. First, there is no indication where the unusual *prandium* in full formal dress with cloak is going to take place. The local adverb *hic* (here, on stage, in front of the house) could well provide this. The particle *quidem* would then appropriately stress the place: "We may have lunch just here (*hic quidem*)." This is very much in tune with the rest of the sentence where the other particulars of the meeting are emphasized.

The second obvious difficulty is the form *togam*. The accusative cannot be correct. Numerous parallels show that the adjective *incinctus* (dressed in) always takes the *ablativus instrumentalis*.[148] For this reason, the accusative *togam* should be changed to the ablative *toga* as in Bothe (1824).[149]

But are all riddles of the text really solved with this? We still have to ask what the content and the possible context of the fragment are. The *prandium* (lunch) referred to is not a normal one.[150] Several unusual details are mentioned. The guests are supposed to take part in it while standing (*stantem*), and not, as usual, lying down at a table. The *toga* does not have to be taken off or changed for a more comfortable garment as usual. Presumably, the meal is to take place in front of the house—in view of spectators—, as may be stressed by *hic*. But this is not all. If the transmitted feminine form *incinctam* is correct, the invitation must be addressed to a woman. This woman cannot be an ordinary Roman woman, as Nonius claims, but must be a prostitute (B 6). She can be specified further as not an elegant hetaera but a prostitute of the lowest social order; for only such women wore the *toga* in historical times, which was considered a disgraceful garment for a woman.[151] But is this a possible scenario?[152] The answer must be: not at all. It is unthinkable that a male invited a prostitute to have 'lunch' with him on an

148 ThLL VII s.v. *incingo* col. 911.58–912.12; Quint. 11.3.146; Val. Max. 3.1.1: *incincta praetexta*; Petron. 135: *incincta pallio*; Ovid. fasti 5.657: *incinctus tunica*. Especially in the case of garments like the *toga* that are wrapped around the body, the word *incingere* (to wrap round) fits well.

149 Against Daviault (1981) 21–22: "*Incinctus* + acc. de la chose dont on est revêtu, seul exemple [!]: syntaxe archaïque sur le modèle de *succinctus* … et *indutus* + acc." Apart from the fact that the accusative is without parallels, the correction of *togam* to *toga* also eliminates the double ending *–am* that looks very clumsy if both words do not form one expression. On the other hand, the origin of the error is easily explained by a misunderstanding of the preceding *incinctam* as an attribute to *togam*.

150 On the meaning of the word and the type of meal, see ThLL X s.v. *prandere* col. 1122.24–1124.64; s.v. *prandium* col. 1125.2–1127.42; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 264–267; RE 22.2 (1954) s.v. prandium, col. 1687–1689 (A. Hug).

151 Against Daviault (1981) 188, who thinks of an elegant hetaera ("courtisane"). However, in Rome, this type of women did not wear the *toga*, but, as Cynthia and Delia, elegant clothes.

152 Cf. the fantasy of Daviault (1981) 188: "Le propos se rapporte à une courtisane, reconnaissable à sa toge … Son comportement est insolite, puisqu'elle ne quitte pas sa tenue de ville pour le vêtement de

open stage. An invitation like this is inappropriate even in the mouth of a *lena* (female brothel-keeper), considering that the *toga* of the prostitutes was regarded as socially degrading. A banquet (*convivium*) of elegant hetaerae, as is mentioned in the *Cistellaria* of Plautus,[153] but not shown on stage, is therefore also to be excluded.

For cultural and dramaturgical reasons, it is very doubtful that the transmitted form *incinctam* is correct. We may therefore advance the hypothesis that Afranius wrote the masculine form *incinctum* which—influenced by the feminine noun *togam* next to it—corrupted to *incinctam*. Taken with the changes proposed above, the text would have been as follows:

> *<hic> quidem prandere stantem nobiscum incinctum toga*
> to eat with us here standing dressed (as you are) in *toga*.

The person invited to the *prandium* is therefore a man. Invitations to men for a meal are well attested in Roman comedy.[154] They can be issued by other males as well as by prostitutes (*meretrices*). In the *Menaechmi* of Plautus, for example, one of the twins tells his brother how the *meretrix* Erotium had invited him to a *prandium* at the beginning of the play (351ff) because she mistook him for his brother:

> Plaut. Men. 1140–1142
> *meretrix huc ad prandium*
> *me abduxit, me sibi dedisse aiebat. prandi perbene,*
> *potavi atque accubui scortum.*
> The prostitute led me hither to the *prandium*. She said I was all hers. I had a great meal and drink and slept with the whore.

If a female spoke in Afranius, the words may belong to a first flirtation. One *meretrix*, out of a group of prostitutes (*nobiscum*) standing before the house, wanted to lure a suitor with the prospect of an informal *prandium*. We can definitely say that he is a Roman citizen, wearing the *toga* that clearly marks his social status in relation to slaves or a freedman. It is no longer possible to determine which of the dramatis personae is invited. One thing is obvious: The deliberately staged and unusually dressed lunch

table … et ne s'allonge pas sur le triclinium pour manger: la remarque cherche sans doute [!] à illustrer la goinfrerie du personnage, qui se jette sur la nourriture sans prendre la peine de s'installer à table."

153 Plaut. Cist. 10–11: *ita in prandio nos lepide ac nitide || accepisti apud te, ut semper meminerimus*. [The reception for lunch you gave us was so excellent and elegant that we will always remember it].

154 Plaut. Bacch. 79–82: PIST(OCLERUS): *Quid si apud te eveniat desubito prandium aut potatio || forte aut cena, ut solet in istis fieri conciliabulis, || ubi ego tum accumbam?* BACCH(IS). *Apud me, mi anime, ut lepidus cum lepida accubet. || locus hic apud nos, quamvis subito venias, semper liber est* [(P) What if by chance a breakfast or a drink or a dinner should suddenly take place at your home, as is customary in these meeting places, where will I lie down then? (B) On my side, my darling, so that beautiful man lies down with a beautiful woman. This place is always free with me, even if you come unexpectedly].

could have been a ploy towards devious ends. One possible target may have been a mean old man (*senex*), as it is in Plautus' *Miles gloriosus*.

Perhaps *Fratriae* F 16 placed next by Ribbeck belongs to the same scene.[155] There we also hear of an invitation, but no longer to a *prandium* (lunch), but to a *cena* (dinner). Different meals are also mentioned together in other comedies.[156] Again, the text suffers from corruption, but may be restored as follows:[157]

> *interim merendam accuro; ad cenam cum veni<as>, iuvat.*
> Meanwhile I take care of the *merenda*; if you should come to the *cena*, I am pleased.

The *merenda* is an afternoon snack considered a meal in itself that could also be part of a light *cena*.[158] If F 15 and F 16 formed a unit, the entire situation was perhaps like this: Character A declines B's invitation to an informal *prandium* because he has other things to do first. Nevertheless, he accepts the offer. Character B then promises to take care of the food and says he would be glad to see A later on in the evening. Nothing spectacular, just everyday life, as it is put on stage by Roman comedies.

7.8 T. Quinctius Atta

The last playwright of the Togata discussed here is Quinctius Atta, whose life is to be dated roughly to the times of Sulla, when the Togata—as the Palliata had done long

155 Gratwick (n. 76) 733 against Daviault (1981) 185.

156 Plaut. Miles 712: *me ad se ad prandium, ad cenam vocant* [they call me to lunch with them, to have dinner with them]; Vidul. 51–53: *prandium … merendam … cenam* [lunch … afternoon meal … dinner].

157 Nonius p. 41.34 L.: *interim merendam occurro ad cenam. cum veni, iuvat*. As to the text printed by Lindsay, there are two difficult points. The translation of Daviault (1981) 185 "entre temps je tombe sur un casse–croûte après mon arrivée, bravo!" is not convincing. In the present form, there is missing at least a preposition with *occurro*. Ribbeck's emendation *accuro* (cf. his *Corollarium* p. LXX) is the best so far, even though Ribbeck banished it from the text in his 3rd edition. It is supported by a parallel in the *Menaechmi* of Plautus (210: *iube igitur tribus nobis apud te prandium accurarier* [Let breakfast be prepared for the three of us at your place!]). Apart from that, the transmitted *veni* must be corrected. That it is an imperative is ruled out by metrical reasons (law of Luchs), and that it is a perfect form (so Ribbeck) by the content. The *Menaechmi* show how we have to imagine the situation: One of the brothers says goodbye to the *meretrix* Erotium, who tells him that he can expect a meal at any time (215): *Quando vis veni, parata res erit* [come when you want; things will be ready]. In the *Bacchides* of Plautus, the hetaera Bacchis says goodbye to her lover (82): *locus hic apud nos, quamvis subito venias, semper liber est* [this place at my side is always free for you, even if you come unexpectedly]. As regards metrics and content, the second person singular *venias* should be restored in Afranius.

158 ThLL VIII col. 801.69–802.5. In the 'living' language, the word is attested only in Plaut. Vidul. 50–53 and Ennius (Sota) F 5 Courtney (= Varia v. 26 Vahlen^3); see RE 15.1 (1931) s.v. merenda, col. 1017–1018 (H. Schroff).

before—came to an end.[159] In a brief notice, Jerome gives us information about the full name, date of death (77 BCE), and burial place of this playwright, who is otherwise the least known of the three authors of Togatae.[160] As to statistics, we know only twelve play titles and only have access to them through seventeen fragments.

7.8.1 *Aquae caldae* F 1 R. (= F 1 Daviault)

His first play discussed here is best preserved of the twelve plays. As the name *Aquae caldae* (Hot Springs) suggests, the play must have been about a seaside resort, such as Baiae and its amusements. A similar backdrop, albeit from a different perspective, is found in Seneca and the Augustan poets. A mime of Laberius (see below) carried the same title. F 1 refers to the various activities of prostitutes in this spot. Again, the fragment is quoted by Nonius and therefore needs some restoration work:[161]

> *cum* †*meretricae* (L) *nostro ornatu per vias* †*lupantur*
> (for a translation, see below)

The manuscripts offer the variants *meretricae* L^1 *meretrice e* B^A and *meretrice* C^AD^A. Among the various suggestions, the emendation *meretriculae* (harlots) proposed by Onions (1895) seems the most likely. Onions rightly starts his reasoning with the version of the codex L (*meretricae*). This manuscript usually represents the archetype (and its mistakes) quite faithfully. In the other manuscripts, medieval scribes seem to have already interfered with actual or purported corruptions, offering mistaken solutions and thereby masking the original defect. F 1 provides a good example of this. The letters UL have obviously been omitted, as often happens in the manuscript tradition of Nonius. The error was caused by an abbreviation of this syllable that was misunderstood or disappeared afterwards. The diminutive *meretriculae* (harlots) fits perfectly with the depreciating tone of the rest of the fragment. In contrast, Buecheler's (1873) suggestion to emend the adverb *meretricie* (in the manner of a prostitute), based on the readings C^AD^A and accepted by Ribbeck and by Lindsay in their respective editions, seems much less attractive when taking paleography and content into account.

In addition, the word order offered by the manuscripts creates a metrical difficulty. Lindsay and Daviault (1981), who follows Lindsay, retain the transmitted order and split the quotation into two half verses. However, the number of syllables we have

159 Bardon I (n. 12) 165–166; Stärk (n. 75) 262.

160 Hier. chron. p. 152.7–9 Helm: *Titus Quinctius Atta scriptor togatarum Romae moritur sepultusque via Praenestina ad miliarium* II [Titus Quinctius Atta, writer of Togatae, died in Rome and is buried on the Via Praenestina near the second milestone].

161 Nonius p. 193.12–13 L.: *lupari, ut scortari vel prostitui. Atta Aquis Caldis*: F 1 [*lupari* as *scortari* or *prostitui* (to prostitute oneself). Atta in the *Aquae Caldae*: F 1].

corresponds exactly to the number needed for a trochaic septenarius. It is thus attractive to transpose *lupantur* following Buecheler und Onions, because single words are often misplaced in Nonius. This restores the following perfect verse:

> *cum meretric<ul>ae lupantur nostro ornatu per vias*
> with harlots fornicating in our garb in the streets

The situation described is simple enough.[162] An indignant Roman matron vents her anger, complaining that prostitutes are plying their trade on the streets of *Aquae Caldae* in the garb of honourable women (like herself). Her annoyance expresses itself in the diminutive *meretriculae* (harlots) and in the exaggeration *per vias lupantur*. In a typical Roman manner, the social status of the matron is marked by clothing (*ornatus*). The garment in question that has been usurped by the prostitutes is the *vestis longa* or *stola* (B 4).[163] The opposition between the clothing of the *matrona* and that of the *meretrix* is a literary commonplace. We also find it, for example, in Afranius (see above).

The literary *fabula Atellana*

The *literary* Atellan farce (*fabula Atellana*) is an artificial literary product that was created—together with the Mime (*mimus*)—by the Roman poets after hundred fifty years of experimenting with comic forms.[164] It traces its origins back to an improvised Oscan farce with at least four fixed characters (Maccus, Bucco, Pappus, Dossennus), which is only known to us through its literary successor and the notions ancient scholars had about it. Pomponius and Novius, the two best known authors of this type of comedy, lived in the first half of the first century BCE.[165]

162 Against Daviault (1981) 255: "Interprétation incertaine. Une matrone désavouerait d'autres matrones, qui … vivent comme des courtisans au vu de tout le monde et déshonorent le costume de la femme honnête … Mais le blâme pourrait au contraire vises les courtisanes qui osent pratiquer leur métier vêtues comme les femmes honnêtes avec le chignon e la stola" and McGinn (1998) 158–159: "The speaker might be a matron indignant at the behavior of prostitutes usurping matronly garb or [!] a prostitute indignant at matrons adopting her mode of dress."

163 Cf. also B 4 p. 330.

164 RE 2.2 (1896) s.v. Atellanae fabulae, col. 1914–1921 (F. Marx); F. Leo, Römische Poesie in der sullanischen Zeit, Hermes 49 (1914), 161–195 (= Kl. Schriften I (1960) 249–282); recently Stärk (n. 75) 264–269 (with bibliography).

165 The edition by Frassinetti (1967) offers no progress compared to Ribbeck. It has shortcomings as to the constitution of the text, see the very critical reviews by H. D. Jocelyn, Gnomon 41 (1969), 41–48 and A. S. Gratwick, CR 20 (1970), 34–36.

7.9 Novius

Looking for descriptions of female clothing, we have to consider only Novius because there is no fragment of Pomponius concerning dress. As to Novius' person, we know nothing more about him than his Oscan name. A total of about ninety fragments and forty-four titles of his comedies have been preserved. They have been handed down to us mostly by Nonius. We know very little about the content of all his plays. Not a single plot can be reconstructed, even approximately. Our ignorance stems from the fact that we usually have no more than two or three verses of each comedy.

The play of which most fragments (six, including two concerning female dress) survive is referred to throughout by Nonius as <*in*> *Pedio*.[166] Since Bothe (1824), editors usually extract from this the title *Paedium* (παιδίον). The same name is attested for a Palliata of Turpilius. It is also known from Greek comedies.[167] In the *fabula Atellana*, titles consisting of Greek loanwords are very rare. Pomponius wrote *Adelphi* (ἀδελφοί) and *Synephebi* (συνέφηβοι). Apart from Novius' Greek *Paedium*, we only find his *Hetaera* (ἑταίρα), which is once mentioned by Nonius. Like *Paedium*, it is the name of a Palliata of Turpilius.[168] According to Leo (1914), the farces *Adelphi* and *Synephebi* of Pomponius may have been a parody of famous comedies or well-known comic themes (Caecilius, Terence) performed by the comic Atellan characters of Maccus and Pappus.[169] The *Paedium* of Novius may have been a similar literary product. Here a farcical masked performance may have been performed on the basis of a well-known comic play. For his theory, Leo draws on the analogy of known travesties of 'serious' myths and well-known tragedies. The premise of all this reasoning is that Novius, the *Atellanarum probatissimus scriptor* (the best author of Atellan farces),[170] exclusively wrote *Atellanae fabulae*. However, being considered the best at one genre does not guarantee that he never at least dabbled in others. The few fragments of the *Paedium* prove little that it was a *fabula Atellana*. One indication that the *Paedium* could have been part of the genre Novius was famous for is that in F 1 there is talk of a huge *rostrum* (snout, beak), a word colloquially also applied to human noses.[171] This could refer to the comic mask

166 Nonius pp. 494.5, 803.17, 865.21, 867.24, 880.29: *Novius Pedio*. 729.12: *Nonbis in Pedio* (with the common confusion of B and V); For orthographical details, see the edition of Müller. Lindsay usually does not note them, cf. his introduction pp. XXXVI–XXXVIII; and the criticism of Jocelyn (1969) 42. In p. 866.11 L., all manuscripts have *Nevius* (*Novius* edd.) *in Pedio*. In the edition of Stephanus (1564), all fragments were therefore attributed to Naevius (*Pedius*). They are correctly assigned to Novius only since Bothe (1824).

167 Apollodoros (of Karystos or Gela) F 9–10 K.-A.; Menander F 273–279 K.-A.; Poseidippos F 22 K.-A.; Platon comicus (παιδάριον) T 1, F 98 K.-A.

168 Nonius p. 813.33 L.

169 Leo (n. 164) 147 (= I 264–265).

170 Macrob. Sat. 1.10.3.

171 Nonius p. 729.13–14 L.: *nec umquam || vidit rostrum <in> tragoedia tantum Titi <theatrum>* (Buecheler apud Ribb.) [Never has a Roman theatre seen such a big beak (= nose) in a tragedy].

worn by one of the actors of this sort of comedy. Apart from this, we have no further linguistic hint as regards the comic form of the *Paedium*. There are no other parodic exaggerations to be found in our fragments. Its style reads very much like a Togata, suggesting that maybe the farcical effect of a *fabula Atellana* was mainly caused by the funny costume of the actors.

This dearth of evidence makes it impossible to reconstruct the entire plot of the *Paedium*. We can identify some characters that are typical for comedy: a beautifully dressed young woman (*puella*) that is perhaps the *paedium* of the title herself, a young man (*adulescens*) in love with her, and a father (*senex*) worrying about it. F 3 and F 4 refer to clothing. They clearly belong to the same description, referring to the garments of the young woman. Editors have arranged the fragments in different ways (F 4, F 3 or F 3, F 4). The following section argues that the continuous description of clothing ends in F 3 in the middle of the verse. For this reason, it is better to place F 3 *after* what is usually considered F 4, as was already suggested by Bothe (1824). My reconstructed and rearranged form reads as follows:

Novius, Paedium F 4 + 3 (Nonius)
(A) <…> *molliculam crocotam chiridotam reticulum,*
supparum purum Melitensem. (B) *interii, escam meram!*

(A) <She was dressed in> a soft *crocota* with long sleeves, a hairnet, a **supparus*, pure Maltese stuff. (B) I am doomed, a true bait!

In this form, the text offers two easy statements. However, it will be a long way to achieve this result from the text found in the manuscripts. The transmission suffers from heavy corruptions that have not yet all been healed. A detailed discussion of both lines is necessary.

7.9.1 *Paedium* F 4 R. (= F 4 Frassinetti)

F 4 is a trochaic septenarius as to its metre. It is quoted three times by Nonius in varying forms under different lemmas:[172]

(A) *ricam*] *mollicinam*[173] *crocotam ceridotam ricam ricinum*
(B) *mollicina*] *mollicinam crocotam, ceridotam ricinum*
(C) *crocotulam*] *mollicinam crocatam uridotam richam ricinium*

The text poses several difficulties as to its content and transmission. Only the meaning of the second and third words (*crocotam ceridotam*) is clear. There is talk of a red tunic

172 Nonius pp. 865.22, 867.25, 880.30 L.
173 *mollicinam* $LA^{A}B^{A}$: *molucinam* $C^{A}D^{A}$.

(*crocota*) with long sleeves (*ceridota*).[174] All other words, however, are more or less incomprehensible glosses and are interpreted differently by editors.

Let us first consider some seemingly insignificant detail: the spelling of the Nonian hapax *mollicina*. Different solutions have been proposed for this. Munk (1840) and Lucian Müller (1888) in their editions give the form *mo**lli**cinam* throughout; Lindsay gives *mo**lu**cinam*, though it is only found in one manuscript as a variant; Bothe (1824) and Ribbeck ([1]1852) give *mo**li**cinam*; Ribbeck[2+3] also uses *mo**lu**cium* (his own conjecture); and finally, Fassinetti ([2]1967) gives *mo**lucin**am*. Which orthography is correct? As to the spelling of Nonius (separate from the original by Novius his entry is based on), Müller's edition is correct. Nonius must have read *mo**lli**cinam* (with double L), as is shown by his explanation *a mo**lli**tie dicta* (called thus after its softness). The spelling *mollicinam* is also found in codex L, which usually comes closest to the archetype. In contrast, Lindsay's text of Nonius based on the less well attested variant *molucinam* is to be rejected.

But is *mollicina* the form Novius (and not the later Nonius) wrote in his comedy? This is very unlikely *prima facie* because the gloss *mollicina* first occurs in the dictionary of Nonius. We should thus try to emend it as is done by modern editors of the playwright Novius (Ribbeck and Frassinetti). In contrast to them, however, it is advisable to stick to the meaningful phoneme *moll-* (soft), with a double L, and to consider the word ending. The solution is simple and was already proposed by Bothe (1824) in the critical apparatus of his edition: *nihili verbum videtur mollicina … recte se haberet mollicula crocota* (the word *mollicina* is void of sense; *mollicula crocota* would be right). Obviously, the error in Nonius originated from an abbreviation for the letters UL being resolved incorrectly to an IN. This causes difficulties in many other places in Nonius, i.e. a second time in this fragment (see below). The diminutive adjective *molliculus*, from *mollis* (soft), is attested by Plautus, albeit not in connection with a garment.[175] In contrast, *mollis* itself is used with clothing in several passages.[176] The feminine form *mollicula* goes with the following *crocota ceridota* (red tunic with long sleeves). It has nothing to do with the rare adjective *mo**lo**chinus* (of linen) discussed above[177] or a pseudo-garment called **molucium* (OLD: "(perh.) a women's ornament") and should be removed from modern Latin dictionaries as supposed evidence for this garment.[178] The woman described is just wearing a *mollicula crocota ceridota*, a soft red tunic with long sleeves.

This is only a prelude to the changes to come. There are still more thorny problems waiting at the end of the verse. Given that the fragment is quoted three times by Nonius in various versions, we should have first asked —as in the case of Naevius[179]—which

174 Cf. A 4 p. 78 and B 1 pp. 257–261.

175 Plaut. Cas. 492, Poen. 367; ThLL VIII s.v. *molliculus* col. 1082.33–43.

176 ThLL VIII s.v. *mollis* col. 1372.31–47 (*de vestimentis*).

177 Cf. p. 139.

178 Against Frassinetti (1967) 137: "una veste color malva, una color zafferano."

179 Cf. A 3 p. 56.

of them is Nonius' starting point. Editors usually remove the differences, taking A/C, which contain the gloss **ricam*, as a starting point. They also prefer the dubious **ricinum* (without I after the N)[180] offered by A/B (only attested here, in Nonius) to **ricin**i**um* (with the I). This solution is attractive, since it restores a metrically correct septenarius.[181] However, as to method, it is better not to mingle different versions in Nonius. Moreover, it is unclear what the obscure words **rica* and **ricinium* should signify in this context. A meaningful solution has not been put forward so far. Chapters A 4 and D 4 propose a possible solution.[182] In D 4, Nonius' entire lemma **rica* and the respective quotation of Novius will be subjected to more detailed textual criticism since the arguments can be understood more easily in an overall panorama. The results may be summed up here as follows: Version B (without **ricam*) is to be regarded as the original version of Novius. In addition, the meaningless Nonian hapax **ric**in**um* should be emended to the meaningful *retic**ul**um* (hairnet), the false resolution of UL to IN again playing a decisive part in the corruption process. When all of these errors are removed, the content of F 4 is quite simple. It refers to two garments commonly worn by young and beautiful women, at least in comedy: a coloured tunic (*crocota*) and a hairnet (*reticulum*). We can now turn to F 3 and see how it fits in with the beautiful clothing mentioned in F 4.

7.9.2 *Paedium* F 3 R. (= F 3 Frassinetti)

F 3 is quoted by Nonius as the second of four examples for the term **supparus*. In its transmitted form, the metre is a trochaic septenarius:[183]

supparum purum belliensem interim escam meram.

The first two words are quite clear. The gloss **supparus*, though a difficult term, denotes an over-tunic worn by a young woman.[184] The adjective *purus* (pure) must refer to it or to the adjective **belliensem* next to it. The problems start here since the hapax **belliensis* is altogether a non-word. It is completely void of meaning. The following adverb *interim* (meanwhile) is also hard to explain in the context. As to metre, the hiatus before and after *interim* have to be justified as well.

180 Bothe and Ribbeck[1] put the **ricinium* in the text. This gloss, thought to denote a thick and rough primeval cloak, is already out of the question for reasons of content.

181 In addition, Lucian Müller puts the word **ricam* before the word *cheridotam*.

182 Cf. A 4 p. 73; D 4 pp. 628–630.

183 Nonius p. 866.11–13 L. The entire entry is dealt with in D 5 pp. 653–655.

184 Cf. D 5 p. 656.

The solution to the first difficulty is straightforward. Ribbeck (^{2}1873) corrects the corrupted **belliensem* to *Melitensem*, an adjective derived from the island *Melite* (Malta).[185] This solution makes perfect sense as regards what Novius wrote (Nonius may well have had a corrupted version of Novius' text). As Diodorus and Cicero show, expensive clothing was produced on Malta, a Phoenician colony (B 9).[186] The Roman magistrate Verres, for example, had garments made for his wife at Malta because he appreciated the quality of *Melitensia* (Maltese clothing) very much.[187] In Lucretius, Maltese clothing is mentioned among articles of luxury.[188] Isidor of Seville talks about a nonsensical *tunica Velenensis* (= *Melitensis*) that must refer to Maltese garments.[189]

The next challenge is the word *interim*, which is more difficult to emend. To start with, Munk (1840) restores the verse to *purum Veliense linteum omnem escam meram*. Regarding the transmission, Munk's rewriting of the verse looks rather precarious. Nevertheless, his conjecture *linteum* (piece of linen cloth) appears to have some merit since it takes up Nonius' lemma: *linteum femorale* (a linen loin cloth). However, as a rule, Nonius' own words do not guarantee the wording of the authors quoted by him. Moreover, understanding the noun *linteum* while maintaining the gloss **belliensem* requires putting the opaque adjective into the neuter. The changes—as can be seen in Munk—thus begin to multiply. Ribbeck's conjecture *supparum purum Melitensem linteum* (a real Maltese **supparus* made of linen) takes *linteum* to be a form of the adjective *linteus*. This might seem more attractive at a first glance, but there is also an obstacle to it. The expression *supparum purum Melitensem* (a **supparus*, pure Maltese stuff) does not require any further addition, but is already complete in itself. The mentioning of Malta already implies that the garment was made of fine linen, since that was the type of clothing for which Malta was famous. Any further explicit reference to the material is unnecessary. The origin usually serves to fully characterize the garment in question. In Varro, for example, we read of a *mitra Melitensis* (a bonnet from Malta)

185 In the first edition, Ribbeck still offers the conjecture *Veliensem*, which goes back to Lipsius (1577) in his *Epistolicae Quaestiones* 4.20 [4.19]. Modifying Lipsius' suggestion, E. Munk, De fabulis Atellanis, Leipzig 1840 and Frassinetti (1967) print *Veliense*. However, Lipsius' interpretation of the passage is not tenable.

186 On the *vestis Melitensis*, see Marquardt/Mau (1886) 490; RE 15.1 (1931) s.v. Melita (11), col. 544 (J. Weiss); B 9 pp. 384–385.

187 Cic. Verr. 2.4.103: *insula est Melite … in qua est eodem nomine oppidum … quod isti textrinum per triennium ad muliebrem vestem conficiendam fuit* [There is an island called Malta … on it there is a city with the same name … Three years, it served as textile factory for this guy (= Verres) to produce female clothing]; 2.2.176, 183; cf. also A 10 p. 201.

188 Cf. A 11 p. 213.

189 Isid. Etym. 19.22.21: *Velenensis tunica est quae affertur ex insulis* [The *velenensis* is a tunic brought from the islands]. Isidor obviously thought the name to refer to the *velum* (sail) and thus concluded that it was imported by ship (therefore *ex insulis*). Cf., however, Pausch (2003) 138, 142 on the non-existent *tunica velenensis*.

without any addition.[190] Similarly, the famous *Coae vestes* (Coan clothes) are usually mentioned without any further specification. For this reason, the reference to linen either by the noun *linteum* or the adjective *linteus* is superfluous. We should refrain from creating it by conjecture and should try to find a simpler solution instead.

The reason why Munk and Ribbeck came to propose something else for the word *interim* in the first place may serve as a starting point for further discussion: Both obviously wanted to remove the hiatus caused by *interim*. A hiatus may indeed indicate that a transmission is troubled, but it has to be noted that there are certain places where it is allowed in comic verse without any restriction.[191] Early editions of dramatists are often impaired by postulating too severe metrical rules in this respect. Hiatus is possible, especially when there is some cause for this metrical licence, and such reason could exist here: a change of speaker.[192] The first letters of the word *interim* therefore do not need to be altered. However, the meaning of *interim* and the hiatus after it still cause difficulties. If we keep close to the transmitted letters, the emendation to *interii* removes both problems. The exclamation *perii* or *interii* (I am doomed, I am lost) is often found in comic language.[193] It is used as an interjection, only loosely connected with the rest of the sentence. It fits in here very well. We have to imagine the following situation: Character A describes a beautiful young woman; B responds with the expression of astonishment, even fear: *interii*.

Why this fear? To understand it, let us first see what is next. The noun *esca* means "bait," especially when it is used metaphorically in connection with an attractive *meretrix*.[194] It evokes the image of fishing or bird hunting. In the *Epidicus* of Plautus (216), prostitutes are said to have hunting nets under their clothes (*sub vestimentis secum habebant retia*). In the mouth of a father (*senex*) who worries about the amorous adventures of his son (*adulescens*) an exclamation like *interii* makes good sense. The beautiful girl is called an *esca mera* (a pure bait) because she will decoy the *adulescens* or has already done it, exactly as it happens in the *Epidicus*. There, the *senex* Periphanes, when informed how his son fell into the snares of a hetaera, first cries *perii hercle* (I am dead, by Hercules) (246), then *certo ego occidi* (I am certainly dead) (253). The situation described in the *Hetaera* of Turpilius is very similar to that.[195]

190 Varro Men. F 433 Astbury; cf. A 9 p. 193; D 4 pp. 637–638.

191 On hiatus in the *fabula Atellana*, see Leo (n. 164) 171 n. 1. A comprehensive metrical study on the subject is still missing.

192 A change of speaker after *interim* is already adopted by Müller and Lindsay in their editions of Nonius.

193 On *interii*, see Plaut. Amph. 399, 1076, As. 243, Aul. 713, Bacch. 836, 853, Cist. 576, Epid. 56, 325, Merc. 751, Miles 206, Most. 1031, Pseud. 910.

194 Plaut. As. 219–221: *auceps sum ego*, || *esca est meretrix*, *lectus inlex est*, *amatores aves* [I am a bird catcher; the *meretrix* is a bait; the bed is a decoy; the lovers are the birds] with F. Hurka, Die Asinaria des Plautus, Munich 2010, 123–124; somewhat differently, Miles 581: *numquam hercle ex ista nassa ego hodie escam petam* [By Hercules, I will never get food out of this fish trap today].

195 See above pp. 144–146.

But what about the hiatus between *interii* and *escam meram*? Ribbeck, reading *linteum*, puts in the interjection *em* (look at this) before *escam meram* to avoid the hiatus. He may have also thought that the M of *interim* preserves traces of *em*. It is, however, not necessary to interfere here. The accusative *escam meram* is to be understood either as an accusative of exclamation or as taking up the accusative of the preceding words. As to grammar, the cry *interii* is disconnected from *escam meram* so that a hiatus at this place appears to be tolerable. A further interjection in addition to *interii* is superfluous since *interii* already has this function. Thus, it seems best to accept the hiatus.

In summary: The lady described is elegantly dressed. She wears a red tunic with long sleeves (*crocota cheridota*) and a **supparus*. She has a hairnet (*reticulum*) on her head. Her beauty causes concern in the male observer, who probably fears for his son. In the scene, the Greek tradition and the Roman variation of the theme can be studied. As to literary motifs, the parallels to the *Epidicus* of Plautus and the *Hetaera* of Turpilius are clearly visible. In the Palliata, the beautiful clothing of the women contributes in no small part to the fact that an *adulescens* falls in love with them (and subsequently pays for their services). In Plautus, we hear about elegant tunics, as well as in Turpilius, who also mentions the hairnet as a second article of dress (see above). Already in the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes (138–139), the κροκωτόν and the κεκρύφαλος (hairnet) are basic components of the costume of a young woman, together with a fine cloak (χλανίς).

Novius therefore shows us three elements of costume. The *crocota* and the hairnet remain as in Aristophanes, but the cloak is replaced by a **supparus*. It is difficult to exactly determine what this was, but it seems to be a tunic that could be worn as an upper garment. With the exception of the catalogue in the *Epidicus*,[196] the term **supparus* is only found in the Togata and might thus denote a typical Italian costume element. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that Italic everyday life also comes into the comedy scene inspired by Greek models through the adjective *Melitensis*. As far as I can see, the island of Malta is not mentioned in Greek comedy as a production site of fine clothing. In Greek comedy, it is mostly the fine wool from the city Miletus that makes clothing valuable.[197] We may therefore call the **supparus Melitensis* an Italic variation of an old Greek literary motif.

196 See A 4 p. 79.

197 On wool production in Miletos, see Blümner I (1912) 99–100. On the elegant and expensive Μιλησία χλανίς [Milesian cloak], see Plutarch. Alc. 23.3; de genio Socratis 14 p. 583 E.

The Mime

The Mime (*mimus*) is a Greek theatrical genre.[198] It was originally an improvised performance without masks. The literary (comic) Mime, however, leads us down in time to the end of the Roman Republic, the Mime—like the *fabula Atellana*—only then being adapted to Latin literature. The Mime replaced the short-lived literary Atellan farce and remained the only theatrical comic form in the Roman Empire. As its titles and literary motifs show, it came close to the preceding comic genres,[199] though it was more spectacular in expression and dress, nude female actors also appearing on stage. The playwrights of mimes best known to us are Decimus Laberius (see below) and Publilius Syrus (first century BCE). Here, we have to consider only Laberius because there is no reference to female dress in the fragments of Publilius Syrus.

7.10 Decimus Laberius

The poet Decimus Laberius (ca. 106–43 BCE) was a Roman knight (*eques*).[200] He is famous for Julius Caesar forcing him to perform on stage in one of his own plays. Caesar then immediately restored him to the status of an *eques* that he had lost through his forced performance (acting was forbidden to higher social classes at Rome). Of his entire oeuvre, forty-two play titles and about hundred fragments have been preserved.

7.10.1 *Natalicius* F 2 R. (= F 40 Panayotakis)

Only one of Laberius' fragments mentions female articles of clothing. For once, it is not quoted by Nonius, but by the grammarian Aulus Gellius in his *Noctes Atticae*. In the respective essay, Gellius deals with the topic that Laberius created his own language in his mimes so that it is sometimes difficult to see whether his glosses are real Latin words at all. F 2, which refers to female dress, is very short and highly problematic. A new explanation will be offered here.[201] The section of the *Noctes Atticae* in which F 2 is quoted runs like this:

198 C. J. Grysar, Der römische Mimus, Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 12 (1854), 237–337; RE 15.2 (1932) s.v. Mimos, col. 1727–1764 (E. Wüst); Leo (n. 15) 372–374; DNP 8 (2000) s.v. Mimos, col. 205–207 with further literature; Panayotakis (n. 1) 1–32. Besides Ribbeck, the commented editions of Bonaria[2] (1965) (cf. Ch. Garton, Rez. Bonaria, Gnomon 39 (1967), 362–365) and of Panayotakis (2010) are to be consulted.

199 Kroll (1924) 247.

200 Cf. RE 12.1 (1924) s.v. D. Laberius, col. 246–248 (W. Kroll); Bonaria (n. 198) 5–9; recently DNP 6 (1999) s.v. Laberius, 1030–1031; Panayotakis (n. 1) 33–90; H. Leppin, Histrionen, Bonn 1992, 26–27, 150–153, where the numerous inscriptions of mimes and pantomimes are collected.

201 On the fragment in general, cf. Panayotakis (n. 1) 294–296.

Gellius NA 16.7.9

item in mimo, qui inscribitur Natal<icius>, "cippum" dicit et "obbam" et "camellam" et "pittacium" et "capitium": "induis" inquit "capitium, tunicae pittacium."

Likewise, in the mime entitled *Natalicius*, he (sc. Laberius) uses the words '*cippus*' and '*obba*' and '*camella*', and '*pittacium*' and '*capitium*'. He says: "You put on a **capitium*, into the tunic a *pittacium*."

The form of the title is uncertain. The manuscripts have *Natal* (R.$^{2+3}$; Bonaria^{2} 1965), which editors have variously changed to *Natalis*,[202] *Natalicium* or *Natalicius* (sc. *mimus*).[203] The form *Natal* is attested only once and, if correct, should be taken as a noun.[204] In any case, as shown by the title, the play had something to do with a birthday and its celebration.

The *obba* (some kind of drinking vessel) and the *camella* (cup or bowl) both belong to a festive meal. In contrast, it is unclear why a *cippus*, a large stone used to demark a boundary or a tomb, should have been mentioned in this context. Perhaps Gellius' text of Laberius already suffered from a mistake. Laberius could have actually been talking about *cyprum* (*ciprum*) or *cyprinum*. This is an aromatic oil made from the κύπρος, the henna bush (= *Lawsonia inermis*). Perfume is a suitable ingredient at a fine banquet.[205]

Contrary to Gellius' view of Laberius' linguistic creativity, Laberius' glosses do not constitute new coinages, at least not with most terms in the fragment. The words *obba*, *camella*, and *pittacium* should not be considered artistic coinages.[206] Parallels show that Laberius rather used terms from everyday Roman language (including Greek loanwords) rather than restricting himself to formal register. The same may be assumed for the dress term **capitium*. As the parallels with Varro suggest, **capitium* was probably a genuine Roman word that was perhaps equivalent in meaning to the word *fascia* (chest band).[207]

Let us now turn to the decisive part of Laberius F 2. It comprises just four words: *induis capitium tunicae pittacium*. As to content, the words somehow belong together.[208]

202 Bothe (1824); Ribbeck^{1}; Grysar (1854) 294; cf. Panayotakis (n. 1), who offers a convenient overview.

203 Hertz (1853) in his edition of Gellius; A. Fleckeisen, Zur Kritik der altlateinischen Dichterfragmente bei Gellius, Leipzig 1854, 38 (in response to Hertz in a critical epistle); Marshall (1968) in his edition of Gellius.

204 LHS I 92, 350.

205 On the word *cippus*, cf. ThLL III col. 1975.76–1078.69; on *cyprus*, cf. LSJ s.v. κύπρος and κύπρινος, OLD s.v. *cyprus*, and Plin. NH 35.195; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 785.

206 On *obba*, cf. ThLL IX 2 col. 36.32–48; on *camella*, cf. ThLL III col. 201.23–29. The words are not attested in archaic texts. However, later sources (Varro, Ovid, Petronius) suggest that they are genuine old words.

207 B 22 pp. 507–508; C 1 pp. 573–574.

208 The metre can no longer be identified with certainty. Bothe (1824) does not try to produce a verse; Ribbeck^{2} suggests a catalectic cretic tetrameter; Hertz and Fleckeisen restore parts of two trochaic septenarii (*induis* || *capitium tunicae pittacium*).

Editors usually interpret them as a complete sentence, but this premise is not necessary. In fact, a better sense can be elicited from the text if we posit a missing predicate at the end. Let us therefore turn to basic grammar first. The conjugated verb *induis* (you put on) is the predicate, **capitium* (chest band) being the direct object. Then the problems start. In the traditional solution, *tunicae* is thought to be the genitive attribute to *pittacium,* the expression *tunicae pittacium* being understood as an apposition to **capitium*. This takes the phrase to mean 'put on a *capitium,* a small stripe of a *tunicae*.' However, this assumption raises some difficulties. In Greek, the word πιττάκιον commonly denotes writing tablets, notes, labels, and the like. In Latin, for example, the word *pittacium* is used similarly by Petronius as the label on a wine bottle and as lottery tickets.[209] It is therefore not easy to see what the expression *tunicae pittacium* and especially the word *pittacium* should mean in this context. Is the latter really a piece of cloth as OLD and other Latin dictionaries assume on the basis of our fragment?[210] And why should a **capitium*, a chest band, be qualified in this complicated way? There may be a better solution, if we start from another premise.

First of all, **capitium* should be separated from *tunicae pittacium*. It alone is the object to *induis* (you put on). The present tense is used like a future, a feature of everyday language. Character A tells B what clothes to wear. We can imagine a female servant giving advice to her mistress, or, the other way around, a mistress telling her female servant what dress to use. In this case, the words *tunicae* and *pittacium* are left without grammatical reference. However, Gellius was only interested in difficult words and not in quoting complete sentences. A second predicate directing *tunicae* and *pittacium* could have been lost because Gellius abridged the quotation.

But what could be missing? The Greek loanword *pittacium* may give us a clue. It is equivalent to the Latin word *tabella*. It could thus denote a letter or some message written on a *tabella*. A piece of advice the teacher of love gives in Ovid's *Ars amatoria* to his female pupils provides an idea (C 9) of what the scene in Laberius might have looked like. The teacher recommends to a *puella* that a female servant should smuggle out letters (*scriptas tabellas*) hidden under her chest band (*fascia*).[211] This is a more clandestine version of the mishap of the letter slipping from the girl's belt in Turpilius' fragment discussed above. Similarly, in Laberius, a mistress perhaps gives advice to her servant on how to dress for the assigned task as a messenger. She should put on a chest band (*induis capitium*) and fix a letter in her tunic in this way (*tunicae pittacium*). If we add, for example, *inseris* at the end of the clause, we get the respective short sentence: *tunicae pittacium inseris* (you tuck the note into the tunic), *tunicae* being a grammatical object in the dative. In Laberius and Ovid, we might thus have a variation of the letter

209 LSJ s.v. and Petron. 34.6.

210 Georges s.v., Walde/Hofmann s.v.

211 Ovid. ars 3.621–622: *conscia cum possit scriptas portare tabellas*, || *quas tegat in tepido fascia lata sinu* [although a female accomplice could bring letters, that a broad *fascia* might hide under her warm bosom]; cf. B 22 p. 508.

motif that we already see in Turpilius.[212] Even though this is only an experiment, this seems to give better sense to the text than the traditional solutions, and all this without creating new meanings for known words.

7.11 Conclusion

Turning our eyes back to the entire evidence discussed in this chapter, we may sum up the results as follows: References to female dress in Latin comedy are but few, offering only a shadow of what female fashion in Roman antiquity may have looked like. We mostly hear of different *tunicae*, long ones and short ones (*tuniculae*). They are used as festive garments in conspicuous colours (*purpura*, *ostrina, crocota*) and as underwear (*interula*). One of them is provided with long sleeves. Besides this, the long garment of the Roman *matrona* (*vestis longa*) is mentioned twice. There are also several mentions of an article of clothing called **supparus* that seems to be an elegant garment of younger women. References to further apparel are very rare. We find hairnets (*reticulum*), headscarves (*mitra calvatica*), a cord/belt (*strophium*), and finally a kind of *fascia pectoralis* (wrap around the chest) called **capitium*. As to materials, we learn of linen and cotton. Wool, being the normal material, is left out. All in all, the evidence in early comedy is largely congruous with what we find in other (later) literary genres. Thus, it helps to back up our knowledge of what otherwise would be a very shrouded cultural period. However, the melancholy remains despite all efforts made in this chapter. What we know is still no more than a shadow of Roman girls and women and their vibrant and dynamic sartorial culture.

212 On such motif adoptions, see Wüst (n. 198) 1746.