

4 *rica (tricae) – Plautus *Epidicus* II

1. Introduction
2. Imperial Period
 - 2.1 Germanicus
 - 2.2 Verrius/Festus
 - 2.3 Gellius
3. Late Antiquity (Nonius) – the pseudo-evidence
 - 3.1 Septimius Serenus *Opuscula* F 1
 - 3.2 Novius *Paedium* F 4
 - 3.3 Lucilius F 71 M.
 - 3.4 Turpilius *Hetaera* F 1
 - 3.5 Varro *Prometheus Liber* F 433
4. The Migration Period (Isidore of Seville)
5. Conclusion

In this chapter, all intricacies offered by textual criticism are on show. The intent is to clear a field that is overgrown by faulty interpretations. The fact that must be stated at the beginning of this chapter is simple: The gloss *rica is a hapax. It is only attested in Plautus' *Epidicus*. Chapter A 4 argues that the word originated there by textual corruption.¹ The meaningful word *tricae* (trifles, nonsense) lost its initial letter T and became an obscure supposed garment called *rica. The corruption of 'trifles, nonsense' into a garment is indeed a pointed joke on what might be called a scholars' tragedy that will hopefully find its end with the following remarks. Readers are referred to chapter A 4 as a prelude to the drama found in this chapter. These pages will only illustrate the efforts ancient scholars wasted on explaining the meaningless gloss they supposed must have referred to an article of clothing. They first found a suitable garment and then literary parallels for what is actually a non-word. Modern scholars subsequently followed this train of thought uncritically.² The power of the gloss should not be underestimated. The *rica received an entire article in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie*. In contrast, the historically ubiquitous *tunica* is absent!

¹ Cf. pp. 72–74.

² Marquardt/Mau (1886) 575–576, 583; Blümner (1911) 234; RE 1.1 A (1914) s.v. rica 794–795 (A. Hug); Wilson (1938) 151; Potthoff (1992) 164–167; GRD (2007) 161; Olsen (2008) 53–54; M. Tellenbach et al. (eds.), *Die Macht der Toga. Dress Code im römischen Weltreich*, Hildesheim 2013, 295.

4.1 Introduction

Like the other three glosses stemming from the *Epidicus*, the word **rica* was a mystery to scholars from the beginning. Their work started with the assumption that the word had to refer to some article of clothing. They did not consider or at least did not want to accept the banal explanation of a corrupted word. They tried to solve this self-imposed mystery in more or less ingenious ways. The origins of the discussion can be traced back to Varro. His teacher Aelius Stilo may have already dealt with it in his own research on Plautus. Varro thought the **rica* to be a kind of primeval shawl or headscarf worn by Roman women at sacrifice.³ Verrius, whose opinions are mirrored by Festus and other Imperial scholars thought the term to designate the purple headdress of the *flaminica* (the wife of the priest of Jupiter). Over the course of centuries, the gloss **rica* was mixed up with two other glosses: **ricinium* (D 1) and **ricula*.⁴ Its meaning became generalized as ‘shawl, headscarf.’ In Late Antiquity, Nonius defined the garment as a handkerchief (*sudarium*) by offering seemingly new parallels from early Latin texts in order to illustrate this meaning.

This hodgepodge of explanations is made worse in modern research. It sometimes combines the various elements so that they form an undigestible and ahistorical mixture.⁵ The fact that the gloss **rica* is actually a Plautine hapax is obscured by the mass of the Imperial authors talking about it and by Nonius’ pseudo-parallels.

This chapter tries to slowly lead readers through the crooked paths of the labyrinth. It describes the second and the third act of the scholars’ tragedy. First, it turns to the Imperial authors in order to disentangle the various strands of their explanations. Then, it analyses Nonius’ chaotic entry on the term **rica/ricula*, showing that all his ‘new’ parallels for the glosses **rica* and **ricula* dissolve into nothing when put to the hard test of textual criticism.

³ Cf. Varro LL 5.130: *sic rica ab ritu, quod Romano ritu sacrificium feminae cum faciunt, capita velant* [Thus **rica* is derived from the word *ritus* because women veil their heads when they perform a sacrifice in the Roman manner (*Romano ritu*)]. Cf. also C 1 p. 575.

⁴ Similarly modern scholars, cf. Marquardt/Mau (1886) 575–576; Potthoff (1992) 166: “*ricinium* ist etymologisch wohl zu lat. *rica* zu stellen, womit ein dem *ricinium* ähnliches, wohl kleineres Kleidungsstück bezeichnet wurde, das vor allem als Kopfbedeckung genutzt wurde, und daher häufig als ‚Kopftuch‘ gedeutet wird.”

⁵ GRD (2007) 161 (following Wilson [1938]) defines it as “a kerchief worn as a veil especially by the *flaminica* [!] Dialis, wives of *flamines*, or used as a handkerchief,” without questioning the absurdity of the idea that sacred headscarves in purple colour and handkerchiefs (of huge size) should have been designated by the same term.

4.2 Imperial Period (Germanicus, Verrius, Gellius, Festus)

Before turning to the scholars of Imperial times, we should briefly review what Varro said about the **rica* (C 1).⁶ We do not wish to miss the first act of the tragedy, after all. Varro defined the **rica* simply as some kind of headscarf worn by women when sacrificing in the Roman manner. The Imperial grammarians, we will see, greatly expanded on this. Thus began the **rica*'s own story through history. The story leads us deeply into the dark realm of ancient Roman religion or at least what scholarly fantasy thought it to be. The Imperial authors we have to consider are the erudite poet (and prince) Germanicus (15 BCE–19 CE) and, in chronological order, the grammarians Verrius, Gellius, and Festus. Germanicus is dealt with first in order to keep the statements of the grammarians together, although he dates later than Verrius and may have been influenced by his work.

4.2.1 Germanicus

Germanicus uses the gloss **rica* in his *Aratea*, a learned translation of the astrological poem of the Hellenistic poet Aratus of Soloi. The term describes the headdress of the *Virgo Astraea*, which Germanicus equates with the goddess *Iustitia* (justice). In the Silver Age, the virgin Justice withdraws from society and covers her face with a gesture of mourning (123): *tristique genas abscondita rica* (her cheeks covered by a sad **rica*). With the **rica*, Germanicus adds a visual detail to his Greek source, Aratus' *Phainomena*,⁷ in order to make his translation appear more Roman. His remarks are by no means a primary evidence for the existence of the **rica*. Germanicus, a *poeta doctus*, wants to show his erudition. He does this by including an obscure word (both in its meaning and its frequency of use) he knew from his reading the grammarians. He believed the grammarians' interpretation that the **rica* was some kind of female garment and simply created a mourning variant.

4.2.2 Verrius/Festus

The grammarian Pomponius Festus roughly dates to the second half of the second century CE. He lived in a time that started to reduce the large works of Augustan scholarship to handy compendiums. In line with this, Festus' work *De significatione verborum* (About the meaning of words, i.e. glosses) is, as he himself tells us, an excerpt of the far more comprehensive *De verborum significatu* written by the famous Augustan

⁶ Varro LL 5.130.

⁷ Cf. Arat. Phaen. 133–134a: καὶ τότε μισήσασα Δίκη κείνων γένος ἀνδρῶν || ἔπταθ' ὑπουρανίη [and at this time, the Justice loathed this kind of men, and flew to heaven].

grammarian and librarian Verrius Flaccus (ca. 55 BCE–20 CE). Most of its content can be confidently attributed to Verrius. For this reason, Festus is usually equated with Verrius, as is done elsewhere in this book—by referring to these scholars as Festus (Verrius). However, Festus sometimes adds remarks of his own, the extent of his additions being disputed in modern research. That being said, we can now turn to Festus' contribution to the story of the *rica. It comprises two entries, differing from each other in content. One of them is clearly nothing more than an excerpt of Verrius. As to the second entry, there is reason to attribute parts of it to Festus himself.

We will start with the entry that without a doubt just repeats Verrius' words. It is more comprehensive and looks like the 'central' article on the subject matter, though it comes second in Festus. The manuscript has been badly destroyed in this passage by a mechanical loss. However, the text can be restored to some extent with the help of Paulus' excerpt of it. The text is partly illegible. The translation tries to include the gaps:⁸

Festus p. 368.3–11 L.

*rica est v[estimentum quadratum]
fimbriatum, pur[pureum, quo flaminicae pro]
palliolo, mitra*⁹*[ve utebantur ...]
existimat. Titi[us dicit quod ex lana fiat]
sucida alba vesti[mentum ...]
triplex, quod conf[iciant virgines inge-]
nuae, patrimae, m[atrimae,]
tum lavetur aqua p[... caeru]
leum.*

The *rica is a square purple garment that has fringes. The *flaminicae* <used it> as a shawl or headscarf (*mitra*) ... thinks. According to Titius, it is a garment from fresh white wool ... consisting of three layers, produced by freeborn virgins, *patrimae*. and *matrimae* washed with water ... dark.

At the beginning, there is, as usual, a general definition. First, it states that the *rica—like the *recinium in Festus (D 1)—is a square piece of cloth (*vestimentum quadratum*). It is of purple colour (*purpureum*) and has fringes (*fimbriatum*). Then, we learn who wore it: The *flaminicae* supposedly wore it as a headscarf (*palliolum*). The word *flaminica* can mean simply 'priestess,' but it often designates the most important one, the wife of

⁸ Paulus Diaconus p. 369.1–4 L.: *rica est vestimentum quadratum, fimbriatum, purpureum, quo flaminicae pro palliolo utebantur. Alii dicunt, quod ex lana fiat sucida alba, quod conficiunt virgines ingenuae, patrimae, cives, et inficiatur caeruleo colore.*

⁹ *mitra* Orsini (see below): *mitrai* edd. The facsimile of the Codex Farnesianus does not show a letter after A.

the priest of Jupiter, the *flamen Dialis*.¹⁰ This passage very likely refers to this specific kind of *flaminica*, since the **rica* is posited as an extraordinary sort of purple garment. We then come to the first problem. The word *mitra* is still part of the introduction. The reading of the Codex Farnesianus is uncertain as to the word ending.¹¹ It is best to restore *mitra<ve>* (or a *mitra*) because both the *palliolum* (B 17) and the *mitra* (B 13) are dress alternatives. The **rica* of the *flaminica* was thus said to be a scarf or headscarf (*mitra*). But what time period is the text talking about? We must again look at Paulus' excerpt for the predicate. Paulus, who usually keeps close to Festus in these matters, has *utebantur* (they usually wore) in past tense and we should restore this in Festus, too. Festus is therefore referring to ancient Roman religious practice, not to a custom of his own times. We are in the realm of religious history. But who said this? Is his name lost in the gap? Orsini thinks that we have to add the name of Verrius before *existimat* (*ut Verrius existimat* [as Verrius thinks]), since Festus often quotes Verrius at the beginning of historical or textual claims. However, Veranius, who is quoted with Titius elsewhere for religious matter (see below), fits in even better, if we take the length of the gap into account. In the end, it is better to leave the question open. We just do not know. In any case, the specialist definition that makes the **rica* a valuable and conspicuous headwear of the most important Roman female priestess stands in contrast to Varro's opinion.

After this, more information from some other scholar is added. In Festus, we get the beginning of his name—Paulus has only *alii dicunt* (other authors say)—which Karl Otfried Müller (1839) plausibly restored as *Titius*. This Titius—a name used in Latin like Mr. Smith in English—is largely unknown. The author is quoted by Festus (Verrius) together with Veranius another time in the entry *offendices* (the word is also a hapax), which deals with the garb of priests.¹² One may assume that he was a grammarian who lived shortly before Verrius. In any case, the 'specialist knowledge' he offered was basically gibberish. As far as we can see, Titius talked about how the

¹⁰ On the meaning of the word *flaminica*, cf. ThLL VI 1 s.v. col. 862.17–864.36. On her social function, cf. most recently ThesCRA V 126–127.

¹¹ The reading *mitraeve*, ascribed to Orsini by Lindsay in his apparatus criticus, is probably due to a typesetting error in Orsini's edition. Orsini usually distinguishes his own additions from the transmission by means of blank spaces, dashes, and change of typefont. In this line, his edition offers *mitra* and *ve*, separated by a somewhat larger blank space. This suggests that Orsini read *mitra* in the Codex Farnesianus and added *ve*. Through a printer's error, this was later misprinted, becoming part of the transmitted text. The letter I in *mitrai*, which scholars after Orsini report to have seen, is not definitively shown in the facsimile of the codex. The traces we see there could also be the remains of another letter. In any case, the archaic orthography *mitrai* instead of *mitrae* is not possible in this context.

¹² Festus p. 222.13–18 L.: *offendices ait esse Titius nodos, quibus apex retineatur et remittatur. at Veranius coriola existimat* [Titius says that *offendices* are knots with which the 'pointed cap of priests' is fastened or loosened. But Veranius thinks it is a small piece of leather]. On Veranius, cf. H. Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue*, Paris 1952, 310–311; RE 8.1 A (1955) s.v. Veranius (1), col. 937 (A. Gordon).

**rica* was produced. He contended that it was originally made by virgins he specified as *patrimae* and *matrimae* (the meaning of these words was also obscure and discussed by grammarians) from fresh white wool and that it was washed afterwards with some special lotion and thus received a dark colour. Although there is no indication in the text as to the wearers of the **rica*, the remarks look like an addition to the story of the **rica* of the *flaminica*. According to Titius, its production took the form of a religious ritual.

In conclusion, we can say that the remarks of Festus (Verrius) on the **rica* are very similar in content and style to that on the **ricinium* (D 1). Comparing his version to Varro's, we can watch 'knowledge' growing on both garments. In Verrius, the **ricinium* and the **rica* are described in detail. They become valuable garments. The **rica* receives a place of honour and becomes the headwear of the wife of the flamen Dialis, an important priestess. All in all, Varro's initial thought that the **rica* was worn in religious practice has thus been spun out and developed into a full narrative of Roman religious history. At this point, a look back to Plautus may serve to not let this intellectual fog affect our modern perspective. All these elaborate theories clearly contradict the usage of the word **rica* in Plautus. There, the **rica* appears in a series of garments worn by the sophisticated Greek *puella* or *meretrix*.

Let us now turn to the other entry on the **rica* in Festus. It is the first in order, but much shorter than the one discussed above:

Festus p. 342.27–30 (= Paulus 343.9–10)

ricae et riculae vocantur parva ricinia ut palliola ad usum capitis facta. Gran<ius> quidem ait esse muliebre cingulum capitis, quo pro vitta flaminica redimiatur.

Small **ricinia* are called **ricae* and **riculae*. These are scarves made to use on the head. Granius, however, says that it is a female headband which the *flaminica* uses as a *vitta* for a garland.

This second entry differs greatly from the first one as to the definition of the **rica*. At the beginning, Festus defines the **rica* as a scarf (*palliolum*), without restricting it to any religious ritual or function. For him, the **rica* is simply a universal piece of headwear. In addition, Festus connects the three glosses **rica*, **ricula*, and **ricinium* with each other. His mixing up of different words is very notable, because we do not find this elsewhere in the Imperial tradition. It occurs only afterwards in Late Antiquity in Nonius. The progression of the diminutives is also very remarkable: first the word **ricinium*, then the word **rica* (thought to be a short form of **ricinium*), and finally the word **ricula* (a diminutive formed with the regular suffix). Creating the connection between **ricinium* and **rica* is very strange since it contains a morphological flaw. Latin has abridged and normal forms of words which designate the same item. For example, the short form *subligar* and the longer form *subligaculum* both designate the same piece of underwear (B 24). In the case at hand, the *shorter* word **rica* supposedly designated a *shorter* garment. The obscure **ricinium* is also made part of the definition. Festus therefore needs an additional *ut palliolum* (as a shawl) to convey an understandable sense. His

use of the three glosses in close proximity is thus intended to have the three words explain each other.

After the definition, the entry takes a surprising turn. Festus adds a reference to the scholar Granius, who is to be identified with Granius Flaccus. This was a grammarian writing on religious history who lived in the first century BCE.¹³ Granius gives us the religious explanation that was missing so far. In the vein of the first entry, the **rica* is said to be the headwear of the *flaminica*. However, this time it is neither a scarf (*palliolum*) (B 17) nor a headscarf (*mitra*) (B 13), but a headband (*vitta*) (B 16). The quotation of Granius makes it clear that this part is taken from Verrius. But what about the introductory definition? Its oddity and the fusing of glosses suggests that it is Festus' own work. There is also some other indication to support the hypothesis that the material is heterogeneous in this passage. The entry **rica* follows the entry **recinium* almost immediately, separated from it by only one other lemma. It looks like it was inserted as an afterthought. It stands between several entries that begin with RE (and not with RI). Moreover, it uses the form **ricinium* (with RI) and not **recinium* (with RE), as does the preceding entry **recinium*. This suggests that Festus may have been at work at least as far as the definition is concerned. We could thus date the mixing of glosses and of content—the term **rica* now designating both a normal headscarf and the garb of the *flaminica*—to the second half of the second century CE and not to Augustan times. This also fits in with how the word is used by the next author we have to speak about: Aulus Gellius.

4.2.3 Gellius

The archaist Aulus Gellius (ca. 130–185 CE), the grammarian who left us the results of his nightly studies in his *Noctes Atticae*, seldom comes up in the history of female clothing. However, the few notes he has on dress and dress glosses show that the study of this subject matter went on through the entire Imperial Period—changing, augmenting, and diluting the material we know from Augustan times on its way to Late Antique scholars like Nonius and Servius. The transition is felt, although the process cannot be described in detail anymore.

As regards the gloss **rica*, it is used in Gellius as heterogeneously as in Festus' definition. In a story about Socrates, Gellius tells us how Euclid of Megara disguised himself as a woman in order to visit his teacher Socrates in Athens. As an *homme de lettres*, Gellius does not forget to place the archaic gloss **rica* in his account:

¹³ Funaioli (1912) 1819–1820; Bardon (n. 12) 307.

Gell. NA 7.10.4

Euclides... tunica longa muliebri indutus et pallio versicolore amictus et caput rica velatus e domo sua Megaris Athenas ad Socratem commeabat.

Euclid ... dressed in a long women's tunic, put on a colourful cloak and covered his head with a **rica*. He then went from his home in Megara to Athens to Socrates.

Euclid dresses in a long female tunic (*chiton*), a cloak (*pallium*) that is marked as female by the bright colour, and finally a shawl. Gellius calls this headscarf a **rica*, using the term without any association with religious cult. He thus keeps to the universal definition we first find in the second entry of Festus. In contrast, the religious-historical meaning of the word—also found in Festus—comes across in another chapter of Gellius' work (10.15). There, Gellius deals with the various ceremonies the wife of the flamen Dialis (*flaminica*) has to perform. The **rica* is mentioned as part of the headdress of the *flaminica* (28): *in rica surculum de arbore felici habet* (on her **rica* she has a twig from a lucky tree).¹⁴ The story of the **rica* and the 'garment' itself are enlarged by this explanation. We now even have decorative accoutrements: a special lucky twig.

It is no longer possible to determine what sources Gellius used in his different chapters. He perhaps used one of the books already known to Verrius when discussing the *flaminica*. However, it is interesting to see that he offers exactly the same two meanings of **rica* that we find in the dictionary of his contemporary Festus.

The Imperial part of the story of the gloss **rica* does not end with this. We still have one more author to consider: the polymath Serenus Sammonicus († 212), who is adduced by Nonius and will therefore be dealt with in the next section. The following preliminary conclusion also pertains to him. The self-confident utterances of each of the authors examined in this chapter could lead us to believe in the existence of a garment called **rica*. This belief would, however, require reading each text as individual and practically unrelated explanations. When we actually compare their statements, we see that these scholars did not know what kind of garment it was or by whom it was worn. To them, it was at once a scarf (*palliolum*), a headscarf (*mitra*), and a headband (*vitta*); it was purple, dark, or without colour; it was worn by ordinary women, by Roman women, or by the wife of the flamen Dialis. The **rica* was thus every kind of headdress scholarly fantasy wanted to impose.

Apart from the one mention in Plautus, all these authors had no evidence for the word **rica* to offer—no quotation from other archaic authors or inscriptions. This changes in what we might call the third act of the drama, in Nonius. He gives us plenty of sources, or at least it seems so at first.

¹⁴ In Servius Auctus (= Donatus) ad Verg. Aen. 4.137 *surculum* is replaced by *arculum*.

4.3 Late Antiquity (Nonius) — the pseudo-evidence

In Nonius, many parallels from Latin Republican authors suddenly crop up, seemingly proving the meaning of the words **rica*, **ricula*, and **ricinium*. Regarding the general lack of sources for these terms, this may first seem very welcome. However, the following section argues that Nonius all but fabricated his claimed sources. All of the new evidence in Nonius consists of pseudo-parallels due to textual corruption, most of it instead leading to the common dress term **reticulum* (hairnet).

Sifting through Nonius' slipshod work requires a great deal of patience before we finally reach this result. The lemma of Nonius on the term **rica* is one of the longest and most detailed entries in his dictionary. As usual, the text suffers from a high degree of corruption. It raises various difficulties as to single words and has also been handed down in different versions. In the most important manuscripts, it is split in two—a new lemma **ricinum* beginning at p. 865.22 L. In the transmitted form, the text is given below. It is taken from the new edition of Gatti/Salvadore (2014), which provides a modern apparatus criticus, but offers no progress as to the text itself. Markings of textual problems are added for the purposes of this chapter in the form of cruces (†) and bold font. These annotations are intended to give an impression of what needs to be done in order to sort through Nonius' claims.

rica est quod nos sudarium dicimus. Plautus in Epidico: ricam, basilicum aut exoticum. Serenus †opusculo lib. I: aut †zonula aut acum aut ricam. Novius Paedio: †mollicinam crocatam ceridotam †ricam || ricinum. Lucilius satyrarum lib. II: †hrodyty aurati †cice et oracia mitrae. Turpilius †Veliterna: ducit me secum postquam ad aedem venimus, || veneratur deos. interea aspexit virginem || †instantem in capite riculam indutam ostrinam. Varro Prometheo Libero: aliae †mitrant ricinam aut mitram Melitensem.

It is often hard to decide at which stage of transmission the corruptions in the quotations originated (our manuscripts, Nonius himself, or the texts he used as sources). However, probably Nonius himself must be blamed for many of the errors. The version of the entire text (including fragments of other authors for which this section argues) is as follows. As to the fragments, the text is given in the original form that it might have had, not in the form Nonius might have written:

*rica est quod nos sudarium dicimus.
Plautus in Epidico (230): ricam, basilicum aut exoticum.
Serenus opusculo<rum> lib. I (F 1): aut zonulam aut acum aut ricam.
Novius Paedio (F 4): molliculam crocotam cheridotam [ricam] r<et>iculum.
Lucilius Saturarum lib. II (71): cheridotae auratae [cice] thoracia mitrae.*

Turpilius <Hetaera> [Veliterna] (F 1): ducit me secum. postquam ad aedem venimus, || veneratur deos. interea aspexit virginem || iniectam in capite r<et>iculum indutam ostrina.

Varro Prometheo Libero (433): aliae [mitrant] reticulum aut mitram Melitensem.

The **rica* is what we call a *sudarium* (handkerchief).

Plautus *Epidicus* (230): **rica, basilicum* or *exoticum*;

Serenus in his *Opuscula* book I: either a little belt or a hairpin or a **rica*;

Novius in his *Paedium* (F 4): a soft *crocota* with long sleeves, a hairnet;

Lucilius in his *Satires* book II (71): tunics adorned with gold and with long sleeves, decorative cuirasses, *mitrae*;

Turpilius in his *<Hetaera>* (F 1): 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*; Varro *Prometheus Liber* (433): other women a hairnet or Maltese headscarf.

The discussion of **rica* in Nonius must begin with understanding the section as a whole. As is his wont, Nonius begins with a definition of his own. This is not influenced by any of the explanations from Republican and early Imperial times. It comes closest to what we read in Festus' second entry. Nonius connects the **rica* with a piece of clothing known to him by personal experience. A *sudarium* is a handkerchief or a napkin put to various uses. After the definition, Nonius adduces six authors to prove his statement: 1. Plautus, 2. Septimius Serenus, 3. Novius, 4. Lucilius, 5. Turpilius, 6. Varro. Five of them date to Republican times (four also to Pre-Classical literature). In contrast to the others, Serenus, intruding after Plautus, wrote much later, dating only to the reign of Septimius Severus.

4.3.1 Serenus *Opuscula* F 1

The verse of Plautus' *Epidicus* has already been discussed in chapter A 4.¹⁵ The most relevant aspect in the context of this chapter is the hypothesis that it is the one and only primary evidence we have for the term **rica* (see below). The first in the line of secondary sources is then the poet known by the name of Serenus. His true identity and his exact lifetime are a matter of debate.¹⁶ He may be the same as the polymath Serenus Sammonicus. His *floruit* dates to the time of the Severan dynasty, if not later. The title of his work was the neuter plural form *Opuscula*, as can be seen from five other quotations in Nonius—in total, we have nine fragments. The newest edition of Nonius erroneously refers to his text with the singular form *Opusculum*. However, the transmitted text should be corrected to *Opusculorum*, following Lucian Müller (1888). The title *Opuscula* did not refer, as the plural might suggest, to a collection of smaller

¹⁵ Cf. pp. 72–74.

¹⁶ Cf. on him most recently, Courtney (1993) 406; K. Sallmann, art. Septimius Serenus (Sammonicus), in: *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 4 (= HAW VIII.4), Munich 1997, 591–593.

poems, but to a poem about agriculture and country life. This is shown by its alternative title *Ruralia* (Country Life) and a summary of its contents in Terentianus Maurus.¹⁷

The relevant fragment offers two difficulties. One is easy to solve. The most important manuscripts (LA^AB^A) have the feminine nominative singular form *zonula*. However, the nominative does not fit in the line. It has to be corrected with D^A to the accusative *zonulam*. The entire sequence is also difficult as to its metre. If *aut zonulam aut acum aut **ricam*** is thought to form an ordinary iambic dimeter, the accusative form of **rica*—which is supposed to have a long vowel I—does not fit in. Many editors therefore change the order and restore the metrically ‘correct’ sequence *aut zonulam aut **ricam** aut acum*.¹⁸ However, it is better not to touch the transmitted text. The scarce remains of Serenus’ poetical work show that it was quite heterogeneous as to metre, and we do not know for certain whether he did not want to write a choliambic verse. In this case, **rica* would fit in perfectly.

Serenus lists three accessories of the peasant housewife or possible gifts to her: a belt, a hairpin, and the obscure **rica*. The belt is referred to as *zonula*. The diminutive form is a stylistic mannerism found in Latin Neoteric poets like Catullus, whom Serenus likes to imitate (F 17). The inclusion of the hairpin (*acus crinalis*) would have made immediate sense to ancient readers. Serenus and his readers knew its use (and misuse) from Ovid’s *Amores*, in which we see a lady mistreating her maidservant with it. The final item, the **rica*, was probably included by Serenus because he thought it to be a headscarf. He inserted it as a Plautine gloss to show his erudition.

The fragment of Serenus divides the lemma of Nonius into two parts as regards the glosses. The evidence for the word **rica* ends with it. Afterwards, all quotations relate to the non-word **ricinum*, or respectively **ricula/um* (= *reticulum*). The citation of the late author Serenus indicates that Nonius had no further evidence for the word **rica* from earlier times, apart from the real primary source, Plautus. Otherwise, Nonius would certainly have quoted it before Serenus. The hypothesis that two lemmas were actually fused in the lemma on **rica* is also supported by the division in the manuscript tradition (see above). It suggests that a second lemma began with the word **ricinum* (not to be mistaken for **ricinium*, written with an additional I), which comes last in the following quotation from the comic playwright Novius. However, the assumption that Plautus is the only evidence for the term **rica* must still be proven by examining the following quotations, and we will turn to them now.

¹⁷ Courtney (1993) 406–407. Terent. Maur. 1975 (= Seren. F 10): *Septimius, quo docuit ruris opuscula libro* [Septimius in the book in which he teaches the *opuscula* of the countryside].

¹⁸ Müller and Lindsay in their editions of Nonius; Courtney (1993).

4.3.2 Novius *Paedium* F 4

The fragment of Novius (with a V) comes from an Atellan farce with the title *Paedium*. It is examined more closely in chapter A 7 so that a short introduction will suffice here.¹⁹ The verse describes the clothing of a young woman. It seems to be related to another verse from the same play, which is also quoted by Nonius in his dictionary. The text of this fragment is disturbed. The majority of the manuscripts, as mentioned already, separate the last word (**ricinum*) from the fragment and start a new lemma. In addition, the verse is quoted by Nonius not only here, but in a different form two more times. To see what the comic playwright Novius (whom Nonius is quoting) really wrote, we first have to compare all versions:

ricam] *mollicinam crocotam ceridotam* ***ricam*** || *ricinum* (p. 865.22 L.)
mollicina] *mollicinam crocotam, ceridotam ricinum* (p. 867.25 L.)
crocotulam] *mollicinam crocatam uridotam* ***richam*** *ricinium* (p. 880.30 L.)

Editors up to now have considered the version containing **ricam* to be the original version. They also place **ricinum* (without a third I) at the end of the verse in order to create a complete septenarius. However, this solution contains two difficulties: The word **ricinum* (without a third I) is not attested outside of the dictionary of Nonius. The words **ricinum* and **ricam* are also very similar in their pronunciation, which would create a clumsy phonetic doubling.²⁰

Let us now turn to the first problem and look at what could be hidden behind the new meaningless **ricinum*. It cannot be our cherished **ricinium* (with a third I) because a simple and heavy Roman cloak does not fit the context (D 1). It has been noted elsewhere in this book that the abbreviation of the syllable UL often caused confusion among copyists, who often mistook it for IN or N or left it out altogether. Presuming this to be the case here, we get the form **riculum*. A similar corruption of the letters UL probably affected the quotation from Varro's *Prometheus* with which Nonius concludes the lemma (see below). However, the word **riculum* is still nonsensical. A final stage is still needed before an intelligible meaning can be established. The final step is assuming that a second abbreviation is hidden in our corrupted form: The abbreviation of the beginning RI seems to be hiding the longer sequence RETI. We thus get the completely normal dress term **reticulum* (hairnet), which—as we will see—perfectly fits most of Nonius' subsequent quotations.

We can now turn to the second issue: The word **ricam* creates a strange repetition of similar words, raising the question of the original wording of the fragment of Novius (before it was corrupted by either Nonius or a later copyist). Deviating from all previous editions, the version without **ricam* should be our basis. First of all, this

¹⁹ Cf. pp. 168–174.

²⁰ Lucian Müller (1888) tried to avoid this by transposing *ricam* before *ceridotam*.

is the version that is quoted in the lemma **mollicina*. The fragment altogether begins with the word *mollicinam* and was probably excerpted to explain it. Therefore, we may assume that it has the original form. Starting from this hypothesis, it is easy to see how the copied secondary version with the additional **ricam* developed: The word or letters were written above the line as a variant. This later found its way into the body of the text. Before turning to further parallels, let us more closely examine what must have happened during this process. As we will find in Nonius' lemma later on, the ending of the non-word **riculum* varied between *-um* and *-am*. The ending *-am* on its own or the syllables *ric-am* together were written above **riculum* as an alternative. The desire to find further parallels for the **rica* metamorphosed these letters into a full word and helped to bring it into the text. This resulted in the clumsy repetition of the expression **ricam riculum*. The desire to produce a complete septenarius probably played a certain role as well.²¹

This hypothesis may seem daring for non-specialists, but there are good parallels for these appalling errors in Nonius. In fact, the last quotation from Varro in this same lemma seems to suffer from a similar intrusion. The marginal note or explanation *mitram* appears to have entered into the text in front of **ricinum*. The same structural argument can be made even when relying only on the examples that concern textiles. A case where we can clearly prove this process is found in Nonius p. 864.11 L. There, Plautus *Epidicus* 223 *an regillam induculam an mendiculam* is given as *an regillam tuniculam **indulam** an mendiculam*. The archetype would then have had the variant *indu-* written above *tuniculam*, which later entered the text as a complete word. In Caecilius *Pausimachus* F 3, the explanation *carbasinus* (made of cotton) is found next to the word *molochinus* (made of cotton) that it was thought to explain (A 7). Another fragment from Varro provides an additional interesting parallel. It is quoted twice in different forms by Nonius in the lemma *aulaea* (p. 861.14–16 L.) and in the lemma *plagae* (p. 862.19–22 L.). In the lemma *aulaea*, we find the juxtaposition of two variants *pallae* and *plallae*. The second form is a non-word that is given instead of *plagulae*. This leads some manuscripts to begin a new lemma on **plallae*—as in the case of *ricam ricinum*. In Nonius' lemma *plagae*, the additional *pallae* is missing altogether in the same quotation from Varro. The version without *pallae* is certainly the correct one. Taking all the evidence together, we should not hesitate to remove **ricam* from the original text of Nonius (and should ascribe the error to Nonius or a copyist).

Before concluding this section, we still have to take a short look at **mollicinam*, the first word of the verse. This also suffers from minor corruption. It will suffice to state only the results here. The matter is discussed in detail in chapter A 7.²² The transmitted meaningless word *mollicinam* is to be emended to *molliculam* (soft). This demonstrates

²¹ A similar phenomenon can also be observed in a fragment from Naevius (A 3).

²² Cf. p. 170.

another instance of where an incorrect resolution of the abbreviation of UL led to an error in our manuscripts.

Admittedly, these are many changes, but they are all based on a careful method and lead to a meaningful and plausible result. In summary, Novius originally wrote that the young woman in the temple was wearing a *molliculam crocotam ciridotam reticulum* (a soft *crocota* with long sleeves, a hairnet). There is nothing obscure to this. The later corruption was enabled by Nonius incompletely quoting the trochaic septenarius for his dictionary. He only quotes it from the second trochee onwards. In other words, he began from the first relevant word. The fact that the verse is not given in its entirety is not exceptional. Nonius often quotes incomplete verses and takes only what he sees as relevant for his purposes. It was not metre that mattered to him, but linguistic parallels. It was then well-intentioned subsequent copyists who completed what they recognized as a technically incomplete verse, resulting in the meaningless word of our modern text.

4.3.3 Lucilius F 71 M. (= 71 Chr./Garb.)

After Novius, the dictionary includes a quotation from the *Satires* of Lucilius. Again, the manuscripts offer gibberish. Scholars have tried to produce a meaningful text with combined efforts but have not come to a completely satisfying solution. The discussion will start from their proposals and then propose a new solution. In the transmitted and in the restored version presented in this section, the verse from Lucilius reads thus:

hrodyty aurati cice et oracia mitrae (codd.)

chirodytae auratae [ci/ce e] *thoracia mitrae* (Radicke)

The transmitted form of the verse, which is part of a hexameter, presents several difficulties.²³ The sequence HRODYTY is incomplete; the beginning and ending of the word are seriously muddled. Likewise, the sequence CICE ET ORACIA is meaningless. Lucian Müller (1888) wrote *chirodyti* (with long sleeves) at the beginning;²⁴ Carrion (1583) emended *cice* (E=AE) to **rica*;²⁵ Karl Ludwig Roth (1842) restored *et thoracia* (small ‘waistcoats’) out of *et oracia*.²⁶ In a first step, we will see what we can make

²³ On the early history of its emendation, cf. T. F. Winkelsen, *Die centones Luciliani* des Janus Dousa Pater (= BAC 89), Trier 2012, pp. 221–222.

²⁴ Cf. also R. Bouterwek, *Das erste Buch des Lucilius, nebst zwei Fragmenten des Sergius*, RhM 21 (1866), 344 and id., *Quaestiones Lucilianae*, Elberfeld 1867, 7, who proposed *chiridoti* (= χειριδωτοί). However, this does not fit into the metre for reasons of prosody. The transmitted *hrodyty* with the two striking Y also points to the form *chirodyt-*, cf. Marx (1914) in his commentary ad loc.

²⁵ L. Carrion, *Emendationes et Observationes*, lib. I cap. 2, restores: *ricini aurati, ricae, oraria, mitrae*.

²⁶ In the edition of Nonius which Roth made together with F. Gerlach (1842). The emendation is proposed there in the apparatus criticus.

of these proposals and what problems remain. Müller's solution is correct, insofar as some form of a Greek loanword like **chirodytus* or *chirodyta/es* has to be restored (see below). We must, however, see whether the masculine ending is correct. Roth's solution (*thoracia*) also goes in the right direction (see below). The preceding *et*, however, does not fit because it is against the rules of Latin enumeration. In contrast, Carrion's conjecture (**ricae*) is not easy. Despite this, it is taken up by all editors of later centuries. It is not clear how a Roman female **ricae* belongs in among 'Oriental' clothing. It is even more out of place since the list of clothing probably concerns men.

The core of all of these problems is the sequence CICEE. Any solution to Nonius' quotation of Lucilius must begin there. CICEE gives us the letters CI and CE, which are needed at the beginning of the line in the word *chirodytae* that designates a tunic with long sleeves (on its form, see below). The Greek semantic field connected with χεῖρ (hand, arm) appears in numerous Greek composite loanwords. The Greek εἰ can be transcribed in Latin either as E or I; the Greek letter χ (usually written as CH in modern transcription) is often transcribed by a mere C in ancient sources—hence CER, CIR. This is the usual form in the manuscripts of Nonius.²⁷ It is now easy to imagine what happened. Like in the preceding quotation taken from Novius, some letters were written above the line. The intent was either to make up for the missing letters in HRODYTY or, if H is to be taken as a misread CI, as some kind of header that gave the possible orthographic variants. Later on, both alternatives were incorporated into the text to complete the hexameter in this passage, where one foot was missing. This means that an interlinear addition would have again been inserted at the wrong place. The next question is the redundant letter E. The starting point for the proposed solution is that it was yet another variant written above the text. It concerned the ending of *aurati*, giving the female ending *ae* (= *e*) as an alternative. Stray endings cause similar chaos elsewhere in Nonius. We have seen above what an *-am* did to the **riculum* (*ri-cam*). Another clear case in the same book is Nonius p. 864.7 L. There, a variant ending in the expression *in Sardinia/is tapetibus* (on Persian rugs) later caused the manuscripts to contain the nonsensical *Sardinia ista pedibus*.

We should keep this possibility in mind later when discussing the entire content of the verse. First, there is another serious objection to the hypothesis that must be addressed. The theory of textual error runs quite smoothly if we look only at the text of the fragment. However, we must not forget that we are still dealing with Nonius' lemma on the gloss **rica* or **ricula*. This is the reason why Carrion's emendation appeared so attractive to many scholars. It supplied the missing word **rica*. Without it, the following question arises: How did the verse get into this section?

In Nonius, poetical fragments often start with the word in question. At least, they are often excerpted with the intention to use them in this way. We should therefore turn to the first word, *chirodyta*. This is very rare in Latin literature (see below) and therefore

²⁷ Cf., for example, Nonius p. 865.22, 867.25 L.: *ceridotam*, 880.30 L.: *uridotam* (= *ciridotam*).

a suitable candidate to be explained by Nonius. It is equal in meaning to the likewise very rare **chirodotus* (with long sleeves), which we find in the immediately preceding quotation taken from Novius. The encounter of these two very rare words is hardly by chance. It seems that both quotations were first put together in the dictionary by Nonius to illustrate this gloss. Nonius later went on to use them together without regard for the quotations' original purpose. This is how Lucilius ended up next to Novius. It may seem strange to us, but there are other parts in the book where a similar chaos prevails. We should keep in mind that Nonius' work is similar to a filing box (and a badly organized one at that).

Let us now turn to the content of the line. It is very likely that it refers to male Oriental costume. The first word designates, as has been said above, a long-sleeved *tunica* (*chiton*). In Classical Latin literature, the Latin term *tunica manicata* is commonly used for this un-Roman type of tunic.²⁸ In archaic and archaistic Latin texts, this type is still designated by two similar sounding Greek loanwords: **chiridotus* (χειριδωτός) and *chirodyta/es* (*χειροδύτης). The adjective *chiridotus* is attested several times in Greek texts, but is a hapax in Latin: It occurs only in the preceding quotation from Novius. In contrast, *chirodyta/es* (a noun that can be used as an adjective) is attested twice in Classical Antiquity and once in Late Antiquity,²⁹ though it is made to disappear in some dictionaries through false orthography.³⁰ In a long essay called *De tunicis chirodytis* (*About tunicae chirodytae*), the archaist Gellius tells us the following about it:

Gellius NA 6.12.5

tunicis uti virum prolixis ultra brachia et usque in primores manus ac prope in digitos Romae atque in omni Latio indecorum fuit. eas tunicas Graeco vocabulo nostri 'chirodytas' appellaverunt.

For a man to wear ample tunics reaching below the arms and as far as the wrists, and almost to the fingers, was considered improper in Rome and in all Latium. Such tunics our countrymen called by the Greek name *chirodytae*.

It is a whim of fate that the Greek word Gellius is talking about is not attested in Greek texts. However, the parallel formation ἐπενδύτης (= overgarment)³¹ leads to the regular Greek form *χειροδύτης. Hence we reach the Latin *chirodytes* (or with a Latin ending, *chirodyta*), and not, as dictionaries (ThLL, OLD) want us to believe, **chirodytus*.³² For this reason, we have to restore *chirodytae* in our fragment and not the form *chirodyti* usually given by editors. We should also not opt for the masculine *aurati*, but for the feminine variant *auratae*. This has the benefit of finally putting the stray letter E (= ae)

²⁸ Cf. B 1 pp. 257–261.

²⁹ Hist. Aug. Pertinax 8.2: *chirodytas Dalmatarum* [long-sleeved *Dalmaticae*].

³⁰ ThLL, OLD print it s.v. *chiridotus*.

³¹ LSJ s.v.

³² Georges s.v. only offers the plural *chirodyti*, explaining it to mean 'sleeves.'

to good use. By this, we get the regular expression *chirodytae auratae* (tunics with long sleeves adorned with gold).

It is clear that Lucilius is not talking about normal garments. The long-sleeved tunic is often referred to in Greek literature as the Persian male costume. Persians wear such clothes in Herodotus.³³ In Lucilius, we hear of tunics decorated with gold (*auratae*). The combination of the two elements fits the image of a rich Oriental (or at least orientalized) costume.³⁴

The same statement holds true for the following *thoracium* (θώρακιον). The diminutive is attested in this sense only here, but we find the normal form *thorax* in both Greek and Latin. It designates a garment in the form of a cuirass made of cloth. In Herodotus, we read of a magnificent linen *thorax* as a cult gift,³⁵ and we have to imagine something similar here. An unknown wife of an unknown Kallistratos donated a θώραξ κατάστικτος (a spotted *thoracium*) to Artemis Brauronia.³⁶ But there were also less splendid examples. In Imperial times, Augustus wore a wool *thorax* (*thorax laneus*) in winter, and a boy was given a green *thorax* (*viridis*), a kind of jersey for his favorite racing team, by his *patronus*.³⁷ In Latin literature, the *thorax* is always worn by males as a close-fitting intermediate garment, similar to a modern waistcoat.

In this context, the term *mitra* seems to also refer to a Persian-style male headwear. A certain type of *mitra* (in the shape of a headscarf) was also used by Greek and Roman women (B 14)—especially in bed, but also to cover unattractive hair while outside. The passage from Lucilius, however, more likely is referring to something wholly different: a fine Oriental costume worn by men. This exotic costume consists, as in Herodotus, of long-sleeved tunics decorated with gold, ornamental cuirasses, and Phrygian caps (*tiarae*).

When we look for a larger suitable context for the fragment, it is tempting to place it between two other verses from Lucilius (FF 12–13 = 18–19 Chr./Garb.).³⁸ These bookend

³³ Herodotus 7.61.1: περί δὲ τὸ σῶμα κιθῶνας χειριδωτοὺς ποικίλους [around the body they wear coloured tunics with sleeves]. On the Persian costume with sleeves, cf. in general E. R. Knauer, *Ex oriente vestimenta. Trachtgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Ärmelmantel und Ärmeljacke*, in: ANRW II 12.3, Berlin 1985, 607–622; B. Bäbler, *Fleißige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen*, Stuttgart 1998, 22–24; A. Scholl, *Der ‚Perser‘ und die ‚skythischen Bogenschützen‘ aus dem Kerameikos*, JdI 115 (2000), 79–112.

³⁴ Female tunics with sleeves are listed twice in the inventory of the Artemis Brauronia, cf. IG² II 1529.10: χιτωνίσκον χειριδωτόν; 1523.23: χιτωνίσκον περιήγητον χειριδωτόν. However, the diminutive form χιτωνίσκος (small tunic) shows that these are probably undertunics.

³⁵ Herodotus 3.47.2: θώραγα ... λίνεον καὶ ζώων ἐνυφασμένων συγχῶν, κεκοσμημένον δὲ χρυσῷ καὶ ἐρίοισι ἀπὸ ξύλου [a linen *thorax* with many figures woven into it, decked with gold and cotton embroidery].

³⁶ IG² II 1523.20.

³⁷ Suet. Aug. 82.1; Iuven. 5.143.

³⁸ Nonius pp. 860.27, 867.28 L.

the fragment in Nonius' text.³⁹ In descriptions of this kind, dress terms often appear in larger groups, comprising more than one verse. Nonius usually aims to make full use of his excerpts, sometimes dividing them up between different entries. For this reason, the passage of Lucilius he excerpted might have been somewhat longer. In this way, we get the following text (which is ultimately only an experiment):

praetextae ac tunicae, Lydorum opus sordidu<lum> omne, (F 12 M.)

chirodytae auratae ... thoracia mitrae (F 71 M.)

psilae atque amphotapae villis ingentibus molles (F 13 M.)

Praetextae and tunics—all this mean Oriental stuff—with long sleeves decorated with gold ... 'cuirasses', Oriental caps, rugs with pile on one side and soft rugs with huge nap on both sides.

In this reconstruction, F 26 reads like an explanation of the ironic comment *Lydorum opus sordidulum omne*. The noun *tunicae* (F 26) is taken up by *chirodytae* (F 27), which is used adjectivally (like in Gellius), being prepared for by the inserted comment "all this shabby Persian stuff." It is clear that a supposed Roman *rica has no place in such a context, and we should altogether refrain from emending the sequence CICE to it.

4.3.4 Turpilius Hetaera F 1

The next text adduced by Nonius is taken from a Palliata of Turpilius († 104 BCE) with the title *Hetaera*. The content of the fragment is discussed in chapter A 7.⁴⁰ The following remarks will focus on textual criticism. The *Hetaera* (including parts of this fragment) is also quoted elsewhere by Nonius (see below). The manuscripts offer the title *Veliterna* here, but this is obviously a mistake,⁴¹ *Veliterna* is actually the title of a comedy by Titinius, not Turpilius (an understandable confusion). The quotation is long by the standards of Nonius. It comprises three complete iambic senarii. The situation is as follows: A slave reports what happened to his young master. As he prayed in the temple, he saw a graceful woman, probably the eponymous *hetaera*. The young man falls in love at once. In its transmitted form, the text runs as follows. The third verse offers some textual problems.

*ducit me secum. postquam ad aedem venimus,
veneratur deos. interea aspexit virginem*

³⁹ Nonius assigns our verse to the second book of Lucilius' *Satires*, whereas he attributes the others to the first. However, the corruption of Roman numbers, especially of I to II (or vice versa), is not an insurmountable obstacle because Nonius often misquotes titles. In this lemma, for example, two of the six titles contain an error.

⁴⁰ Cf. pp. 144–146.

⁴¹ Stephanus (1564), in his edition of comic playwrights, still gives the fragment under the title *Veliterna*.

**instantem† in capite riculam indutam ostrinam.*

(*iniectam in capite reticulum, ostrina indutam* [Radicke])

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*.

This comparatively long passage is drawn on again later in the dictionary. The last two verses (from *interea* onwards) are quoted again by Nonius under the lemma *ostrinam*.⁴² There, the title of the play is given correctly as *Hetaera*. The second quotation differs slightly at the beginning of the last line, reading *iniectam* instead of *instantem*. The relevant portion reads *iniectam in capite riculam indutam ostrinam*. The text has been printed in many editions of Nonius, the comic playwrights, and Turpilius.⁴³ Editors usually adopt Nonius' longer version and correct the meaningless *instantem*.⁴⁴ Stephanus (1564) puts a comma after **riculam*, separating it from the rest of the line. This suggests two garments, a *ricula* and an *ostrina* (sc. *tunica*). However, since Carrion (1583),⁴⁵ all editors assume that *riculam* and *ostrinam* form one expression.⁴⁶ In that case, both words would go with *indutam*. All scholars leave the problem of what to do with **riculam* untouched.

(1) As to method, it seems best to follow Mercier (1613)⁴⁷ and to start with Nonius' second version: *iniectam in capite riculam indutam ostrinam*. In this way, fewer changes of the text are needed to come to a good result. The text also makes perfect sense, the only exception being the word **ricula*.⁴⁸ The verb *inicere* (to put or throw on or over) is well attested with garments.⁴⁹ The verb then stands in the medio-passive form *virginem iniectam* (a young woman dressed in) and the following **riculam* is the accusative object designating what is put on.

⁴² Nonius p. 881.9–10 L.

⁴³ Turpilius *Veliterna* F 1 Stephanus (1564); Turpilius *Hetaera* F 10 Bothe; F 11 Grautoff (1853); F 1 Ribbeck (1852); Ribbeck² (1871); Ribbeck³ (1898); F 1 Rychlewska (1971).

⁴⁴ Stephanus (1564) *gestantem in capite riculam, indutam ostrinam* (in this form already in the *Cornucopiae* of Perotti, 1526); Ribbeck (1852): *instantem, in capite indutam ostrinam riculam*; Grautoff (1853): *inrantem, caput indutam ostrina ricola*; Ribbeck² (1882): *ibi stantem, in capite ostrinam indutam riculam*; Rychlewska (1971): *ibi stantem in capite riculam indutam ostrinam*. See, however, Bothe (1834): *iniecta in caput ostrina indutam ricola*.

⁴⁵ Carrion (1583), in his *Emendationes et observationes* p. 5, writes *adstantem* and puts a comma after it, thus separating it from the rest.

⁴⁶ Cf. also Georges, OLD s.v. *ostrinus*; and André (1949) 103.

⁴⁷ In his second edition of Nonius. In the first edition (1583), Mercier still printed the emendation *gestantem*.

⁴⁸ That the quality of this version might be better is also suggested by the fact that the quotation is given under its correct title, while the wrong title in the longer version points to a greater confusion in the process of transmission.

⁴⁹ ThLL VII s.v. col. 1612.38–54; OLD s.v. *inicio* 5.

(2) Stephanus was right in putting a comma after **riculam*. The text is not talking about one garment, but about two articles of clothing: the **ricula* and the *ostrina*. The adjective *ostrina* (crimson) is either used as a noun, as often happens with clothing terms (especially with those designating coloured garments⁵⁰) or a word like *tunica* or *vestis* is added in the next verse, which is now missing. The verb *induere* also describes a process of dressing, but it differs slightly from *inicere*. The girl's crimson tunic (*chiton*) is put on by pulling it over the head. Again, we find the expression in its mediopassive form *virginem indutam* (a young woman dressed in). The object is contained in the accusative *ostrinam*. Here we face two smaller problems. The verb *induere* can be construed either with the ablative or the accusative.⁵¹ We should probably restore the ablative form in order to get the unambiguous expression *indutam ostrina*. Mistaken 'harmonization' of endings is another common error in Nonius.⁵² We should also consider following Ribbeck³ in changing the word order to *ostrina indutam* for prosodic reasons.⁵³ The word *ostrinus* usually has a long vowel I, which does not fit in the transmitted verse position, where a short syllable is technically required. If we leave the word in its transmitted place, we must assume an irregular prosody.⁵⁴ The discussion up to now shows that Turpilius is definitively describing the visible costume of a young lady. She is wearing something on her head (as is indicated by the word *iniecta*) and a crimson tunic (*chiton*). The combination of elements brilliantly depicts the figure of the beautiful hetaera that we also encounter in other *Palliatae*.

We can now tackle the obscure term **ricula*, which must refer to some kind of headwear. In both versions of Nonius, we find the feminine form. But what did Turpilius really write? The conclusions of previous chapters suggest that Nonius' text is corrupt. The ugly accumulation of words⁵⁵ with similar endings (*virginem*, *iniectam*, and *riculam*) blurs the grammar. It suggests that a similar corruption could have occurred in *riculam* as it did in *ostrinam*. The simplest assumption is that Turpilius offered the masculine ending -um. This leads us to the form **riculum*, which can be restored in the preceding fragment of Novius and in the following one from Varro. It is very likely an unresolved abbreviation of the word *reticulum* (hairnet). Again, we have found a perfectly normal headaddress underlying the obscure gloss. The young lady wore a hairnet as part of her elegant attire. It turns out that the **ricula* is not some unknown garment, but simply the corruption of a common term.

⁵⁰ Cf. for example, the adjectives in the catalogue of Plautus' *Epidicus*.

⁵¹ ThLL VII 1 s.v. col. 1268.27–66.

⁵² Afranius, *Fratriae* F 15: *incintam togam* instead of *incinctam toga*; cf. A 7 p. 163.

⁵³ So also in LHS I 121, 327.

⁵⁴ ThLL IX, s.v. *ostrinus*, col. 1161.4–21 compares *murrinus* and *coccinus* (with a short I) to it. However, these adjectives are not exact parallels. In contrast to *ostrinus*, they are regularly written with a short vowel I in Latin and a short Iota in Greek.

⁵⁵ Bothe (1834): "*cumulata m littera, quod vitari solet*"; Grautoff (1853) 17: "*accusativorum accumulatio inelegans*."

4.3.5 Varro *Prometheus Liber* F 433

The last quotation of Nonius comes from Varro's Menippean satires, namely from the *Prometheus Liber*. The content of the fragment has been dealt with in chapter A 9.⁵⁶ Its text is also severely corrupted and requires detailed discussion. The manuscripts of Nonius as transmitted provide a meaningless version of the text. It was most recently corrected by Astbury (433):

aliae mitrant tricenam aut mitram Melitensem (codd.)
aliae ... nt ricinium aut mitram Melitensem (Astbury)
aliae [mitrant] reticulum aut mitram Melitensem (Radicke)
 other women a hairnet or Maltese headscarf

The form *mitrant* is meaningless. According to Astbury, it originated out of the following word *mitram* by a leap of the eye. It then displaced a verb whose ending is still extant in the sequence of the letters NT. However, it is more likely—as we have seen in other fragments—that the annotation *mitram* was written above the line or in the margin to explain the gloss **ricenam*. This would have later been adopted in the main text and adapted accordingly by a scribe in order to make some sense of it. The form *mitrant* should therefore be deleted, as proposed by Lucian Müller (1888).

The next sequence of letters TRICENAM is just as meaningless. It has been variously emended by editors. Mercier (1583) proposed **ricinam*, Müller (1888) **reicam*. These proposals nonetheless both produce non-words. Popma's (1601) guess **ricinium*⁵⁷ is not much better. The gloss **ricinium* does indeed exist in Latin historical texts, but Varro thought that it designated a thick primeval cloak.⁵⁸ Unfortunately, this does not fit the following fashionable *mitra* from Malta. Moreover, Nonius would have included this fragment by Varro in his lemma **ricinium* if he had thought it to contain that rare word. For these reasons, we should not opt for this emendation.

As to the expected content, the **reticulum* (hairnet) is again the best solution. In *De lingua Latina*, Varro mentions it as a typical Roman headwear.⁵⁹ But what happened to it in this case? The sequence looks a bit like an anagram. The error perhaps originated from a misplacement of some letters. This combined with the usual inability of the scribes to resolve an abbreviation of the letters UL (see above). A similar process can be

⁵⁶ Cf. p. 192.

⁵⁷ Popma prints the text of Mercier in his edition, but remarks in his notes p. 700: "*Nonius hoc adducit in voce rica, ut fortassis legendum sit, aliae ricam, ricinium, aut mitram.*"

⁵⁸ Cf. C 1 pp. 565–568.

⁵⁹ Varro LL 5.130: *quod capillum contineret, dictum a rete reticulum ... mitra et reliqua fere in capite postea addita cum vocabulis Graecis* [Because it held the hair, the *reticulum* was named after the net (*rete*). ... The *mitra* and almost all other headaddresses were added later along with their Greek names]. Cf. on it B 12 p. 455.

observed in the gloss *amperinta*, which appears to be a completely garbled *interulam* (B 6).

But why did Nonius excerpt this fragment in the first place, if not for the gloss **ricula*? We should recall here that we are still fighting our way through Nonius' entry on the glosses **rica/*ricula*. The answer to this question is quite simple: The textual error is not due to Nonius or his scribes. It was his manuscript of Varro that was already defective in this place, offering a **ricula* instead of a *reticulum*. Nonius is guiltless. He just copied what he read. And that was wrong. The third act of the scholars' tragedy of the **rica* now comes to an end. Plautus' **rica* is the only **rica* that remains in primary evidence.

4.4 The Migration Period (Isidore of Seville)

The aftermath of the drama **rica/ricula* in the Migration Period is very short. Its history ends in Isidore of Seville with a brief notice on the **ricula: rricula est mitra virginalis capitis* (the *ricula* is a headscarf of the head of a young woman).⁶⁰ Again, Isidore adds something of his own. In keeping with the (supposedly) diminutive form of **ricula*, he makes it a kind of headband not of the woman but of the *virgo*. A large caveat to his proposal is that Isidore would not have seen what he refers to as a **ricula* in his entire life.

4.5 Conclusion

This concludes the scholars' tragedy. After humble beginnings, we have watched 'knowledge' on the **rica* grow in the early Imperial Period to form a small story of its own. First, the simple **rica* became a purple garment. It was worn by the wife of the *flamen Dialis*. It was produced by holy virgins in a ritual. Then, the story of the **rica* got mixed up with that of other glosses. Suddenly, Nonius pulled new evidence out of thin air in what was a real *coup de theatre*. Hopefully this chapter succeeded in dispelling Nonius' conjured illusion. After all this work of sifting through scholarly and scribal errors, we have seen three **reticula* (hairnets) and one **cice* dissolving into nothing. This forensic work also found that all texts have meaningful grammar and content. Their meaning can be established without in turn conjuring up an ancient world full of mysterious things. The only way to break through Nonius' illusion was a rational method guided by textual criticism. This was able to explain virtually every letter and the course a corruption might have taken in the manuscripts. In the end, there remains only Plautus' **rica*, and that was, if my hypothesis is correct, originally a **tricae* (nonsense, trifles).

⁶⁰ Isid. Etym. 19.31.5.

It seems that the comic playwright has yet another joke at our expense. If only he knew the havoc the innocent sequence RICA would cause. The ancients would certainly have chuckled at the nonsense written about their times.

