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ABSTRACT

Although many scholars have studied the work of Plautus, their work has focused largely on Plautus as a manipulator of Greek comedy or as an interesting study in archaic Latin. Only recently have scholars begun to look at Plautus in terms of his own language and his own audience. Even so, the few linguistic studies that have been done were primarily statistical and contributed little to an understanding of his audience.

Earlier investigation into the language of Plautus reveals that he used the foreign languages of Greek and Punic along with his native Latin in his plays. Previously, most believed the Greek was used to mark its users as "intelligent," and the Punic was believed by most to be intended as gibberish; this is in fact not the case. Both languages served to place his characters in the real world in which he and his audience lived. This in turn reveals that Plautus expected his audience to have at least a basic understanding of Greek and some familiarity with Punic.

While previous studies of Plautus that have analyzed his use of the idioms that served as markers of so-called "female" language have
concluded that he crossed the boundaries of gendered language for whatever reason, the largest such study was primarily statistical and gave no reason as to why Plautus would have done that. In fact, Plautus did not use such markers as markers of "feminine" language at all, but rather as markers of emotion and power. Plautus played on the connotations such idioms had in the minds of his audience to create his own version of the *adulescens amator*, who was in fact the forerunner of the elegiac lover of later Roman poetry.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The turn of the century marked an important milestone in the history of Scholarship on Plautus—the compilation of a standard text. F. Leo published his text, along with his *Plautinische Forschungen* first in 1895, and he published the second edition of the *Plautinische Forschungen* eighteen years later. In the first chapter, Leo explains that he follows the consensus that our two manuscript traditions, the Ambrosian Palimpsest (A), and the archetype of the other manuscripts (P), are ultimately derived from the same tradition. Our manuscripts are based on copies of stage copies that were collected by various grammarians in the outlying provinces because copies of Plautus’ work had been all but obliterated from Rome. This tradition, Leo feels, can only be traced back as far as the second century AD, a conclusion Leo reaches by a study of the number of passages with hiatus in them and comparison to epigraphic evidence of that time period that seems to show that the scribes of the second century AD believed that hiatus was allowable during the archaic period and therefore preserved it.
Consequently, many lines that exhibited a hiatus were not emended, and Leo follows their text. Generally speaking, Leo arrives at his text by accepting those readings common to both manuscripts as accurate.

Leo also disagrees with the traditional biography of Plautus. In the second chapter he tells us that he feels that the traditional story of Plautus as related by Gellius--that he was a comic actor, a trader, a mill-slave, etc.--was all a romanticized fiction created by the grammarians who followed the style of the Alexandrians. Leo feels that anyone who had a life so stricken with troubles would not have been able to study and learn to write as prolifically and as well as he did. The only part of the traditional biography Leo seems to believe is that Plautus was an actor before he began to write plays.

Leo next, in the third chapter, takes up the question of Plautus' originality. He believes that, due to the relationship between Euripides and New Comedy, we can infer that anything Euripidean in Plautus is of Greek origin. This includes philosophical sentences, reflections on the gods, reflections on humanity, and so forth. The prologues, however, which Leo takes up in the fourth chapter, he believes are pretty much Plautus' own work--even though they may have been slightly altered by
later generations. He goes so far as to proffer the opinion that the passages that relate to the titles of the plays could have been written by Plautus himself.

Leo, like so many of the German scholars who worked on Plautus during this time period, was interested in the Greek originals of Plautus' plays. The primary goal was to peel off what Plautus had done to the Greek originals and thus to discover what lay beneath--what they hoped would be the pristine original Greek play. The theory that underpinned this was precisely that: the Greeks knew what they were doing; their plays were perfect and pure. Anything that was rude, rough, and/or inconsistent had to have been, therefore, a Plautine addition. Leo went further to discuss his theory of contaminatio--the practice of inserting part of one play into another--in Plautus; an inconsistency or illogicality in a character's actions would often be his evidence that there had been a piece of another play inserted here.

Between Leo's two editions of his Plautinishe Forschungen, from 1904-1906, W. M. Lindsay published the Oxford Classical Text of the plays, accompanied by his own version of why he chose the text he did--Ancient Editions of Plautus. Lindsay's biggest quibble with Leo was that he feels--although he admits that he is in the minority--that the two recensions of the text belong to two different traditions rather than the
same one. He feels that, although mistakes occur in the same passages in both sets of manuscripts, the mistakes are not quite the same. Further, he points out that many of the mistakes common to both manuscripts are those of the sort that copyists are prone to make--leaving out a syllable (haplology) or running two words together (e.g. 
*gererem* for *gerere rem*) should be recognized as common mistakes and not necessarily assumed to be a consensus between the manuscripts that indicates a common origin. It is true that Lindsay had an advantage that Leo did not--he had the newly-discovered Codex Turnebi to which he could refer--but he was nevertheless criticized for his "renegade" opinion. E.A. Sonnenschein voices the view that many others must have held: whether the errors are those the scribes were prone to make or not, there are too many of them to be considered mere happenstance.¹

Unlike Leo, Lindsay believes in emending the text where there is an unusual hiatus. He further believes that one should disregard the attestations of the grammarians, generally speaking, unless they are specifically speaking about strange words or forms because it is quite likely that a copyist would have changed such words or forms into something more recognizable.

---

¹E. A. Sonnenschein, "Lindsay's Plautus," *CR* 19 (1905), 311-316; 313.
Leo published his second edition of his *Plautinische Forschungen* in 1912; to the dismay of some, it was virtually unchanged. Lindsay commented that the increase in the number of pages was due mainly to the increase in the size of the type.\(^2\) While Lindsay noted that Leo's theories of *contaminatio* were praised by many, he also cautioned the reader that we would never know precisely how Plautus worked until Egypt delivered a Greek original of one of Plautus' plays; he could not have known how prophetically he was speaking. Lindsay also, somewhat lightly, commented that the German theories of *contaminatio* tended to make lovers of Plautus either amused or angry, and that comment also proved to be somewhat prophetic.

Eduard Fraenkel, in *Plautinisches im Plautus*, in 1922, was the next to apply his pen to the fine art of scholarship on Plautus. Fraenkel's work, however, marked an important turning point in such scholarship; instead of focusing on the Greek originals on which Plautus based his plays, Fraenkel sought out what was unique and original in the playwright himself. He uses key words and phrasing upon which to base his theories. Wordplay on the word *ludus* and its derivatives, for example, is a particularly Plautine way of introducing the tricks that one

character will play on another; Fraenkel uses Pardalisca's announcement of the "games" that Cleostrata will play upon her husband as a particular example--although Pardalisca compares the "games" to the Greek Nemean or Olympic games, the idea expressed is still entirely Plautine despite the fact that the games around which the entire speech is centered are in origin Greek.³

In this way Fraenkel compiles a vast list of passages in Plautus that, on the surface, appear to have been of Greek origin, but that he seems to have turned--with Roman ideas and phrasing--into his own original motifs. Plautus tries, in a variety of ways, to elevate the events and characters of his plays above the banal world in which he lives. This is especially true in the monologues in which Plautus has his characters surpass (Fraenkel believes that the word superare is a key to recognizing a passage as Plautine) those of Greek myth or history; the slave Tranio declares that the deeds he is doing are comparable to those of Agathocles or Alexander the Great (Most. 775-777), and the adolescens Charinus proclaims that his distraction rivals that that Pentheus suffered at the hands of the Bacchantes (Merc. 469-470).⁴ In order to elevate his plays

---

³E. Fraenkel, Elementi Plautini in Plauto, Trans. F. Munari, (Firenze, 1960), 7ff. All citations are from the Italian translation; the only real difference between the two is the huge list of Addenda Fraenkel added in 1960.

⁴Fraenkel, 171 ff.
above the ordinary, Plautus also personifies inanimate objects; Pseudolus proclaims that the letters on Calidorus' tablets are so badly written that they appear to be attempting to procreate (Pseud. 23-24), and Sosia's voice "flies," as if a bird, to Mercury's ear (Amph. 325).  

Plautus' purpose, believes Fraenkel, is to strengthen the element of "comicty" in his comedies. This element stemmed from improvisatory theatre and Italic farce, and it dominates Plautus' plays everywhere. It is this "comicty" that serves to elevate the characters and actions Plautus puts on stage above those of the everyday world, and it is an element that Fraenkel finds to be uniquely Plautus'.  

In his study, Fraenkel compiles scores of passages from Plautus in order to study the recurrence of certain ideas and motifs that he finds to be either Roman or Plautine. He notes that Plautus had other, Italic, predecessors from which to draw, and he did not necessarily have to base everything on something the Greeks had done first. As Henry Prescott put it, "Why should we study the relation of Plautus to his Greek originals, contamination, and the like when these plays offer such rich

---

5Fraenkel, 98.

6Fraenkel, 370.
opportunities for appreciating the niceties of Latin expression and style?" Fraenkel had opened the door to studies which focused on Plautus and Latin rather than Plautus and Greek.

Although there was a flurry of activity during the years between 1922 and 1960--to some of which I shall return later--there was no work as ground-breaking as that Fraenkel, Leo, and Lindsay had already done. Inevitably, perhaps, there had been two camps established. The conservative scholars who followed the predominately German view expressed by Leo believed that one of the best purposes for which we moderns could use Plautus was to mine him for whatever vestiges we could find of the Greek models on which he based his plays. Others, however, predominately (and understandably) Italians, took offense at this because the Germans based their "quest for the Greek models" on the premise that the Greek models were perfection and that anything imperfect, therefore, was a Plautine addition. Fraenkel had been the first to try and look for what was uniquely Plautine, and he had been the first to look at the plays from the perspective of not only their Greek models, but their Italic heritage of farce, mime, improvisatory theatre, and the

---

like. The Italians, therefore, viewed the "German" view that anything Plautus did ruined the perfection of the Greek original as an insult to their own Italic heritage.\(^8\)

Fraenkel republished his *Plautinisches im Plautus* in Italian as *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* in 1960. Although he made few changes, he added 45 pages of addenda in an attempt to address discoveries made and scholarship written since the publication of his first edition. Unfortunately, however, as one reviewer has noted,\(^9\) Fraenkel, more than likely because it was published at about the same time as his own book, failed to address the discovery and publication of the *Dyskolos*.

Erich Segal, in 1968, was the next to enter the fray, and it was with his book that we finally leave behind the almost unanswerable (and in many respects, irrelevant) question of what Plautus did to the Greek plays upon which he based his comedies. Segal’s *Roman Laughter* is not only the first book in English to deal exclusively with Plautus’ comedies, it is the first to leave firmly aside the question of how horribly he mutilated the perfection of his Greek models. Segal deals with Plautus in

\(^{8}\text{See John Hanson, "Scholarship on Plautus Since 1950," CW LIX (1965), 103-129, 141-148; 103. Hanson remarks, "It is therefore gratifying to note that an excellent new edition of Eduard Fraenkel's *Plautinisches im Plautus* appeared in Italy, in an Italian translation, in 1961. This hopefully indicates some healing of mutual animosities in the realm of Plautine criticism."}\)

terms of the Roman society for whom he wrote his plays. He feels that it is in terms of their ideals, their norms, their moral values, etc., that the Roman playwright's offerings can best be understood.

In fact, Segal argues, the entire thrust of Plautus' plays is that of upending those ideals, norms, and moral values for the duration of the play. He adopts the Freudian theory that Plautus' comedies served as a psychological release from the moral and/or ethical constraints of everyday life. Plautus' plays were performed during Roman festivals, and he incorporated into them that festive, carnivalesque air by inverting or subverting societal norms until the end of the play.\textsuperscript{10} Hence, a son is \textit{impius} rather than \textit{pius} toward his father, slaves trick their masters out of money and/or force them into the positions of slaves, wives outmaneuver their husbands, slaves get married, and so forth.\textsuperscript{11} Plautine slaves generally enjoy more freedom and get away with more trickery than any other type of character in his corpus; this again is part of the "role inversion" that Segal sees as part of the festive atmosphere that Plautus used as the framework for his plays.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11}Segal, 15 ff.
\textsuperscript{12}Segal, 136.
\end{flushright}
Segal's work received mixed reviews. On the one hand, it was praised as being a serious attempt to examine the plays on their own terms without focusing on the Greek models Plautus used.\(^\text{13}\) On the other hand, Segal does not follow the traditionally pedantic methods of presenting his ideas; he writes in a humorous informal style, and he translates both the quotes from Plautus and most of those of foreign writers--two things that deeply offended one scholar.\(^\text{14}\) Another seems insulted that Segal writes in a "gee-whiz" style that impresses undergraduates, and believes that Segal is convinced that those for whom he is writing are an unsophisticated audience.\(^\text{15}\)

While these scholars may be right in their assessment of Segal's effort, it is most important to bear in mind that this book opened the door to attempting to understand Plautus' comedies in their own terms and in the light of his society. It was, therefore, a major turning point in scholarship devoted to Plautus. Further, while some scholars may have


\(^{15}\) James W. Halporn, "Roman laughter: The comedy of Plautus, by Erich Segal," CJ LXV 1970, 234-236; 234, 236.
found Segal’s style and use (or misuse) of Freud deplorable,\textsuperscript{16} it is precisely those qualities that make the book understandable and therefore valuable still to undergraduates.\textsuperscript{17}

Instead of focusing on Segal’s translating every passage originally written in a foreign language or the fact that his language is informal and easy to understand, critics should adopt the attitude of J. N. Hough:\textsuperscript{18} Segal writes for the layman, includes both the original and an "excellent" translation of every Latin passage, and contrasts and parallels in modern French and English comedy; all of these things serve to make Plautus and his works more accessible to people who might not, at least at this point, have the ability to deal with the dense and technical scholarship that, up until this point, was the focus of those members of the academic community who worked on Plautus.

John Wright, in his \textit{Dancing in Chains}, takes a step backward to look at the originality of Plautus and other Roman comic playwrights, and argues that Plautus and his fellows were not necessarily following

\textsuperscript{16}Halporn, 235-236.

\textsuperscript{17}Scholars who condemn these qualities must bear in mind that if they refuse to write in a manner that students can understand, they will eventually, due to the inability to interest students in something that is written too far above them for them to understand, kill the field in which they have chosen to work; without new students to become future scholars, there will soon be no field.

the Greek style of New Comedy, but that they in fact had their own
traditions of theme, expression, style, and language that they followed.
He dissects passage upon passage of Plautus and other more
fragmentary playwrights--Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, Caecilius
Statius, etc.--and in doing so believes that he has enough evidence to
prove his case. He notes that the playwrights often use the same or
similar phraseology, and he concludes from this that they share a
common fascination with words that have a similar sound and a roughly
similar meaning; the Roman playwrights, then, share a common love of
language.19

There are recurrent motifs in many of the passages he compares.
The motifs of giving a ring as a love token is one such motif, as are those
of drunkenness and perhaps the tradition of flagitatio. He also follows
Fraenkel in noting the common motifs of transformation and
identification as appearing to be an evidently Roman, if not particularly
Plautine, device.20 Wright also, along with recurrent motifs, notes the
recurrent appearance of certain stock characters and the strengthening
of their roles--the cook, the parasite, and the clever slave.21

19John Wright, Dancing in Chains: The Stylisitic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata,

20Wright, 74.

21Wright, 156-161.
Wright feels that the Roman playwrights all worked within the parameters of these traditional patterns, and that their audience therefore expected a play which followed these patterns. This, Wright feels, is the reason that Terence was largely unsuccessful. Rather than trying to capture the audience's attention with a clever character such as Plautus' Mercury in the *Amphitryon*, Terence insulted them for paying attention to something else or accusing him of something he felt that everyone else had also done. Wright follows Segal in noting the comic inversion of such Roman values as *pietas*; but he notes that where Plautus will have a son invert *pietas* by threatening his parents, *pietas* is serious business for Terence. While the traditional Roman comic slave---especially that of Plautus---is clever and cunning, he is, for Terence, a good slave who worries about pleasing rather than tricking his master. The traditional arrival motif is one that Plautus uses as an excuse for making jokes; Terence treats it seriously.

Many have said that Terence's style is "more elegant" than that of Plautus; Wright finds this to have been Terence's fault rather than his asset. The Roman comic tradition called for lots of word-play,

---

22 Wright, 130.

23 Wright, 137.

24 Wright, 145.
alliteration, hyperbole, run-on lines, etc. Terence generally avoids all these things--perhaps, in Wright's opinion, following the Greek more closely. Hence, Wright concludes that, while all the other Roman comic playwrights worked within the tradition, Terence worked outside of it, and that was why he had difficulty in getting and sustaining the attention of his audience.

David Konstan, in his 1983 *Roman Comedy*, preferred to follow the path that Segal had begun and basically laid aside the question of Plautus' and Terence's dependence on or difference from their Greek originals, and instead focuses on how the Roman comedies are reflections of the Roman city-state. In Konstan's view, the characters of the Braggart Soldier and the Pimp, who are so often the impediment to the fulfillment of the young love that usually serves as the impetus for the plot of the comedy, are outside the bounds of the ties of commerce and family that make up the community. They symbolize military service and sex, both of which are excluded from the normal bonds of a society. The young lover's passion, on the other hand, is not socially acceptable.

---

25 Wright, 132.

26 Wright, 151 n. 32.
per se, but in realizing the goal of that passion, the would-be lover defends his community against the unequal advantage of the wealthy intruders.  

Hence, the *Aulularia*, in the character of the miserly Euclio, reflects the Roman value of thrift. On the other hand, Euclio excludes himself from Roman society by denying himself fire and water and by refusing to trust *fides*, the Roman value of trust and fidelity. In this way Euclio withdraws from society, and he must again become a part of it by the conclusion of the play. He does this in part by giving the pot of gold as dowry for his daughter’s marriage; the dowry serves as a symbol that reaffirms the values of the city-state.

By such detailed analyses of each of seven plays of Plautus and one of Terence, Konstan interprets the meaning of the play by examining verbal and metaphorical structure, operation of legal or ethical terminology, imagery drawn from various natural or religious spheres, and the explicit statements of the characters themselves. He concludes that the meaning of each play mutually conditions and is conditioned by

---


28 Konstan, 35-38.
the comic representations of character and motive; the social content of
comedy is inseparable from its meaning and it is therefore inseparable
from its society.\textsuperscript{29}

Continuing Segal's trend of examining the plays of Plautus in the
context of performance and the culture whose members formed their
audience, Niall Slater, in 1987, gave us \textit{Plautus in Performance}. In this
book, Slater analyzes six of Plautus' plays in terms of metatheatre, or, by
his definition, self-conscious theatre. Each of the plays has a character
who controls the action and knows that the play is a play rather than
that character's reality. This is borne out by the use of such linguistic
devices as the use of \textit{agere}, which means at the same time "do" and "act;"
to the outside audience, the word means "act," but to the characters of
the play for whom the play is reality, it means "do." Dramatic devices
such as eavesdropping scenes also play a part; in such a scene, a
character or characters, standing to one side of the character who is
center-stage, comment either as an aside to the audience or asides to
each other on what the central character is doing.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29}Konstan, 167.

A primary example is that of the slave Pseudolus in the play of the same name. Upon the pimp Ballio's entrance, the character of Pseudolus reminds that this is a play by means of an eavesdropping scene; after Ballio finishes berating his slaves, Pseudolus and his young master Calidorus comment to each other--and the audience--about Ballio and his actions. Shortly thereafter, Pseudolus, left alone on stage, gives a soliloquy in which he identifies himself with a poet/playwright. Another eavesdropping scene, this one between Pseudolus and the audience, occurs when Pseudolus witnesses Simo telling his friend Callipho that he is aware of his son's infatuation. It is after learning this that Pseudolus begins to improvise his "plays" by means of which he will cheat Ballio and Simo; the beginning of the "play-within-a-play" trickery that will form the play's denouement is announced when Simo tells Pseudolus that he may begin them by proclaiming them with words Fraenkel long ago noted as signalling something Plautine "indice ludos nunciam."32

Such metatheatrical devices are, according to Slater, to be found throughout Plautus' work. By means of these mechanisms, usually

31 John Wright, "The Transformations of Pseudolus," TAPA 105 (1975), 403-416. Slater follows the groundwork laid by John Wright's article in which he discussed how the language Plautus put in the mouth of the slave Pseudolus serves to give him control of the play, elevate his stature, and even identify him with the playwright himself.

32 Slater, 123-130.
focused on one character but sometimes focused on several, the
classic who controls the action straddles the line between illusion and
reality. Through these characters, Plautus not only performs for, but
carries on a dialogue with, his audience.  

With William Anderson's 1995 *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman
Comedy*, scholarship on Plautus appears to have come full circle.
Anderson goes back to Menander's *Dis Exapaton* in order to discover
exactly what it was that Plautus did to his Greek originals. He puts the
Greek and Latin together for a side-by-side comparison, and concludes
that Plautus' goals were entirely different from those of Menander, and
that he achieved them by "deconstructing" the Greek playwright's work.
Where Menander strove for reality to gain the audience's sympathy for a
character, Plautus strove for caricature to provoke laughter and disbelief.
Where Menander wants the audience to sympathize with the two friends'
misunderstanding, Plautus sets out to amplify and extend the
misunderstanding.  

Plots, intrigues, and "rogues" are comic devices by means of which
Plautus "deconstructs" his Greek originals to compose his own comedies.
As Wright noted before him, Anderson claims that where the Greek

33Slater, 150-152.
comedies focused on romance, Plautus merely used the romance as an impetus from which to spring into some funny business. In the 
_Aulularia_, for example, the pot of gold and not the _adulescens_' love for the young girl remains the focus of the play.\(^\text{35}\)

Continuing down the avenue opened by Segal and Slater, Anderson also notes Plautus' exaggeration of a quality he calls "heroic badness" in the "rogue" characters who control the action of the plays. This quality turns _malitia_, which, according to Roman norms, would be a quality of "badness," into a virtue; it is through the use of this quality that the rogue characters achieve their goals. Pseudolus' _malitia_, for example, gives him the craftiness to outwit both Ballio and his master Simo. In the _Casina_, Cleostrata's _malitia_ allows her to outwit her would-be-philandering husband by means of a series of shenanigans her slave Pardalisca announces to the audience in a speech full of _ludus_-derivatives.\(^\text{36}\)

In a conclusion that seems parallel to those posited by Konstan, Anderson claims that the plays put forth the clash between stalwart family values and the roguish heroes. The rogue characters help the

\(^{35}\)Anderson, 61; 65-68.

\(^{36}\)Anderson, 100-104.
young lover, and, according to Anderson, enact the imagined superiority of undeveloped Rome over overdeveloped Greece. Plautus found the Greek values laughable, and so he portrayed them as such.\textsuperscript{37}

Only recently, then, have we begun to look at Plautus and his work in terms of Rome and the culture in the context of which he wrote and performed his plays. This seems to be a positive direction, for surely it was the Romans for whom Plautus wrote and performed rather than the Greeks. It is the Roman values of \textit{pietas} and \textit{fides} that he parodies and inverts; he would not do so unless he knew that his audience, who believed in those values, would be amused by such inversion.

This inversion of Roman values leads me to believe that I can surely find other reflections of his audience in his work. We can be sure that he expected his audience to stay and watch the play rather than run off and watch a rope dancer or something else. Holding their attention demanded that he allow for the fact that intelligence and social rank did not necessarily go together. He knew that he had to acknowledge his audience's intelligence and use cliches, jokes, and stereotypes that they would not only understand but find amusing; this in turn required him to use language and ideas that they could understand. It would follow that an examination of that language and those ideas may shed some

\textsuperscript{37}Anderson, 140-146.
insight upon the language, thoughts, and ethos of the members of Plautus' audience. It is with this hypothesis that I begin my investigation of Plautus' use of language in his plays.
CHAPTER 2

PLAUTUS, HIS LANGUAGE, HIS PEOPLE, AND HIS AUDIENCE

Having finally determined that Plautus is best understood in terms of his own culture and audience, perhaps we can now go on to try and understand the audience for whom he wrote. He uses language very creatively in crafting the characters of his plays. Not only does he use his own native Latin in puns and etymological figures as most scholars who have read his work have noted, but he also uses foreign languages and what ancient scholars have told us are "female" speech idioms. Most scholars believe that Plautus uses Greek as a higher-status language than Latin to mark the intelligence of its user;38 this seems to be an erroneous conclusion because the variety of Greek Plautus uses is not of the type one would consider particularly "elite." The most recent scholarship39 about Plautus' Punic in the Poenulus holds that it is not Punic at all, but rather gibberish; if that were so, it would seem that

38 See, for example, Nixon's Loeb edition of Plautus' plays in which he translates all Greek into French as if it were a higher status language.

rather than publishing several articles on how to translate it, they would have found it entirely incomprehensible. Finally, no one has adequately addressed the issue of precisely how or why Plautus uses the foreign languages or "female" speech idioms, although J.N. Adams has done an exhaustive quantitative study in which he analyzes the number of appearances of several of the idioms and the characters in whose mouths they are put.40

Plautus is known for throwing Greek phrases and words into his work; translators routinely translate these into French. Yet the Latin language, even in Plautus' time, is filled with words either derived from, borrowed from, or cognate with Greek words. Further, he either keeps the original Greek names of his characters or renames them with new Greek names; he usually does this in order to make puns on these names. It is clear, then, that Plautus expects his audience to understand the Greek and the Greek borrowings that he uses, and Plautus' audience was not merely the educated elite, but anyone who happened to walk by him on the street. Hence, Plautus expected the ordinary John Doe on the street to understand such Greek as he put in the mouths of his characters perfectly well.

Yet the translators’ insistence on translating the Greek into French belies this; such action implies that Plautus considered Greek a higher status language than Latin. If that were the case, then it would have marked those who could speak and understand it as either "educated" or "snobs" or both. This is clearly not the case.

Along the same line, Plautus puts several lines of "Punic" in the mouth of the character Hanno in the *Poenulus*. It is unclear, because of corruption of the text, emendations, and the like, whether or not this is intended to be real, intelligible Punic that a Carthaginian of the time would understand, or whether it is intended to be pure gibberish that the Romans would not understand. Either way, Plautus uses it to characterize Hanno in some fashion; the question is what he expected his audience to understand from his use of this device.

Modern sociolinguistic scholarship has sought to understand how language reflects its speakers. Labov studied the appearance of [r] as a marker of social class in the speech of the employees of various department stores in New York City.\(^{41}\) Trudgill studied the use of several different phonological variables in Norwich, England, and concluded that their use was related to social class and gender.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{41}\)Labov, William, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, (Philadelphia, 1972)

\(^{42}\)Trudgill, Peter, *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*, (Cambridge, 1974)
Scholars have gone beyond Trudgill’s study to examine more explicitly the relationship between language and gender. Robin Lakoff’s landmark study concludes that much of the language--both spoken language and gestures--that women use is a result of their subordinate position in their societies.\textsuperscript{43} Tannen and others have analyzed the conversations between men and women to conclude that their different methods of discourse often lead them to speak to each other at cross-purposes; different expectations of each gender by society often are the reasons that force them into different linguistic modes of communication.\textsuperscript{44}

What all these studies have in common, however, is that their authors could go out into the field with tape recorders, converse with their subjects, and record by some means their subjects' speech. This is, of course, not possible when we deal with an ancient language. We have only the representatives of the ancient language and their analyses of that language from which to draw. With the help of the text we study

\textsuperscript{43}Lakoff, Robin, \textit{Language and Woman's Place}, (New York, 1975); Jennifer Coates, \textit{Women, Men, and Language}, (New York, 1986) gives a more quantitative study.

\textsuperscript{44}Tannen, Deborah, \textit{You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation}, (New York, 1990); see also the collection \textit{The Feminist Critique of Language}, ,Ed. Deborah Cameron, (New York, 1990)
and the ancient commentators, it is nevertheless possible to discern how
certain linguistic markers or idioms were perceived by the ancients who
heard them.

The Members of Plautus' Audience

The question of the composition of Plautus' audience is,
unfortunately, a somewhat vexed one. The first thing we must consider
is the fact that Plautus put on his plays during the *ludi scaenici*, the
dramatic festivals, which consisted of at least four festivals during the
Roman year. The *ludi Romani* were the oldest of these; they were
instituted in September 364 BC, and Livy tells us that by Plautus' time,
beginning in 214 BC, the curule aediles who were responsible for these
games devoted four days to dramatic performances.\(^{45}\) The plebian
aediles were in charge of the *ludi plebii*, which were instituted in
November 220 BC; the didascalia for the *Stichus* tells us that it was first
performed at these games in 200 BC. The urban praetor produced the
*ludi Apollinares*, which were first celebrated in July 212 BC. In April 204

\(^{45}\)Livy XXIV.43,*Ludos scaenicos per quadriduum eo anno primum factos ab
curulibus aedilibus memoriae proditur.*
BC, the *ludi Megalenses* were first established by the curule aediles to honor the Great Mother; the *Pseudolus* was first performed at these games in 191 BC\(^46\)

With regard to who could go to the productions, anyone—senator or slave, man, woman, or child, Roman or foreigner—could go. The *ludi* were put on at the expense of the magistrates, and everyone could attend for free.\(^47\) Along with those who actually lived inside the city, surely many of those who lived outside the city were capable of attending the spectacles;\(^48\) while no political business was conducted on the days of a festival, there were some people who were there to sell food, and there may well have been others who took advantage of the crowds to sell other wares.\(^49\)

While very little is known about Plautus himself, the consensus is that he was a freeman who came to Rome and sought some kind of labor in the theater, perhaps as a performer of Atellan farce, before

---

\(^46\)Duckworth, G, *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, 2nd Ed, (1994), 76-77; Duckworth goes into a reasonable amount of detail in discussing the dramatic festivals.


\(^48\)Morely, Neville, *Metropolis and Hinterland*, (1996); 110-111, notes that villas whose agricultural production was intended primarily for sale were situated immediately outside of the city. In this way, they avoided the unsanitary conditions of the city itself and were close enough to come and market their produce without risking its spoiling. A festival, when the crowds proliferated in the city, would have afforded a good occasion upon which to sell their products.

\(^49\)The *prologus* of the *Poenulus* tells the professional applauders to go away while the show is in progress and burst into the bakery (*Poen.* 41-42).
embarking upon his career as a playwright.\textsuperscript{50} The actors who performed his plays were a regular troupe of actors (\textit{grex}); some of them may well have been slaves, but the master of the company (\textit{dominus gregis}) was usually either a freeman or a freedman. The rest of the company, however, may have been slaves; Livy notes that performers of Atellan farce are not forbidden to serve in the army as professional actors are.\textsuperscript{51} Actors, as well as slaves, were considered the lowest class of society and were prohibited from serving in the army.\textsuperscript{52} This in turn raises another issue: if several of the acting troupe were slaves, they would not have been native Romans. Yavetz quotes figures in which he remarks that, after the Second Punic war, 50,000 Punic slaves were taken; most of the nearly 50,000 other slaves at the same time were either Greek or Celtic.\textsuperscript{53} Even supposing that these figures are exaggerated, there must have been quite a few foreign slaves in Rome,\textsuperscript{54} and there is no reason to think that none of them would have been members of an acting troupe.\textsuperscript{55} Finally,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Beare, 45; Duckworth, 50.
\item Livy, \textit{AUC VII.ii.12}.
\item Duckworth, 77, remarks that this may mean, especially in later times, that some of the slaves may well have been aliens or freedmen.
\item Yavetz, Zvi, \textit{Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome} (1988); 2.
\item Bradley, Keith R., \textit{Slavery and Society at Rome}, (1994), 32; remarks that the reduction of conquered enemies to slaves was one of the principle means of acquiring slaves.
\item Potter, D.S., and D.J. Mattingly, \textit{Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire}, (1999), 266, point out that the because the Roman dramas of Plautus' time all
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
many slaves were brought to Rome not as agrarian slaves, but as tradesmen.\textsuperscript{56} At the very least, slaves of foreign birth would have been in the audience, and they would have more than likely been more fluent in their native language than in Latin.\textsuperscript{57}

The fact that these plays were put on during festivals, however, tells us that Plautus had yet another problem he had to address. The festivals in Rome were raucous affairs, and in their celebratory mood much of the crowd evidently became drunken and unruly.\textsuperscript{58} He would have not only been able to communicate with them on their own terms, but he would have to hold their attention throughout the play.

The best evidence for the composition of Plautus' audience, however, comes from Plautus himself. Plautus addresses wet-nurses and their charges, slaves, wives, prostitutes, and people of all walks of life in the prologue of his \textit{Poenulus}: he tells the prostitutes not to sit on the stage, the slaves not to block free men, the nurses to tend to their

\textsuperscript{56}Polybius, X.9 tells us that when P. Cornelius Scipio took New Carthage, he divided up the captives between the tradesmen and the citizens; he left the citizens there but took the tradesmen to Rome as public slaves.

\textsuperscript{57}Noy, David, \textit{Foreigners at Rome}, (2000), 4; Noy notes that nearly all foreign slaves, even if manumitted, were likely to stay in Rome as freedmen.

\textsuperscript{58}Segal, 2, mentions that Horace, \textit{Ars}, 225 ff says of the spectator "spectator functusque sacris et potus et exlex."
babies at home rather to let them cry through the performance, and he
tells the *matronae* to be quiet and not to irritate their husbands as much
at the performance as they do at home. His making such an address
clearly that indicates that he thought all of those people could easily
have been in his audience. Furthermore, it is of note that the only
members of Roman society that he does NOT address in this prologue are
the members of the upperclass; if he had expected his audience to be
primarily composed of upperclass aristocrats, he would have not insulted
them by calling them "freemen" or "whores."

An actor or playwright could not afford to insult his audience. In
the first place, there was a very real threat of at least being beaten or
boooed off the stage and forced to seek refuge elsewhere, at most, one

---

59 Plautus, *Poen.* 17-35. Admittedly, there are problems with some of the
prologues; that of the Casina, for example, is clearly post-Plautine as it refers to the
play of Plautus as being an *antiquam comoediam* (Cas. 13). Duckworth, (80), although
he notes that Ritschl assumed ALL the prologues are products of revivals of Plautus’
work, clearly believes that this is an erroneous conclusion; Ritschl’s assumption is
based solely upon the mention of Plautus’ name in the prologue. This, as a basis for
such an assumption, seems far fetched. The playwrights were paid for their efforts (cf.
Terence, *Eun.* 20), and Plautus makes mention of hired applauders and those who
would bribe the aediles for the artistic prize (cf. *Amph.* 66-74; *Poen.* 36-42). If the plays
were being revived, there would be no need to reward Plautus, but if he were, in fact,
producing them for the first time, he would have had every reason to see to it that his
name was made known.


61 cf. Cicero, *Pro Rosc*, *Com.* 30, where Cicero explains how Roscio protected a
fellow actor who had boooed off the stage; *Quod item nuper in Erote comoedo usu venit;
qui postea quam e scaena non modo sibilis sed etiam convicio explodebatur, sicut in aram
confugit in huius domum, disciplinam, patrocinium, nomen: itaque perbrevi tempore qui ne
in novissimis quidem erat histrionibus ad primos pervenit comoedios.*
could be imprisoned for insulting the wrong people.\textsuperscript{62} Plautus certainly could afford to do neither if he wanted to be able to continue producing his plays. He wanted to entertain his audience well enough that they would not only stay for the entire play, but they would spread word of his good work to others.

As we have seen, his audience was quite diverse, and would likely understand not only his own native Latin, but at least smatterings of other languages as well. Foreigners, whether slaves or tradesmen, would have to know not only their own native languages but also enough Latin to get around and sell their wares. Likewise, the individuals who did the marketing would have to know enough of any foreign language to be able to conduct business with any foreign traders who were in the city.\textsuperscript{63}

Although the comedy of Plautus is admittedly a literary art form, comedy is a better source than most literature for the study of a civilization's language because of its use of stereotypes and idiom that is meant to be understood by all who watch it. Further, Plautus' language

\textsuperscript{62}Evidently the entire Roman world was familiar with the example of Gn. Naevius, who insulted the Metelli. Ps-Asconius, a scholiast on Cicero's Verrine orations, tells us the offending remark: \textit{Fatò Metelli Romae fiunt consules}, and the supposed reply of the Metelli, "\textit{Dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae.}" Naevius was supposedly imprisoned, a fact to which Plautus himself is believed to allude at Miles 211-212: \textit{nam os columnatum poetae esse indaudii barbaro/qui bini custodes semper totis horis occupant.}

\textsuperscript{63}Noy, 251-3, comments especially on the fact that many slaves were brought to Rome by North African slave traders.
is more colloquial than that of other playwrights, and, unlike the Greek comic playwrights who wrote primarily for the elite, he wrote for anyone and everyone who wanted to watch. That means that his language must have been intelligible to most and that any linguistic idioms or markers must have been understandable as such to most of his audience. Hence, the comedies of Plautus offer us a reasonable opportunity to gain insight into the connotations that language and linguistic markers brought into the minds of the members of his audience—whether native Romans or otherwise, drunken or sober, senator or slave.

**Aristophanes’ Use of Greek Dialect**

Despite the differences in their respective audiences, we may gain some analogical perception of Plautus' use of language in comparing Aristophanes' use of different dialects to characterize certain *persona* in his plays. For example, Aristophanes used some semblance of Doric Greek to characterize the Spartan women as "backwoods hicks" in the *Lysistrata*. It is clear that his "Doric" is designed to be intelligible for the Athenians for whom the play was performed, and it is equally clear that his use of it is specifically for the purpose of characterizing the Spartans as Spartan. What is not clear, and bears closer examination, is precisely
what Aristophanes expected his audience to read into his use of such a characterization. Perhaps the Athenians and the Spartans communicated perfectly well, and his use of a dialect that was "filtered" through Attic Greek was meant to convey them as more intelligent than the average Spartan.

Recently, in fact, Stephen Colvin undertook the task of studying the sociolinguistic implications of Aristophanes' use of dialects other than Attic and his characterization of foreign characters. He examines Aristophanes' use of language, dialect, and linguistic markers in the Old Comedy of the fifth century BC in Athens. In his study he undertakes an investigation to determine what, if anything, we can learn from Aristophanes use of language about the ancient Greeks' perception of dialect.64

Colvin notes that part of what separates ancient comedy from other literary genres such as tragedy is that it is founded in reality. Its subject matter includes references to everyday issues and it is often vulgar; its plots are often ridiculous and serve primarily as vehicles for jokes. Its writers attempt to represent reality with a discourse structure that is less formal than that of tragedy; there are interruptions and true

dialogue. Comic playwrights use poetic vocabulary rarely--usually to make it the butt of a joke. There is a meter, but it is far looser than that of comedy and sometimes seems non-existent.65

Colvin begins his study by examining Aristophanes' literary predecessors. The language of epic poetry which pervades much of tragedy is almost non-existent in comedy. While Aristophanes makes every attempt to distinguish foreigners and non-Athenian Greeks by means of their language, epic makes no such distinction. He concludes from this that Homeric epic was based in unreality. It was a universal in which no Greek was different from any other and there was no specific time or place setting. This is very different from Aristophanic comedy which is based in the reality of a specific date and time.66

Far more useful is the literature left to us by the Attic historians, who wrote in the Attic-Ionic dialect in which scientific treatises were written. Herodotus in particular was interested in the customs, manners, and languages of other peoples, and on occasions he would remark that something was called by a particular word in a particular language.67 On the whole, however, Herodotus generally uses the same

---

65 Colvin, 32.
66 Colvin, 49.
67 Colvin cites 9.10--"the name of this meal in Persian is tukta..."
dialect of Greek throughout his work. Even though he recognizes the fact that Greeks from different poleis speak in different dialects, he makes no real attempt to represent those dialects in his text.  

Xenophon's history was like that of Herodotus in that he was writing about Greeks fighting Persians. While Herodotus occasionally makes the language differences known by remarking on a particular word, Xenophon does so by reporting that the speech is made through interpreters. Rarely does Xenophon use a different dialect in relating the speech of Greeks from different city-states; he merely mentions that one spoke Boeotian or Laconian or the like.  

In five cases, however, Colvin notes that Xenophon directly quotes Laconian. Four of them are the phrase νοι τω σιώ or its negative, and the other is a sentence which includes that oath. Colvin concludes that the oath itself is such a Laconism that Xenophon uses it to mark a Laconian in a state of passion. The last sentence appears to have been a direct quotation which was imported wholesale rather than Xenophon's attempt to represent the Laconian dialect. In any event, it is clear that Xenophon understood not only the differences in dialect that marked the citizens as

\[\text{\textsuperscript{68}}\text{Colvin, 59.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{69}}\text{Colvin, 69.}\]
being from a particular *polis*, but also that he expected that, despite
differences in dialect, the Greeks could understand each other
reasonably well.\(^70\)

Thucydides, however, is writing a history of the Peloponnesian war
which is one in which the Greeks fought against each other. As such,
Thucydides seems more aware of the Greeks' perceived differences
among themselves and how well they understood their various dialects,
and he does note that dialect difference goes hand-in-hand with ethnic
difference.\(^71\) While Thucydides usually makes no real attempt to
represent the differences of dialect in the direct speech of his work, he
does mention the fact that there are differences on occasions when those
differences become important to his story.\(^72\)

\(^{70}\)Colvin, 72.

\(^{71}\)Colvin, 64, cites the *locus classicus* for this observation as 7.57. He also notes
Thucydides attachment of horrific customs to those who speak a dialect of Greek that is
difficult to understand (3.39.5), in which the Eurytaniotes, whose dialect of Aetolian was
difficult to understand, were said to eat raw flesh.

\(^{72}\)Colvin, 64, cites the three occasions on which the Athenians tried to use the
Messenians against the Spartans (4.3.3, 4.112.4, 4.41.2), the fact that the members of
the Athenian contingent who raised the paean in Doric frightened the Athenians
because their dialect was the same as that of the Spartans.
Thucydides does, however, appear to have quoted two treaties
between the Spartans and the Argives in dialect:


There are, unfortunately, problems with this transcription; it is unclear what alphabet would have been used to codify such treaties, and it is likely that Thucydides used his own alphabet to represent the sounds of the Western Greek dialects. In this case, he would have had to decide which features to attempt to represent and which to ignore. While we cannot be certain what principles guided his decisions, it is more than likely that he, like Aristophanes, would represent the Spartan θ with a σ, would drop an intervocalic σ, or the like.\(^{73}\)

Thucydides' attempt to represent dialect at all, however, indicates that he views the differences in dialects as markers which serve to differentiate one group of Greeks from another. His use of dialect in transcribing the treaties is his way of emphasizing what he perceives as a difference between the Greeks who wrote the treaties and the Athenians. Finally, Thucydides' use of these dialects not only shows that the Greeks themselves were acutely aware of the differences in their language and that these differences acted almost as brands which served to distinguish a Laconian from an Athenian from a Megarian, but also that these

\(^{73}\)Colvin, 65.
different dialects were mutually intelligible. Thus, while the historians do not use much dialect in their works, they provide invaluable information for those of us who wish to study their time: they provide the social and historical background of the fifth century against which Aristophanes sets his stage.  

Tragedy also, while, perhaps because of its Homeric roots, is not as "realistic" as comedy, nevertheless provides some interesting insights about Greek attitudes toward foreign language and dialect during the fifth century. Aeschylus, while he does not appear to have attempted to represent any non-Attic dialects in his plays, does refer to the differences among the languages of the different city-states. In Seven Against Thebes, the Thebans refer to the language of the coming Argives as "different," but Aeschylus represents neither the Boeotian dialect of Thebes nor the dialect of Argos per se in his play. Likewise, Orestes tells his friend Pylades that they will speak in the tongue of the Phocians, but Aeschylus makes no attempt to represent that in the dialogue. Although Colvin notes that the actor may have assumed a tone or something equally unmarked in the text, he concludes by following Richardson's

---

74Colvin, 74.

75Colvin, 75, cites Seven Against Thebes (167-170) in which the Thebans ask the gods not to betray the city to speakers of a different tongue, and Choephoroe 563 ff, in which Orestes says that he and Pylades will speak as Phocians.
theory that the convention of dialect in Attic tragedy was satisfied by merely remarking that the character was using another dialect.

It is likely that, as Colvin suggests, much of the reason for this failure on the part of the tragedians to use actual foreign phrases or dialects is the fact that the characters of tragedy, like those of Homeric epic, are not really located in the real world. In comedy the characters must be located in the real world because it is the real world that is the point of the joke. In Homer as in tragedy, the characters and gods are not located in time and are therefore not differentiated linguistically. Comedy is largely a parody that derives much of its humor from the specific localization of characters and events, and much of that localization is marked by the use of fractured Greek (in the case of foreigners) and different dialects being spoken by Greeks from different poleis.\textsuperscript{76}

Unlike his predecessors, Aristophanes does use dialect in creating some of the characters in his comedies. In the \textit{Lysistrata}, three Spartan characters speak in a Laconian dialect, and in the \textit{Acharnians} a Megarian speaks in his native dialect, and a Theban speaks Boeotian. It is this to which Colvin turns his attention; by comparison of Aristophanes' rendition of the various dialects, he attempts to discover

\textsuperscript{76}Colvin, 88.
whether or not Aristophanes' version is stereotypical and/or superficial and whether Aristophanes attempted to write in dialect by replacing sounds or by importing words and expressions wholesale. From the answers to these questions, he tries to understand what we can in turn conclude about the Athenian view of outsiders.\textsuperscript{77}

After a thorough analysis of the phonology, morphology, and lexical items, Colvin concludes that Aristophanes tries to represent the dialects fairly well. He distinguishes among the three dialects he represents, and he makes distinct from each other the Megarian and Laconian dialects of West Greek. Further, each of these dialects is in turn distinct from its literary counterpart; the Spartans do not speak in literary Doric, nor do the Boeotians speak in literary Aeolic.

There is, then, a genuine attempt to represent the true dialects of the non-Athenian characters in Aristophanic comedy. After analyzing the few remaining fragments of other authors of Old Comedy, Colvin determines that this also appears to be the case in Old Comedy in general. In fact, Attic Greek is not put into the mouth of any non-Athenian character. The accuracy with which each dialect is represented, however, seems to be determined by the dramatic role of the speaker.

\textsuperscript{77}Colvin 120.
The question is, therefore, why the writers of comedy used dialect to depict their characters when there was no literary precedent for doing so. The logical reason for having done so is in order to make the play more humorous, but there are several factors that weigh against this. As Colvin suggests, if creating a comic effect were the main intention, one would expect more exaggeration and less accuracy. One would expect lapses into Attic in order not to distract the audience's attention when some other action on the stage would be more important. Consequently, if the dialect had been used in this way, it would have been adapted to the needs of each play individually, and one not expect the consistency with which each linguistic group is represented. One would expect to find the imitation closer to parody than accuracy, and that is not the case.

There also is no indication that the Athenians are amused or bewildered by the non-Athenian characters' dialects; if the effect were supposed to be strictly for humor, one would expect some indication of that in the Athenian characters' reactions. Colvin also remarks that, according to Dover's study of Aristophanic humor, Aristophanes focuses
on only one source of humor at a time. If this is the case, then language would have to be the subject at hand in order to be the source of comedy.\textsuperscript{78}

Aristophanes does use cross-dialectal puns. In the \textit{Lysistrata}, for example, he puns on the words χαία (good) and χαία by association with χαίνειν (huge). This is not, however, making fun of the language itself but manipulating the language in the situation to make a joke.\textsuperscript{79} Rather, the joke in this situation is that Cleonice assumes that the Corinthian woman must be fat because Corinth was known for its decadence, and plumpness was a sign that one had an abundance of everything—especially food. The joke manipulates language to make a joke about a stereotype held by contemporary society. The two women speak in a Laconian dialect because they are Spartan and the use of the dialect characterizes them as such; the joke is funny because it is placed in a time and place with which the audience can identify.

The Megarian in the \textit{Acharnians} is starving; Athens was blockading them during the Peloponnesian Wars. The Boeotian is portrayed as stupid, but he arrives with a huge herd of cattle; Boeotians were known

\textsuperscript{78}Colvin, 303, cites Dover, \textit{Greeks and the Gods} (Oxford, 1987), Chapter 25.

\textsuperscript{79}Colvin, 304; Lysistrata 90-92; Lampito says of the Corinthian woman "χαία ναὶ τῷ σίω," meaning that she appears to be of good family. Cleonice, however, misunderstands and replies that she is fat, "ξαία νη τὸν Δία / δῆλη ἕστεν ὁμοιοι ταυταὶ τἀντεψενή."
for cattle and overeating. The Spartan women in the *Lysistrata* are strong and muscular while their men are effeminate homosexuals. The dialect marks the characters as being from a particular place, but the jokes play on the stereotypes associated with these places.

Aristophanes’ use of dialect, then, is not merely an attempt to create a source of humor. Nor is there any indication that his use of dialect is an attempt to poke fun at those who do not speak Attic Greek because any dialect other than their own sounded like so much meaningless babbling to their own ears; if that were the case, there would be less accuracy and less evidence that the speakers understood each other perfectly well. The main function of dialect seems to be to have been that of marking a particular character as being from a particular place, and it served to reinforce the stereotype associated with that place.⁸⁰

---

⁸⁰Similarly, Classical Sanskrit drama uses Prakrit dialects to characterize the female characters. We know that Prakrit dialects were considered uneducated, lower status than Sanskrit, and therefore markers of lower class. It would seem, then, that the authors wanted to portray the female characters as lower class than the males. On the other hand, the audience was expected to understand both dialects; this indicates that Sanskrit speakers understood Prakrit well enough to understand the play. cf. Hock, Hans Heinrich, and Pandharipande, Rajeshwari, “The Sociolinguistic Position of Sanskrit in Pre-Muslim South Asia,” *Studies in Linguistic Learning*, I.2 (1976); 106-138; 115-116, argue that this method of characterization proves that both dialects were mutually intelligible. Deshpande, Madhav M., *Sanskrit and Prakrit: Some Sociolinguistic Issues*, (1993), 90, notes that Prakrit’s loss of prestige meant that the kings in Sanskrit dramas always spoke Sanskrit, while the lower-class characters spoke a variety of Prakrit.
Unlike the the writers of epic and tragedy who preceded him, Aristophanes needed to ground his stories in a particular time and place; it was precisely the situations of his own time that he used for humorous purposes. Because a particular region was itself associated with its own social, moral, and aesthetic characteristics, and a particular dialect was associated with each region, the use of a dialect to portray a particular character also marked that character as being associated with the other attributes of that region. This in turn allowed the playwright to use the stereotypical characters of his own time as butts of jokes. Aristophanes' use of dialect was not intended as a marker of less than civilized status, nor was it intended solely as a source of humor. It was a touch of realism that the poet found necessary in creating his plays.

Plautus uses similar devices in crafting the characters of his plays. His slaves spatter their language with Greek words, his Carthaginian speaks in Punic, and he uses language that some have considered markers of feminine speech. My purpose here is to examine his use of language and learn if, like Aristophanes, Plautus was using these devices to ground his plays in the reality of his time. If that is the case, we may be able to learn more about what that use of language says about the reality of his time.
Comedy is one of the most telling forms of literature of any society. In our own society, we are amused when we see a man gaze longingly at a beautiful woman clad in stunning designer attire, chase her relentlessly, finally catch her, speak to her, and be completely stunned when she finally opens her mouth to speak in a nasal Brooklyn accent that completely belies the sophisticated exterior. Such an accent, in our American society, is stereotypically interpreted by some in our culture as uneducated and/or low class. We have very little information on Roman society during the middle Republic when Plautus was writing, yet we have 21 of Plautus' plays. Surely such comedy ought to tell us something about his audience. Although the language of his comedies is virtually all we have, we know that language serves to mark people in one sense or another, and it stands to reason that his language would be able to tell us about the people for whom he successfully wrote and performed his plays. It is with this in mind that examine the language that Plautus used to characterize the creations with which he peopled his plays.
CHAPTER 3

PLAUTUS’ USE OF GREEK AND THE STATUS OF GREEK IN PLAUTUS’ TIME

Paul Nixon, in his 1916 Loeb translations of Plautus' plays, routinely translates Greek words into French rather than English. Because most native speakers of English view French as the language of "high culture," Nixon’s translation of Greek into French implies that the Romans viewed the Greek language in much the same way. This need not have been the case, however; much Greek was quite familiar to the Romans. Further, Plautus, unlike the Greek dramatists of the classical period, wrote his plays for anyone and everyone who wanted to watch rather than merely the educated elite; it is difficult to believe that he

81Nixon is not alone. Evidently it has long been the practice to translate the Greek that Cicero uses in his speeches and letters into French rather than Latin. Based on this principle, most commentators suggest translating Plautus' Greek into French as well.

82Robert McCrum, William Cran, and Robert MacNeil, The Story of English, (1986), 73; The authors note that this view of French as being a "high status language" began with the Norman invasion in 1066. They go on to say "To this day the use of French words in conversation is thought to show sophistication, or savoir-faire."

83R. Maltby, "The Distribution of Greek Loan Words in Plautus," Papers of the Leeds international Latin Seminar 8, (1995), 31-69; Maltby’s study concludes that most of the Greek words in Plautus are straight transliterations of Greek, and he omits those words--such as types of dress and the like--that are necessary for the play.
would use as much Greek and as many derivatives of Greek as he did if only the educated elite would have understood it. There was, to be sure, the Greek that only the educated orators of Cicero’s day spoke, but there was also that ordinary brand of Greek that the man on the street spoke.

The Romans themselves appear to have decried the use of Greek in some circumstances. Lucilius, for example, deplores the use of Greek words when there are perfectly good Latin ones that will do (e.g., Greek *arutaenae*, *clinopodas*, and *lychnos* for Latin *aquales*, *pedes lecti* and *lucernas*). Lucilius later remarks that the Roman hero Scaevola made fun of Albucius as preferring Greek to Roman because he used Greek *lexeis* instead of Roman *verba*, and he preferred to be a Greek *rhetoricoterus* instead of a Roman *orator*. Plutarch remarks that Cato the Elder, even though trained in Greek, clung staunchly to his Roman Latin and ridiculed those who admired everything Greek. What is striking about these acerbic views, however, is that they are primarily aimed at those who use Greek when "good old Latin" would work.

---

84 Lucilius FR 14-16; *arutaenaeque, inquit, aquales; porro clinopodas lychnosque ut diximus semnos; ante pedes lecti atque lucernas.*

85 Lucilius FR 84-86; *Quam lepide lexis compostae ut tesserulae omnes arte pavimento atque emblemate urmiculato. Crassum habeo generum, ne rhetoricoterus tu seis.*

86 Plutarch, *Cato Maior* 12.5; Πλέιστον δὲ χρόνον ἐν Ἀθηναίαις διέτριψε. Καὶ λέγεται μὲν τις αὐτοῦ φέρεσθαι λόγος, ὃν Ἐλληνιστὶ πρᾶς τὸν δῆμον εἶπεν, ὥς ξηλών τε τὴν ἄρτην τῶν παλαιών Ἀθηναίων τῆς τε πόλεως διὰ τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος ἡδονῶς γεγονός θεατῆς· τούτῳ δ’ οὐκ ἀληθές ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ δ’ ἐρμηνεύος ἐνέτυχε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, δυνηθεὶς ἣν αὐτὸς εἶπεν, ἐμμένων δὲ τοῖς πατρίοις καὶ καταγελῶν τῶν τά Ἑλληνικά τεθαυμασκότων.
perfectly well, or they are aimed at those who perceive a Greek education as necessary (i.e., Cato was trained in the Greek art of oratory) but prefer to cling to values that are Roman—including the language. The use of Greek precisely BECAUSE one thinks that it is a mark of one's elite education is therefore viewed as an attempt at sophistication that is perceived by others as snobbery.

The Greek that Plautus uses, however, is not of this variety. Plautus' Greek is simple language and in some cases, Greek that fills a void in Latin—one instance in which ordinary Latin would not do. Although some of the words are indeed borrowed from Greek, they are clearly not those one would expect to learn only in an elitist Greek education. Furthermore, it is perhaps of note that on one very significant occasion when one would think it appropriate to USE Greek language as a marker of superiority, Plautus chose to use Latin. The scene in question is that in the Pseudolus when Pseudolus pretends to be a seer and parodies Greek tragedy:

...PS:  *io  
io te, te, turanne, te, te, ego, qui imperitas Pseudolo,  
quaero quoi ter trina triplicia, tribu' modis tria gaudia,  
artibus tribu' tris demeritas dem laetitias, de tribus  
fraude partas per malitiam, per dolum et fallacias;  
in libello hoc opsignato ad attuli pauxillulo. (Pseud.702-706)
Hence, as we see, on the perfect occasion to USE the Greek that only someone who had had a good Greek education in literature would have understood, Plautus chooses to use Latin. With the exception of the word _turanne_, borrowed from Greek, Plautus’ language is common Latin. Clearly he did not expect his most of his audience to understand the Greek such a scene would have necessitated (and he may not have understood it himself), nor did he feel that he should have put it into Greek either to mark Pseudolus as "clever" for comic effect. His reasons for using Greek, then, would seem to have nothing to do with marking a character as intelligent or arrogant.

If that is true, then scholars have misconstrued his intention for years, and Plautus’ Greek bears closer scrutiny. Their translating Plautus’ Greek into French is a particularly bad choice because it indicates that they thought Plautus’ audience viewed the Greek his characters used as higher status than their own Latin. Plautus did not expect that his audience would have been composed of the educated elite; rather, he expected it to consist more of lower-class citizens and slaves.\(^{87}\) If that was the case, then he could hardly have expected them to have the same elite Greek education that the upper classes were afforded. Hence, if Plautus had used a lot of complicated Greek words

\(^{87}\)See above, p.30.
that he did not expect the lower classes to understand, he would have seemed to them to be showing off his own knowledge of Greek rather than trying to entertain them. They would have perceived his own use of educated Greek as his own snobbery and an insult to them; Plautus' goal was to entertain the masses, not to flaunt his own knowledge of Greek.

There was a flurry of activity between 1930 and 1960 in which scholars made some weak attempts to examine the question of why Plautus had some of his characters speaking Greek. Shipp argued that Plautus' use of Greek reflected the ambivalence of the Romans' view of the Greeks.  

Seaman, allowing that Plautus used Greek to heighten the humor of his plays, believes that the average Roman did not understand the Greek, but that the Romans did not have to understand the Greek in order to understand the plays.  

J. N. Hough, in his study of Plautus' use of Greek, argues that Plautus' use of Greek becomes increasingly artistic with the result that one can trace the chronology of Plautus' plays through the depth of his artistry in his use of Greek.

---

88 G.B. Shipp, "Greek in Plautus," WS 66 (1953), 105-112; 112.


All who have studied Plautus' artistry in his use of Greek have concluded that he places most of it in the mouths of the lowest-class characters. Gilleland concludes that this means that Plautus was marking the lower-class characters as those upon whom the Roman populus would look down because of their resentful attitude toward the Greeks.\(^{91}\) Shipp concludes that, while borrowing foreign words is seen as an affectation of the upper classes in the modern world, it is a mark of servile status or frivolity in Plautus.\(^{92}\) Hough, in his study, notes that Plautus placed the Greek words increasingly in the mouths of those characters from whom the words would seem most clever--the lower-class characters.\(^{93}\) This fact serves as more evidence, they believe, that the use of Greek is a mark of affectation or assuming airs of a higher station. Such a belief implies that the Romans viewed Greek as having a higher status than their own Latin.

It is clear that Plautus did put Greek in the mouths of his characters for some reason, but it seems to me equally clear that that reason was not because he expected his audience to consider Greek as a

\(^{91}\)M. Gilleland, *Linguistic Differentiation of Character Type and Sex in the Comedies of Plautus and Terence*, Diss. University of Virginia, 1979, 86, 172, notes that Leo, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Rome, 1960) I.10-11, was so convinced of this that he took a Greek word from the adolescens Calidorus and placed it in the mouth of the slave Pseudolus on the grounds that the Greek was better suited to the slave in Plautus.

\(^{92}\)Shipp, 112.

\(^{93}\)Hough, 363.
higher status language. If that were the case, he would not have expected the ordinary man on the street to understand it, and that was the audience to whom he catered. Nevertheless, it must have meant something, and perhaps a closer examination will tell us what Plautus' use of Greek tells us about his culture, his audience, his expectations of them and theirs of him.

Although Hough's intention is to investigate whether or not Plautus' artistry with Greek follows the traditional chronology of his plays and not to investigate how the Romans viewed the Greek language, his study is nevertheless helpful in our quest. He divides Plautus' Greek up into categories: the "garage, hangar" category in which he feels that the connection to Greek has been largely lost, the "rendezvous" category in which daily use does not completely eradicate the foreign flavor of the word, and those such as "coiffeur" and "braggadocio" which, Hough contends, are used by "cultured" people and habitually understood by the masses. Use of words in the last category, Hough believes, implies
an amusing elegance or assumption of airs,\textsuperscript{94} and it is precisely this
category of words--those written in Greek\textsuperscript{95}--with which we are
concerned.

While most have concluded that Plautus placed his Greek in the
mouths of characters to mark them, in one way or another, as being of
lower status than other characters. I contend that this was not, in fact,
the case in Plautus' plays. In Plautus' time, there were many soldiers
who had been in Greek cities in Rome as well as many Greek slaves. The
slaves were not only responsible for many of the upper class children,
they were also responsible for much of the marketing and so forth; the
Greeks and the Romans would have had to have arrived at some feasible
method of communication in order to accomplish anything. Hence, it is
quite likely that the language of the common people, to whom Plautus
slanted his plays, was one which employed Latin and smatterings of
Greek which were understood equally well by both Romans and Greeks.
In this case, the Greek employed by these people would not be of a
higher status than Latin, it would actually be part of the same language.
This, I believe, is what the Plautine corpus reveals.

\textsuperscript{94}Hough, 348.

\textsuperscript{95}Maltby, 32, notes that many of the Greek words--such as types of clothing,
weapons, etc, were necessary in the context of the play. There were also several Greek
loan words that had been adapted into Latin, and were therefore considered Latin.
Plautus throws Greek words into ordinary conversation as if there were no change in language or even dialect. One of the most interesting phrases here is ναι γάρ, which corresponds roughly to the French "mais oui." In Bacchides 1162, the senex Philoxenus, evidently ashamed (pudet...me, 1155), tells his comrade that he is in love with a prostitute, one of the Bacchis sisters. When his disbelieving comrade asks him for affirmation of what he just said, Philoxenus replies ναι γάρ. Ernout simply points out other occurrences of this phrase, and M'Cosh states simply that Greek is often found in Plautus. Barsby remarks that the phrase seems to be a "deliberate affectation designed to cover his embarrassment." Shipp anticipates Barsby in believing the phrase is affected, but he goes farther to remark that the phrase does not appear to have been quotable in the Greek of Greece. Shipp further states that Philoxenus is using the phrase to mark his frivolity and turn the matter into a jest. Why, however, would an aristocrat who is ashamed of his

---


98 Shipp, 107.

99 Shipp, 109.
behavior use speech that is "affected," and does the fact that the phrase does not appear to have been quotable in the "Greek of Greece" mean anything at all?

We may find an answer in Pseudolus' use of the same phrase in lines 482-484 and 488 of the Pseudolus:

Si: quid ais? ecquam scis filium tibicinam
meum amare? Ps: vāl γάρ. Si: liberare quam velit?
Ps: καὶ τοῦτο vāl γάρ..... (483-484)

Si: fatere, dic καὶ τοῦτο vāl. Ps: καὶ τοῦτο vāl . (488)

In this case, however, Pseudolus is deliberately affecting the air of a seer who answers Simo's questions truthfully. This phrase seems to be viewed in the same category as oaths, and Sturtevant remarks that Greek words are frequent in Plautus because a large proportion of the adult population had been encamped in various Greek towns and had brought home many Greek phrases--especially oaths, slang, and marketing terms.\(^{100}\) Auden remarks that Plautus regularly introdudices "well-known" Greek expressions.\(^{101}\) Willcock, however, in the most recent


\(^{101}\) Plautus, Pseudolus, Ed. with Commentary H.W. Auden (Cambridge, 1896), 95. See also Plautus, Pseudolus, Ed. with Commentary E.P. Morris (Boston, 1895), xx, who allows that Latin was flexible enough to allow many foreign expressions.
English commentary on the Pseudolus, agrees with Shipp that the phrase does not seem to have existed in the Greek of Greece, but he remarks that this merely means that it comes from the lower-class *patois* in Rome because it is not found in extant Greek.\(^\text{102}\)

Willcock would seem to be on the right track here; just because we do not have examples of the phrase ναὶ γὰρ in extant Greek means nothing; it is certain that the language that was spoken in the Roman streets in 200 BC was a far cry from either Euripides’ Greek or Cicero’s Latin. On the other hand, he seems to raise an interesting point. If the phrase is part of the ”lower-class *patois,” then why would using it be a mark of affectation of an upper class? More to the point, why would Philoxenus be ”affecting airs” to cover his embarrassment by using a phrase which belonged to the common street language? It appears, then, that the force of this phrase was not one of affectation, but something else, and that it was indeed something found in colloquial language rather than that of Cicero.

To be sure, the phrase still has the same ring of ”*mais ouïl*, but it is obvious in Pseudolus’ case that Pseudolus is enjoying himself in playing a part, whereas Philoxenus seems to have been genuinely ashamed. On the other hand, Pseudolus has assumed this role of ”the

Delphic Oracle" in an effort to convince Simo that he is indeed telling him the truth. The one thing that both characters have in common when they utter the Greek words is apparent earnestness; it could be that ναὶ γὰρ was a more fervent indicator of earnestness than the mundane oaths sworn in Latin--edepol, hercle, pol, and the like.

Another appearance of ναὶ as an indication of earnestness appears in the Captivi when Ergasilus swears a series of oaths by various gods and cities to convince Hegio that he is telling the truth when he says that he has seen his son.

HE: *certon?* ER. ναὶ τὸν frousinόna. HE. *vide sis.* ER. ναὶ τὸν Αλάτριον.
(880-883)

The commentators all note that Ergasilus here uses the Greek μὰ incorrectly; it usually means "no, by ____," but here it seems to be positive. 103 Furthermore, they note that he picks up on the fact that

103Hallidie, Plautus, Captivi, Ed. with commentary (London, 1891), points out that Plautus uses μὰ "correctly" at Most. 975, μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, when Phaniscus is vehemently denying that Philolaches spent talents on a courtesan.
Kora is a Greek goddess whose name happens to sound like that of the Italian city Cora, and he uses that as a springboard from which he begins to swear by all the other cities in the neighborhood as if they were goddesses. Shipp remarks that it is difficult to believe that Plautus invented this "misuse" of μᾶ, and he believes that it came from Magna Graecia. He goes farther to say that ναὶ would have attracted the attention of the Romans because words meaning "yes" notoriously attract attention, and because there was no real equivalent in the Latin tongue. Perhaps μᾶ is a less assertive "yes" in the spoken language Plautus' contemporaries used. In this event, it is perfectly logical that the word should have been adopted by the Romans, and, in situations in which they wished to vehemently assert something, they would use the only word for "yes" that they knew. Hence, Plautus' characters, when they are particularly earnest, use the ναὶ or ναὶ γάρ in their statements. Plautus' use of ναὶ γάρ is thus a colloquial one which expresses a strong "yes" in the best way the Romans of his time had available to them. Philoxenus does indeed use the phrase to turn the matter into a

---

104 Harrington, Plautus, Captivi, Trinumus, et Rudens, Ed. with Commentary, (New York, 1870), 241 notes that μᾶ is the negative particle; Hallidie, 186-187, notes that μᾶ was usually negative but could be positive; Elmer, Plautus Captivi, Ed. with Commentary, (Boston, 1900) agrees with him. Morris, Plautus, Captives and Trinummus, Ed. with Commentary (Boston, 1898) 73, notes Ergasilius' jumping on the similarity of names. Lindsay, Plautus, Captivi, Ed. with Commentary, (Bristol Classical Press, 1924), 110 goes farther to add that all the cities by which Ergasilius swears are along the road going southeast from Rome.

105 Shipp, 107-108.
joke, but the joke has nothing to do with the fact that he uses Greek, it has to do with the fact that he says, "Yes, of course I'm in love with the meretrix," as if it is the proper thing to do. In effect, he tells his friend that he is the one who is acting unnatural because he is not in love with the meretrix. Pseudolus and Ergasilus swear using the Greek formula νο� γάρ not because it is Greek, but because it is the best expression of earnest sincerity available to them. They are making jokes, to be sure, but the jokes have nothing to do with their using Greek per se, but rather with what they are acting or saying. Philoxenus is stating something that is amusing because it is probably more true than most aristocratic Romans would care to admit, Pseudolus play-acts the part of a Delphic oracle obeying the man who is asking the question, and Ergasilus swears by Italian cities rather than goddesses.

There does not, therefore, appear to be any indication in Plautus' use of this term that it marked either low-class or affectation of a higher class. Philoxenus had no reason to "affect airs" in admitting his feeling for the prostitute. Pseudolus was putting on a show, but the show was one in which he vehemently desired to convince Simo of the truth of his words. Ergasilus was in the same position; he very much wanted Hegio to believe him. This is not a mark of upper class or lower class status; it is merely a mark of intensity of feeling.
The same may well be said of oaths sworn by the gods in Greek. They certainly seem to convey more serious intent than the usual colloquial Latin oaths. On this note, it is particularly interesting that, while Ergasilus swears by Roman cities, he does so in Greek. His sincerity would certainly have seemed less if he had said *edepol* or *mehercle* instead of swearing the oaths as he did. Pseudolus also, in fervently agreeing with Callipho, swears by Zeus (*ὢ Ὁ Ἐδω, 443*) in Greek, and Olympio swears the same oath in the *Casina* when he is trying to get Lydsidamus to keep his hands to himself (*ὢ Ὁ Ἐδω, 730.*)

Plautus sprinkles the ordinary conversation of his characters with Greek elsewhere as well. In the *Casina*, the slave Olympio and his master Lysidamus have a brief battle of words:

```...
Ol: *enim vero πράγματα μοι παρέχεις.*
Ly: *dabo tibi*
μέγα κακόν,
*ut opinor, nisi resistis.* (729-731)
```

MacCary and Willcock follow Shipp in pointing out that μέγα κακόν is merely a Greek translation for the *magnum malum* that most slave owners use when threatening their slaves.\(^{106}\) Shipp goes on to say that

---

106\footnote{Plautus, *Casina*, Ed. with Commentary, W.T. MacCary and M.M. Willcock, (Cambridge, 1976), 180; Shipp, 106.}
Lysidamus answers in Greek to give Olympio tit for tat. What neither seems to recognize is that Olympio's statement is far more clever than Lysidamus' not because it is in Greek, but because it is more complex and has more alliterative sound effects. Lysidamus would have been better off saying "magnum malum" because it would have had the same alliterative force as Olympio's statement; his answering in Greek shows his ineptitude, not any "affectation" of airs on his part. As MacCary and Willcock state, Olympio's use of Greek is a colloquial one taken from contemporary speech in the streets of Rome;\(^{107}\) hence, his use of Greek would not point toward his "affectation of airs," but his speaking in the local vernacular.

In Persa 159, when the slave Toxilus has just told the parasite Saturio to adorn his daughter in order to fleece the pimp, Saturio responds with a surprised "πόθεν ornamenta?" (159). As Shipp notes, póqen was more than a mere Greek translation of the Latin unde; it was often used emphatically to express "surprise or negation." Shipp cites Euripides' use of the word in the same sense as Saturio uses it here, and he notes that such a use would be just the kind of colloquial use the

\(^{107}\)MacCary and Willcock, 180.
Romans would likely have adopted.\textsuperscript{108} Hence, this use of Greek is also a colloquial one, and it does not seem to be a sign of affectation on the part of the parasite.

In the \textit{Trinummus}, the slave Stasimus makes fun of his young master's inability to understand what happened to all his money: \textit{ratio quidem hercle appareat: argentum \iota\chi\epsilon\omicron\omicron\alpha\iota} (419). Both Gray and Morris remark that the use of the foreign word gives a comic effect to the contrast with appareat, and this is probably true. On the other hand, as Morris goes on to say, the use of such a term implies a knowledge on the part of the audience because otherwise the point of the joke would be lost.\textsuperscript{109} Shipp elaborates on this by remarking that Menander's use of the word shows its colloquial quality, and that it is an emphatic word which is just the sort that would have been imported by the Romans who had heard spoken Greek.\textsuperscript{110}

At another point in the \textit{Trinummus}, Stasimus is eavesdropping on the two young adventitious as Lysiteles lectures Lesbonicus on why Lesbonicus should allow him to marry his sister even though she has no dowry. Stasimus heartily approves Lysiteles' remarks, and he shouts out

\textsuperscript{108}Shipp, 107, cites Liddell and Scott.
\textsuperscript{110}Shipp, 108.
"non enim possum quin exclamem: eugae, eugae, Lysiteles, πάλιν!" (705).
The commentators here all suggest that palin is the equivalent of
"encore!" or "de capo". Shipp agrees with them, but goes farther to say
that the word was a colloquial one which entered into the Roman
vernacular in much the same way as encore and da capo have entered
the English; he states that the lack of extant proof of the term's having
been used this way in Greek is accidental, and he cites it's presence in
modern Greek as proof of this.112

Megaronides tells his friend Callimides in Trinummus 187 paûsai:

*vicisti castigatorem tuom* when Callimides is telling him all the reasons
that what people are saying about him is false. Wagner can find no
reason for the Greek here,113 Morris suggests that Plautus found it in his
original and kept it intact,114 and Gray claims that, like the Greek Cicero

---

111Wagner, Plautus, *Trinummus*, Ed. with Commentary (Cambridge, 1890), 99,
offers *da capo*; Morris, 145, offers *encore*, and Harrington, 145, offers *encore* and
explains that the word is Greek for *rursus*.

112Shipp, 108; it is possible, however, that use of *palin* in this way originated
among the people of Italy and the Greeks adopted it from them. Further, as all the
commentators point out, this is a very theatrical use, and as such it would be
considered a mark of Plautus' metatheatrical play-crafting, and not so much a mark of
the character's assuming the airs of a higher station. See Niall W. Slater, *Plautus in
Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*, (Princeton, 1987) for some basic metatheatetical
readings of Plautus.

113Wagner, 32.

114Morris, 104.
uses, the translation is best rendered in French.\textsuperscript{115} Shipp claims that Megaronides utters this phrase in much the same vein as the supposedly ashamed Philoxenus utters νολ γάρ in the Bacchides.\textsuperscript{116} Shipp goes on, however to offer Ernout's and Meillet's suggestion that perhaps \textit{pausa} is a backformation from \textit{pausare} which was in turn based on the aorist of παύω, and that perhaps it was the imperative that first caught on in Rome. It may well have been the imperatival use that first caught on in Rome, but there is no need to have to go back and forth between Greek and Latin to get there; infinitives had long been used as imperatives in Greek. Further, using an aorist infinitive in a word like παύω, "stop" is particularly logical because the immediacy and "one-time-only" aoristic force is particularly appropriate to the urgency implied in "stop!" Shipp make much more sense when he compares its adoption and use by the Romans to the adoption and use of Italian \textit{basta} by native speakers of English today; "\textit{Basta!}" is how tourists who are buying goods at the market in Rome regularly tell the Italians to stop measuring out their


\textsuperscript{116}Shipp. 109.
wares. As Gratwick states,\textsuperscript{117} much of the Greek that the Romans picked up was that of commerce, and \textit{παύσαι} may well have been used then as \textit{basta} is used today.

At \textit{Truculentus} 558, Cyamus remarks on his master's "cleaning out his house" for the love of a meretrix: \textit{puras esse sibi volt aedis: domi quidquid habet eicitur ἔξω}. As Shipp states, the ἔξω implies a strong motion toward the outside, and it thus serves to emphasize the Latin \textit{foras egerones} (552) and \textit{foras iubet ferri} (556) he uses previously in his speech.\textsuperscript{118} As such, the Greek term is merely the climax of the slave's feelings about throwing everything away for the sake of love; the fact that it is Greek is merely coincidental. This also appears to be a use that is more colloquial than affectative.

A final use of Greek in ordinary conversation occurs in the \textit{Pseudolus} when Calidorus, in the Pseudolus, refers to Pseudolus as his \textit{ἐὔρετης}. None of the commentators offer any real suggestion as to the reason why Calidorus would use Greek except to say that it may be perhaps that Calidorus is applying a serious term to Pseudolus' trickery.\textsuperscript{119} Shipp offers a more plausible explanation. Calidorus admires Pseudolus and turns to him in any crisis, and he probably

\textsuperscript{117}Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II.112.
\textsuperscript{118}Shipp, 108-109 cites Lucian as evidence for the current use of the term.
\textsuperscript{119}Morris, 162.
would have picked up the term from him. This is a far more likely explanation of how an aristocratic youth would throw "street jargon" into ordinary conversation, and it also raises another point. Many of the slaves in Rome were Greek, and it is those slaves who were often responsible for tending the children; it is very likely that young people would have learned phrases of Greek from them. Calidorus' use of a Greek word, then, may be more a reflection of reality than a sign of affectation or frivolity on his part.

A similar situation occurs when Stichus, in the midst of the slaves' party at the end of the Stichus, spouts a Greek proverb: cantio Graecast: ἦ πέντε ἦ τρία ἦ πίν’ ἦ μὴ τέπταρα, (707). As Shipp notes, the fact that Stichus introduces the proverb with the phrase cantio Graecast is an indication that he did not copy it from his Greek model.120 It is also the case that a foreign language often takes proverbs and the like over wholesale in the language from which they originated. In English we have taken over phrases such as quid pro quo from the Latin, gesundheit from the German, and c’est la vie from the French.

Milphio introduces another such saying, as quod dici solet..., Poenulus 137, but this is more interesting. The phrase Milphio uses is κολλάραι λύραι, which by itself means something like "crude bread-lyres"

120Shipp, 110.
---it makes no sense. But Milphio equates it with the Latin *gerrae germanae*—"utter nonsense." The one thing that the two phrases have in common is the alliterative sound effects. Paratore, who translates the phrase as "clashing songs," bases his translation on the sound effects more so than the nonsensical meaning of the phrase.\(^{121}\) Children are notorious for using such alliterative phrases, and certainly for this reason if no other the phrase could have found its way into the common language.

But Plautus was also an artist, and he also used Greek frequently in order to pun—especially on a character’s name. The slaves in the *Pseudolus* puns on Harpax’s name twice:

...PS: *apage, Harpax; hau places huc quidem hercle haud ibis intro, ni quid âρπαξ feceris* (653-654)
BA:... *tun es Harpax?* SI: *ego sum atque ipse âρπαξ quidem.* (1010)

Pseudolus, upon meeting Harpax (whose name means "a seizing"), says that Harpax should not go inside lest he make a "âρπαξ." Ballio asks Simia, who is playing the part of Harpax, if he is indeed Harpax. Simia replies that he is âρπαξ itself.

\(^{121}\)Tito Maccio Plaut, *Tutte le Commedie*, trans. into Italian by Ettore Paratore (Rome, 1993). He explains this in a note; in the text he translates the phrase by "chansons blageuses," "joking songs."
On another occasion in the *Pseudolus*, Pseudolus makes a play on the name of Charinus, Calidorus' helpful friend. After Calidorus introduces Charinus, Pseudolus remarks *iam χάριν τούτῳ ποιώ* (713). Morris remarks that this is a literal translation of the Latin *gratiam illi facio* turned into Greek for the sake of the pun.\textsuperscript{122} In this case, the meaning is a clever, "Thanks but no thanks for this Favor," or something along those lines.

In the *Miles Gloriosus*, Sceledrus makes a rude pun when Palaestrio introduces Philocomasium as Dicea. Sceledrus, who believes that Philocomasium is cheating on his master, remarks ἕδικας *es tu*, *non δίκαιος*, *et meo ero facias iniuiam* (438), "Injust are you, not Justine, and you will do harm to my master."

Plautus' puns in Greek tell us one very important fact: he expected his audience to understand the Greek he used as he used it. This could also well mean, despite Seaman's contention that the Romans did not have to understand the meaning of the Greek names in order to enjoy the plays,\textsuperscript{123} that Plautus counted on their understanding the meaning of the Greek names. If they did not, then there was no point in punning on them because the audience would not understand the jokes.

\textsuperscript{122}Morris, 163.
\textsuperscript{123}Seaman, 117.
If he used jokes that the audience did not understand, then they would not be interested in watching his plays--and he would be out of a job.

Shipp contends that Plautus used Greek as a mark of servility because most of the Greek is spoken by slaves. Scholars since Leo have noted Plautus' servus calidus character, and several have commented that Plautus' putting Greek words and phrases in the mouths of slaves is yet another way of characterizing them as clever. But one must also, in examining the status of Greek in Plautus, consider his audience and his expectations of them. It is clear that his audience consisted of anyone who happened to be there to watch, and it is equally clear that they could be easily distracted. If he wanted to keep their attention, he could not use language or jokes that they could not understand. Hence, he expected the members of his audience--whether of upper or lower class--to understand the Greek he used.

Further, as we have seen, it does not seem to have been the fact that the words are Greek that marks the slaves as clever, but what the Greek they use means. It seems, therefore, that the use of the Greek

---

124 Shipp, 112.

125 See above, p. 3. See Erich Segal for a lengthy discussion about the clever slave and role reversal in Plautus' comedies.

126 Terrence makes the difficulty of keeping such an audience's attention quite clear; he describes the distractions which drew them away especially well in the second prologue to the Hecyra (l. 29-34.)
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language was not in itself a mark of status one way or the other. What is more likely is that it was a reflection of reality. Because more and more Romans were being exposed to Greek and living near Greek cities where they would learn some Greek just to be able to get around, and because more Greeks were being brought to Rome as slaves, it is likely that one heard smatterings of Greek more and more frequently in the streets of Rome, and it was from these streets that Plautus drew his audience and his characters. It is likely, therefore, that the Greek Plautus used was more an indication of reality than status.

Tenney Frank suggests that perhaps Plautus was himself a soldier in the second Punic War, and that he had thus experienced life among the other Roman soldiers encamped at Greek cities. In this way he acquired an accurate knowledge of how much Greek the soldiers and others of that class would understand.127 Whether or not that is how he came by such knowledge, Plautus certainly did seem to base his use of Greek in his plays on what he expected his audience to understand. Furthermore, the Greek he uses appears to be used because of what it means, not the fact that it is a fancy way of saying something that could be said just as easily in Latin. Greek had a way of expressing a strong "yes" that Latin lacked, and the Romans evidently adopted it; Plautus

127Tenney Frank, Life and Literature in the Roman Republic, (Berkley, 1930), 72-
wisely used this in his plays. Plautus used Greek names for his characters, but he regularly made puns on them in Greek--which he clearly expected his audience to understand. Hence, Plautus appears to have used Greek because such Greek as he used was part of the colloquial language of the Romans of his time. Plautine Greek seems to have been somewhat like the English words such as "voila" and "siesta"--they may have entered this language from another, but they have become English. Further, Plautus' Greek is used colloquially rather than formally; colloquial language is a mark of mundanity rather than of status. Hence, the Greek that Plautus used was not a status-marker; it was merely another type of colloquial language he used in his work.
CHAPTER 4

PLAUTUS' USE OF PUNIC AS A MARKER OF REALITY

As we have seen, Plautus put Greek in the mouths of his characters. This certainly served as a means of staging puns and making jokes, but more than anything else it seemed to be a mark of reality. Plautus’ audience used Greek in their everyday lives, and it was logical that the characters in the plays he produced for that audience should be readily identifiable to members of that audience as people like them.

Greek, however, is not the only language other than his native Latin that Plautus put in the mouths of his characters. In the Poenulus, Plautus put Punic in the mouth of his Carthaginian character, Hanno, and he gave us a scene in which it seems likely that it was not out of the realm of possibility that he expected members of his audience to understand Punic. Most scholars, however, who have examined Hanno’s language and the interchange between him and the Romans believe that the Punic was intened as gibberish, but that is not necessarily so. There
seem to be more reasons to believe that Plautus and at least part of his audience understood at least some Punic than there are to think that no Romans understood Punic.

If Tenney Frank is correct in his suggestion that perhaps Plautus was himself a soldier in the second Punic War, it is possible that Plautus may have been exposed to Punic in that way.\(^{128}\) It is certainly clear that he understood the language, and it seems that he expected at least some of his audience to understand it as well. Not only were the Punic Wars fresh on the minds of his audience, but the Carthaginians had been the traders of the Mediterranean for centuries; certainly those who carried on the business of the household were able to use at least SOME Punic.

The Carthaginian Hanno in Plautus’ Poenulus makes a long speech in Punic immediately upon his entrance (930ff). In the extant text,\(^{129}\) however, Hanno’s speech is recorded in Punic twice (ll. 930-939, ll. 940-949) and then in Latin (ll. 950-960).

\(^{128}\) Tenney Frank, Life and Literature in the Roman Republic, (Berkley, 1930), 72-73.

\(^{129}\) The best text available is that of Lindsay; T Macci Plauti: Comoediae, V. II, (Oxford, 1905).
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Text I; (ll. 930-939)

Ythalonimualoniuthsicorathiiisthymhimihyamacomsyth
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iu lecantheconaalonimbalumbarche dechor
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Text II; (ll. 940-949)

deos deasque ueneror qui hanc urbem colunt
ut quod de mea re huc ueni rite uenerim,
measque hic ut gnatas et mei fratris filium
reperire me siritis, di uostram fidem!
[quae mihi surruptae sunt et fratris filium]
sed hic mihi antehac hospes Antidamas fuit;
eum fecisse aiunt sibi quod faciundum fuit.
Eius filium esse hic praedicant Agorastocles:
ad eum hospitalem hanc tesseram mecum fero;
is in hisce habitare monstratust regionibus.
Hos percontabor qui hinc egrediuntur foras.
(ll. 950-960; speech L)

Hanno: I worship the gods and goddesses who watch over this
city, so that I might have rightly come for the reason I came here,
and that you would allow me to find my daughters and my
nephew. This is where Antidamas was our hostbefore. They say
that he has done what he had to do and died. But they also say
that his sone, Agorastocles, is here; I take this token of hospitality
with myself to him. He’s been said to live in this part of town. I
will ask those men who are coming outside here.
The Punic itself has caused quite a debate among scholars, ranging from the question of whether or not the Punic was gibberish or a true representation of the language as the Romans understood it, to orthographic questions, to questions about why the same speech is recorded three times in two languages.\textsuperscript{130}

Much of the earlier questions arose over textual difficulties. Lindsay’s analysis of the Codex Turnebi proved enlightening; he found that the two versions of Hanno’s speech in Punic did not appear to have originated from the same text. Rather, Lindsay\textsuperscript{131} traces the Codex Turnebi ($T$) back beyond the archetype of the Palatine ($P$) family; the common ancestor of both the archetype of $P$ ($P^A$) and $T$ was not much younger than the Ambrosian Palimpsest ($A$), the oldest Plautine text and the only representative of a tradition other than the Palatine.\textsuperscript{132}

Lindsay notes that the second version of Hanno’s speech (ll. 940-949), found in $A$, appears to have been not only more corrupt and therefore less intelligible than the first version (ll. 930-939), but it

\textsuperscript{130}A. S. Gratwick, “Hanno’s Punic Speech in the \textit{Poenulus} of Plautus,” Hermes (1971), 25-45; 25-26, gives the best summary of the “opuscles” written on the speeches since the 1500s.

\textsuperscript{131}W.M. Lindsay, “The Carthaginian Passages in the ‘Poenulus’ of Plautus,” CR XII, 1898; 361-364; Lindsay includes the text of the \textit{Poenulus} in his facsimile of the Codex Turnebi in his fuller study of the codex, \textit{The Codex Turnebi of Plautus}, (1898).

\textsuperscript{132}Lindsay, “Carthaginian Passages,” 362.
appears to have been reproduced in the margin of the ancestor of $T$ and $P^4$. Lindsay surmises that it was copied from a manuscript of the Ambrosian family because it shows up in $P^4$ as part of the text immediately following the first version of the speech. Here, however, it become terribly corrupted—perhaps at least in part because of its transmutation from scholia to text.\textsuperscript{133}

Most recently, the classicist A.S. Gratwick and the semiticist Charles Khrahmalkov have shed new light on the problem of the text as we have it.\textsuperscript{134} Gratwick agrees with Lindsay’s analysis of the two Punic passages and the Latin passage as being three speeches of ten lines in length\textsuperscript{135} and all meaning the same thing.\textsuperscript{136} He goes on to prove, through orthographic means, that the first speech (ll. 930-939) is actually the later of the two Punic speeches and the speech which follows it in the text (ll. 940-949) is the earlier one. Text II uses $i$ or $u$ instead of $y$; $t$ or $s$ instead of $th$; $c$ instead of $ch$; hence, text I must have been written originally without $y$’s, $th$’s, and $ch$’s; rather than these orthographic symbols, it used $u$, $i$, $t$, and $c$. Even if Plautus directly

\textsuperscript{133}Lindsay, “Carthaginian Passages,” 362.


\textsuperscript{135}Gratwick, 36, notes that the only reason the Latin speech is eleven lines long is because line 954 is interpolated.

\textsuperscript{136}Gratwick, 36.
copied a Punic speech from a Greek play, he could not have used the letters *th, ch, ph, or y* to represent Greek ϑ, χ, φ, or υ because those spellings for the Greek symbols were not introduced into Latin until after Plautus’ time. On the other hand, the symbols used in Text II are consistent with the resources available to Plautus. Hence, Text II must be Plautus’ text, and Text I must have been a scholar’s repair of the woefully corrupt earlier speech that was written at or after the time of Varro when all the symbols were available for that particular transcription.

Gratwick notes that Leo has proven that both A and P descend from the *Fabulae Varronianae* of the second century AD, and he concludes, as did Lindsay, that he concludes that P included all three

---

137 Krahmalkov, Phoenican-Punic Dictionary, (Leuven, 2000), 15; Krahmalkov comments that Plautus’ original was the *Carchedonius* of Alexis, but that Alexis used no Punic to mark Hanno’s speech; Plautus appears to have been the only one to do this. He further comments (16) that there are, extant in the Punic fragments, a play whose story is reminiscent of the *Poenulus* although it is clearly not the same; likewise in that play, there is no Latin to mark the Romans’ speech. Finally, he remarks that there is also a Punic version of the Greek play that Plautus made into the *Aulularia*. Based upon these remarks, how can he then say that Plautus’ use of Punic to mark Hanno’s speech was intended as gibberish? If there were Greek, Latin, and Punic versions of the same play, clearly the three cultures were exchanging ideas as well as commerce and “literature.” Although surely the general population of none of these civilizations was literate, they likely understood each others’ spoken languages. It is significant, perhaps, that Plautus’ plays, unlike the Greek ones upon which he based them, were performed for the general *populus* rather than the aristocracy; it was the general *populus* who would have been carrying on the bulk of the trade and other negotiations with the Phoenicians and who would have been the most likely to understand any Punic that he used. If Plautus had intended the Punic to be gibberish, why would he have gone through the effort of using real Punic that would have been intelligible to a great part of the masses?

138 Gratwick, 37.
versions of the speech while A lacked the first one. ¹³⁹ This would be consistent with his theory that Text I is the later version of the speeches, and that it was a repair of Text II. Furthermore, Lindsay has proved, using the Codex Turnebi, that A is older than P, and Gratwick’s theory is also consistent with that. ¹⁴⁰ Gratwick’s theory, then, is a very plausible explanation for the presence of two Punic versions of the same speech.

Gratwick goes on to prove that the Latin speech is a translation of the Punic by making a word-by-word comparison and attempting to reconstruct the Punic speech. ¹⁴¹ Although he does an admirable job, it is Krahmalkov who irrefutably proves Gratwick’s case. Krahmalkovseizes upon Gratwick’s foundation to carry out the analysis more fully. ¹⁴² Krahmalkov not only compares the Latin transcription of the Punic, he analyzes the Punic itself. In his analysis, he concludes that Text II was actually written in Punic, and Text I was written in neo-Punic. Furthermore, the second passage follows the syntax of the Latin version of the speech (ll. 950-960). ¹⁴³

¹³⁹ Gratwick, 35; He cites Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, chapter 1, as his source.

¹⁴⁰ Lindsay, 361.

¹⁴¹ Gratwick, 37-38.


¹⁴³ Krahmalkov, 57.
Krahmalkov begins by noting that he had failed, in an earlier paper¹⁴⁴ to adequately address the issue of the differences between Text I and Text II.¹⁴⁵ He claims that his purpose in this particular study is to confirm Gratwick’s theory that Text II was the older one and that the Punic used in that text was that of Plautus’ period, while that of Text I was late Neo-Punic.¹⁴⁶ By means of a textual comparison of the first line of each of the speeches, he establishes the relationship between the three versions by analyzing, reconstructing, and finally translating the first line of each of the speeches; he believes that this line in particular shows the process that must have been at work in the construction of the three speeches. For this comparison, he uses both line 940 from the Palatine recension (940P) and line 940 from the Ambrosian Palimpsest (940A).¹⁴⁷

Received Readings

(940P) ex anolim uolanus suc curratim is tim alt imacum
(940A) yth alonim unalniuth si corath sy thy th ymacom syth
(930) yth alonim ualonuth si corathi sy macom syth
(931a) chymlachchun yth m um ysthy

---

Reconstructed Readings

(940P) *et alonim ualonut succart caruti is timlacun alt imacum esse*

(940A) *yth alonim ualonuth sicarth carothi is thymlahun th-ymacom syth*

(930- 931a)

(a) *yth alonim ualounuth sicarth carothi ys thymlahun yth m(ac)um ysyth*

(b) *yth alonim ualonuth sicarth carothi ys macom syth thymalchun*

Translations

Punic: I invoke you gods and goddesses of the city who rule over this place.

Neo-Punic: I invoke you gods and goddesses of the city who rule this place.

Latin: I revere you gods and goddesses who tend this place.

As Krahmalkov notes, the versions are virtually identical. Latin renders the Punic *corathi*, “I invoke,” as *veneror, “I revere;” where the Punic and Neo-Punic have “you rule,” (*thymlacun*), Latin has “they tend,” (*colunt*). In meaning, however, the three versions are basically the same.

---

148 Krahmalkov, (1988), 57; He also comments (60) that the Latin does not use “of the city,” because that phrase was not in the Greek original that Plautus “translated”–a misconception in its own right–but that supposition is ludicrous. As Krahmalkov argues, the meaning of the three passages is virtually identical. The Latin does not have “of the city” because the Latin translates the phrase as if the gods are protecting the city rather than patrons of it. In other words, in the Latin, “the city” (*urbem*) is the object of the verb rather than a genitive that qualifies “deos.”
Further, Krahmalkov points out that esse (l. 940) is the demonstrative pronoun of Punic, while syth (l.930-931a) is the Neo-Punic equivalent. The use of the Neo-Punic syth for the Punic esse, then, appears to decisively show that Text I was not Plautine, but a later reconstruction. The Romans of Plautus’ time regularly represented the /z/ (usually articulated as a geminate [zz] sound that was the Punic demonstrative pronoun) with ss.\textsuperscript{149}

In a further analysis, Krahmalkov compares line 947 of the Palatine version of Text I (947P), line 947 of the Ambrosian version of Text I(947 P), line 937 of Text II, and line 958 of the Latin.

Received Readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>947 A</th>
<th>947 P</th>
<th>937</th>
<th>958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sitt</td>
<td>ett</td>
<td>ythem</td>
<td>ad eum hospitalem hanc tesseram mecum fero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>esed</td>
<td>ese</td>
<td>aneth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anec</td>
<td>anec</td>
<td>i h yrch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nasote</td>
<td>naso te li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs ahelicot</td>
<td>ahelicos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconstructed Readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>947A</th>
<th>947 P</th>
<th>937(a)</th>
<th>937(b)</th>
<th>958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itt</td>
<td>ett</td>
<td>ythem</td>
<td>ythem</td>
<td>ad eum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>esde</td>
<td>esde</td>
<td>anech</td>
<td>anech</td>
<td>hospitalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anec</td>
<td>nasote</td>
<td>nasothi</td>
<td>yth</td>
<td>hanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nasote</td>
<td></td>
<td>li yth</td>
<td>irs</td>
<td>tesseram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aehlichot</td>
<td>mecum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>fero.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{149}Krahmalkov, (1988), 62; he also points out that the Romans also represented the Greek <z> which was originally doubly articulated (as [zd]) as ss by the turn of the third century BC.
Translation

Punic           To this fellow I bring in my behalf a sherd of hospitality.
Neo-Punic      To him I bring in my behalf this sherd of hospitality.
Latin          To him I bring with me this sherd of hospitality.

In his two analyses, Krahmalkov notes that the Neo-Punic of Text II was revised. He points to two specific places in which this seems particularly evident: lines 930-931a and line 937. The verb *timalcun*, “you rule,” in line 940 is preserved only by the syllable *tim=*thym=; the full reading *thymlacun* is found in line 931a. In the Ambrosian version of the text (940A), the verb immediately followed the relative pronoun *is*, “who,” and was in turn followed by the direct object *yth macom syth*, “this place.” Later, however, as we see in the Neo-Punic of line 930-931a, the text was revised and the verb was placed at the end of the sentence following the syntax of the Latin *colunt*. Likewise, in line 947, *nasothi*, “I bring,” appears to have been moved from its original position following *anec*, “I,” to the final position following the syntax of the Latin *fero*, “I bring.”

---

Krahmalkov believes that the -i- and -h- following the first person pronoun aneth (anec) in the received reading are traces of the original position of the verb nasothi.\textsuperscript{151}

By such word-by-word analyses and comparisons of the various versions of the text, Krahmalkov concludes that not only was Gratwick correct in his assessment that Text II was the Plautine one and Text I was composed during the time of the Empire, but that the Latin text was a translation of Text I, and the Neo-Punic of Text II was in turn a translation of the Latin.\textsuperscript{152} It seems, then, that Plautus’ version of the play included the Punic with no Latin translation. The question is, then, did Plautus not include a translation because he expected it to be “merely gibberish” to his audience,\textsuperscript{153} or did he not include a translation because he expected at least some of them to understand it?

Gratwick argues that the meaning of Hanno’s dramatic program and his piety can be adequately argued even if he speaks gibberish.\textsuperscript{154} Krahmalkov contends that there were very few, if any, people around

\textsuperscript{151}Krahmalkov, (1988), 65.\textsuperscript{152}Krahmalkov, (1988), 65-66; Louis Gray, “The Punic Passages in the Poenulus of Plautus,” American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XXXIX, (1923), 73-88; 74-45, argued the same sequence of events many years earlier.\textsuperscript{153}Krahmalkov, Phoenician-Punic Dictionary, (Leuven, 2000), 15, remarks that the Punic in Plautus’ version of the play had no functional purpose and that it was “gibberish” to the audience.\textsuperscript{154}Gratwick, 33.
who would have understood the Punic in the first place. On the other hand, Krahmalkov applauds Plautus because he alone, of all the playwrights who wrote a version of the Poenulus, uses both the native tongue of the majority of the audience and Punic in his play; it seems strange to do this if Plautus expected no one in his audience to have a clue as to what the main character was saying. After all, the Romans and the Carthaginians had been in contact since the late sixth century BC if we are to believe Polybius; they had to be able to communicate if they were to establish any kind of treaty or trade relations. This belief that at least some members of Plautus’ audience knew at least a little Punic is the one that Gray, who put forth the same sequence of composition of the three speeches espoused by Gratwick and Krahmalkov, posited.

Hanno’s monologue was evidently translated into Latin some time after Plautus first produced it. In the scene that follows Hanno’s speech, we find Milphio attempting to communicate with Hanno in Punic and attempting to translate Hanno’s Punic into Latin for Agorastocles. It is in

---


156 Charles Krahmalkov, A Phoenician-Punic Grammar, (Leiden, 2001); 3.

157 Polybius, III.1.22, quotes a treaty between Rome and Carthage that he dated to the founding of the republic in 509 BC.

158 Gray, 76.
the light of this scene that we may best examine this question of whether or not Plautus expected any members of his audience to understand the words Hanno spoke.

Milphio and Agorastocles first determine that Hanno is Carthaginian from his manner of dress;\(^{159}\) upon determining this, they must decide how best to communicate with him. After Milphio, claiming that he understands Punic, approaches Hanno, he asks Hanno who he is and where he is from; Hanno replies that he is Hanno son of Myttan-Ba’al. Milphio turns to Agorastocles and translates Hanno’s statement as “He says that he’s Hanno, from Carthage, the son of the Carthaginian Mythumbalis.”

994 Mi: Avo! Quoiates estis aut quo ex oppido?
995 Ha: annobynmytymballebechaedreanech.
996 Ag: quid ait? Mi: Hannonem se esse ait Carthagine,
997 Carthaginiensis Mythumballis filium.

**Milphio:** Hi there! Who are you and what town do you come from?  
**Hanno:** I am Hanno, son of the senator Mattan-Ba’al.\(^{160}\)

\(^{159}\)Agorastocles remarks in line 976 that Hanno has a Punic appearance (facies quidem edepol Punicast) and they remark (ll 979-981) about the odd dress of Hanno’s servants who wear earrings:

- **MI:** servos quidem edepol ueteres antiquosque habet.
- **AG:** qui scis? **MI:** viden omnis sarcinatos consequi?
- **ATQUE UT OPINOR DIGITOS IN MANIBUS NON HABENT.**
- **AG:** quid iam? **MI:** quia incidunt cum anulatis auribus.

\(^{160}\)Gray, 80. Gray reconstructs Hanno’s statement of line 995 as: anno byn mythymbal lebechaedre anech, which he then translates as “I am Hanno, son of Mattan-Ba’al, a senator.” He admits that the word “lebachaedre” is a difficult one, and
Agorastocles: What does he say?  
Milphio: He says that he’s Hanno from Carthage, son of the Carthaginian Mytthumal.

There are two things we may learn from this little exchange: Hanno understands what Milphio asks him in Latin, and Milphio tells Agorastocles that Hanno says he is Carthaginian when Hanno has said no such thing. This means that Milphio understood enough of what Hanno said to correctly identify his name and that of his father. The fact that he was dressed as a Carthaginian convinced Milphio and Agorastocles that they must be able to understand Punic to communicate with him.

From this point, however, Plautus uses Milphio’s “Punic” as a framework for jokes and puns. Hanno goes on to greet Milphio, and Milphio “translates” Hanno’s words for Agorastocles:

994  HA: avol  MI: salutat. HA: donni . MI: doni uolt tibi dare hic nescioquid. audin pollicitarier?

Hanno: Greetings......
Milphio (to Agorastocles): He sends greetings.
Hanno:...... Sir.
Milphio (to Agorastocles): He says he wants to give some gift or other to you. Didn’t you hear him promise?

he believes that it may be a Punic attempt to reconstruct the Roman “senator.
Although Milphio puns on Hanno’s word *donni* (“My Lord,” “Sir”)\(^\text{161}\) as if it were the Latin *doni* (“of a gift”), he evidently understands perfectly well that it is part of Hanno’s salutation rather than a promise of a gift. He goes on, when Agorastocles tells him to return greetings in Punic, to give Hanno the same salutation with which Hanno greeted him.

1000 AG: *saluta hunc rursus Punice suis uerbis.*
1001 MI: *auo donnim inquit hic tibi uerbis suis.*

**Agorastocles**: Greet him back with his own words in Punic. **Milphio** (To Hanno)" He says “Greetings, Sir!” to you with his own words.

Hence, despite his joke, Milphio understands that “*Avo donni*” is the entire salutation, and that the Punic *donni* does not have anything to do with the Latin *doni*.

Analysis of the next interchange is a little more complicated. Lindsay has:

1002 HA: *meharbocca*.\(^\text{162}\) MI: *istuc tibi sit potius quam mihi.*
1003 AG: *quid ait?* MI: *miseram esse praedicat buccam sibi.*
1004 *Fortasse medicos nos esse arbitrarier.*

\(^{161}\)Gray, 80. The Punic *donni* was evidently the usual form of polite address. 
\(^{162}\)Krahmalkov, (1969), 183, notes that perhaps the final syllable of -char >har was added by comparing the Punic to the Latin *miseram buccam.*
Hanno: I am one who pledges to be your friend.
Milphio: That’s better for you than me!
Agorastocles: What does he say?
Milphio: He says that his cheek hurts.

Scholars dispute how exactly to translate the Punic *me har bocca*.\(^{163}\)

Milphio comes up with something other than what Hanno says to offer Agorastocles as a translation. Although the audience need not have known precisely what Hanno said in order to understand that Milphio’s translation was wrong, it must BE wrong in order for Milphio to MISTRanslate it.

The next interchange poses another question.

1004 (MI): *fortasse medicos nos esse arbitrarier.*
1005 AG: † *si est †, nega esse; nolo ego errare hospitem.*
1006 MI: *audin tu?* HA: *rufeenychoissam.* AG: *sic volo*
1007 *profecto vera cuncta huic expedirier.*

Milphio: Perhaps he thinks that we are doctors.
Agorastocles: If it is, deny that it it is so. I don’t want a stranger to make a mistake.

\(^{163}\)This is a difficult line; Maurice Szynce, *Les Passages Puniques en Transcription Latine dans le <<Poenulus>> de Plaute,* (Paris, 1967), 139-40, seems at a loss to interpret this, although he calls Gray’s (80) offering of “The morrow with the!” absurd. Krahmkov, “The Punic Speech of Hanno,” *Orientalia* NS 39 (1970), 59 n.1, believes that meharbocca is probably the idiomatic response to another’s salutation, and it may be translated “[I am] one who pledges you (in friendship),” although earlier (Observations on the Affixing of Possessive Pronouns in Punic,” *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 44, 1969), 181-187; 183, he seemed to think that the translation may have coincided with one of Gray’s (80) offerings of “Who is your companion?” Later, in his *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary* (2000), p.467, he offers still another suggestion, *me sem abuca,* “what was your father’s name.”
**Milphio** (to Hanno): Are you listening?

**Hanno:** The man there is not a doctor.

**Agorastocles:** I certainly want everything to be done rightly for him.

There seems to be little dispute over the meaning of the Punic here. Gray offers “so the man there is not a physician,”{{164}} Sznycer does not really dispute him.{{165}} It is interesting, however, to note that Hanno seems to have understood Milphio’s remark about the doctors very well. Likewise, Milphio does not seem to have to translate Hanno’s reply when he asks him if he’s listening.

From this point on, however, it seems that either Milphio is deliberately MISunderstanding what Hanno says in order to make jokes, or he doesn’t understand what he’s saying and tries to pretend that he does. On the other hand, Hanno’s remarks seem to be quite appropriate to what Milphio and Agorastocles say, as well as the circumstances at hand.

---

1008 ... MI: *tu qui sonam non habes*,
1009 *quid in hanc venistis urbem aut quid quaeritis?*

---

{{164}}Gray, 81.

{{165}}Sznycer, 143.
1011  MI: *non audis? mures Africanos praedicat*
1012  *in pompam ludis dare se uelle aedilibus.*

**Milphio:** You who aren’t making a sound, why have you come into this city or what do you seek?
**Hanno:** An explanation....
**Agorastocles:** What does he say?
**Hanno:** Who will lead them.....?
**Agorastocles:** Why does he come?
**Milphio:** Don’t you hear? He says that he wants to give African mice to the Aediles for the games for the parade.

Again, there is some dispute over exactly what the Punic means here. Gray takes it as “an explanation (has already been given)” and “Who will lead them (the mice), (if not I?”166 Sznycer prefers that of Shröder, who offers “ What do these words mean?” and “Who answers the stranger?”167 Either one of these translations would make sense in the context; Hanno answers either “what do these words mean?” or “An explanation (has already been given)” to Milphio’s question about why he came here; he’d already answered that question in his speech when he’d entered. He

---

166Gray, 81.

167Sznycer, 143; Sznycer allows, however, that Shröder’s translation is also difficult because two of the transcriptions for the interrogative are otherwise unattested in Punic.
answers Agorastocles’ question about what he’s saying by saying either (in response to Milphio’s remark about the mice) “Who will lead them?” or, asking who Agorastocles is, “Who answers the stranger?”

They continue to banter back and forth with Hanno beginning to get frustrated:

1013 HA: lechlachananilimniichot. AG: quid nunc ait?
1014 MI: ligulas, canalis, ait se aduexisse et nuces:
1015 nunc orat operam ut des sibi, ut ea ueneant.

**Hanno:** Get out of here!
**Agorastocles:** What does he say now?
**Milphio:** He says that he’s brought reeds, troughs, and nuts; he asks now that you help him to sell them.

Both Gray and Khrahmalkov agree about the translation of the Punic here.\(^{168}\) Again, Hanno’s frustration here makes perfect sense; it’s actually Milphio’s “translation” that makes NO sense. That is, of course, the point; Milphio has no clue about what Hanno is saying, and his translation should sound nonsensical in order to let the audience know that.

\(^{168}\)Krahmalkov, (2000), 157; Gray, 81, although Gray adds “…slave, and get thrashed,” which would only emphasize the frustration that Hanno must be feeling. Szynyger, 143, remarks that there were two co-existing forms of the imperative, and that may account for some of the confusion.
The scene continues:

1016 AG: mercator credo est. HA. assamarbinam. MI. quidem.\(^{169}\)
1017 HA: palumergadetha. AG: Milphio, quid nunc ait?
1018 MI: palas uendundas sibi ait et mergas datas,
1019 ad messim credo, nisi quid tu aliud sapis,
1020 ut hortum fodiat atque ut frumentum metat..
1021 AG: quid istuc ad me? MI: certiorem te esse vult,
1022 ne quid clam furtim se accepisse censeas.

**Agorastocles:** He’s a merchant, I believe.
**Hanno:** What he says is fine.
**Milphio:** Indeed.
**Hanno:** Great speech! You’ve ruined it.\(^{170}\)
**Milphio:** He says spades and forks have been given to him that he
must sell,
--I think for the harvest, unless you sense something else--
so that he can dig and he can harvest the corn.
**Agorastocles:** What’s that to me?
**Milphio:** He wants you to be sure, so that you won’t think he’s
taken anything secretly.

\(^{169}\) Lindsay follows the Palatine recension here (HA. assam. MI. arbinam...) here; the Ambrosian text attributes both words to Hanno (assamarbinam). Gray reads Hanno’s words as Lindsay has written, ‘SM. Others, however, beg to differ.
Szyncer cites Shröder as interpreting assam with the word aruinam, which Lindsay has given to Milphio, and Gray cites Götz-Löwe as doing the same, ‘S M’R BN’M, which Shröder reads as “That which he says is agreeable,” and Götz-Löwe as “He DOES talk with them.”

\(^{170}\) Shröder (Szynce, 143) has “You magnificently deform the speech,” Gray (82), “Wonderful oration! You’re a kid!” Krahmakov feels that this line, which he translates as “not a word (BL MR) was stolen from a Punic version of the play and is the answer to the question “Do you remember any Punic?” (muphonimmsycortham, l. 1023); he claims that Plautus lifted both lines from the Punic version of the play, presumably the Punic words that Plautus translates as ll. 985-986: MI:....ecquid commeministi Punice?/AG: nihil edepol....

94
Hanno responds to what Agorastocles says with a comment that makes reasonably good sense. Milphio’s response is probably sarcastic, and Hanno’s response to Milphio certainly is. Again, Milphio picks up on what Hanno has said and makes puns in Latin on the Punic words. There is no reason here, though, to think that anyone but Agorastocles has NO clue as to what’s going on; Milphio could be deliberately mistranslating the Punic.

1023 HA: muphonnimsycorathim. MI: hem! Caue sis feceris  
1024 quod hic te orat. AG: quid ait aut quid orat? expedi.  
1025 MI: sub cratim ut iubeas se supponi atque eo  
1026 lapides imponi multos, ut sese neces.

**Hanno:** What Punic do you remember?\(^{171}\)  
**Milphio:** Please, be careful that you don’t do what he asks!  
**Agorastocles:** What does he say—what does he ask? Tell me.  
**Milphio:** That you order him placed in a wicker basket and that lots of stones be thrown at him so that you can kill him.

---

\(^{171}\) Krahmalkov, (2000), 13, 399, sees *mu phonnim* as “what Punic...”, and he takes *sycorathim* as *sucartim* “do you remember;” although his purpose is to argue that Plautus lifted this line from the Punic version of the play, his translation seems to make sense. Gray follows Shröder in taking *muphonnim* as a participle, but he draws his meaning from an Arabic word that means “to be feeble-witted;” Szyncer also follows Shröder and offers no real translation for *phonnim*, but he suggests “those who have returned,” for *sycharthim* based on a comparison with the form *sicorathi* that is found in ll 930, 940.
Krahmalkov’s translation of the Punic here is very logical. Unfortunately, it would seem to refute his argument that Plautus simply lifted his Punic from the Punic version of the play without understanding it, and that he expected it to be gibberish to his audience.172 Hanno, realizing that Milphio is “translating” his words to Agorastocles and understanding Milphio’s Latin, asks in exasperation exactly what Punic is is that Milphio remembers. Furthermore, Milphio would actually seem to understand him here—although he gives Agorastocles yet another wrong translation, he tells him that he should not do what Hanno asks—namely, understand Punic. If Agorastocles understands Punic, then Milphio’s game is over. The audience, of course, or at least those of them who understood the Punic that was being spoken, would have found this twice as funny as they would have otherwise.

1027 HA: gunebelbalsameniyrasa. AG: narras, quid est?
1028 quid ait? MI: non hercle nunc quidem quicquam scio.
1029 HA: at ut scias, nunc dehinc latine iam loquar.

Hanno: Great Ba’al. I will make him shut up!
Agorastocles: Tell me, what is it? What does he say?
Milphio: Damned if I have any idea whatsoever.
Hanno: Well, I’ll speak in Latin from now on so that you will know.

Hanno has, evidently, had quite enough of Milphio’s shenanigans. He found them amusing for a while, but now the time has come to get down to business. He comes out with a phrase off which Milphio can’t manage to pun, and he immediately chastises Milphio for making fun of him. Milphio, in turn, condemns Hanno for letting him go on for so long and “trapping him” in the snare of his own making.

1030 (HA:) *seruom hercle te esse oportet et nequam et malum,*
1031 *hominem peregrinum atque aduenam qui inrideas.*
1032 MI: *at hercle te hominem et sycophantam et subdolum,*
1033 *qui huc advenisti nos captatum, migdilix,*
1034 *bisulci lingua quasi proserpens bestia.*

**(Hanno:)** You surely must be a worthless and useless slave, who ridicules a foreigner and a stranger.

**Milphio:** And YOU are a conman and a swindler, who has come here to capture us, you—you magnifier of perversion, with a forked tongue like a snake!

This interchange, while brief, seems to confirm our suspicions that Milphio was indeed deliberately mistranslating Hanno’s words. Hanno, at least, seems to think that is the case; he accuses him of deliberately making fun of him. Milphio, on the other hand, is angry because Hanno evidently understood perfectly well what he was doing and made no attempt to stop it. In the process, Milphio calls Hanno a
migdilix. This is a word that scholars have, until recently, been unable to translate, although some have tried to connect it to the Greek μίγδονα, (promiscuously). Far more likely, given the context, is Krahmalkov’s reading of it as the Punic MGDL’QS, “magnifier of perversion.”

Milphio’s use of a Punic term of abuse in an angry outburst indicates that he is more familiar with the Punic tongue than he would have had us believe. Hanno surely suspected this; he knew what Milphio was doing. Agorastocles, a Carthaginian by birth, also seems to have an inkling about what has been going on, because he also condemns Milphio for ridiculing and lambasting a fellow countryman.

One final scene in which Plautus puts Punic in the mouths of his characters is in lines 1141-42. In this scene, Hanno finally meets his old maidservant Giddenis, and she tells him that he’s arrived in the nick of time to keep his daughters from becoming prostitutes. While Hanno is talking to her, one of his slaves, who is evidently Giddenis’ son, runs up to her and greets her warmly. Giddenis and her son speak in Punic, while Hanno interprets the goings-on for Agorastocles.

1140 PU: auonesilli. GI: hauonbanesilliimustine.
1141 mepsietenestedumetalannacestimim.

---

Puer: May my mother live long!
Giddenis: May my son live long!.....

Although scholars are at a loss to interpret the last line of Giddenis’ speech, all seem agreed on the interpretation of line 1140. The long-lost mother and son greet each other, just as Hanno explains to Agorastocles. Hanno, however, has no reason to make fun of the man he has just learned is his nephew.

From the preceding discussion, it seems clear that the Punic Hanno speaks is not the “educated” variety, but rather, the ordinary spoken variety. His remarks, furthermore, can be understood as making perfectly good sense within the context. It also seems clear that Milphio is deliberately having fun at Agorastocles’ and Hanno’s expense, because he doesn’t realize that Hanno understands Latin. Finally, Milphio appears to understand more Punic that he would have the others realize, although Hanno seems to have understood, and for a while been amused by, Milphio’s word games.

Milphio certainly had reason to want to make fun of his master and perhaps even to keep his master from understanding what Hanno is saying. He had never particularly liked him, and earlier (ll. 818-820) he

---

174 Krahmalkov, (2000), 461; Szynce, 144-5; Gray, 83. The only one who seems to disagree among them is Gray, who again seeks recourse to Arabic. Even he, however, notes that what they are saying is as Hanno explains to Agorastocles.
had intimated that he thought he was a fool. It is only when he talks to Lycus’ slave and learns that the girl his own master desires is freeborn, and Carthaginian as is his own master, that he starts to think that he might be able to get his master to give him his freedom. His hopes might come to naught, however, if Hanno takes the girls, his daughters, back to Carthage; Agorastocles would not be able to have his beloved Adelphasion. Milphio is very likely deliberately mistranslating Hanno’s words.

This in itself, however, doesn’t really reveal much about Plautus’ audience. There are still other factors to consider. Gratwick argues that the entire scene can be acted without the audience’s understanding the words that are spoken, and Krahmalkov goes further to state that Plautus used the Punic strictly so that the Romans would laugh at the gibberish that Hanno was speaking. To brush off Plautus’ Punic as mere “gibberish,” however, would seem to be doing the playwright and his audience a disservice.

Krahmalkov believes that not only was there a Greek version of the play, but there was also a Punic one. In the Greek version, the Karkhedonios by Alexis, all the characters spoke Greek. In the Punic

\(^{175}\)Gratwick, 33; Krahmalkov, (2000), 12.
version that Krahmalkov believes existed, all the characters would have spoken Punic. Krahmalkov believes Plautus not only copied Alexis’ Karkhedonios, but that he merely copied the lines from the Punic version of the play and inserted them into his Latin version in the mouth of Hanno at the appropriate places.

It is highly unlikely, first of all, that Plautus “copied” anything. The discovery of a large fragment of Menander’s Dis Exapaton, which has been accepted as the basis for Plautus’ Bacchides for nearly 200 years, has allowed for a side-by-side study of Plautus’ work and his “original.” Handley, in 1968, conducted such a study, and he found that Plautus may have followed some lines, but he largely adapted more than copied and changed the structure and language of the play to suit his own ends.177

More recently, William Anderson compares the two passages and concludes, as did Handley, that Plautus was adapting more than copying. Menander’s play was more melodramatic; Plautus expands scenes, cuts scenes and changes lines to develop his trademark

\footnote{Krahmalkov, 12-13; Krahmalkov offers no concrete evidence of this Punic version of the play other than an attempt to reconstruct that version from the Punic that Plautus uses in his Poenulus.}

\footnote{E W. Handley, Inaugural Lecture Delibered at University College, London, 5 February, 1968.}
character of the clever slave and to develop what scholars have come to recognize as another Plautine trademark—self-conscious theatre. Whereas Menander usually ended his plays in a warm family reunion, Plautus’ version ends in a complete upset of the traditional morality. Anderson concludes that Plautus’ motives were far different from Menander’s; far from slavishly “copying” Menander’s works, Plautus was well aware of the “alien” qualities the Greek play would have for his Roman audience, and he adapted them freely with that in mind.\textsuperscript{178}

Furthermore, the only evidence that Krahmalkov gives of a Punic version of the play is what he reconstructs using Plautus’ own Punic.\textsuperscript{179} An argument for a play upon which a supposedly subsequent version is based which uses the subsequent version as the basis for its existence is tautological, at best. Even if there were such a play, however, one would have to consider exactly how Plautus would have known precisely which lines to copy if Punic were mere “gibberish” to him and his Roman audience. Although they may differ on the nuances of translation, scholars basically have translated the Punic in the Poenulus, and they


\textsuperscript{179}Krahmalkov, 12-13; Krahmalkov argues that the Plautus borrowed from the Punic play the fragments \textit{Mu Ponnim sucartim? Bal umer, ladata?}, which show up in Plautus’ play as lines 1023 and 1017. These Punic fragments are roughly parallel to Plautus’ lines 985...\textit{ecquid commeministi Punice?}, 986 \textit{nil edepol...}, and 991 \textit{an scis?}...
have translated it as Punic that both made sense in the context in which it was spoken and sounded enough like Latin words that Milphio could easily make puns off it. Such words and phrases would have been difficult to choose if Plautus perceived Punic as mere “gibberish.” Even if there had been a play, how could Plautus have gone through it and chosen the precise words that Krahmalkov supposes he chose? Plautus did not translate; he adapted. In such an event, a line-by-line attempt to “find the translation” would have been impossible unless Plautus had a clue about the words for which he was looking. He had to have known some Punic.

The fact that scholars can translate the Punic at all would seem to argue against Krahmalkov’s opinion. If Plautus didn’t understand the words he was using, the words would have been mere “gibberish” rather than real words structured in syntactically correct, translatable phrases. If he had wanted to use “gibberish,” he could easily have done so. All he would have had to do, if he wanted it to sound like Punic, was to put the right sound effects into the language.

Finally, there is the matter of the initial speech that Hanno makes when he comes onstage. Gratwick and Krahmalkov have proved that the only speech that was present in the oldest text of the *Poenulus* was the Punic one. This could have, as both Gratwick and Krahmalkov argue,
been adequately acted with no need for a translation. Evidently the later scribes disagreed because they felt that it was necessary to include two—one in Neo-Punic and one in Latin. The logical conclusion is that later scribes, whose audience was not as familiar with Punic as Plautus’ audience was, must have felt that it was necessary to understand Hanno’s introduction. Plautus’ not including a translation indicates that his audience needed no translation; at least SOME of them must have understood what was being said.

To be sure, they did not translate the shorter phrases into either Neo-Punic or Latin—but then, to have done so would have spoiled the comic effect of Milphio’s mistranslating and getting caught with his pants down. It also would have spoiled the comic effect of reversing the roles180 and making the Carthaginian the more clever of the two. Certainly Milphio was clever, but the audience eventually sees that he outsmarts himself.

It seems clear that Plautus understood enough Punic to include it in his dialogue. If this is so, then there is no reason to believe that he would expect any less from his audience. This does not mean, of course,

180Segal, Erich, Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus (Oxford, 1987), based his entire book on the subject of the “festival” nature of Roman comedy and the fact that role reversal was a primary part of that “festival” nature. It would surely have been more appropriate, given the time frame in which the Poenulus was produced, to have made the clever slave the clever one and the Carthaginian, the enemy of Rome, the bumbling fool.
that Plautus’ audience spoke fluent Punic, but they surely understood enough to communicate with the Punic traders; most Romans could probably speak and understand the "Where is the harbor?" variety of Punic. In fact, Hanno’s use of the words *muphonnim sycorathim*, "What Punic do you remember?" (l. 1023) is very similar in meaning to Milphio’s question to Agorastocles in l. 985, "ecquid commememiniši Punice?" In our own vernacular, this is just like the German’s "Sprechen Sie Deutch?" the Spaniard’s "Usted habla Español?," the Italian’s "Parlate Italiano?," or the Frenchman’s "Parlez-vous Francais?" Asking if someone can speak your language is one of the first things one learns if one routinely has to communicate with native speakers of another language; one needs both to be able to ask the question and to recognize it if it is asked of him or her.

Plautus’ putting Punic in the mouth of Hanno, then, was not, as scholars have argued, an attempt to make fun of Punic or to use “gibberish” to represent Hanno’s speech. Rather, it was Plautus’ attempt to mark Hanno as Carthaginian. Plautus used the Punic just as he used the Greek; the language served as a way of putting the action in the real
world. In Plautus’ world, much of his audience was familiar enough with Punic not only to recognize the sounds of the words, but to understand the language well enough to understand the Punic he put into the mouth of Hanno.
CHAPTER 5
PLAUTUS’ USE OF AMABO AND OPSEcro AS MARKERS OF EMOTION

If Plautus used Greek and Punic as a means of putting his characters in the real world, then what are we to make of his use of linguistic gender markers? There were a few such markers in ancient Latin, and several scholars have noted that Plautus has used them in his plays. Although some have counted the words and made note of them, no one has thoroughly examined the reasons WHY Plautus might have put a word believed to be part of a woman’s speech in the mouth of a man or vice-versa. Were they also markers of reality, were they marks of stereotype, or both? Were they even markers of female speech at all, or was Plautus using them another way?

The past few decades have seen a burgeoning interest in the way men and women use language differently.\(^{181}\) Such studies are very important and quite illuminating, but they unfortunately do little to shed

any light on any differences between the language of Roman women and Roman men. The only sources to whom we can turn for such analyses would have to be the Romans themselves, and we are fortunate in that several Romans--notably Varro, Aulus Gellius, Donatus, Cicero, and Quintillian were interested in their language.

Recently, several sources of the ancient Romans’ view of the way women spoke have been examined by M. Gilleland and J. N. Adams;\textsuperscript{182} while each of them has done a respectable job, neither has focused his investigation on the way Plautus used the markers which each of them discusses. If we restrict our ancient sources to those other than Plautus himself that are relevant to the language of women during the time of the second century BC, we have only two strong sources. Only Aulus Gellius and Donatus seem to have written about the speech of women during that period. Both note distinctions between what men should say and what women should say, but the older is Aulus Gellius,\textsuperscript{183} who, in the second century AD, remarks in XI.vi:

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{183}Varro, in the first century BC, evidently had a few comments on women’s speech in the first three books of his \textit{De Lingua Latina}, which are, unfortunately lost to us.
\end{flushright}
In veteribus scriptis neque mulieres Romanae per Herculem diurant neque viri per Castorem. Sed cur illae non iuraverint Herculem, non obscurum est, nam Herculaneo sacrificio abstinent. Cur autem viri Castorem iurantes non appellaverint, non facile dictu est. Nusquam igitur scriptum invenire est apud idoneos quidem scriptorem, aut ‘me hercle’ feminam dicere aut ‘me castor’ virum; ‘ederep’ autem, quod iusiurandum per Pollucem est, et vireo et feminae commune est. Sed M. Varro adseverat antiquissimos viros neque per Castorem neque per Pollucem deiurare solitos, sed id iusiurandum fuisse tantum feminarum ex initiis Eleusinis acceptum; paulatim tamen inscitia antiquitatis viros dicere ‘ederep’ coepisse factumque esse ita dicendi morem, sed ‘me castor’ a viro dici in nullo vetere scripto inveniri.184

Two and a half centuries later, Donatus, in his Commentum Terenti also has several remarks to make about the language customarily used by women. If Donatus is any judge, it seems that Terence made every attempt to represent the language of women with as much verisimilitude as possible. Donatus comments about how the way in which Terence uses the female speech markers throughout his works reflects reality. The gender markers in Terence’s work are therefore markers of reality—much like Plautus’ Greek and Punic. Because Terence writes only about a generation after Plautus’ heyday, the Latin of his Rome should not be much different from that of Plautus, and Donatus’ remarks about the language of women at Terence’s time should be

184This appears in the Bipontium text of Varro’s De Lingua Latina.
equally true of women at Plautus’ time. What remains to be seen, however, is if Plautus used the same linguistic markers as markers of reality as Terence did.

As Canthara leaves her pregnant charge in Adelphoe 289, she says to her modo dolores, mea tu, occipiunt primulum. Donatus remarks et rursum ‘mea tu’ blandimentum est, sine quo non progreditur colloquium feminarum et maxime trepidantium (again, “my heart” is a cajolery, without which the speech of women, and those most greatly anxious, would not progress.”)\(^{185}\) Attaching meus to a vocative is evidently a coaxing form of address that was usually associated with women, and womanly speech seems to be filled with forms of coaxing. This kind of speech was so strongly associated with women, in fact, that Donatus notes that a matrona would use such types of language even when addressing someone who was not her own:

quoerit Probus, an matrona tam familiariter recte dicat alieno, sed frustra; nam feminarum oratio, etsi non blanditum, blanda est.

---

\(^{185}\)It is perhaps of interest to note that Donatus assigns such forms of address not only to women, but to those who are upset. Such a distinction was also made by the Sanskrit dramatists, who would have their upperclass speaking in Sanskrit only to resort to the "lower-class" Prakrit dialects when they are upset by lust, greed, or the like. (Baumer & Brandon, Sanskrit Drama in Performance, Honolulu, 1981, 25; B. Bhattacharya, Sanskrit Drama and Dramaturgy, Delhi, 1994, 165.) Donatus makes a similar remark at Andria 685: mollis oratio et feminea multis implicata blandimentis.
It is also a point of interest that such speech is associated with anxiety and hyper-emotionality—traits long associated with women.

Donatus also tells us that women are prone to complaining about nothing as if it were a major life-changing event. When Sostrata, concerned that no one is there to help the women with the birth, complains at Adelphoe 296 miseram me, neminem habeo; solae sumus, Donatus remarks

nam haec omnia muliebria sunt quibus pro malis ingentibus quasi in aceruum rediguntur et enumerantur nullius momenti querelae

We learn, therefore, that women can only swear by certain gods and that their language full of coaxing words, complaints, and self-pity. Several scholars have taken Gellius' comments about the differences between men's and women's oaths and analyzed the men's and women's language in Plautus accordingly.\textsuperscript{186} Their conclusions are generally that female speech is marked and male speech, for the most part, is unmarked. Nicolson believes that both Plautus and Terence use the

\textsuperscript{186}Frank W. Nicolson, "The Use of Hercle (Mehercle) Edepol (Pol) Ecastor (Mecastor) by Plautus and Terence," HCSP 4 (1893), 99-103; B. L. Ullman, "By Castor and Pollux," CW 37 (1943), 87-89.
oaths to mark male and female speech.\textsuperscript{187} Ullman notes that Cicero later used the feminine oath "Pol" to mark the speech of a homosexual man.\textsuperscript{188} Most recently, J.N. Adams has concluded that Plautus does not use them as much as Terence does to differentiate the speech of the two genders; although Plautus uses these markers frequently, he is more likely than Terence to put them in the mouths of characters other than those of the gender to whom they would properly belong.\textsuperscript{189} Adams believes that this is probably due to the way the language was changing, and that may well be true.

If so, it is possible that Plautus' use of words that came to be well-recognized linguistic gender-markers will shed some light on the connotations they had in the Roman mind and why these particular idioms came to be recognized as "feminine." It is likely that a closer examination of the two idioms most commonly connected with women, \textit{amabo} and \textit{opsecro}, would help us find an answer. Since the idioms are not too much later recognized as "usual" in the mouths of women, it

\textsuperscript{187}Nicolson, 100.

\textsuperscript{188}Ullman, 89.

\textsuperscript{189}Adams, 48.
seems most logical that an examination of the language of those characters who use feminine speech markers other than females would help illuminate the subject.

*Amabo*

Women's speech is marked by coaxing words such as *opsecro* and *amabo* that are used to lighten the tones of commands. It is curious that, even though Adams notes that Plautus does not appear to mark one gender's language predominately over another, one of the main markers of female speech, the word *amabo* in the sense of a coaxing "please, honey....," is used primarily by women in Plautus. ¹⁹⁰ Although Adams goes through great pains to analyze statistically which gender is speaking to which and whether or not it is followed by an imperative or a question, it may be that he overanalyzes here; it may be the context rather than the statistics that will give us more insight into what was happening. Perhaps Plautus believed that the importance of this marker was not that it was particularly feminine, but that it brought along with it all those things associated with women---coaxing, querulousness, familiarity, and hyper-emotionalism. It is true that he uses it primarily

¹⁹⁰Adams, 61, remarks that Terence uses it exclusively as a female word.
to mark the speech of women, but he does use it on a few occasions to mark the speech of men. If Plautus was already using this word as an indicator of female speech, then why would he put it in the mouths of men? Perhaps the one word the Plautus DOES seem to use as a marker of a female's speech would serve as the best place to begin our examination.

The *adulescens amator* of the *Asinaria*, Argyrippus, uses the word *amabo* twice (707, 711), both times addressed to the slave Libanus. Argyrippus has just been thrown out of his love's house because he does not have the money to pay for her, and he has discovered that Libanus not only has the money, but is supposed to give it to him. Unfortunately, Libanus refuses to give him the money until Argyrippus carries him on his back; Argyrippus, desperate for the money, complies, but Libanus wants to make him work for it.

Argyrippus is upset not so much at Libanus' shenanigans as he is at the fact that Libanus refuses to give him the money. The money is necessary, of course, to buy his lady-love. Argyrippus cannot afford to offend Libanus by using force, however, so rather than commanding his compliance, he good-naturedly goes along with Libanus' wishes and uses a term of coaxing rather than ordering to persuade him.\textsuperscript{191}

Menaechmus I, the \textit{senex amator} of the \textit{Menaechmi}, uses \textit{amabo} when he has been caught cheating by his wife and has to retrieve her \textit{palla} from his lover Erotium because his wife has learned about Erotium and his giving his wife's \textit{palla} to her.

\begin{quote}
\textit{ME: immo edepol pallam illam, amabo te, quam tibi dudum dedi, mihi eam reddē. uxor rescuüt rem omnem, ut factum est, ordine. (678-679)}
\end{quote}

Menaechmus is upset. His wife has just found out about his cheating on her, and his lover likes the present he's given her. He needs to give his wife her \textit{palla} back, but Erotium doesn't want to give up her gift.\textsuperscript{192} Menaechmus is not, however, prepared to give up his lover, so he does

\textsuperscript{191}There could also be implications of a homosexual relationship here; see below, p.31.

\textsuperscript{192}It could be of importance here that Menaechmus also, in his eagerness to persuade Erotium to return what she considers a prize, uses what later became an oath used by women, \textit{edepol}, although he does not use the preferred women's form \textit{pol}. 
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not want to make her defensive by ordering her around or using force to barge into her home and take the palla from her. Rather, he sees that it is in his best interest to use flattery and sweet-talk to get her to do as he asks.

In the *Mostellaria*, the *adulescens amator* Callidamates, who is quite drunk and enjoying the company of his lover Delphium, uses *amabo*\(^\text{193}\) when he asks her to help him walk.

\[(\text{CA:}) \ duce \ me \ amabo. \ DE: \ caue \ [ne] \ cadas, \ asta.\]
\[\text{CA:} \ o--o--ocellu's \ meus; \]
\[\text{tuos sum alumnus, mel meum.} \ (324-325a)\]

Callidamates is obviously overcome with wine and adoration for the woman who is taking care of him. He refers to himself as the product of her nursing (*alumnus*) and uses terms of endearment (*meus ocellus*, *meum mel*) to refer to her. Under normal circumstances, these would be indicators of language that a woman would use, but these are not ordinary circumstances. Callidamates is enjoying the company of the woman he loves, and he partied a little too much in the process.

---

\(^{193}\) Lindsay notes that some give *amabo* to Delphium, but he prefers that it go with Callidamates, and I follow his text here.
Obviously, he needs her assistance to keep him from falling down; if he wants her to help and not drop him, it is in his best interest to coax her in loving terms rather than to be rude.

In the _Persa_, the slave boy Paegnium uses the word _amabo_ when he's addressing the slave woman Sophoclidisca. Each is on a mission to deliver a letter to the other's owner. They have run into each other on the way to complete their missions, and each is trying to figure out what the other is doing.

SO: _dic amabo_. PA: _dic amabo_. SO: _nolo ames_. PA: _facile impetras_. (245)

We learn a couple of things from this exchange. Paegnium's use of the term _amabo_ is probably no more than an attempt to mock Sophoclidisca. She, on the other hand, does not appear to have any real feelings for him; nevertheless she uses the word _amabo_ to persuade him into giving her the information; wheedling him may gain the information, but yelling at him certainly would do nothing but drive him away.

Paegnium's using it to make fun of alludes to the feminine quality of the word, and the fact that he was not going to be fooled by her wheedling. Sophoclidisca's response of _ames_, however, shows that the true meaning
of the word had not been lost; even though it has come to mean basically a coaxing "please, honey...," it still has its original tone of "I will love (you)."

Later in the Persa, the *adulescens amator* Toxilus tries to convince his beloved Lemniselenis to make love with him: *sed, amabo, oculus meu*, *quin lectis nos actutum commendamus?* (765). Toxilus not only uses the coaxing *amabo*, he addresses Lemniselenis with the endearment *oculus meus*—a form of address usually associated with women. He, of course, wants what every overheated young lover wants—sex with his woman. The couches, however, are also used for dining, and the party must come first. To be sure, he may proceed to embrace and fondle his beloved as they celebrate, but the actual lovemaking must wait. Especially because they are going to have a party and they are going to be one couple amidst others, Toxilus needs his lover's cooperation; sweet-talk and flattery will probably win her over before force will.

In the Poenulus, Agorastocles' slave Milphio accosts Agorastocles' love Adelphasium to try to convince her not to be angry with Milphio because Milphio has been unable to free her yet. Aorastocles has told him to beg, flatter, and stroke her, and he proceeds to do so as Agorastocles watches from the sidelines.
MI: mea voluptas, mea delicia, mea uita, mea amoenitas, meus ocellus, meum labellum, mea salus, meum sauium, meum mel, meum cor, mea colustra, meu' molliculus caseus--
MI: noli, amabo, suspersere ero meo caussa mea. (365-370)

Milphio is working for his master. His master wants his woman back, and Milphio must use cajolery rather than anger. If Milphio were to anger her, he would only bring his master's wrath upon himself. Hence, after Alephasium tells him to get lost because he's only flattering for his master, Milphio pleads some more--this time for himself.

MI: iam hercle ego faciam ploratillum, nisi te facio propitiam, atque hic ne me verberetillum faciat, nisi te propitio, male formido: novi ego huius mores morosi malos. quam ob rem amabo, mea voluptas, sine te hoc exorarier. (377-380)

We learn a couple of things from Milphio here. First of all, he's acting like the desperate lover his owner is. To this end, he uses endearments, the coaxing "please, honey..." and flattery. This coaxing form of persuasion is more likely to win her favor and less likely to gain her wrath. When the lady sees through his actions, though, he suddenly becomes concerned for his own welfare. Again, however, in trying to persuade her to forgive his master, he uses the same formula--
endearments, the coaxing "please, honey...," and flattery. He also appeals to her "feminine side" when he tells her that if he can't win her, his master will beat him; surely the nurturing part of any woman would respond to this.

All the devices that Milphio has used to persuade Adelphasium to forgive his master are things that would have been associated with the language of women. At one point, Milphio plays the part of the *adulescens amator*, and he uses language similar to that of the other *adulescentes amatores* we've met (Argyrippus, Callidamates, and Toxilus) as well as the *senex amator* Menaechmus. Even Agorastocles, when he watches Milphio try to work his wiled on Adelphasium, refers to himself as *discrucior miser* (368)—a term of complaint that was usually associated with women.

Most of these gentlemen have been addressing their lovers, but Argyrippus was addressing the slave Libanus. What is the common link? Adams mentions that some men were marked as homosexual by their use of feminine language, but this surely does not seem to be the case with these men. Each of them, including Argyrippus, is very much infatuated with a woman. It may be that such language is associated

---

194 Adams, 53.
with the *amator*—whether an *adulescens* or a *senex*. If this is the case, then further examination of the evidence should strengthen this conclusion.

Opsecro

Another word that is often used as a marker of female speech is the word *opsecro*. Adams remarks that the idiom could not have been considered normal in the mouths of Plautus' female characters, yet he goes on to show that statistically the female characters use it six times more frequently than men.\(^\text{195}\) Its usage seems to give it the "womanly" quality of flattery; it is most often used to modify an imperative, a demanding question, an *ut* clause.\(^\text{196}\) Furthermore, Adams' analysis shows that Terence associates *opsecro* even more with women; this would indicate that some change was going on in the language that would associate the word *opsecro* more with women and less with men.

\(^{195}\) Adams, 58-59, remarks that men usually use *quaeso* rather than *opsecro*, and later use suggests that it became more like *amabo* in that its tone implied familiarity. Cicero, for example, used it only informally only when he was distraught. In *Ad Fam.* 14, in letters written while Cicero was in exile, he uses it while addressing his wife in intimate terms similar to those Plautus uses to portray a lover: *quod ad te, mea Terentia, scribis, te uicum uendituram, quid, obsecro te (me miserum) quid futurum est?* (14.4.1); *obsecro te, mea uita, quod ad sumptum attinet*... (Cited by Adams.)

\(^{196}\) Adams, 56.
Again, however, Adams' statistical analysis fails to take into account the context of the males' use of the word; doing so shows that it does indeed have a "feminine" quality.

Sosia, Amphitruo's slave in the Amphitruo, runs into "himself"—or rather, Mercury pretending to be him—on the way to his master's house. Mercury has to get rid of Sosia in order to give Jupiter time with Alcumena, so he threatens to beat Sosia. Sosia is already quite confused at seeing what he thinks can only be himself. When he insists that he, not Mercury, is Sosia, Mercury threatens to beat him for his lies.

...ME: *nunc profecto uapula ob mendacium.*
SO: *non edepol uolo profecto.* ME: *at pol profecto ingratiis.*
*hoc quidem 'profecto' certum est, non est arbitrarium.*
SO: *tuam fidem opsecro.* ME: *tun te audes Sosiam esse dicere,*
*qui egi sum?* SO: *perii.* (370-374)

Later Sosia uses what Adams has concluded is the masculine form of the idiom, *opsecro* and an *ut* clause.

ME: *fugit te ratio.* SO: *utinam istuc pugni fecissent tui.*
ME: *ego Sosia ille quem tu dudum esse aiebas mihi.*
SO: *opsecro ut per pacem liceat te adloqui, ut ne uapulem.*
(386-388)
Sosia is clearly out-gunned here. Mercury has to have him out of the picture, so he will get rid of him by whatever means he must. Sosia, on the other hand, has already been stunned by the stranger wearing his face who appears to be he. Sosia fears for his life; Mercury has already beaten him, and he knows that Mercury could kill him if he wanted to. He addresses him in terms that indicate passion and submission. A curious note is that whereas Sosia uses edepol in his remark to Mercury, Mercury, who is trying to be a better Sosia than Sosia, uses pol; it is the latter form of the oath that became more and more associated with women.

Later in the Amphitruo, Amphitruo finds himself in much the same position as Sosia did. He's come home to his wife, only have her tell him that he spent the night with her. As Sosia had done, Amphitruo is beginning to doubt his own sanity when his wife can repeat the details of his battle and claims that he told her. When she claims that he left a golden bowl which had been presented to him as a gift, with her, he first accuses Sosia of having told her.

....AL: ego equidem ex te audiui et ex tua accepi manu pateram. AM: mane, mane, opseco te. nimi' demiror, Sosia, qui illaec illi me donatum esse aurea patera sciat, nisi tu dudum hanc conuenisti et narravisti haec omnia. SO: neque edepol ego dixi neque istam uidi nisi tecum simul. AM: quid hoc sit hominis?.... (764-769)
Amphitruo, like Sosia, is also nearing the end of his rope. His wife knows things that she can't possibly know unless he told her; yet he wasn't there with her last night to tell her---or was he? His wife seems quite sure that she slept with him last night; he can't believe that she would either betray him OR lie to him; in fact, she's treating him as if he is the one who is in the wrong. In desperation, he turns to Sosia in the hope that Sosia was the one who told her all these things. His language betrays the strength of his emotions and desperation---he needs to have his wife understand that he is Amphitruo and he has not lost his mind. It is only Alcumena, however, who can fully convince him that he is sane.

Jupiter, the senex amator in the Amphitruo, uses the same idiom to address Alcumena when he is trying, as Amphitruo, to seduce her after Amphitruo has left to find evidence that she is lying about his being with her. She is not ready to forgive him, and he is trying to convince her to do so by telling her that it was all a joke.

...IU:  *si quid dictum est per iocum,*  
*non aequom estid te serio praeuortier.*  
AL:  *ego illum scio quam doluerit cordi meo.*  
IU:  *per dexteram tuam te, Alcumena, oro, opsecro,*  
*da mihi hanc ueniam, ignosce, irata ne sies.*  
(920-924)
Jupiter wants to make love with Alcumena in the worst way. Rape is not quite his style, so he needs her co-operation. Unfortunately, she’s not willing to forgive him and let him back into her bed. Although Jupiter’s desperation is not so much fear for his life or fear that he is losing his mind, he is nevertheless desperate in his passion for Alcumena, and it is only Alcumena who has the power to grant his request.

Libanus, the slave in the Asinaria, uses the word opsecro several times when he addresses one of his masters. The first occasion is one in which he is trying to tell his master Demaenetus about his son’s love for the courtesan next door; Libanus fears that if he tells his master something his master does not want to hear, he will send him to the mill.

LI:  *dic opsecro hercle serio quod te rogem.* *caue mihi mendaci quicquam....* (14-15)

... 

DE:  *modo pol percepi, Libane, quid istuc sit loci:* *ubi fit polenta, te fortasse dicere.* LI: *Ah,* *neque hercle ego istuc dico nec dictum uolo,* *teque opsecro hercle ut quae locutu’s despuas.* (36-39)

Libanus is afraid that he’ll be sent to the mills--every slave’s worst nightmare. The only person who can guarantee that that will not happen is Demaenetus, and Demaenetus refuses to take him seriously. Needless to say, he grows more desperate as the discussion progresses.
Later, Libanus puts on a show for the trader who has come to buy Demaenetus' donkeys. He pretends to be the slave for whom the "angry" Leonida has been searching, and he ostensibly cowers in terror. He has given the trader a description of the man he seeks (Leonida pretends to be him), and now, to gain his trust, he pretends to need his protection.

...LE: *hodie saluere iussi*  
*Libanum libertum? iam manu emissu's?*  
LI: *opsecro te.*  
LE: *ne tu hercle cum magno malo mihi obuiam occessisti....*  
(410-412)

...LI: *perii, hospes!* (416)

...LI: *hospes, te opsecro, defende!* (431)

Here Libanus is putting on an act in which he is pretending to be a slave who has angered his master. This could easily cost a slave his life; hence, Libanus must be properly upset and desperate. He shows this, in part, by his language that makes the stranger to whom he appeals feel as if he may be the slave's last hope.

Finally, in the *Asinaria*, Argyrippus, the *adulescens amator* uses the idiom *opsecro* when addressing Leonida and Libanus, who have withdrawn from him just after telling him that everything will be all right.
The slaves have put their heads together to discuss Argyrippus' situation, and he is rightfully frustrated at their not telling him anything.

...AR:  *opsecro uos eadem istac opera suauiust complexos fabulari.* (639-640)

In this event, Argyrippus is quite frustrated at the slaves treatment of him. He is standing there with his beloved, whom he's just been told another will buy. The slaves have told him that everything will be all right, and they have proceeded to withdraw together and not tell him anything. On the one hand, they have made him feel as if they're his only hope; on the other, they have told him nothing.

In the *Aulularia*, the *adulescens amator* Lyconides has learned that his uncle is about to marry the young woman who is about to have Lyconides' child. Lyconides is very much in love with the girl, and he goes to his mother as the only person who can persuade his uncle to relinquish his claim on her so that Lyconides can marry her.

LY:  *dixi tibi, mater, iuxta mecum rem tenes, super Euclionis filia nunc te opsecro resecroque, mater, quod dudum opsecraueram; fac mentionem cum aunculo, mater mea.* (682-685)
Obviously, Lyconides is at his wits' end. His lady is about to give birth to his child, and she's been betrothed to his uncle. His mother is the one who talked his uncle into the marriage in the first place; obviously, she has some standing in his eyes. It is only logical that he appeal to her as his last hope in trying to wed the lady he loves. In his speech, we notice not only *opsecro*, but *opsecraueram* and the endearment *mater mea*; all of these are markers common to a woman's speech; why are they found here in the speech of this young man?

Euclio, the miserly old man in the *Aulularia*, is horrified to find that his precious pot of gold is stolen. There is no one to help him except the audience, so he appeals to them:

**EU:** *opsecro ego uos, mi auxilio, oro, optestor, sitis et hominem demonstratis, quis eam apostulerit*  
(715-716)

Unfortunately, even though he sees them as his only hope of finding his gold, they are unable to help him.

In the *Bacchides*, the *adulescens amator* Mnensislochus exclaims in frustration at the slave Chrysalus. Chrysalus' plan for getting the money
to buy Mnesilochus' woman makes no sense to the young man, but he
has no one else to turn to except Chrysalus.

MN: opsecro, quid istic ad istunc usust conscriptis modum,
   ut tibi ne quid credat atque ut uinctum te adseruet domi?
   (749-750)

Mnesilochus has no choice except to trust Chrysalus, but he is
frustrated at what he feels is Chrysalus' useless plan.

After Nicobolus has taken Chrysalus into his house and tied him
up, Chrysabalus convinces Nicobolus that his son Mnesilochus' life is in
danger. The soldier who has bought Mnesilochus' lady, Cleomachus,
has just arrived on the scene, and he is threatening to do horrible things
to the man who is with his woman; Nicobolus, watching in horror,
believes Chrysalus. Either Nicobolus buys off Mnesilochus' girlfriend's
"husband," or Mnesilochus may well end up dead.

...NI: pacisce ergo, opsecro, quid tibi lubet,
dum ne manufesto hominem opprimat niue enicet.
CL: nunc nisi ducenti Philippi redduntur mihi,
   iam illorum ego animam amborum exsorbebo oppido.
NI: em illoc pacisce, is potest; perge, opsecro.
pacisce quiduis. (866-871)
Chrysalus has Nicobulus frightened for his son's life; Nicobulus will do anything to keep his son from being harmed. Chrysalus appears to be the only one who knows anything; it is Chrysalus who holds the key to saving his son.

Later, after accosting Cleomachus and telling him that Bacchis and Mnesilochus are no longer in the house, and promising him two hundred minae, Cleomachus leaves and Nicobulus has Chrysalus to thank for making the bargain that saved his son. Chrysalus, however, begs Nicobulus to let him chide Mnesilochus for his bad behavior.

CH: ... sine me, (per te, ere, opsecro 
deos inmortalis) ire huc intro ad filium. (905-906)

Obviously, Chyrsalus has to at least let Nicobulus think that he's the only one who could grant this request.

Finally in the *Bacchides*, Chrysalus brings Nicobulus another letter from his son, which Nicobulus reads aloud.

NI: 'nunc si me fas est opsecrare aps te, pater, 
da mihi ducentos nummos Philippos, te opsecro.'  
(1025-1026)
In reality, Chyrsalus has probably dictated this letter just as he has the first one. It is important to make Nicobulus feel that he is his son's only salvation, and of course, Mnesilochus must maintain the proper obsequious tone.

In the *Captivi*, the gentleman Philocrates and his slave Tyndarus, both bought as slaves by Hegio, have exchanged places in an effort to get Philocrates back home. Philocrates, as the two of them go inside to Hegio, entreats his slave to remember the part he plays.

...PH:  *et propterea saepius te uti memineris moneo: non ego erus tibi, sed seruos sum; nunc opsecro te hoc unum--quoniam nobis di inmortales animum ostenderunt suum, ut qui erumme tibi fuisse atque esse nunc conservum uelint, quod antehac pro iure impertabam meo, nunc te oro per precem--per fortunam incertam et per mei te erga bonitatem patris, perqu' conservitium commune, quod hostica evenit manu, ne me secus honore honestes quam quom seruibas mihi, atque ut qui fueris et qui nunc sis meminisse ut memineris.*
(240-248)

The slaves' master, Hegio, has been buying all the slaves he can in order to have the means to buy back his own son, who has been captured. Tyndarus has been Philocrates' slave since childhood, and the two are very close. The only way they can see for Philocrates to get home is for Tyndarus and he to exchange places. Philocrates has no other hope than Tyndarus here.
After Hegio discovers the deception, he threatens to torment
Tyndarus in the most horrible ways possible. Tyndarus, however, does
not believe that is the real reason for Hegio's anger.

...TY: fateor omnia
facta esse ita ut (tu) dicis, et fallaciis
abiisse eum aps te mea opera atque astutia;
an, opsecro hercle te, id nunc suscenses mihi? (677-680)

If Tyndarus is to be tormented, he would at least like to know why.
Hegio makes the threat; it is Hegio who holds Tyndarus life or death in
his hands, and it is only to Hegio that Tyndarus can make the appeal.

Later Hegio realizes that it is Philocrates' father who bought his
son, and he summons Philocrates to him. At long last, Hegio is about to
learn what happened to his son: Philocrates, per tuum te genium opsecro,
exi, te uolo (677). Hegio's only hope at learning what happened to his son
is Philocrates. He is put in the position into which he had put Tyndarus
earlier.

In the Casina, Lysidamus, the senex amator, is determined to have
the slave Casina as his own by marrying her to his slave and claiming ius
primae noctis. His wife, however, is equally determined that he not have
her, and she has arranged a phony wedding in which her own (male)
slave will play the part of Casina. The maid has to keep Lysidamus out
of the house while they are making preparations, and she's come to tell
him that Casina has picked up a sword in each hand and refuses to
marry anyone. Lysidamus is about to have the prize for which he's
worked so hard snatched away:

LY: *timor praepedit uerba. uerum, opsecro te,
dic med uxorem orare ut exoret illam
gladium ut ponat et redire me intro ut liceat...*
(704-706)

Lysidamus sees everything he's ever wanted disappearing, and his only
hope is this maid; if she will do as he asks, he may yet obtain his heart's
desire.

In the *Cistellaria*, the father of the *adulescens amator* has come to
bribe the woman his son loves into staying away from his son. The girl--
the wrong girl in this case--decides to have some fun with him and
protests that she will be all alone without his son. The father, who has
been quite adamant about his son's marrying the daughter of a rich
man, sees the gold that would be his son's dowry slipping away...
SEN: sed (opsecro) te, nullu'nest tibi amator alius quisquam?
GY: nisi tuo' modo unus filiust, quem quidem ego amem alius nemo est.
(369-370)

The old man has nasty visions of all the lovely money that would be his son's dowry--if only he would marry a respectable girl---slipping away. Talking to his son does no good; persuading the girl to give him up was his last hope.

In the Curculio, the adolescens amator serenades the door of his love's house:

PH: pessuli, heus pessuli, uos saluto lubens, uos amo, uos uolo, uos peto atque opsecro, gerite amanti mihi morem, amoenissumi, fite caussa mea ludii barbari, sussilite, opsecro, et mittite istanc foras quae mihi misero amanti ebit sanguinem.
(145-150)

Phaedromus is, of course, drunk and being silly, but nevertheless, the bolts are the only ones who can grant his request--even if through the agency of another.

---

197 Although this is an emendation, both Leo and Lindsay follow it, and it fits the context very well; the text of the Cistellaria as a whole is very badly mutilated.
Later the true source of Phaedromus' hope, the parasite Curculio, whom Phaedromus had sent to raise the money to buy his love, returns. Phaedromus greets him eagerly, but Curculio thinks only of his belly.

...PH: o mea opportunitas, Curculio exoptate, salue. CU: salue. PH: saluom gaudeo te aduenire. cedo tuam mi dexteram. ubi sunt spes meae? eloquere, opsecro hercle. CU: eloquere, te opsecro, ubi sunt meae?
(305-309)

Each is the other's best hope for fulfilling his deepest desires---Curculio supposedly has the money Phaedromus needs, and Phaedromus can supposedly supply the meal that Curculio wants.

Finally, after the Leno Cappadox has been tricked into handing over the girl to Phaedromus and the girl has been discovered to be freeborn, the soldier whose money Curculio and Phaedromus used to buy her tries to get his money back from the pimp. The soldier threatens to hang him if he does not turn over the money. The only other people on the scene are Phaedromus and his love, and it is to them that the pimp appeals for help: opsecro, Planesium, et te, Phaedrome, auxilium ut feras, (697). They are the only people on the scene who could possibly help the
pimp now; as he sees it, his life may depend on whether or not they do so.

In the *Menaechmi*, a comedy of errors ensues when Menaechmus II has pretended to be crazy and run off while his twin has reappeared on the scene. His father-in-law, thinking that this is the man who was crazy, is determined that a doctor examine him. As slaves run toward Menaechmus I to carry him off to the doctor, he panics mightily, and Menaechmus II's slave, Messenio, runs to his rescue.

(SE:) *ego ibo ad medicum: praesto ero illi, quom uenietis.* MEN: occidi!

*quid hoc est negoti? quid illisce homines ad me currunt, opsecro? quid uoltis uos? quid quaeritatis? quid me circumsistitis? quo rapitis me? quo fertis? perii, opsecro uostram fidem, Epidamnienses, subuenite, ciues! quin me mittitis?*

MES: *pro di inmortales! opsecro, quid ego oculo aspicio meis? erum meum indignissume nescioqui sublimem ferunt.*

MEN: *exquis suppetias mi audet ferre?* MES: *ego, ere,audacissum.*

*o facinus indignum et malum, Epidamnii ciues, erum meum hic in pacato oppido luci deripier in uia, qui liber ad uos uenerit! mittite istunc.* MEN: *opsecro te, quisquis es, operam mihi ut des neu sinas in me insignite fieri tantam iniuriam.*

(996-1007)

Menaechmus I, just like Euclio, first believes that his only hope for salvation lies in the audience (Epidamnian citizens); when some strange slave appears on the scene and runs to his aid, he sees that slave as his
only real hope. The slave, on the other hand, is probably appealing to
the gods; they would, of course, offer the only hope of his not seeing what
he thought he was seeing. Menaechmus I then frees Messenio, even
though Messenio is not his slave, and Messenio then tells him that he
would like for him to command him as if he were still his slave:

MES:...sed, patronem, te opsecro
ne minus imperes mihi quam quom tuos servuos fui
(1033-1034)

Obviously, since Menaechmus was Messenio's master (or so he thinks),
he is the only one to whom Messenio can appeal to treat as the slave he
had been.

In the Mercator, Acanthio, the slave belonging to the adulescens
amator, Charinus, runs back from the harbor to tell Charinus that his
father has not only seen Charinus' new mistress, but fallen in love with
her. Acanthio can only manage to get out that it is bad news, when
Charinus, fearing the worst, says opsecro hercle te istuc uti tu mihi malum
facias palam (179). Later, Charinus fears that his love is gone forever,
and he is preparing to leave town when his friend Eutychus approaches
him and tells him that he knows where she is.
(EU:) tuam amicam—CH: quid eam? EU: ubi sit ego scio.
CH: tune, opsecro?
CH: ego me maeulum.
EU: potin ut animo sis tranquillo? CH: quid si mi animus fluctuat?
EU: ego istum in tranquillo, quieto, tuto sistam: ne time.
CH: opsecro te, loquire (propere) ubi sit, ubi eam uideris.
(888-892)

Eutychus has the power, in Charinus' eyes, to be his salvation.

Unfortunately, Eutychus cannot manage to get the words out quickly enough.

Finally at the end of the Mercator, when everyone gangs up on Demipho for being a philanderer who stole his son's mistress, Demipho finally tells them to take the woman and be done with it: iam opsecro hercl' uobis habete cum porcis, cum fiscina (988). His only hope of getting rid of everyone is to get them to agree; they are the only ones who can get themselves away from him.

At the end of the Miles Gloriosus, the soldier Pyrgopolynices, who has been tricked into entering into an affair with a woman he believes is married, is dragged out of the woman's house by the slaves. They have caught him being "adulterous," and they beat him for this offense. Pyrgopolynices begs for his life and his manhood.
Pyrgopolynices is in mortal terror; these slaves are not only beating him unmercifully, they are threatening to castrate him. It is only they who can grant his wish for mercy.

In the Mostellaria, the slave Tranio has tried to rescue his master, Philolaches, from the wrath of his father by saying that Philolaches spent all his money buying the house next door. Unfortunately, Simo, who owns the house next door, comes home and seems all too unperturbed by Tranio’s predicament. When he threatens the punishment of whips, irons, and crucifiction, the slave in terror grasps Simo’s knees and cries
out *per tua te genua opsecro/ ne indicium ero facias.* Clearly, Tranio is terrified and sees Simo as his only hope.

Eventually, however, Philolaches' father, Theopropides, learns the truth. Furious at being tricked and in need of help, he turns to the one person he can trust, Simo.

*(TH): nunc te opsecro ut me bene iuues operamque des.*
*SI: quid uis? TH: i mecum opsecro una simul.*
*(1036-1037)*

Simo, who thought that Philolaches was wrong in the first place, is the one person to whom Theopropides can turn to for help.

Finally, Philolaches' friend Callidamates comes to Theopropides to beg him to forgive Philolaches.

...(CA): nunc te opsecro,
stultitiae adolescentiaeque eiius ignoscas; tuost;
scis solere illanc aetatem tali ludo ludere.
*(1156-1158)*

The only person who can forgive Philolaches is his father whose money the young man squandered.
In the *Persa*, the *adulescens amator* Toxilus seeks the aid of his fellow slave Sagaristo in raising the money to buy his love. He needs for Sagaristo to volunteer his daughter to play the part of a kidnapped foreign girl in order to gain the necessary funds to buy his love. Sagaristo, however, is not too sure of this idea.

TO: *opsecro te*—SAG: *resecroque*. TO: *operam da hanc mihi fidelem*. SAG: *ah! odio me enicas.*
(48-48a)

He needs the girl; Sagaristo is the only one of his friends who can supply one of the right age.

Agorastocles, the *adulescens amator* of the *Poenulus*, follows his slave’s scheme to accuse the pimp who owns his love of theft; in that way Agorastocles can gain both the girl and the money. He tells those who will act as his counsellors *opsecro hercle, operam celocem hanc mihi, ne corbitam date* (543). This lawsuit is his only hope of getting the girl; he has to convince the counsellors that it is real.

Finally, Hanno comes and claims the pimp Lycus’ girls as his daughters. Agorastocles' phony lawsuit has suddenly become a real one.

---

198Leo brackets this, but Lindsay believes it belongs here.
The pimp, seeing that he faces financial ruin, begs that he be allowed to repay the debt to Agorastocles after he holds an auction the next day.

(LY):  _uerum opsecre te ut liceat simplum soluere; trecentos Philippos: credo conradi potest: cras auctionem faciam._
(1362-1364)\(^{199}\)

Only Agorastocles has the power to prevent Lycus' suffering financial ruin, and it is to him that Lycus appeals. Finally, Lycus supplicates Agorastocles as he begs him to have mercy upon him and allow him to repay the money.

LY:  _accedam. per ego te tua te genua opsecro et hunc, cognatum quem tuum esse intellego:_
(1387-1388)\(^{200}\)

Lycus now turns not only to Agorastocles, whose knees he holds, but also to Hanno, who is Agorastocles' uncle. Agorastocles is the citizen, but Hanno is his elder. Only they have the power to allow him to repay the debt.

\(^{199}\)Leo brackets this and several other lines at the end of the play; Lindsay thinks they were part of an alternate ending.

\(^{200}\)Leo brackets this line, but Lindsay puts it in the alternate ending.
Calidorus, the *adulescens amator* in the *Pseudolus*, is at first overjoyed when the pimp Ballio tells him that his woman is no longer for sale because it means that he no longer has to raise the money to buy her. Then, Ballio tells him that it would be better for Calidorus if he were dead, and Calidorus is quite bewildered. Needing to know whether or not his love is for sale or not, Calidorus finally says

*CA:* *dic mihi, opsecro hercle, uerum serio hoc quod te rogo.*
*non habes uenalem amicam tu meam Phoenicium?*

(340-341)

Ballio, as far as Callidorus is concerned, holds his life in his hands. If Callidorus' love is still for sale, he still has to raise the money; if not, then surely he can marry her. Only Ballio has the answer.

Labrax, the pimp in the *Rudens*, goes so far as to try to rip the two young women he considers his property from their sanctuary in the temple to Aphrodite. Old Daemones tries to protect them, as Plesidippus, the man from whom Labrax supposedly bought one of the girls, comes to their rescue, he has Labrax hauled off in a noose because Labrax did not pay the entire price before he absconded with the girl. Labrax calls out to the man who may be his only friend for help:
...LA: *opsecro te, subueni mi, Charmides. rapior optorto collo.* CH: *quis me nominat?*
(867-868)

When Charmides appears less than willing to help him, Labrax tries again:

LA: *sequere, opsecro,me.* CH: *pariter suades qualis es: tu in nruom rapere, eo me opsecras ut te sequar.*
(875-876)

Charmides turns out to not be much of a friend, but he is evidently the only one that Labrax has.

Eventually, the pimp’s trunk that contains the tokens by means of which the young lady will be identified as freeborn is found. The only one who knows what the trunk contains, however, is Plesidippus’ slave Trachalio, who tries to claim a share of the contents. When the finder refuses to share, old Daemones is appointed the arbitrator, and Trachalio appeals to him as the only one who could possibly save this young lady from a life of prostitution.

TR: *unum te opsecro ut ted huiius commiserescat mulieris si quidem hic lenonis eius est uidulus, quem suspicor;*
hic nisi de opinione certum nihil dico tibi.
(1090-1092)

Fortunately for Trachalio, his appeal works, and old Daemones learns that he is the young lady's father.

Finally, in the *Truculentus*, the *adulescens amator* Diniarchus approaches Callicles, the father of the young lady to whom Diniarchus had been betrothed; unfortunately, Diniarchus raped her during a night of drunken carousing. The girl had a child whom she gave to a maid to be exposed, and Callicles is after the father AND the child.

CA: *ubi is homost quem dicis?* DI: *adsum, Callicles. per te opsecro genua ut tu istuc insipiente factum sapienter feras mihique ignoscas quod animi inpos uini uitio fecerim.*
(826-828)

Obviously, in this situation, the girl's father Callicles is the only man who can possibly grant forgiveness for Diniarchus' deed, and Diniarchus desperately needs his forgiveness. A dowry may be at stake.

Callicles is not quite ready to just forgive Diniarchus, though. He threatens to take him to court. Diniarchus protests that he can marry Callicles' daughter instead of going to trial.
...Di: *quid uis in ius me ire? tu es praetor mihi.*
*ue rum te op secro ut tuam gnatam des mi uxore m, Callicles.*
(841-842)

Callicles, of course, agrees to Diniarchus' request. Diniarchus retrieves his child and marries Callicles' daughter, and everyone lives happily ever after.

Conclusions

What these data reveal is that Plautus does indeed see a difference between the markers *amabo* and *opsecro*. *Amabo* is usually used in the context of one lover to another and means "please, honey, please..." It is a word that a woman would use to talk her man into doing whatever she wanted him to do, and it is clearly a word that Donatus would have considered "womanly." Because it implies the need to coax and therefore manipulate, its use implies that the user is subordinate in some way to the one to whom she says it.

*Opsecro*, on the other hand, has an entirely different meaning. While *amabo* has a coaxing tone, *opsecro* has a pleading tone. *Opsecro* is a word of supplication used by the inferior toward his superior. It is no
surprise, then, that we not infrequently see it used with *per tua genua* as the bereaved individual grasps his savior's knees.

*Amabo* is a word of manipulation that implies that, while the speaker may at least be overtly lower than the person she addresses, she still has the power to bend him to her will. Conversely, *opsecro* is a word of panic that indicates the individual has absolutely no control over the situation. In every case, with or without an *ut*-clause, with or without *te*, the individual who uses the idiom feels powerless over the situation at hand and addresses the one individual he or she thinks can help him or her.

In Plautus' world, a woman was more likely to coax and be manipulative than a man, and she was more likely to use *amabo* than a man; it is no accident that many appearances of the idiom are in the mouths of prostitutes who are simply out to get more loot from their lovers. Wheedling was not, however, beyond men, especially men in a sticky situation such as Menaechmus who had to retrieve his wife's *palla*. Nor are coaxing words and sweet talk unusual in a man who is trying to talk his lover into sharing a little time with him, as several of Plautus' *amatores* do. It is not a coincidence that Milphio, trying to talk Agorastocles' lover into taking him back, uses endearments and words of coaxing when he speaks with her.
Although a woman was probably more likely to find herself in a position that required her to persuade a man to help her than vice-versa, anyone could find himself or herself in a situation that demanded the help of anyone who was able to do so. Slaves frequently were at the mercy of their masters, and young men were at the mercy of their fathers. It would thus be part of the well-known Plautine role reversal—or perhaps a pointed statement on the economy—when Argyrippus has to beg his slaves for help. Likewise, it is a statement on male passion, and on Jupiter’s philandering in particular, when he has to beg Alcumena for forgiveness simply because he wants to share her bed one more time.

It is clear that both *amabo* and *opsecro* imply inferiority, on some level, of the user to the one to whom the user speaks. The fact that Terence, who was writing a generation after Plautus, generally put both idioms in the mouths of women tells us that the Romans came to associate such inferiority with women. To be sure, such inferiority does not necessarily mean subservience or submission; while *opsecro* may imply submission, *amabo* clearly implies manipulation.

Both idioms are also associated with a highly emotional state—whether it be panic or passion. The passion of a young man in love or a dirty old man is an object of fun in comedy, but in the real world it is something that only women should feel. Panic, on the other hand, can
happen to anyone, although more likely to women and the young than an older, wiser MAN. Donatus put women and those who were greatly afraid in the same category.

What we see in Plautus, then, is the stage at which the words had not become exclusively markers of female language. Plautus used them as markers of a type of emotion the character was experiencing. They are associated with those traits that Donatus associated with women, yes, but Plautus has not yet made a clear distinction between the emotionality and inferiority of women with respect to men. It is clear, however, that to Romans words and idioms that connote emotionalism, passivity, and/or inferiority were associated with the female gender. This is a distinction that Terence, according to Donatus, clarifies by more explicitly attaching the use of the idioms to women.
CHAPTER 6

THE CONNOTATIONS OF THE LANGUAGE OF PLAUTUS' AUDIENCE

Plautus has rooted his comedies firmly in the world in which he lived. His sprinkling Greek words in the mouths of his characters reflects the language of the people around him. His putting Punic in the mouth of the Carthaginian Hanno both portrays Hanno realistically and shows that the Romans had a basic understanding of Punic. His use of the markers amabo and opsecro shows us a stage in the language in which the words had not been completely identified with the language of women.

While the Greek and the Punic, however, appear to have had no real identification with status or relative position, the words amabo and opsecro each was packaged with several connotations in the Roman mind that would imply that the speaker was inferior to the person addressed. Furthermore, we also know from Sophoclidisca's response of nolo ames to Paegnium's dic amabo that amabo (Persa 245), even though it basically meant "please, honey...", never lost its association with amo. As Donatus
says, this is wheedling language; it is the language a lover would use to her beloved to talk him into doing something. In effect, its use means both that she perceives herself as being somehow less capable of doing whatever it is she wants done than her lover, and that she also perceives herself as having the power to convince him to do it for her.\(^{201}\)

The use of *opsecro*, on the other hand, implied complete powerlessness on the part of the speaker. Only a person who perceived himself as being completely helpless would supplicate another, and it is clear from the use of *opsecro* in close context with *per tua genua* that *opsecro* implied supplication. Such a person basically sought out his savior as the last resort; he had no preconception of his ability to persuade him or not, but his situation was so desperate that he had to try.

What is interesting is that Plautus frequently uses both idioms in association with love relationships. We would expect *amabo; opsecro* is a little more interesting. While both idioms have a similar meaning, the

\(^{201}\)Lakoff, Robin, *Language and Women's Place*, (New York, 1975), 18-19, discusses the issue of politeness as exhibited by adding modifiers to a request to make it clear that the request is a request and not a command; this, in her mind, is more the province of men then women. While she does not say so, it seems that, at least in contexts similar to that in which we find *amabo*, the same sort of "power inversion" may be going on.
connotations they bring to the minds of the Roman audience were opposite; the one implied power—albeit of a devious sort—on the part of the speaker, the other implied powerlessness.

These connotations are strengthened when we consider that we often find amabo used with the mi-form of direct address, which only serves to add to the implication of intimacy and honey-sweet persuasion. Likewise, we find such expressions as miser sum and perii in proximity to opsecro. Donatus considers all of these things to be markers of women's flattering and querulous language, but Plautus does not use them that way. Rather, when love is involved, it is women who use amabo and the mi-form of address and men who use opsecro, miser sum, and perii.

Amphitruo says to his beloved wife, as she turns to leave him mane, mane, opsecro te...(Amph. 765). Jupiter, trying to regain Alcumena’s favor, says per dexteram tuam te, Alcumena, oro, opsecro...(Amph. 923). When Argyrippus sees the slaves who promise him that he will have his love and then go away to talk, he says opsecro uos eadem istac opera suaviust...(As. 639-640). When Lyconides thinks he’s going to lose the love of his life to his uncle, he begs his mother nunc te opsecro resecroque, mater...(Aul. 683-684). When Mnesilochus thinks

---

202Adams, 56, believes that opsecro had a tone of "coaxing politeness," and that was the reason that Terence put it in the mouths of primarily adulescentes among the male characters.
that Chrysalus' plan cannot possibly gain him his heart's desire, he 
exclaims opsecreo, quid istis ad istunc usust conscriptis modum (Bacch.
749). Lysidamus, terrified that he will lose his night of love with Casina, 
exclaims to the maid uerum, opsecreo te, dic med uxorem....(Cas. 704-705).
In a lighter context, a drunken Phaedromus begs the door sussilite, 
opsecreo, et mittite istanc foras... (Cur. 149). Phaedromus accosts 
Curculio, who is supposed to have the money to buy his girlfriend ubi 
sunt spes meae? eloquere, opsecreo hercle! (Cur. 308-309). Fearing that 
Acanthio's news of his love, Charinus begs opsecreo hercle te istuc uti tu 
mihi malum facias palam (Merc. 179). When Eutychus approaches 
Charinus with news that his love is still there, Charinus exclaims opsecreo 
te, loquere propere ubi sit, ubi eam uideris (Merc. 892). When Toxilus 
needs the help of his fellow slave to gain his lady, he begs opsecreo 
te...(Persa 48). Calidorus, trying to find out if he can still buy his love or 
not says dic mihi, opsecreo hercle, uerum serio hoc quod te rogo (Pseud.
340).

Usually when we meet the adulescens amator, he is lamenting the 
fact that, for whatever reason, he has been separated from his beloved. 
He always bemoans his fate, and he often threatens suicide: Argyrippus 
believes that he will not be able to purchase his beloved and wishes his 
lady a final farewell  bene uale: apud Orcum te uidebo (As. 606).
Lyconides, not knowing if his mother can persuade his uncle to let him marry his beloved moans *ego sum miser* (*Aul.* 731). Mnesilochus, thinking that Bacchis is forever out of his reach complains *sumne ego homo miser*? (*Bacch.* 624) and *perii* (*Bacch.* 625, 626). Alcesimarchus, thinking that he will be forever parted from his beloved says that he is

\[\textit{iactor crucior agitor} \\
\textit{stimulor uorsor} \\
\textit{in amori rota, miser exanimor}....\]

(*Cist.* 206-208)\(^{203}\)

Shortly before he sings his ode to the door, Phaedromus calls himself *perditus sum miser* (*Curc.* 133). Charinus, thinking that his love is forever gone, laments

\[\textit{...occidi!} \\
\textit{di penates meum parentum, familii Lar pater,} \\
\textit{uobis mando meum parentum rem bene ut tutemini.} \\
\textit{(Merc. 843-845)}\]

---

\(^{203}\)I follow Lindsay's text; Leo brackets *crucior*. Due to the fact that the Cistellaria's text is so badly mutilated, we have very little or Alcesimarchus' part.
Agorastocrates claims that he differor/cupidine eius (Poen. 155-156).

Calidorus, when he learns that the pimp has sold his lady to a soldier
tells his slave Pseudolus

\[ \text{restim uolo emere} \]
\[ \text{...qui me faciam pensilem} \]
\[ \text{certum est mihi ante tenebras tenebras persequi.} \]
(Pseud. 88-90)

Such seems to be the portrait of the adullescens amator. Even
though they use words which later came to be markers of female speech,
there is nothing particularly effeminate of homosexual about them;
indeed, they are clearly quite heterosexual. They are simply at the mercy
of their infatuation.

The adoration of a woman, however, is not the only type of love
Plautus shows us. Curculio, the parasite of parasites, answers
Phaedromus' question of "where are my hopes?" with eloquere, te
opsecro, ubi sunt meae? (Curc. 310).

As the exchange continues, Curculio refuses to tell Phaedromus whether
he was successful or not until he gets some food:

\[ \ldots \text{CU: tenebrae oboriuntur, genua inedia succidunt} \]
\[ \text{PH: lassitudine hercle credo. CU: retine, retine me, opsecro.} \]
\[ \text{PH: uiden ut expalluit? datin isti sellam, ubi adsidat, cito} \]
et aqualem cum aqa? properatin ocius? CU: animo male est.
PA: uae capiti tuo! CU: opsecro hercle, facite uentum ut gaudeam.
PA: Iuppiter te dique perdant! CU: perii, prospicio parum gramarum habeo dentes plenos, lippiunt fauces fame, ibi cibi uaciiitare uenio lassis lactibus.
(Curc. 309-320)

While Phaedromus hopes for his love, Curculio hopes for food.

Phaedromus thinks that he will die unless he can claim his love, and Curculio thinks that he will die unless he has a full belly. Phaedromus does everything he can to gain his love, just as Curculio does everything he can to get a dinner. In fact, Plautus portrays Curculio's relationship with food in the same language that he uses to portray Phaedromus' and other adulscientes' relationships with their lovers. The only difference between the hunger of a parasite for food and the hunger of a lover for his beloved is the object of their desire; the emotion, it seems, is the same.

Yet another type of male love is portrayed by the character Euclio, the miserly old man of the Aulularia. Euclio is a miserly, unfriendly
fellow whom most believe was modeled after Menander’s Knemon. While Knemon is crafted primarily as an stereotypical misanthropic miser, however, Euclio is a little more colorful.

When we first meet Euclio, he is abusing his elderly female slave, Staphyla. He has hidden a pot of gold, and he fears that she will find it. To keep this from happening, he threatens to dig out her eyes (oculus hercle ego istos, inproba, ecfodiam tibi..., 53.) Again, when Megadorus approaches him in friendship, he outwardly suspects that Staphyla has told Megadorus about his money, and he threatens to tear out her tongue and dig out her eyes, (quoi ego iam linguam praecidam atque oculos ecfodiam domi, 189).

Later, when Euclio learns that his pot of gold has been stolen, he entreats the audience to help him:

EU: opsebro ego uos, mi auxilio,
oro, optestor, sitis et hominem demonstretis, quis eam apstulerit (715-716)

Later, when he meets Lyconides, he deems himself more wretched than the young man in love: immo ego sum, et misere perditus (Aul. 731).

The markers that Plautus has used to paint Euclio’s character are interesting ones. Because he is afraid she will find and steal his gold,
Euclio speaks to and about Staphyla with threats that Donatus says are more appropriate for a scorned female lover to make. He entreats the audience, in a highly agitated state, to tell him where the individual is who stole his precious money. He speaks of himself as wretched, answering Lyconides' yearning for his love with his own yearning for his gold.

It's true that Euclio threatens to rip out Staphyla's eyes and cut out her tongue, but he does not make these threats because she spurned him; rather, he thinks that her eyes, that see everything, will spy his pot of gold. Likewise, Euclio's obvious distress when he begs the audience to help him find the thief is not over a love affair, but over a pot of gold. These linguistic markers are ones that the Romans recognized, and they are ones that they would have attached to a lover's love and passion. Here, however, Plautus uses those same markers to connote in the Roman mind those emotions over a man's love of and fear of losing not a woman, but a pot of gold. Greed, it seems, is the same as love; it is only the object of the passion that is different.

Plautus has also given us an interesting little portrait of how the lover imagines his woman will treat him. When the two slaves, Chalinus and Olympio, argue over who will win the slave Casina as his bride,
when Olympio tells Chalinus that he will torture Chalinus by making him listen to him and Casina make love:

\[
\textit{quom mihi illa dicet ‘mi animule, mi Olympio, mea uita, mea melilla, mea festiuitas, sine tuos ocellos deosculer, uluptas mea, sine amabo ted amari, meu’ festus dies, meu’ pullus passer, mea columba, mi lepus’} \\
\textit{(Cas. 134-138)}
\]

In the young lover's fantasy, the lady is willing. She uses the \textit{mi}-form of address in the many endearments by which she calls him. She asks only to kiss him and to be made love to. The lover, of course, is only too willing to allow her to do so.

Although Plautus gives us few pictures of the women themselves who are the object of desire, there seem to be two types. The type we see the least of is the virtuous woman; the matrona Alcumena is such a woman. Alcumena, before everything goes wrong, appears with Jupiter (who is masquerading as her husband, and is reluctant to let him leave \textit{(quid istuc est, mi uir, negoti quod tu tam subito domo /abeas, Amph. 502-503)}. Shortly after that, Sosia (Mercury) incurs Jupiter's wrath, and Alcumena persuades him not to hurt the slave \textit{(noli amabo, Amphitruo, irasci Sosiae caussa mea, Amph. 540)} Jupiter, of course, does as she wishes \textit{(faciam ita ut uis, Amph. 541)}.  
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Planaesium, although she belongs to a pimp, has managed to retain her chastity. In the brief time we see her with her lover Phaedromus, Phaedromus tries to hit a slave who is maligning her, and she persuades him not to do so (noli, amabo, uerberare lapidem, ne perdas manum, Curc., 197.) Phaedromus, of course, does as she asks.

Alcumena and Planaesium act as if they genuinely want to spend time with the men in their lives. Their guile wins them the reward of having the men do as they wish. It is clearly the women who have the upper hand in both relationships.

The other, and more common type of beloved, in the plays of Plautus is the courtesan. The courtesan is, unlike the virtuous Alcumena or Planaesium, interested in her lover primarily for what he can give her. Philematium, for example, tells Philolaches that she would happily have wine with him for ten minae (cedo, amabo, decem: bene emptum tibi dare hoc uerbum uolo, Most. 298). He tells her he’s already paid thirty (triginta minas pro capite tuo dedi, (Most. 300), and that he has never made such a fine investment, (nec quicquam artenti locaui iam diu usquam aeque bene, Most. 302) Clearly, Philolaches is so besotted with Philematium that he is quite willing to pay whatever she likes and more for her favors even if he has had to borrow the money; she, on the other hand, is happy to comply with his wishes as long as she is happy
with the pay. Even though Philolaches has bought her, it is she who
appears to have the upper hand in the relationship; he acts according to
her wishes rather than his own.

Adelephasium is the perfect example of the woman out only for
herself. Unfortunately, her lover Agorastocles cannot see that. He
accosts her as she is on her way to the temple of Venus where they are
having an open sale on prostitutes today; she is looking for a new "lover"
because Agorastocles has not paid her as he promised to do:

AG: sunt mihi intus nescioquot nummi aurei lymphatici.
ADE: deferto ad mihi, faxo actutum constiterit lymphaticum.
(Poen. 346-347)

Agorastocles grabs her by the arm as she is leaving. She says mitte
amabo, and he does so, asking quid festinas? (Poen. 336.) She finally
persuades him to leave her after he tries to persuade her to stay with him
one last time:

ADE: segrega sermonem. taedet. AG: age, sustolle hoc amiculum.
ADE: pura sum, comperce amabo me attrectare, Agorastocles.
AG: quid agam nunc? ADE: si sapias, curam hanc facere
compendi potest.
(Poen. 349-351)
Adelphasium tells Agorastocles that he could keep her there if he came across with the money he had promised. He, on the other hand, is completely at her mercy.

Phronesium has devised a plot by means of which she can ensnare a soldier and gain much money from him. To do this, she has borrowed a baby from a friend and she pretends that it belongs to the soldier. Unfortunately, the young man Diniarchus who has bankrupted himself paying for her favors, is still quite infatuated with her. He allows her to play out her little charade in the hope that after she gains enough money from the soldier she will return to him. Later, Diniarchus learns that the child is his, and the child's grandfather orders him to retrieve the child and marry his daughter or be dragged off to court. He goes in to Phronesium to get his child.

DI: *otium ubi erit, de istis rebus tum amplius tecum loquar.*
nunc puerum redde. PH: *immo amabo ut hos dies aliquos sinas eum esse apud me.* DI: *minime.* PH: *amabo.* DI: *quid (eo) opust?*  
PH: *in rem meamst.*
*triduom hoc saltem, dum miles aliquo circumducitur, sine me habere: siquidem habebo, tibi quoque etiam proderit; si aufers [puerum], a milite omnis [tum] mihi spes animam ecflauerit.*
DI: *factum cupio, nam refacere si uelim, non est locus; nunc puero utere et procura, quando pro cura aes habes.*  
(Truc. 871-878)
Diniarchus is persuaded, even though he may be hauled into court, to leave the baby with Phronesium. There may be profit in it for him, to be sure, but any profit he makes may be too late to save his hide from the child’s grandfather, and it is clearly pleasing Phronesium that is more important. He tells her as he leaves that they will be together as soon as the opportunity presents itself to him (...operae ubi mi erit, ad te uenero, Truc. 883)

In each case, the woman is able to wheedle her lover into giving her what she wants. The lovers are bound by their infatuation for their women to capitulate. To incur the wrath of their loves would mean that they would have to live without them, and that, as we have seen, is the most undesirable thing that could happen.

Most of these women, on the other hand, seem to have no such problem. Alcumena threatens divorce (ualeas, tibi habeas res tuas, reddas meas, Amph. 928.) Adelphasium is quite ready to leave Agorastocles when he does not pay her price (deferto ad me, faxo actum constiterit lymphaticum, Poen. 346). Phronesium is more interested in money than she is in letting her lover have his son:

    PH: in rem meamst.
    triduum hoc saltem, dum miles aliquo circumducitur,
    sine me habere: siquidem habebo, tibi quoque etiam proderit;
si aufers [puerum], a milite omnis [tum] mihi spes animam ecflauerit.  
(Poen. 873-875)

The other two whom we have discussed, Planaesium and Philematium, have both been bought and paid for. Planaesium is eventually revealed as freeborn and thus able to marry Phaedromus. Philolaches has already paid for Philolaches and her favors; we hear little of their relationship beyond that.

What is clear from all these cases, however, is the fact that the woman is in control of the relationship. The man will do anything to keep the woman happy so that she will stay at his side. The man is bound by the bonds of love to the woman.

This relationship is one that F. O. Copley and P. Murgatroyd refer to as *servitium amoris*. Plautus' use of two markers, amabo and opsecro, that will later serve as markers of female speech, acts as a way to paint the young lover as the lover enslaved by his love for his mistress. Plautus uses the word *amabo* to imply potency and *opsecro* to imply impotence; hence, the woman in a love relationship is the superior and
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204 F. O. Copley, "*Servitium Amoris* in the Roman Elegists," *TAPA* 68 (1947), 285-300; P. Murgatroyd, "*Servitium Amoris* and the Roman Elegists," *Latomus* 49 (1981), 588-606; 591. Although Murgatroyd takes Copley to task for not noting the presence of the motif in Euripides and Hellenistic Literature, he relegates its debt to Roman comedy to a parenthetical reference. See also F. O. Copley, *Exclusus Amator*, (Oxford, 1956); likewise, although Copley later (notes the connection of the elegiac *exclusus amator* with comedy, he makes no connection between comedy and the bonds of love.
the man is the inferior. It was the associations these words brought to the Roman minds that allowed him to do this; although the words were not yet markers of female language, they nevertheless had associations that would later push them in that direction. It was those associations that Plautus was able to use in order to create his enslaved young lovers, and that later artists were able to use to craft their own version of the young lovers.
CHAPTER 7
PLAUTUS' INTERACTION WITH HIS AUDIENCE

Erich Segal, in 1968, pointed out that Plautus was unique among the ancient Roman playwrights in that his name was evidently enough to draw the attention of a huge and unruly crowd. Plautus was so popular that other producers would evidently put his name on a script just to draw a crowd; there were over 130 plays attributed to him at one point.\textsuperscript{205} He feels that Plautus was so successful because he celebrated the festivals of which the plays were a part by putting hijinks, silliness, and outright upside-down behavior on the stage. When the play was over, the spectators left this hilarity of the play behind with the festival to take up their mundane tasks in the real world.\textsuperscript{206}

\textsuperscript{205} Plautus' name is often mentioned in the prologue; Segal mentions the Men. 3, "adporto uobis Plautum–lingua, non manu, but Plautus' name is also used to draw the spectator's attention at Pseud 2, "Plautina longa fabula in scaenam uenit," and to the revival of the Casina, "studiose expetere uos Plautinas fabulas" (Cas. 12) Segal also notes the attempts by Varro, Aulus Gellius, and Macrobius to determine the play's authenticity; such debates still rage today, as Segal himself demonstrates in the appendix to the second edition of his book entitled "Is the Captivi Plautine?" (191-214)

\textsuperscript{206} Segal, 169.
Niall Slater picked up on Segal's premise and attempted to delve into the audience's view by means of what he calls "metatheater." By his definition, metatheater is largely "self-conscious theater" in which the actors demonstrate acute awareness of the fact that this is a play they are acting, and the audience is in on the joke. He uses a passage in the *Poenulus* in which the counselors whom Agorastocles has hired to deceive Lycus address his anxiety as an example of this:

\[
\text{omnia istaec scimus iam mos, si hi spectatores sciant;} \\
\text{horunc hic nunc causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula: } \\
\text{hos te satius est docere, ut, quando agas, quid agas sciant (550-552)}
\]

Rather than addressing Agorastocles as the man who has hired them to deceive a pimp, they address him as the actor in a play who must explain the story to the spectators if they don't understand what is going on in the play that is being acted onstage.

Timothy Moore agrees with Slater that Plautus' plays are very metatheatrical, and he goes a step farther by pointing out how necessary the audience was to the actors. The actors were, after all, usually slaves, freedmen, or poor freemen; according to Terence, there was a real
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\(^{207}\) Slater, 13-14.
possibility that they could be driven from the stage by rival entertainers or a noisy and uninterested audience. While Terence is known to harangue the audience for not allowing his play to proceed on an earlier occasion, Plautus saves his bids for attention for the end of his plays; the fact that he usually commands them in the imperative plural tells us that he is directly addressing his audience. At the end of the *Amphitryon*, the *dominus gregis* tells the audience to applaud; the *grex* tells the audience that they can prevent the old man’s getting a beating if they give loud applause at the end of the *Asinaria*; the *grex* tells the audience that he wishes that they be well and applaud at the end of the *Bacchides*; at the end of the *Captivi*, the *dominus* tells the audience to applaud if they wish to reward virtue; at the end of the *Casina*, the *dominus* tells the audience that if they applaud they will have the mistresses they desire; at the end of the *Cistellaria*, the *grex* tells the spectators to do as
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208 The *locus classicus* for this is Hec.4-5, *ita populus studio stupidus in funuambulo/animum occuparat*. The *prologus* says in the second prologue, however, that some of Caecilius’ new plays were hissed off stage, *In is quas primum Caecili didici nouas/partim sum earum exactu’, partim uix steti*, (14-15), and he also says that the coming of boxers and their paid supporters drove him from the stage when he first tried to present the *Hecyra*,

*quam primum eam coepi pugilum gloria*
*comitum conventus, strepitus, clamor mulierum*
*fecere ut ante tempus extrem foras.* (33-36).

In *Phormio* 30-32, the prologus begs that the audience be silent and avoid the uproar that drove their acting company from the stage the last time:

*date operam, adeste aequo animo per silentium,*
*ne simili utamur fortuna atque usi sumus*
*quam per tumultum noster grex motus locost.*
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custom dictates and applaud the end of the comedy; the actor playing
Therapontigonus tells the audience to applaud at the end of the Curculio;
the author himself tells the audience to applaud and be well at the end of
the Epidicus; the servus calidus Messenio tells the audience to fare well
and applaud when the Menaechmi ends; at the conclusion of the
Mercator, the actor who plays Eutychus tells the audience that they will
enact a law by means of which old men can seek out prostitutes, and
fathers cannot prevent sons from having affairs--then he bids them
applaud if they approve the law; the actor who plays Pyrgopolynices
orders the audience to applaud at the end of the Miles Gloriosus; the
actor who plays Theopropides at the end of the Mostellaria tells the
spectators that the play is over and tells them to give them their
applause; the actor who plays Toxilus tells the audience to give them
their applause at the end of the Persa; the actor who plays Agorastocles
in the Poenulus tells the audience to applaud at the play's end;
Pseudolus' portrayer tells the audience at the end of the Pseudolus that if
they applaud and approve, he'll invite them back tomorrow; the actor
who plays Daemones tells the audience to give applause at the end of the
Rudens; Stichus' portrayer, at the end of the Stichus, tells the audience
to applaud and then go home and party; a member of the chorus bids
the audience applaud when the Trinummus ends; the actor who plays
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Phronesium, at the conclusion of the *Truculentus*, tells the audience that they should applaud for the sake of Venus because Venus was the guardian of the play--therefore they should be well and applaud; in fact, the only nearly complete play we have in the Plautine corpus that does NOT have this bid for approval at the end is the *Aulularia*--which is lacking the conclusion.

The point here is the same, whether the bid for attention comes with a harangue at the beginning of the play or with a wish that the
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209 Amph. 1146, spectatores...plaudite; Asin. 947, nunc si uoltis deprecari huic seni ne uapulet/remur impetrari posse, plausum si clarum datis; Bacch. 1211, spectatores, uos ualere volumus etj clare adplaudere; Capt.1036, date plausum ; Cas. 1015, nunc uos aequomst manibus meritis meritam mercedem dare qui faxit, clam uourem ducet semper scortum quod uolet; uerum qui non manibus clare quantum poterit plasurit ei pro scorto supponetur hircus unctus nautea.
Cist. 786-787, nunc quod ad uos, spectatores, relicum reliquuitur/ more maiorum date plausum postrema in comoedia; Curc. 729, spectatores, plaudite; Epid. 733, plaudite et uate; Men. 1162, nunc, spectatores, ualete et nobis clare plaudite; Merc. 1015-1026, ....immo dicamus senigus legem censeo priu' quam abeamus, qua se lege teneant contentique sint annos gnatus sexaginta qui erit, si quem scibimus si maritum siue hercle adeo caelibem scortarier, cum eo nos hic lege agamus: inscitum arbitraborum et per nos quidem hercle egebit qui suum prodegerit. neu quisquam posthac prohibeto adulescentem filium quin amet et scortum ducat, quod bono fiat modo siquis prohibuerit, plus perdet clam (qua)/si praehibuerit palam. haec adeo / uti ex hac nocte primum lex teneat senes, bene ualete; atque, adulescentes, haec si uobis lex placet, ob senum hercle industriam uos aequom est clare plaudere.
Miles 1437,plaudite ; Most. 1181, spectatore, fabula haec est acta, uos plausum date; Persa 857, mei spectatores, bene ualete. leno perit. Plaudite.; Poen. 1422,plaudite ; Pseud. 1334, uerum sei uoltis adplaudere atque adprobare hunc gregem et fabulam in crasstium uos vocabo; Rud. 1423, plausum date; Stich. 772, uos, spectatores, plaudite...; Trin. 1189, plaudite; Truc. 967-968, Veneris causa adplaudite: eius haec in tutelast fabula/spectatores, bene ualete, plaudite, atque exsurgete.
audience fare well at the end of the play, as Moore says, the situation that he describes was a real one.\textsuperscript{210} The audience had the power to make the actors and the playwright; if they disliked either one, they could "boo" them off the stage one way or another. Although, as Richard Beacham suggests, the dramatic productions in Rome were not a contest for artistic excellence, the artist nevertheless needed to please the crowd in order to eat; the more he pleased the crowd, the better his reputation, and the more he would be able to support himself by means of this trade. The officials in charge of the games would necessarily turn to those playwrights whose reputations for pleasing the crowds were the best.\textsuperscript{211} Needless to say, those who held the attention of the audience were the most eagerly sought entertainers and writers.\textsuperscript{212} The playwright, then, had to please the audience in order to survive--and that meant that he had to meet them on their own terms.

Erich Gruen addresses one more point that is helpful here. Plautus used the events that happened in Rome as a means of communicating with his audience. For example, when senators were battling over who got a triumph and who got an \textit{ovatio}, Plautus has his

\textsuperscript{210}Moore, 9.

\textsuperscript{211}Beacham, Richard, \textit{The Roman Theatre and Its Audience}, (1992); 22-25.

\textsuperscript{212}Moore, 9-10.
clever slave Chrysalus speak to the audience and refer to his victory as an *ovatio* because to have a triumph would have been too common.\textsuperscript{213} While senators were accusing each other of inventing victories so that they could have a triumph, Plautus' *miles gloriosus* Stratophanes in the Truculentus announces that his victories are not false—as have been those of many others.\textsuperscript{214} Megadorus' diatribe against the extravagance of women who come into marriage with a huge dowry by means of which they force their husbands into servitude is often thought to be representative of the situation the Lex Oppia sought to correct.\textsuperscript{215} The scene at the end of the Casina in which the senex amator Lysidamus, trying to talk his way out of having left his cloak at an assignation with what he THOUGHT was the slave Casina, tries to tell his wife that some

\textsuperscript{213}Gruen, Erich, *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*, (1990), 137; *sed, spectatores, uos nunc ne miremini/ quod non triumpho: peruolgatum est, nil moror.* (Bacch. 1072-1073).

\textsuperscript{214}Gruen, 138; *Truc. 482-486: Ne expectetis, spectatores, meas pugnas dum praedicem: manibus duella praecicare soleo, haud in sermonibus. scio ego multos memorauisse milites mendacium: et Homeroida et postilla mille memorari potest qui et conuicti et condemnati falsis de pugnis sient.*

\textsuperscript{215}Gruen, 144; *Aul. 167-169: istas magnas factiones, animos dotes dapsiles, clamores, imperia, eburata vehicla, pallas, purpuram, nil moror quae in seruitutem sumptibus redigunt uiros.*
Bacchantes took it, and her friend remarks that there are no more 
Bacchantes; this is thought to represent the fact that the Bacchanalia 
had been banned in 186 BC\textsuperscript{216}

All these indications show that Plautus had to communicate with 
his audience on their own terms. He used current events as jokes 
because they all knew what was happening and would understand the 
joke. He used their own language because THAT was what they 
understood. We can, therefore, look at the language he used and the 
relationship he had with his audience and determine that if they in fact 
stayed through the end of his plays and enjoyed them, as they seemed to 
do, then they must have understood what was going on on stage.

Using current events is one method of grounding a comedy in 
reality; everyone knows what is happening in the city, so everyone 
understands. Another method of doing so is by using the language of the 
people who are watching the play, and it was at this that Plautus 
excelled. Just as at least one contemporary comedy has used the phrase 
[aait] for "all right" to characterize an inner city African American,\textsuperscript{217}

\textsuperscript{216}Gruen, 151; LY: Bacchae hertle, uxor—CL: Bacchae? LY: Bacchae hertle, 
uxor/MY: Nugatur sciens, nam nunc Bacchae nullae ludunt.

\textsuperscript{217}See The Fresh Prince of Belair, "Day Damned One," first airing on NBC on 
Dec. 3, 1990; the entire episode was an examination of how language is used to 
distinguish the upperclass, educated young man from the lowerclass, supposedly 
uneducated young man. "[aait], I want y'all to swear....."
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Plautus used the Greek that slaves routinely spoke—and that everyone understood—to characterize his own slaves. In the same way that Meryl Streep attempts to assume the accented English of a speaker of the target native language of the part she is playing, Plautus used Punic to make his own Carthaginian more realistic. Just as we hear the words "blonde bimbo," and immediately picture a curvaceous blonde woman with a vacant stare who frequently twirls her hair, so Plautus could use the connotations of his target audience’s language to build upon the comic stereotypes that they came to his plays to see.

The use of language in this way is nothing new; as Colvin argues, Aristophanes used Greek dialect as a method of putting his own characters into the real world in which his comedies were based; it is clear that he expected his audience to understand the dialects involved, or the fact that he was putting Doric in the mouth of the Spartans would have meant nothing. Sanskrit dramas put the higher-status Sanskrit into the mouths of kings because it was the language of the educated, while female characters and lower status characters spoke lower-status Prakrit dialects. In Sanskrit dramas as in Greek dramas, the use of
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218Hock, Hans Heinrich, and Pandharipande, Rajeshwari, 115-116, argue that this method of characterization proves that both Sanskrit and Prakrit dialects were understandable to the audience. Deshpande, Madhav M., 90, notes that Prakrit’s loss of prestige meant that the kings in Sanskrit dramas always spoke Sanskrit, while the lower-class characters spoke a variety of Prakrit.
dialect to make such a distinction would have fallen flat if the audience had been unable to understand the language and would therefore have not realized the dialect as a mark of distinction.

What we must bear in mind, then, is that none of Plautus' use of different languages would have worked if the audience had had no understanding of his language. As we have seen, most of his audience did not consist of upperclass individuals who had had an elite education in Greek oratory, philosophy, and the like. Hence, the Greek that he used would not have been intended to mark anyone as elitist. If Plautus had used the philosophical or rhetorical Greek of Cicero and others, the audience would have perceived that as an attempt on his part to showcase his knowledge of Greek rather than to entertain them; they would have walked off and watched the rope dancers or the boxers because they would have thought he was making fun of them.

Rather, however, Plautus used the Greek that was part of everyone's vernacular. Plautus' Greek was not a marker of status, but a marker of the reality of the Rome that he saw around him. That was what his audience knew, and he knew that he could only hold their attention if he reached them in terms that they understood. Just as French is viewed by some native speakers of English as the language that
people use to show their own superiority,\textsuperscript{219} Plautus was using Greek to show his audience that he understood their identity. Translating his Greek as French, therefore, belies his intention;\textsuperscript{220} it makes him look as if he was making fun of his audience.

It seems clear, then, that despite most previous scholars’ interpretations of Plautus' Greek as marking the character who spoke it as more intelligent or more educated than others, Plautus' Greek was simply a reality marker that serves to give us a picture of spoken language of his audience. Paul Nixon’s--and other editors’--translating Plautus' Greek as French, then, is misguided; in either American or British English, French is viewed as a higher status language than that of the native speakers. Translating Plautus’ Greek into French amidst those languages, then, indicates that the Greek was a higher status language than the Latin, and this was simply not the case. Most Romans’ language was sprinkled with Greek on the order of \textit{μεγάλα κακόν} and νολ γὰρ; not only were there quite a few Greek slaves in the city, but the slaves were often the ones who taught the Romans. Latin sprinkled with Greek was the language the members of Plautus’ audience spoke;

\textsuperscript{219} See above, p. 47, n. 82.
\textsuperscript{220} See above, p. 47 and n. 81.
the Greek was not a status marker, but an indication of the reality of the language at the time Plautus was writing.

Surely Plautus did not expect his audience to speak fluent Punic, but he did expect them to recognize it and perhaps even to have a little understanding of it. Hanno’s entrance, in which he has a long monologue invoking the gods, could probably have been acted well enough that everyone could have understood what was happening even if they did not understand the language. The smaller pieces of Punic, however, may well have been understood by some of his audience; there were more than likely a few Punic slaves among them, and not only would they would have needed to learn Latin to survive, they would probably have taught others a little Punic in the process.

Plautus’ use of Punic was simply a way to paint the character of Hanno as a Carthaginian. The Phoenicians were traders; like most traders, they spoke smatterings of many languages as well as their own. Hanno, like his counterparts in reality, spoke most easily in his native Punic, but he could also understand and speak Latin quite well. Likewise, most Romans would have an understanding of the ”Where is the harbor?” variety of Punic, and Plautus’ free use of Punic, even writing Hanno’s jokes in Punic, was a clear indicator of the fact that he expected that his audience would at the very least recognize Punic as such and
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perhaps even be able to understand it. Despite the consensus of scholars up to this point, it seems clear that if Plautus had wanted his "Punic" to be gibberish, he surely would have used gibberish; he could certainly have had a great deal of fun in using nonsense words rather than a real language. Plautus, however, had more respect for his audience than to throw gibberish at them and pretend it was Punic; he used real Punic because he knew that most of his audience would expect a Carthaginian character to be speaking Punic, and that most of them would have understood the Punic he used. Again, Plautus used another language as a way of putting the character who spoke it into the real world of which he was a part.

Plautus' language, then, was firmly rooted in the reality of his time, and he used it to his full advantage not just to place those characters in that time, but also to craft them into comic creations of his own. It seems clear that most Romans had a basic understanding of Greek and Punic, but, at least in Plautus' world, neither of those languages had any real associations of status either public or personal. His use of those languages, then, seems to be a reflection of what was going on in the Rome that he knew.

It was his own native Latin, however, that afforded Plautus the most ability for creativity. Plautus' use of language that later writers
used to mark a female's speech led many scholars on a quest to catalog Plautus' every word in an attempt to show that he either followed such conventions or crossed them. What he did, however, was neither one; because he understood all the associations of inferiority and submission that his use of certain language and markers would call into the minds of his audience, he was able to use those associations to craft his own interpretation of the *adulescens amator*.

This young lover was a caricature who was bound by chains of love to his beloved. The fact that he may seem somewhat effeminate is an accident that points toward the later "feminization" of the language with which he is portrayed. The language Plautus uses has no real association with gender at the time he employs it here. Rather, it has associations of dependency, impotence, and manipulation; these qualities would necessarily become more and more associated with the female gender which is the inferior in social status.

Plautus' characterization of the young lover, however, was one which later writers adapted in their own portraits of the elegiac lover. Although authors have at least commented on the fact that Plautus' use of the *paraclausithyron* is a precursor to the motif prevalent in elegiac poetry, no one seems to have noticed that the *exclusus amator* is but a small piece of that character known as the elegiac lover. The elegiac
lover is enslaved by chains of love to his mistress, for whom he wages the eternal war of love; this character finds its roots directly in the *adulescens amator* as Plautus has created him.

What, then, can we say of Plautus and his audience? Plautus wrote for an audience whose native language was certainly Latin, but whose colloquial language was peppered with Greek and perhaps even Punic. Latin and Greek are closely related languages, and most of Latin literature, including Plautus' plays, was modeled after that of the Greeks; it would have been odd if the Romans had NOT used occasional Greek phrases in their language. This was especially likely if there was some deficiency in the Latin---as for example, the absence of the word "yes."

Likewise, the Romans and the Carthaginians had had a longstanding commercial relationship. It is no accident that Hanno speaks Latin nearly as well as he speaks his native Punic; one would expect this of someone who regularly sold his wares to speakers of different languages. Likewise, those who regularly bought from someone who spoke a different language would have had to have at least a rudimentary understanding of that language; otherwise, they would not have been able to communicate effectively enough to negotiate.

Plautus' audience also had emotional associations that attached themseves to certain idioms and words. These connotations led them to
perceive speakers of these idioms as weak or inferior; they did not, however, in Plautus' time go so far as to directly attach the connotations brought to mind by these phrases to women's speech. Ultimately, however, they did allow Plautus more creativity because he could play on these connotations in his characterization.

Plautus expected his audience to be the colloquial one who spoke the language of the street---those who frequented the streets would have been the most likely to understand the Punic. He expected them to understand the puns he would make on both Greek and Punic; this didn't necessitate that they understand either language, but it would certainly have made the jokes more amusing. He expected their minds to call forth the associations of impotence summoned by his language in order that they fully understand the characters he had crafted.

Plautus made his audience feel clever. After all, one's station in life is not necessarily an indication of one's intelligence, and Plautus knew that. He expected most of his audience to be the ordinary men on the street, he used THEIR language and he gave them credit for having the intelligence they had. They understood the jokes because the jokes were written for them; in fact, the upperclass who did not have as much contact with the speakers of the common language might not have understood the jokes as easily.
Plautus became one of the most popular playwrights of his time for good reason. He followed the first rule of all good writers; he wrote what he knew. What he knew was what was happening around him and the language the people of his country spoke. Their own words told him that Greek was part of their vernacular, and that his using it as he did would pay tribute to their own language rather than insult them for being stupid. Their own language told him that Carthaginians should speak Punic, not some kind of gibberish that no one, let alone any Punic trader or slave in the audience would not be able to understand. Their own idiom allowed him to create the stereotypes that are the staple of all comedy. In short, his audience's language allowed him to communicate with them, and his use of it made him the most demanded playwright of his day and beyond.
APPENDIX

GREEK WORDS AND WORDS DERIVED FROM GREEK

In this discussion, I have tried to use only those words that the ancients appear to have recognized as Greek. These are the words that the ancients appear to have actually written in Greek in the manuscripts or that, even in Roman letters, are obviously Greek (nai gar, for example.) There are, however, many words in the texts of Plautus that are either of Greek origin or derived from Greek. For the purposes of deciding how the Romans viewed the Greek language, most of them can be discounted because they can be viewed as necessary within the context of the plays that were, after all, set in Greece, or they had become so much part of the Latin language that the Romans considered them their own. The list below is borrowed from Michael Gilleland's 1979 dissertation; it is comprehensive but not intended to be exhaustive.\textsuperscript{221}

1. aer, ἀήρ, "air," 1x

2. aerumna, "labor, trouble," from αἰρομένη, "lifted up, borne," 18x

3. aerumnosus, "dull of trouble, wretched," from aerumna , 2x

4. agoranomus, ἀγορανόμος, "market inspector," 3x

5. alcedo, ἀλκύων, "bird," 1x

6. alicarius, "pertaining to alica, "ἄληξ, "graina, "1x

7. amomum, ἀμωμον, "spice," 1x

8. amphora, ἀμφορεὺς, "jar," 2x

9. ampulla, "bottle," from amphora , 3x

10. ampullarius, "bottle dealer," from ampulla  1x

11. anancaem, "cup which must be drained in one gulp," from ἀναγκαῖος, "necessary," 1x

12. agape, ἀπαγέ, "begone," 26x

13. apolactizo, ἀπολακτίζω, "kick away," 1x, Epid. 678

14. apologus, ἀπόλογος, "tale," 4x

15. apsinthium, ἀψίνθιον, "wormwood," 1x

16. architecton, ἀρχιτέκτων, "architect," 2x

17. architectus, ἀρχιτέκτων, "architect," 2x

18. arrabo, ἀρραβών, "deposit," 8x

19. artopta, ἀρτόπτης, "bread-pan," 1x
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20. athleticus, ἀθλητικός, "pertaining to an athlete," 2x Bacch. 248; Epid.

21. attat, exclamation, from attatae , 15 x

22. attatae, ἀτταταῖ, exclamation, 6x

23. aurichalcum, ὀρείχαλκος, "metal," 3x

24. babae, βοβαί, exclamation, 4x

25. bacchanal, "shrine of Bacchus," Βάκχος, 4x

26. bacchor "celebrate rites of Bacchus," Βάκχος, 2x

27. badizo, βαδίζω, "go," 1x

28. balanus, βάλανος, "shell-fish shaped like an acorn," 1x

29. baliveae, βαλανεῖον, "bath," 7x.

30. baliveator, "bath-attendant," from baliveae , 3x

31. ballea, φάλλαινα, "whale," 1x

32. ballea, "engine of war, " from βαλλιστής, "thrower," 5x

33. ballestarium, "artillery emplacement," from ballea , 1x

34. balestrum, βάραθρον, "pit," 3x

35. barbaria, "barbarian region," from barbarus , 1x

36. barbaricus, βαρβαρικός, "barbarian," 3x

37. barbarus, βάρβαρος, "barbarian," 7x

38. basilicus, βασιλικός, "royal," 12 x

39. batioca, βατιάκη, "cup," 1x

41. *biclinium*, "couch for two persons," from κλίνη, "couch," 2x

42. *blennus*, βλεννός, "drivelling," 1x

43. *bliteus*, "tasteless," from *blitum*, 2x

44. *blitum*, βλῖτων, "vegetable," 1x

45. *bolus*, "cast (of dice), profit," from βόλος, "cast," 7x

46. *bombax*, βομβάξ, exclamation, 1x

47. *boo*, βοάω, "roar," 1x.

48. *bracchialis*, "pertaining to the arm," from *bracchium*, 1x

49. *bracchium*, βραχίων, "arm," 11x

50. *cadus*, κάδος, "jar," 12x

51. *calamistratus*, "with hair artificially curled," from *calamistrum*, 1x

52. *calamistrum*, "curling iron," from καλαμίς, "reed," 1x

53. *calamus*, κάλαμος, "reed," 2x

54. *calx*, χάλιξ, "pebble," 1x

55. *canthaus*, κάνθαρος, "cup," 16x

56. *capparis*, κάππαρις, "edible plant," 1x

57. *carinarius*, "one who dyes brown," from *carinus*, 1x

58. *carinus*, καρύνος, "nut-brown," 1x

59. *casia*, κασία, "aromatic plant," 1x

60. *casteria*, σχαστηρία, "art of a ship," 1x
61. *catapulta*, καταπελτής, "engine of war," 5x
62. *catapultarius*, "pertaining to a *catapulta*," 1x
64. *causea*, καυσία, "hat," 2x
65. *celocla*, "boat," from *celox*, 1x
66. *celox*, κέλης, "boat," 6x
67. *cercurus*, κέρκουρος, "boat," 3x
68. *cerinus*, κήρινος, "wax-colored," 1x
69. *cetus*, κῆτος, "fish," 2x
70. *charmidor*, "turn into Charmides," Χαρμίδης, 1x
71. *chlamydatus*, "dressed in a *chlamys*," 7x
72. *chlamys*, χλαμύς, "cloak," 10x
73. *choragus*, χορηγός, "supplier of equipment to actors," 2x
74. *chrysus*, χρυσός, "gold," 1x
75. *cicum*, "dividing membrane of fruit, trifle," cf. κικκός, "division,"
   κίκκαβος, "small coin," and κικκάβιν, "trifle," 1x
77. *cinaedicus*, "lewd," from *cinaedus*, 2x
78. *cinaedus*, κίναιδος, "catamite," 8x
79. *cincinnatus*, "with curled hair," from *cincinnus*, 3x
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80. cincinnus, κίκιννος, "curl," 1x
81. cinamum, κίνναμον, "spice," 1x
82. cistella, "small box," from cista, κίστη, "box," 20x
83. cistellatrix, "maid in charge of wardrobe," from cistella, 1x
84. cistellula, "small box," from cistella, 4x
85. cistula, "small box," from cista, κίστη, "box," 9x
86. clastratus, "barred," from clatras, κλήθρα, "bars," 1x
87. coclea, κοχλίας, "snail," 2x
88. colaphus, κόλαφος, "blow," 5x
89. collyra, κολλύρα, "pastry,
90. collyricus, κολλυρικός, "made with pastry," 2x
91. colutea, κολυτέα, "herb," 1x
92. colymphium, κολύφιον, "ham," 1x
93. comarcus, κώμαρχός, "magistrate," 1x
94. comicus, κωμικός, "comic," 5x
95. comissor, κωμάζω, "revel," 7x
96. comoedia, κωμοδία, "comedy," 13x
97. comoedicus, κωμωδικός, "pertaining to comedy," 1x
98. concha, κόγχη, "shell-fish," 4x
99. conchita, "fisherman," from κόγχίτης, "dyer," 1x
100. conger, "γόγγρος, "eel," 3x
101. *congerro*, "fellow0idler," from *gerro*, "buffoon," (*Γέρρων, "comic figure," from γέρρα, "genitals"), 4x

102. *congraecor*, "squander like a Greek," from *Graecus, Грæικός,*

"Greek," 1x

103. *contechnor*, "devise a trick," from *techina*, 1x

104. *contor*, "inquire," from *contus, κοντός, "pole," 1x

105. *coriandrum*, κορίανδρον, "spice," 1x

106. *corolla*, "garland," from *corona*, 3x

107. *corona*, κορώνη, "crown," 16x

108. *cottabus*, κότταβος, "game," 1x

109. *crapula*, κραπάλη, "intoxication," 3x

110. *crapularius*, "pertaining to intoxication," from *crapula*, 1x

111. *crepidula"*, "small sandal, " from *crepida, κρηπίς, (acc. κρηπίδα),

"sandal," 1x

112. *crocinus*, κρόκινους, "made from saffron," 1x

113. *crocotula*, "saffron-colored (sc. vestis)," from *crocota, κροκωτός, "of saffron," 1x

114. *crocotarius*, "pertaining to saffron-colored clothing," from *crocota, κροκωτός, "of saffron," 1x

115. *crumilla*, "small purse," from *crumina*, 1x

117. *cruricrepida*, "one with clanking chains on his legs," from *crus*, "leg," and *crepo*, "clank," with Greek patronymic suffix -ιδης, 1x.

118. *culleus*, "sack," from κολεός, "sheath," 2x

119. *cumatilis*, "wave-colored," from κῦμα, "wave," 1x

120. *cunila*, κονίλη, "spice," 1x

121. *cyathisso*, κυαθίζω, "ladle out," 2x

122. *cyathus*, κύαθος, "ladle," 7x

123. *cynicus*, κυνικός, "pertaining to Cynic philosophy," 2x

124. *danista*, δανειστής, "money-lender," 13x

125. *danisticus*, δανειστικός, "pertaining to a money-lender," 1x

126. *dapino*, "pay for," from δαπανάω, "spend," 1x

127. *dapsilis*, δαψιλής, "abundant," 4x

128. *demarchus*, δήμαρχος, "magistrate," 1x

129. *deruncino*, "plane off, cheat," from *runcina*, ὄυκάνη, "plane," 2x

130. *diabathrarius*, "maker of diabathum, διάβαθρον," "slipper," 1x

131. *dica*, δίκη, "lawsuit," 2x

132. *diobolaris*, "worth two obols," διώβολον, "coin," 1x

133. *discus*, δίσκος, "quoit," 3x

134. *drachuma*, δραχμή, "coin," 7x

135. *drachumisso*, "work for a drachma a day," from *drachuma*, 1x

136. *drapeta*, δραπέτης, "runaway," 1x
137. dulicus, δουλικός, "like a slave," 1x
138. echinus, ἐχῖνος, "sea urchin," 1x
139. elegium, ἔλεγεῖον, "poem," 1x
140. elephantus, ἐλέφας, "elephant," 5x
141. eleutheria, ἔλευθερία, "festival of liberty," 2x
142. elleboros, "insane," from elleborum, 2x
143. elleborum, ἐλλέβορος, "herb," 3x
144. emporium, ἐμπόριον, "market," 1x
145. ephebus, ἑφήβος, "youth," 2x
146. epichysis, ἐπίχυσις, "jug," 1x
147. epicrocum, "flower-colored garment," from ἐπίκροκον, "flower," 1x
148. epistula, ἐπιστολή, "letter," 44x
149. epitheca, ἐπιθήκη, "addition," 1x
150. epityrum, ἐπίτυρον, "relish" 1x
151. eu, ἐὖ, exclamation, 26x
152. euax, ἐὖάξ, exclamation, 5x.
153. eugae, ἐὖγε, exclamation, 39x
154. eugepae, ἐὐγεπαί, exclamation, 8x
155. euhoe, ἐὕοι, exclamation, 2x
156. euschemus, ἐὐσχημος, "handsome," 1x
157. exagoga, ἔξαγωγή, "exportation," 3x
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158. exanclο, ἑξαντλέω, "drain," 1x
159. exballisto, "defeat," from ballista, 1x
160. exentero, ἑξεντερίζω, "disembowel," 4x
161. exoticus, ἐξωτικός, "foreign," 3x
163. flagritriba, "one who wears out whips, " from flagrum, "whip," and τρίβης, "one who rubs," 1x
164. flemina, φλεγμονή, "imflammation," 1x
165. fucus, φύκος, "dye, deception," 2x
166. galea, "helmet," from γαλέη, "weasel," 3x
167. gaulus, γαυλός, "pail," 1x
168. gerrae, "trifle, nonsense," from γέρρα, "genitals,"
169. geuma, γεύμα, "taste, small amount," 1x
170. glandionida, "sweetbread," from glandium "sweetbread," and the Greek patronymic suffix -ίδης, 1x
171. glaucuma, γλαύκωμα, "cataract," 1x
172. graphicus, γραφικός, "artful," 10x
173. gubernator, "pilot," from guberno, 5x
174. guberno, κυβερνάω, "steer," 1x
175. gymnasmum, γυμνάσιον, "gymnasium," 5x
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176. *gymasticus*, γυμναστικός, "gymnastic," 2x

177. *gynaecæum*, γυναίκειον, "women's quarters," 3x


179. *hallex*, "fish sauce," from ἀλλης, "pickled fish," 2x

180. *hamiota*, "fisherman," from *hamus*, "hook," and the Greek suffix, -ιώτης,


182. *harpago*, "grappling iron, greedy person," from ἀρπάγη, "hook," 1x


184. *heia*, εἶα, exclamation, 24x

185. *hemia*, ἡμίνα, "unit of measure," 1x

186. *hepatiarius*, "pertaining to the liver," from *hepar*, ἡπαρ, "liver," 1x

187. *hilaris*, hilarus, ἱλαρός, "cheerful," 14x

188. *hilaritudo*, "cheerfulness," from *hilaris*, 3x

189. *hippodromus*, ἰππόδρομος, "race track," 3x

190. *historia*, ιστορία, "story, account," 3x

191. *hora*, ὥρα, "period of time," 2x

192. *horeaωs*, ὥραιος, "year-old (sc. fish)," 1x

193. *hymen*, ύμην, "wedding song, god of marriage," 8x

194. *hymenæus*, ύμεναῖος, "wedding song, god of marriage," 7x
195. impune, "without punishment," from poena, on the analogy of νηποινεῖ, "without punishment," 10x

196. inanilogista, "babbler," inanis, "empty," and λογιστής, "reasoner," 1x

197. indusiarus, "undergarment maker," from indusium, *ἐνδύσιον (dim of ἔνδυσις), "under-garment," 1x

198. indusiatus, "equipped with an undergarment," from indusium, *ἐνδύσιον (dim of ἔνδυσις), "under-garment," 1x

199. ineuschemus, "not graceful," from euschemus, 1x

200. lacruma, δάκρυμα, "tear," 14x

201. lacrumo, "weep," from lacruma, 11x

202. lagoena, λάγυνος, "bottle," 1x

203. lampas, λαμπάς, "torch," 3x

204. lanterna, λαμπτήρ, "torch," 3x

205. latomiae, lautumiae, λατομίαι, "quarries," 2x

206. latro, *λατρῶν, "mercenary soldier,"

207. latrocinor, "serve as a mercenary soldier," from latro, 3x

208. lembus, λέμβος, "boat," 8x

209. lemniscus, λημνίσκος, "ribbon," 1x

210. leo, λέων, "lion," 2x

211. leoninus, "pertaining to a lion," from leo, 1x

212. lepas, lopas, λοπᾶς, "shell-fish," 2x
213. logus, λόγος, "story," 7x
214. macellum, μάκελλον, "market," 5x
215. machaera, μάχαιρα, "sword," 21x
216. machina, μηχανή, "machine, contrivance," 5x
217. machinor, "contrive," from machina, 5x
218. maena, μαίνη, "fish," 1x
219. magydaris, μαγύδαρις, "plant," 1x
220. malacisso, μαλακίςω, "make soft," 1x
221. malacus, μαλακός, "soft," 7x
222. malum, μῆλον, "apple," 1x
223. mammium, "breast," from μαμμίον, dim. of "mother," 2x
224. marsuppium, μαρσύππιον, "bag," 15x
225. massa, μᾶζα, "lump," 1x
226. mastigia, μαστιγίας, "rascal," 13x
227. medimnus, μέδιμνος, "unit of measure," 1x
228. metreta, μετρητής, "unit of measure," 1x
229. mina, μνα, "unit of currency," 133x
230. minarium, "coin" mina on the analogy of μναδάριον, from μνα, 1x
231. moechisso, μοιχάζω, "commit adultery," 1x
232. moechus, μοιχός, "adulterer," 11x
233. *molochinaris*, "maker of mallow garments," from *molocinus*,

μολόχινος, "made of mallow," 1x

234. *monotropus*, μονότροπος, "alone," 1x

235. *morologus*, μωρολόγος, "speaking foolishly," 2x

236. *morus*, μωρός, "foolish," 5x

237. *murena*, μύραινα, "fish," 4x

238. *murobatharius*, "seller of women's luxuries," cf. μύρον "perfume,"

and βάθρον, "sandal," 1x

239. *murra*, μύρρα, "myrrh," 1x

240. *murrinus*, "of myrrh," from *murra*, 2x


242. *musicus*, μουσικός, "pertaining to music," 1x

243. *mussito*, "mutter," from *musso*, 9x

244. *musso*, "mutter, be quiet," from μύζω, "mutter," 2x

245. *myropola*, μυροπόλης, "perfume seller," 3x

246. *myropolium*, μυροπόλιον, "perfume shop," 2x

247. *naenia, nenia*, *νηνία, "dirge," 4x GM's footnote: cf. νηνίατον,

"tune"

248. *nardinus*, νάρδινος, "of nard," 1x

249. *nauclericus*, ναυκληρικός, "pertaining to a ship's captain," 2x

250. *naucerus*, ναύκληρος, "ship's captain," 3x
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251. *nausea*, ναυσία, "sea sickness," 1x

252. *nauseo*, "be seasick," from *nausea*, 1x

253. *nauta*, navita, ναύτης, "sailor," 3x

254. *nautea*, ναυτία, "bilge water," 2x


   Also, Gilleland mentions that the Grk. νομίμος is thought to be
derived from the Latine *nummus*, and not vice-versa.

256. *oculicrepida*, "one whose eyes rattle," from *oculus*, "eye," and crepo,
"rattle," plus the Greek patronymic suffix -ίδης, 1x.

257. *oenopolium*, οίνοπωλίον, "wine shop." 1x

258. *offucia*, "make-up, deception," from *fucus*, 2x

259. *olea*, oliva, ἐλαία, "olive," 2x

260. *olearius*, "pertain to olive oil ;" from *oleum*, 2x

261. *oleum*, olivum, ἐλαίον, "olive oil," 10x

262. *ophthalmia*, "fish with eye-like markings," cf. ὀφθαλμίας, "eagle with
sharp eyes," 1x

263. *opsonator*, "one who buys food," from *opsono*, 1x

264. *opsonatus*, "buying of food," from *opsono*, 4x

265. *opsonium*, ὀψώνιον, "food," 15x

266. *opsono(r)*, ὀψωνέω, "buy food," 26x

267. *orgia*, ὀργία, "secret rites," 1x
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268. *ostrea*, δόστρεον, "oyster," 1x

269. *ostreatus*, "striped like an oyster," from *ostrea*, , 1x

270. *paedagogus*, παιδαγωγός, "teacher, tutor," 7x

271. *paenula*, φαινόλης, "garment," 1x

272. *palaestra*, πάλαίστρα, "wrestling school," 4x

273. *palaestricus*, παλαιστρικός, "pertaining to wrestling," 1x

274. *palliatus*, "wearing a pallium, ," 1x

275. *palliolatim*, "with a pallium, ," 1x

276. *pallium*, "garment," from *palla*, "garment," and the Greek diminutive ending -ιον, 28x

278. *pancraticus*, "pertaining to a wrestler," from παγκρατιον, "wrestling-boxing match," 1x

279. *pantherinus*, "pertaining to a panther," from *panther*, πάνθηρ, "panther," 1x

280. *pantopolium*, παντοπόλιον, "bazaar," 1x

281. *papae*, παπαί, exclamation, 8x

282. *parasitatio*, "a playing the parasite," from *parasitus*, 1x

283. *parasiticus*, παρασιτικός, "pertaining to a parasite," 2x

284. *parasitor*, "play the parasite," from *parasitus*, 2x

285. *parasitus*, παράσιτος, "parasite," 52x

286. *paratragoedo*, παρατραγωδέω, "speak bombastically," 1x
287. *pasceolus*, φάσκωλος, "bag, wallet," 1x


290. *patellarius*, "pertaining to a dish," from *patella*, diminutive of *patina*, 1x

291. *patina*, πατάνη, "dish," 6x

292. *patinarius*, "pertaining to a dish," from *patina*, 2x

293. *patrisso*, πατρίζω, "take after one's father," 2x

294. *pausa*, παῦσις, "halt," 4x

295. *pax*, παξ, exclamation, 3x

296. *peplus*, πέπλος, "robe," 1x

297. *paratus*, "equipped with a sack," from *pera*, πήρα, "sack," 1x

298. *percontator*, "inquirer," from *percontor*, 1x

299. *percontor*, "inquire," from *contus*, κοντός, "pole," 3x

300. *pergraecor*, "ply the Greek, revel," from *Graecus*, Γραικός, "Greek," 6x

301. *pergraphicus*, "very artful," from *graphicus*, 1x

302. *peristroma*, περίστρωμα, "covering," 2x
303. peronida, "bit of ham," from perna, "ham," and the Greek
patronymic suffix, -ίδης, 1x
304. perula, "small sack," from pera, πήρα, "sack," 1x
305. pessulus, "bolt," from πάσσαλος, "peg," 7x
306. petasus, πέτασος, "hat," 5x
307. pharetra, φαρέτρα, "quiver," 1x
308. philosophor, "philosophize," from philosophus, 4x
309. philosophus, φιλόσοφος, "philosopher," 1x
310. phronesis, φρόνησις, "understanding," 1x
311. phrygio, phyrgio, "embroiderer," from Phrygius, Φρύγιος, "Phrygian," 6x
312. phylaca, φυλακή, "prison," 1x
313. pithecium, πιθήκιον, "ape," 1x
314. plagipatida, "one who endures blows," from plaga, "blow," and
patior, "endure," plus the Greek patronymic suffix, -ίδης, 2x
315. plagusia, "fish," cf. pelagus, πέλαγος, "sea," 1x
317. podagrosus, "afflicted with podagra," ποδάγρα, "gout," 2x
318. poema, ποίημα, "poem," 1x
319. poena, ποινή, "penalty," 4x
320. poenicius, puniceus, φοινίκειος, "purple," 4x
321. poeta, ποιητής, "poet," 6x
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322. *polypus*, πολύπους, "octopus," 2x
323. *pompa*, πομπή, "procession," 9x
324. *poterium*, ποτήριον, "cup," 2x
325. *propino*, προπίνω, "drink to one's health," 7x
326. *propola*, προπώλης, "seller," 1x
327. *proreta*, προφράτης, "naval officer in command of the bow," 1x
328. *proscaenium*, προσκήνιον, "stage," 1x
329. *prothymia*, προθυμία, "eagerness," 2x
330. *prothymus*, πρόθυμος, "eager," 1x
331. *pultiphagus*, "porridge eating, "from puls, "porridge," and φαγεῖν (inf. of ἐφαγον, 2nd aor. of ἔσθιω), "eat," 1x
332. *purpura*, πορφύρα, "purple dye," 8x
333. *purpuratus*, "dressed in purple," from purpura, 1x
334. *purpurissatus*, "painted purple," from purpurissum, 1x
335. *purpurissum*, "purple cosmetic," from πορφύριζων, participle of πορφυρίζων, "be purple," 1x
336. *pyelus*, πυέλος, "tub," 1x
337. *rabo*, "deposit," from arrrabo, 2x
338. *rapacida*, "robber," from *rapax*, "greedy," and the Greek patronymic suffix -ίδης, 1x
339. *recharmido*, "cease being Charmides," Χαρμίδης, 1x
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340. resina, ῥητίνη, "resin," 1x
341. sacciperium, "pouch," from saccus and pera, πήρα, "bag," 1x
342. saccus, σάκκος, "bag," 1x
343. sambuca, σαμβύκη, "harp," 1x
344. sandaligerula, "maid who carries sandals," from sandalium, σανδάλιον, "sandal," and gero, "carry," 1x
345. sarrapis, σάραπις, "robe," 1x
346. scaena, σκηνή, "stage," 1x
347. scapha, σκάφη, "boat," 6x
348. scaphium, σκάφιον, "boat," 6x
349. scaphium, σκάφιον, "cup," 3x
350. schema, σχήμα, "outfit," 2x
351. schoenus, σχοῖνος, "aromatic reed," 1x
352. scorfa, γρομφάς, "sow," 1x
353. scrofipascus, "sow keeper," from scrofa and pasco, "feed," 1x
354. scyphus, σκύφος, "cup," 1x
355. sepia, σηπία, "fish," 1x
356. sepiola, "fish," from sepia, 1x
357. sesuma, σησάμη, "plant," 1x
358. simia, "ape," from simus, σιμός, "snub-nosed," 19x
359. sinapis, σίναπι, "mustard," 2x

202
360. *soccus*, "shoe," cf. συγκις, συκχας, συκχος, all meaning "shoe," 5x
361. *soracum*, σόρακος, "basket," 1x
362. *spinter*, "bracelet," from σφιγκτήρ, "band," 8x
363. *spinturnicum*, "bird," from *spinturnix*, "bird (σπινθαρίς and σπινθάρυς, "spark"), 1x.
364. *sportula*, "little basket," from *sporta*, σπυρίς (acc. σπυρίδα), "basket," 3x
365. *stacta*, στακτή, "oil of myrrh," 3x
366. *stalagmium*, "ear-ring," from *σταλάγμιον, diminutive of στάλαγμα, "drop," 1x
367. *stega*, "deck," from στέγη, "roof," 2x
368. *stomachus*, στόμαχος, "stomach, anger," 1x
369. *strategus*, στρατηγός, "general," 3x
370. *stratioticus*, στρατιωτικός, "military," 3x
371. *strophiarius*, "maker of brassieres," from *strophium*, στρόφιον, "brassiere," 1x
372. *strutheum*, στρούθειον, "fruit," 1x
373. *subbasilicanus*, "one who frequents a basilica," βασιλική, "portico," 1x
374. *subparasitor*, "flatter a bit," from *parasitor*, 3x
375. *sycophanta*, συκοφάντης, "trickster," 13x
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376. sycophantia, συκοφαντία, "trickery," 16x
377. sycophantiosus, "tricky," from sycophantia, 1x
378. sycophantor, "trick," from sycophanta, 2x
379. syllaba, συλλαβή, "syllable," 2x
380. symbola, συμβολή, "contribution to a common meal," 3x
381. symbolum, σύμβολον, "token, tally, seal," 19x
382. syngraphus, σύγγραφος, "contract," 5x
383. talentum, τάλαντον, "unit of currency," 30x
384. tappetia, ταπήτιον, "carpet," 2x
385. tarpezita, τραπεζίτης, "banker," 14x
386. tatae, exclamation, from tat on the analogy of attatae, babae, papae, 1x
387. techina, τέχνη, "device, trick," 4x
388. telinum, τήλινον, "perfume," 1x
389. tessera, "square token," from *τεσσαράγωνος, "four-cornered," 4x
390. thalassicus, "sea-colored," from θάλασσα, "sea," 2x
391. theatrum, θέατρον, "theater," 1x
392. thensaurarius, "pertaining to treasure," from thensaurus, 1x
393. thensaurus, θησαυρός, "treasure," 23x
394. thermopolium, θερμοπωλείον, "cook shop," 3x
395. thermopoto, *θερμοποτέω, "warm with a hot drink," 1x.
396. *thylacista*, *θυλακιστής*, "sacker maker," 1x.

397. *tiara*, τιάρα, "turban," 1x

398. *toxicum*, τοξικόν, "poison," 1x

399. *tragicomoedia*, "tragic comedy," from *tragicus* and *comoedia*, 2x

400. *tragicus*, τραγικός, "tragic," 1x

401. *tragoedia*, τραγωδία, "tragedy," 6x

402. *tragoedus*, τραγωδός, "tragic actor," 1x

403. *triobolus*, τριῳβόλον, "coin," 8x

404. *triumpho*, "celebrate a triumph," from *triumphus*, , 2x

405. *triumphus*, "triumphal procession." from θρίαμβος, "hymn," 2x

406. *trygonus*, τρυγών, "fish," 1x

407. *tus*, "incense," from θύος, "burnt sacrifice," 4x

408. *tusculum*, "bit of incense," from *tus*, , 1x

409. *tympanotriba*, *τυμπανοτρίβης*, "drummer," 1x

410. *tympanum*, τύμπανον, "drum," 1x

411. *tyrannus*, τύραννος, "ruler," 2x

412. *ulmitriba*, "one who wears out elm rods," from *ulumus*, "elm," and -τρίβης, "one who rubs," 1x

413. *zamia*, ζημία, "loss," 1x

414. *zona*, ζώνη, "belt," 6x

415. *zonarius*, "pertaining to belt," from *zona*, 2x
416. ἀδικος, "unjust," 1x
417. ἀρπαξ, "robbing," 2x
418. γάρ, "for," 3x.
419. δέ, adversative and copulative particle, 1x
420. δίκαιος, "just," 1x
421. δύναμις, "quantity," 1x
422. ἐγώ, "I", 1x
423. εὐρετής, "inventor," 1x
424. ἔξω, "outside," 1x
425. ἢ, "or," 3x
426. καί, "and," 3x
427. κακόν, "evil," 1x
428. λύρα, "lyre," 1x
429. μά, particle used in oaths, 2x
430. μέγας, "big," 1x
431. μή, "not," 1x
432. νάι, "yea (by)," 10x
433. οἴχομαι, "go," 1x
434. οὗτος, "this," 4x
435. πάλιν, "again," 1x
436. παρέχω, "furnish," 1x
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437. παύω, "cease," 1x
438. πέντε, "five," 1x
439. πίνω, "drink," 1x
440. πόθεν, "whence," 1x
441. ποιέω, "make, do," 1x
442. πράγμα, "trouble," 1x
443. τέταρτος, "four," 1x
444. τρεῖς, "three," 1x
445. χάρης, "thanks," 1x
446. ὦ, "o," 2x
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Baumer, Rachel, and Brandon, James, Sanskrit Drama in Performance, (Honolulu, 1981)


Bhattacharya, B., Sanskrit Drama and Dramaturgy, (Delhi, 1994)

Bonfante, Giuliano, La lingua parlata in Orazio, (Venosa, 1994)


Bradley, Keith R., Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire, (Brussels, 1984)


Coulter, Cornelia, "The Speech of Foreigners in Greek and Latin Comedy," Philological Quarterly XIII.2 (1934), 133-139.


Currie, H., Plautus, “Poenulus 1174-1279, and a possible Semitic parallel,” LCM 8.6 (1983), 85-86

Deshpande, Madhav M., Sanskrit and Prakrit: Some Sociolinguistic Issues, (Delhi, 1993)


Fitzmyer, “The Phoenician Inscription from Pyrgi,” JAOS 86 (1966)

Flores, Enrico, Latina arcaica e produzione linguistica, (Napoli, 1978)


Fraenkel, Eduard, Elementi plautini in Plauto, (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia", 1960

Fraenkel, Eduard, Plautinisches im Plautus, (Berlin: Weidmann, 1922)
Frank, Tenney, *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, (1979)


Gilleland, M., *Linguistic Differentiation of Character Type and Sex in the Comedies of Plautus and Terence*, Diss. University of Virginia, (Virginia, 1979)

Gilleland, M., *Linguistic Differentiation of Character Type and Sex in the Comedies of Plautus and Terence*, diss. UVA (1979)


Haarhoff, T.J., *The Stranger at the Gate*, (Oxford, 1948)


210
Hanson, John, "Scholarship on Plautus Since 1950," CW LIX (1965), 103-129


Harris, Z.H., *Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, (New Haven, 1936)

Hawkes, Christopher and Sonia, *Greeks, Celts, and Romans*, (Rowman and Littlefield, 1973)


Hopkins, Dr. Herbert Müller, "Greek Words in Plautus," *TAPA* 29, (1898), xiv-xvii.

Hough, J.N., "The Use of Greek Words by Plautus," *AJP* 55 (1934), 346-364

Hough, John N, "Erich Segal, *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*," CW LIX (1968), 140


Konstan, David, *Roman Comedy*, (Cornell University Press, 1983)


Krahmalkov, Charles, A Phoenican-Punic Grammar, (Brill, 2001)


Lakoff, Robin, Language and Women's Place (Harper & Row, 1975)

Lakoff, Robin, Language and Women's Place, (New York, 1975)

Leo, Friedrich, Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie, (Berlin : Weidmann, 1895)

Lindsay, W.M., "Freidrich Leo, Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie. Zweite Auflage" Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 32 (1912), 1633-1640


Lindsay, W.M., Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation, (London, 1898)

Lindsay, W.M., T. Macci Plauti Comoediae, (Oxford, 1905)


212


Maurach, G., *Plauti Poenulus*, (Heidelberg, 1975)


Morely, Neville D.G., *Metropolis and Hinterland*, (Melbourne, 1996)


Noy, David, *Foreigners at Rome*, (Duckworth, 2000)


Petrochilos, Nicholas, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*, (Athens, 1974)


Plautus, *Bacchides*, Ed. with Commentary and Translation, John Barsby, (Bolchazy-Carducci, 1986)

Plautus, *Captivi*, Ed. with Commentary and Introduction, W. M. Lindsay, 
(Bristol Classical Press, 1981)

Plautus, *Captivi*, Ed. with Commentary, A. Hallidie (Cambridge, 1891)

Plautus, *Captivi*, Ed. with Commentary, H. Elmer (Boston, 1900)


Plautus, *Pseudolus*, Ed. with commentary E.P. Morris, (Boston, 1895)


Plautus, *Trinummus*, Ed. with Commentary, J. H. Gray, 3rd ed, 
(Cambridge, 1934)

Plautus, *Trinummus*, Ed. with Commentary, Wagner, (Cambridge, 1890)


Prescott, Henry W., Philologische Untersuchungen, "Plautinisches im Plautus," CP 10, (1924), 90-93


Segal, Erich, Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus, 2nd Ed, (Oxford University Press, 1987)


Shipley, G. W., Certain Sources of Corruption in Latin Manuscripts, (New York, 1904)

Shipp, G.B., "Greek in Plautus," WS 66 (1953), 105-112

Slater, Niall, Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind, (Princeton, 1985)


T. Macci Plauti, Captivi, Trinummus, et Rudens, Ed. with Commentary C.S. Harrington, (New York, 1870)
The Captives and Trinummus of Plautus, Ed. with Commentary, E.P. Morris, (Boston, 1898)

Thorne, Barrie, and Henley, Nancy, Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, (Newbury House, 1975)

Tito Maccio Plaute, Tutte le Commedie, trans. into Italian by Ettore Paratore (Rome, 1993).

Trouard, Sister Mary Alexaidia, Cicero's Attitude Towards the Greeks, Diss. University of Chicago, (Chicago, 1942)

Trudgill, P., "Language and Sex," in Sociolinguistics, an Introduction (Harmondsdsworth, 1974)

Ullman, B.L., "By Castor and Pollux," CW 37 (1943), 87-89


Wright, John, "The Transformations of Pseudolus," TAPA 105 (1975), 403-416


Yavetz, Zvi, Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome, (New Brunswick, 1988)