

Lexical Blends in Greek and Latin Comedic Idiom

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Ryan Seaberg

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Advisor: George Sheets

December 2019

© Ryan Seaberg 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe my heartiest thanks to many people, without whom I could never have written this dissertation: first and foremost, to my advisor Dr. Sheets for all of his encouragements, criticisms, and other comments throughout this process, for his patience in letting this dissertation develop as it did, and for his accommodating my interests in the years leading up to this dissertation by offering the courses and independent studies I asked for; to Dr. Olson, under whose tutelage in courses on Aristophanes and commentary writing and during the years when we worked together on Cratinus I learned how to do the work of classical philology; to Dr. Liberman for letting me “sit among the barbarians” and learn “oodles of Germanic philology”; and last but not least to Elizabeth, to my parents and brothers, and to Paul and Brenda Torresson for their unfailing support and generosity throughout this process but especially during these last few years.

I also owe my thanks generally to everyone in the department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies—professors, fellow graduate students, and administrators alike—for their years of support and camaraderie. I could not have enjoyed my time there as I did without them.

For Holly,

τῆ φιλτάτῃ κυνί, ἣν ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἐθάψαμεν καὶ ἐδακρύσαμεν

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
CHAPTER 1. PLAUTINE <i>MADULSA</i> AND THE STUDY OF BLENDING.....	1
1.1 Assumptions and Methodology.....	12
CHAPTER 2. COMPOUNDING AND BLENDING.....	14
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Compounds and Compounding.....	15
2.3 Ancient Greek and Latin Compounding as Stem Compounding.....	16
2.4 The Linking Vowel.....	18
2.5 The Spelling of Compounds.....	20
2.6 Basic Criteria for the Classification of Compounds.....	21
2.7 Bauer's System of Classifying Compounds.....	24
2.7.1 Coordinative and Subordinative Compounds.....	27
2.7.2 Attributive and Relational Compounds.....	28
2.7.3 Heads.....	30
2.7.4 Endocentricity and Exocentricity.....	30
2.7.5 Orientation.....	32
2.8 The Use of Compounds.....	37
2.9 How Blends Differ from Compounds and How They Are Analogous.....	40
CHAPTER 3. ONOMASTIC BLENDS.....	45
3.1 Introduction.....	45
3.2 Βδελϋ.....	51

3.2.1 Textual Notes.....	51
3.2.2 Formation.....	52
3.2.3 Interpretation.....	53
3.3 σκαταιβάτης.....	59
3.3.1 Textual Notes.....	60
3.3.2 Formation.....	61
3.3.3 Interpretation.....	62
3.4 Ἀττικωνικοί.....	66
3.4.1 Textual Notes.....	68
3.4.2 Formation.....	68
3.4.3 Interpretation.....	68
3.5 ὠτοτύξιοι.....	73
3.5.1 Textual Notes.....	73
3.5.2 Formation.....	74
3.5.3 Interpretation.....	75
3.6 Κλωπίδαι.....	80
3.6.1 Textual Notes.....	81
3.6.1 Formation.....	81
3.6.3 Interpretation.....	81
3.7 οἰκιτιεύς.....	83
3.7.1 Textual Notes.....	84
3.7.1 Formation.....	86
3.7.3 Interpretation.....	86

3.8 Λακιδαίμονος.....	91
3.8.1 Textual Notes.....	92
3.8.2 Formation.....	92
3.8.3 Interpretation.....	94
3.9 Δορίαλλος or Δορύαλλος.....	96
3.9.1 Textual Notes.....	98
3.9.2 Formation.....	99
3.9.3 Interpretation.....	99
3.10 Φαλλήνιος.....	104
3.10.1 Textual Notes.....	105
3.10.2 Formation.....	105
3.10.3 Interpretation.....	109
3.11 <i>Rabienus</i>	112
3.11.1 Textual Notes.....	113
3.11.2 Formation.....	113
3.11.3 Interpretation.....	115
3.12 <i>Biberius</i>	118
3.12.1 Textual Notes.....	118
3.12.2 Formation.....	118
3.12.3 Interpretation.....	119
3.13 Conclusion.....	120
CHAPTER 4. NON-ONOMASTIC BLENDS IN GREEK AND LATIN.....	122
4.1 βομβάυλιοι.....	122

4.1.1 Textual Notes.....	123
4.1.2 Formation.....	123
4.1.3 Interpretation.....	123
4.2 μεσοπέρδην.....	128
4.2.1 Textual Notes.....	129
4.2.2 Formation.....	130
4.2.3 Interpretation.....	131
4.3 τρυγῶδια, τρυγῶδός, τρυγῶδικός, τρυγῶδοποιουμσική.....	132
4.3.1 Textual Notes.....	135
4.3.2 Formation.....	135
4.3.3 Interpretation.....	137
4.4 <i>tragicomoedia</i>	148
4.4.1 Textual Notes.....	150
4.4.2 Formation.....	151
4.4.3 Interpretation.....	152
4.5 <i>tuburcinari</i>	157
4.5.1 Textual Notes.....	158
4.5.2 Formation.....	159
4.5.3 Interpretation.....	160
4.6 <i>virgindemia</i>	175
4.6.1 Textual Notes.....	177
4.6.2 Formation.....	178
4.6.3 Interpretation.....	179

4.7 <i>perenticida</i>	182
4.7.1 Textual Notes.....	183
4.7.2 Formation.....	184
4.7.3 Interpretation.....	184
4.8 Conclusion.....	191
CHAPTER 5. BILINGUAL BLENDS IN LATIN.....	193
5.1 Introduction: Excursus on Bilingualism in Latin Literature.....	193
5.2 Bilingual Blends.....	214
5.2.1 <i>mantiscinari</i>	215
5.2.1.1 Textual Notes.....	216
5.2.1.2 Formation.....	217
5.2.1.3 Interpretation.....	220
5.2.2 <i>merdaleus</i>	231
5.2.2.1 Textual Notes.....	232
5.2.2.2 Formation.....	233
5.2.2.3 Interpretation.....	234
5.2.3 <i>imbubinare</i> and <i>imbulbitare</i>	251
5.2.3.1 Textual Notes.....	251
5.2.3.2 Formation.....	252
5.2.3.3 Interpretation.....	253
5.2.4 <i>Crucisalus</i>	255
3.2.4.1 Textual Notes.....	256
3.2.4.2 Formation.....	257

3.2.4.3 Interpretation.....	259
5.3 Conclusion.....	260
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	262
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	268
APPENDIX I. ANCIENT RHETORICAL THEORY AND BLEND FORMATION.....	297
APPENDIX II. ADDITIONAL LEXICAL BLENDS IN GREEK AND LATIN.....	303
II.1 <i>Paschienus</i> or <i>Pathienus</i>	303
II.2 <i>Pacisculus</i> and <i>Tollius</i>	304

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

I abbreviate the names of ancient Greek authors and their works as in LSJ, except that I omit an author's name in the case of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and the names of ancient Latin authors and their works as in the *OLD*. In cases where an ancient author or work is omitted from either LSJ or the *OLD*, I have tried to give as clear an abbreviation as possible. Except when otherwise indicated, my numbering of Greek fragments follows *PCG* for the comic poets; *TrGF* for the tragic poets; Voigt for Sappho and Alcaeus; *PMG*'s continuous numbering for the lyric poets; Degani for Hipponax; Maehler for Pindar; *SH* for Hellenistic poets; *SVF* for the Stoic philosophers. And except when otherwise indicated, my numbering of Latin fragments follows Ribbeck³ for Republican dramatists except Ennius, for whom I cite Goldberg–Manuwald, and Plautus, for whom I cite Lindsay; Blänsdorf for epic and lyric poets; and Malcovati for Cato's orations.

I cite Erotian from Nachmanson; the *Etymologicum Magnum* from Gaisford; the *Etymologicum Gudianum* α–ζ from Stefani; the *Etymologicum Gudianum* ζ–ω from Sturz; the *Etymologicum Genuinum* from Lasserre–Livadaras; Eustathius from Majoranus, but with cross references to the editions of van der Valk and Stallbaum; the Greek grammarians from *Grammatici Graeci*; Harpocration from Keaney; Hippocrates from Littré; Hesychius α–ο from Latte; Hesychius π–σ from Hansen; Hesychius τ–ω from Hansen–Cunningham; Moeris from Hansen; the paroemiographers from Leutsch–Schneidewin; Orion from Sturz; Pausanias Grammaticus from Erbse; Photius from Theodoridis; Phrynichus' *Eclogae* from Fisher;

Phrynichus' *Praeparatio Sophistica* from de Borries; Pollux from Bethe; the scholia to Aristophanes from Holwerda *et al.*; the scholia to the *Iliad* from Erbse; the scholia to the *Odyssey* from Dindorf; the *Suda* from Adler; and the *Synagoge* from Cunningham. I cite the Latin grammarians from *Grammatici Latini*; and Nonius and Festus from Lindsay.

The following authors and/or works are cited throughout as follows:

- Beekes Robert Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European Dictionary Series 10/1–2: Leiden and Boston, 2010)
- Buck–Petersen Carl Darling Buck and Walter Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*² (Chicago, 1945)
- Chantraine Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque* (supp. by Alain Blanc, Charles de Lamberterie, and Jean-Louis Perpillou: Paris, 1998)
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
- de Vaan Michiel de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* (Leiden Indo-European Dictionary Series 7: Leiden and Boston, 2008)
- EAGLL* Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (3 vols.: Leiden, 2014)
- Ernout–Meillet Alfred Ernout and Alfred Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Latine* (Paris, 1968)
- IACP* Mogens H. Hansen and Thomas H. Nielson (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004)

- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*
- Kassel–Austin see *PCG*
- Kock Theodor Kock (ed.), *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* (3 vols.: 1880–1888, Leipzig)
- LIV* Helmut Rix and Martin Kümmel (eds.), *Lexicon der Indogermanischen Verben*² (Wiesbaden, 2001)
- Lewis–Short Charleton T. Lewis and Charles Short (eds.), *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879)
- LGPN* P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews (eds., vols. i, iiiA–B, iv) and M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne (eds., vol. ii), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (Oxford, 1994–)
- LSJ Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott (eds.), *A Greek–English Lexicon*⁹ (rev. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, rev. supp. by P. G. W. Glare: Oxford, 1996)
- Montanari Franco Montanari *et al.* (eds.), *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (Leiden and Boston, 2015)
- OLD* *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1968)
- PA* J. Kirchner (ed.), *Prosopographia Attica* (2 vols.: Berlin, 1901, 1903; repr. Chicago, 1981)
- PAA* J. Traill (ed.), *Persons of Ancient Athens* (21 vols.: Toronto, 1994–2012)

- PCG* Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* (8 vols.: Berlin and New York, 1983–2001)
- PMG* D. L. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962)
- Pokorny Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*⁵ (2 vols.: Tübingen, 2005)
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
- SH* Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Texte und Commentare 11: Berlin and New York, 1983)
- Stephanis I. E. Stephanis, *Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνῖται* (Heracleon, 1988)
- TLL* *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (11 vols.: Munich, 1900–)
- TrGF* Bruno Snell *et al.* (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (6 vols.: Göttingen, 1971–2004)
- Walde–Hofmann A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (2 vols.: Heidelberg, 1938)

CHAPTER 1. PLAUTINE *MADULSA* AND THE STUDY OF BLENDING

Plaut. *Ps.* 1246-52

quid hoc? sicine hoc fit, pedes? statin an non?

an id voltis, ut me hinc iacentem aliquis tollat?

nam hercle si cecidero, vestrum erit flagitium.

pergitin pergere? ah, serviendum mihi

hodie est; magnum hoc vitium vino est:

pedes captat primum, luctator dolosust.

*profecto edepol ego nunc probe habeo **madulsam**.*¹

How's this? Is this okay, feet? Are you standing up or not? Or do you want this: that someone pick me up as I lie here? For, by god, if I do fall, then it'll be your fault. Are you going to go? Ah! I must do the serving today. This is the great fault of wine: First it lays hold of the feet; it's a tricky wrestler. Surely, by god, I'm truly **plasted**.

The context of the passage makes it clear that the word *madulsam* ought to mean something like “drunkenness”, depending on the text read,² and this is the gloss given by Lewis–Short *s. v.*, who then cite the testimony of Festus for its meaning and etymology: *ebrius, a Graeco μαδᾶν deductum vel quia madidus satis a vino* (“drunken,

¹ Translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.

² The Ambrosian Palimpsest, the oldest known manuscript of Plautus, reads *abeo madulsa*, in which case *madulsa* ought to be mean something like “a drunken man”. But this reading is not generally adopted.

drawn from Greek *madân* ('be drunk') or because it means thoroughly besotted (*madidus*) with wine"). Festus is, it will turn out, not entirely off the mark in positing a connection between *madulsa* and *madidus*. Ernout–Meillet *s. v.* suggest that *madulsa* is an “abstrait formé plaisamment sur *rupulsa*, ou avec un suffixe vulgaire (étrusque?) analogue à celui de *gemursa*. N'est pas, comme le dit faussement l'abrégé de Festus, 113, 9, l'équivalent de *madidus*.”³ The *OLD s. v.*, on the other hand, says of *madulsa*: “[from *madeo*, perh. influenced by *mulsa*] (app.) The state of drunkenness.” And de Vaan *s. v.* merely reports an opinion like that of the *OLD*: “The Plautine invention *madulsa* is said to have been formed [to] invoke *mulsus* ‘honeyed’, f. *mulsa* (*potio*)” (358). Thus, while Ernout–Meillet suggest that *madulsa* is an analogical creation, both the *OLD* and de Vaan posit that *madulsa* is a blend of two different words, a kind of lexical neologism that is sometimes called a “portmanteau” or, more commonly now, simply a “lexical blend”,⁴ the term I will use in this dissertation, along with (*lexical*)

³ Ernout–Meillet translate *ego nunc probe habeo madulsam* as “J’ai maintenant une belle cuite”.

⁴ The terminology in English (as in German and French, which are with respect to blends the languages most studied after English) for blends and blending is inconsistent, a fact that has been much lamented (Hansen 1963; Rodríguez González 1989; Cannon 2000; Bauer 2013). Within these languages individually, there is virtually no terminological consensus, a fact which owes in part to the lack of definitional consensus on blends; however, among the languages collectively, there are sometimes terminological parallels.

Wentworth 1933 was the first to point out the peculiarity of there being such a multitude of terms for a single phenomenon and summarized the causes thus: “The diversity among these terms arises partly from the invention of new ones, in ignorance of those in existence, and partly through a desire to differentiate among types or to include all types in one term” (78). Yet while there may exist no terminological consensus among scholars, within a particular work or a single scholar’s body of work the terms used of lexical blending tend to be well differentiated and defined.

Nor has the situation much remedied itself since Wentworth’s time. Cannon 2000. 953 remarked that “[o]ver the last century, the extensive scholarship on blends has

blending to refer to the process of word formation whereby a *blend* is created. Additionally, I will use the terms *source words* to refer to the two or more words that go into the making of a *blend*; and *splinters* to refer to a blend's constitutive elements. For example, the source words of the blend *brunch* are *breakfast* and *lunch*; the splinters of *brunch* are *br-* and *-unch*.

The term *portmanteau*, a loan from French that originally denoted a leather suitcase that opens into two halves, was first used as a term for blended words by Lewis Carroll. In his children's book *Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There* (1871), Humpty Dumpty acts as an exegete for the titular Alice, explaining the meaning and etymology of some of the curious, nonce words in one of the several

contributed about thirty names for this phenomenon, most of which were one-time uses. They have differing names in various languages: e.g., Span. *el cruce léxico*, Fr. *le mélange*, and Germ. *Kontamination*, with earlier competing forms like *Vermischung* and *Mischform* now faded. The English borrowing of *Kontamination* added a grotesque, illogical, ungrammatical sense to its adapted form, *contamination*, which helped lead to its general replacement by *blend*. But dated synonyms still occasionally appear, such as Lewis Carroll's **portmanteau (word)**, as well as **haplologic word** and **lapse**," while Renner–Maniez–Arnaud 2013, in an introduction to a collection of papers on lexical blending, devotes a section to the terminological dissonance that yet obtains, noting however that "the term *lexical blend* has mostly displaced [Lewis] Carroll's *portmanteau* as the preferred term in English scholarship" (2).

In English, the following are, in addition to those already mentioned, some of the terms that have been used at one time or another to refer to lexical blends: amalgam, fusion, merger, conflation, coalesced word, hybrid, brunch-word, pivot-word, counter-word, cross-form, telescoped word, overlapping word, sandwich word, and cannibal word. In German: Portmanteau-Wort, Amalgamierungsform, Kreuzungswort, Wortverschmelzung, Zusammenziehung, haplologische Wortzusammenziehung, Kontraktion, Mischwort, Kombi-Wort, Wortverschränkung, Klappwort, Kapselwort, Koppelwort, Schachtelwort, Tandemwort, Teleskopwort. In French: *contamination*, *portmanteau*, *mot-valise*, *amalgam*, *mot-tandem*, *télescopage*, *mot-croisé*, *compromot*.

poems within the story, *Jabberwocky*: “Well, ‘slithy’ means ‘lithe and slimy.’ ‘Lithe’ is the same as ‘active.’ You see, it’s like a portmanteau – there are two meanings packed up into one word,” (215) Humpty Dumpty says to Alice after she confesses that the poem “seems very pretty ... but it’s rather hard to understand! ... Somehow it seems to fill my head with ideas—only I don’t exactly know what they are!” (150).

Carroll further pondered the process of lexical blending in the preface to the *The Hunting of the Snark* (1876. 10):

For instance, take the two words “fuming” and “furious.” Make up your mind that you will say both words, but leave it unsettled which you will say first. Now open your mouth and speak. If your thoughts incline ever so little towards “fuming,” you will say “fuming-furious;” if they turn, by even a hair’s breadth, towards “furious,” you will say “furious-fuming;” but if you have the rarest of gifts, a perfectly balanced mind, you will say “frumious”.

Carroll was one of the first, if not *the* first, to put a name to blends, thereby helping to popularize them and the process whereby they are formed, and he added numerous intentional blends to the lexical stock of English, some of which like “chortle” (< *snort* and *chuckle*) remain in use. As noted below, however, blends certainly occur in many languages. They are attested in English long before Carroll’s insight.⁵

⁵ Three early examples of lexical blends according to the *OED* are *ribible* “a kind of stringed instrument,” from *rebibe* and *rebelle* (both kinds of stringed instruments), dating from *ca.* 1330; *drubly* “turbid, troubled,” a blend of *trobly* “troubly” and *drof* “turbid”, dating from *ca.* 1340; and *foolosopher*, a blend of *fool* and *philosopher*, dating from 1549. And in Shakespeare is found *bubukle*, a blend of *bubo* “an inflamed abscess” and *carbuncle* (*Henry V*, III, VI, 108).

Since the early 20th century, blends and blending in English especially have been studied extensively and the literature thereon is voluminous. Already at the beginning of the 20th century, speakers of English had seized upon blending with alacrity and this process of word formation quickly became something of an acceptable trend that seemed worthy of investigation. An early monograph (Pound 1914) said of blends: “[t]here seems to be no doubt that, as word creation becomes a more conscious process, factitious amalgam forms [i.e. blends] are growing in favor” (12). Early scholarly works on blends were predominantly descriptive, attempting to give a taxonomy of blends according to their “manner of origin, or predominant motive in coalescence” (Pound 1914. 19).⁶ Although it was early agreed that functionally blending was a form of wit (Pound 1914; Withington 1931, 1933; Berrey 1939), what formal constraints, if any, govern their formation remains unclear.

Cannon 1986 broadly claims that “the process of blending seems to occur in all languages, to be very common in them, and to occur in every stage of the individual language’s development” (725).⁷ Cannon’s claim has since been, it seems, vindicated by the attestation and study of lexical blends in numerous typologically diverse

⁶ Pound 1914. 20–1, for example, distinguished the following general classes of blends: clever literary coinages (*sneakret*); political terms (*Prohiblican*); nonce blends (*sweedle*); children’s coinages (*tremense*); conscious folk formations (*solemncholy*); unconscious folk formations (*insinuendo*); coined place-names and personal names (*Ohiowa*; *Romiette*); scientific terms (*dextrose*); and, commercial terms (*Nabisco*).

⁷ Bertinetto 2004. 4 however, disputes the notion that lexical blending occurs in all languages, claiming that “Spanish, for instance, exhibits virtually no examples”—this on the dubious evidence that he has “not been able to find a single one, despite consulting a few Spanish colleagues.” However, Piñeros 2000, 2004 offers multiple examples of lexical blends from Spanish such as *pechonalidad* (< *pecho* and *personalidad*), meaning “the personality of a woman with the implication that her chest is an important part of it.”

languages such as French (Bertinetto 2004; Fradin–Montermini–Plénat 2009), Hebrew (Bat-El 1996), and Mandarin Chinese and Farsi (Ronneberger-Sibold 2013).

Corollary to Cannon’s assertion that blending seems to occur at each stage of a language’s development is his claim that “[b]lends are a very old kind of word formation, occurring in many of the world’s languages as early as Vedic Sanskrit, Attic Greek, Latin, and Old High German” (956). Frustratingly, he cites no sources for blends in these old languages and offers only one unsatisfactory example from Latin: *te decora* (Plaut. *Mil.* 619), a syntactic rather than lexical blend of, he claims, the syntagms *te decet* and *tibi decus*. It bears pointing out here that lexical blending differs from syntactic blending and from what might be called morphological blending. The latter two respectively involve the blending of syntagms or morphemes rather than lexemes, and both are conventionally and more traditionally described as the products of “analogy” rather than blending. Plautus’ *te decora* (instead of either *te decet* or *tibi decus*) involves blending two different syntactic constructions. Likewise Latin *nec ... quidem* “nor ... even” can be described as the syntactic blending of *nec* “nor” with *ne ... quidem* “not ... even”.⁸ Greek indirect statements using $\varphi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ with $\delta\tau\iota$ likely result from the syntactic blending of $\varphi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ with an infinitive and $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ with $\delta\tau\iota$.⁹ Morphological blending involves blending together two different morphemes: for example, the rare Greek first person dual middle ending $-\mu\epsilon\theta\omicron\nu$ results from

⁸ E.g. Plaut. *As.* 190 *nec meum quidem edepol* (“nor even mine, by Pollux”), against which compare *Bac.* 1027 *ne unum quidem hercle* (“not even one, by Hercules”); and see Leumann 1972 II.448–50.

⁹ E.g. X. *An.* 7.1.5; and see Smyth 1956 § 2017a.

morphologically blending the first person plural middle ending -μεθα and the second person dual middle ending -σθον.¹⁰

Morphological blends often appear as analogical innovations that have become fully integrated into the grammar of a language and therefore constitute diachronic rather than synchronic phenomena. An example in Greek is the extension of the verb ending -ίζω, derived prehistorically by palatalization from roots ending in -ιδ or -ιγ, to stems ending in other consonants or vowels.¹¹ To be sure, lexical blends too can sometimes be accepted as “normal” words whose blended origin is no longer salient (*motel*, *smog*, and *brunch* are perhaps examples), but if so, that is a diachronic phenomenon that is separate from the factors involved in their coinage.

Despite the occurrence of bona fide lexical blends in Greek and Latin, as will be shown below, their existence has not been generally acknowledged or even recognized. The brief statement of de Vaan quoted above is, it seems, as much as he has to say on blends. Similarly, Beekes neglects blends in Greek, citing, it seems, just two examples of what purport to be blends: δοάσσαί, an aorist optative of δοιάζω “be

¹⁰ Cf. *Il.* 23.485 περιδώμεθον “we two put around”; *S. El.* 950 λελείμμεθον “we two have been left”; *Ph.* 1079 ὀρμώμεθον “we two set out”; *Ath.* 3.98a συντριβησόμεθον “we two will be crushed” and ἀπολούμεθον “we two will be destroyed”, both attributed to Pompeianus of Philadelphia, whose other quotations in the same passage contain many solecisms and who, Olson 2007. 533 n. 12 suggests, may have been a model for the eponymous arch-Atticist of Lucian’s *Lexiphanes*. However, Wackernagel 1916. 55 (followed by West, who prints περιδώμεθα in his edition of the *Iliad*) dismisses the Homeric form as an Atticism, while the manuscripts of Sophocles are divided between the forms in -μεθον and -μεθα.

Other extant forms in -μεθον are given only as examples in ancient grammatical works: for example, in a full conjugation of the verb τύπτω “hit” at in the *Supplementa Artis Dionysianae Vetusta* (*Grammatici Graeci* I.1 pp. 126–31); and in a full conjugation of the verb τίθημι “put” at Theodos. *Grammatici Graeci* IV.1 pp. 87–97.

¹¹ Horrocks 2014. 308

of two minds; hesitate; have in mind” in lieu of the expected aorist optative *δοιάξαι* that allegedly results from blending with *δοάσσατο* “it seemed”;¹² and *ἔνδιον* (“in the afternoon”) in the phrase *ἔνδιον ὕδωρ* (“heavenly water”), where it seems to mean “heavenly” by, according to Beekes *s. v.*, blending with *δῖος* “divine, godlike.” However, each of these examples would be better classified as a folk-etymology than as a blend.¹³ Nor do there seem to be discussions of blends or blending in other, standard etymological lexica of Greek or Latin (Chantraine; Walde–Hofmann; Ernout–Meillet), standard historical grammars of Greek or Latin (Chantraine 1933; Schwyzer 1953; Leumann 1977), or recenter outlines of Greek or Latin grammar (e.g. Weiss 2010).

Leaving aside for now the question of formation of *madulsa* and looking rather at its pragmatics, what does Plautus achieve by using such a word in the passage above? That is, what is the function of this blend in this passage? Provisionally, the coinage adds to the linguistic exuberance of the passage which additionally is marked by alliteration (*ita magnis munditiis et dis dignis*), etymological jingles (*agere ambages*), the personification of feet, and the humorous metaphor of drink as a wily wrestler. That is, the blend here is yet another device in Plautus’ stock of verbal

¹² *s. v.* *δοιοί*: “δοιάζω, -ομαι, aor. δοιάξαι, also δοάσσαι (through blending with *δοάσσατο*) ‘linger, deliberate’, also (after *δοάσσατο*) ‘imagine, believe’.” What Beekes seems to have in mind here is that Apollonius Rhodius has evidently conflated *δοιάζω* “be of two minds; hesitate; have in mind” and Homeric *δοάσσατο* “seemed” at 3.770 *ἐζομένη δῆπειτα δοάσσατο φώνησέν τε* (“then she sat there deliberating and said”); 954–5 *ὄππότε δοῦπον / ἦ ποδὸς ἢ ἀνέμοιο παραθρέξαντα δοάσσαι* (“whenever she doubted whether a noise passing by was that of a footstep or the wind”); and 4.575–6 *τὰ δ’ ἠεροειδέα λούσσειν / οὔρεα δοιάζοντο Κεραύνια* (“and they imagined they could see the misty Ceraunian mountains”).

¹³ There may be some overlap between blending and folk-etymology (cf. Friedrich 2008. 18–20), but *ἔνδιον* is at best a compound, not a blend. See Chapter 2 below. Neither of the word’s constituents is a splinter on the model of *br-unch* or *pecho-nalidad*.

fireworks. More subtly, the blend *madulsa* “performs” just how drunk Pseudolus is: not only does he stumble over his own feet, but he trips over his own tongue, entangling both his feet and his words. It offers a brief meta-commentary on the mental state of its speaker: not only is Pseudolus besotted, but he is foolishly and tastelessly (*insulsus*) or perhaps extravagantly (*mulsum*, an expensive drink) so.

There is, additionally, an element of wit (what Humpty Dumpty called a “balanced mind”) in *madulsa* that humorously conveys an imprecise yet vivid impression. This imprecision is itself a part of the wit: drunken (*madidus*), on expensive wine (*mulsum*), witty (*salsus*), boorish (*insuslus*)—perhaps all at once. This shows that blends are interesting for at least three reasons: 1) their formal constituents; 2) their semantics; and 3) their pragmatic functions. The last of these three, in turn, entails both socio-linguistic and literary perspectives such as how the use of blends reflects on the social context and how it helps to construct an artistic or literary dynamic. All these perspectives are considered in the discussion of individual examples in the chapters to follow.

Just as there is terminological inconsistency when it comes to blends, so too is there a lack of agreement as to what constitutes a blend and what does not.¹⁴ Much

¹⁴ Bauer 2013. 11. Cannon 2010, for example, broadly suggests that “[b]lending can be defined as a process of word formation in which two (or, rarely, three) separate source items are telescoped into a new form, which usually exhibits overlapping and retains some of the meaning of at least one of the source items” (952). On the other hand, Ralli-Xydopoulos 2013 limits blends to only those complex words where no source word remains fully intact. By this more restrictive definition, *sexploitation*, along with *slanguage* and *alcoholiday*, would not be blends. If not blends, however, they are surely something very similar regardless of what they are called. Certainly, they are not compounds, unless the conventional definition of the latter is to be broadened to include such formations. Following a similar tack, Grésillon 1984a, 1984b; Kemmer 2000; and Fradin 2000 consider a complex word a blend only in cases where

scholarship has been devoted to distinguishing blends from the products of other processes of word formation, to distinguishing among different kinds of blends, to explaining why blends have the structure that they do, and to eliciting the rules which govern blends' formation. Generally, the results of this work are neither entirely satisfactory nor universally accepted. Such definitional hair-splitting also tends to beg other questions (if not blends, then what?) and obscures blends' most salient characteristic: their relative freedom from structural constraint. It is that freedom that makes blends witty and vivid. For this reason, *madulsa* works even better if it evokes both *insulsus* and *mulsum* as well as *madidus* and *salsus*.

In this dissertation I will consider as a blend any word in which two or more separate source-words are "telescoped" into a new, complex word whose formal and semantic properties cannot be well explained by appeal to compounding or grammatical derivation.

Chapter 2 (Compounding and Blending) will survey the history of the study of compounding in Greek and Latin historical grammar and review the types of compounds that are traditionally recognized as such. This discussion will provide a backdrop against which to situate the distinctive formal and semantic characteristics of lexical blends as a kind of word formation that is different from compounds.

the left source word has been back-clipped and the right source word has been fore-clipped. For example, in *brunch* the left source word *breakfast* has been clipped to *br-*, while the right source word *lunch* has been clipped to *-unch*. Also, by this definition *sexploitation*, since both source words are not unambiguously clipped (either *sex* or *exploitation* could be fully intact). Conversely, Arcodia-Montermini 2013 consider the overlapping of source words as an essential feature of blends and would consider *sexploitation* a blend. This large area of disagreement is beyond the scope of the present investigation, however.

Chapter 3 (Onomastic Blends in Greek and Latin) identifies blends in which one of the source words is a proper noun or adjective and situates such blends within the broader context of onomastic humor in Greek and Latin. Chapter 4 extends the analysis to non-onomastic blends, while Chapter 5 considers the special category of bilingual blends in Latin, including an excursus on Roman bilingualism. The discussion of individual examples in each of Chapters 3–5 begins with the textual evidence and context for the item at issue, then turns to the formal and semantic characteristics that establish its blended identity, and finally considers pragmatic issues relevant to how the blend “works” as a communicational and/or artistic device in its context.

The attention to be devoted to pragmatic issues perhaps requires further explanation. The functional aspects of word formation in Greek and Latin are understudied. About word formation in ancient Greek, Wouters *et al.* 2014 suggest that, while the enlargement and differentiation of the lexicon is the primary function of word formation, it can have a “stylistic use”, but they do not elaborate what such a stylistic use may be. “Stylistic” to what end and with what effect? Tribulato 2015, in turn, devotes but a few pages amid a 400-plus page discussion of ancient Greek verb-initial compounds and their diachronic development to stylistic considerations. In discussing the stylistics of verb-initial compounds in ancient Greek comedy, she concludes little more than that such compounds often evoke religious and elevated poetic language and are thus “parodic”.¹⁵ “Parodic” of what? In order to avoid the

¹⁵ The functional side of word formation is in general understudied, with naming often presented as the sole rationale for forming new words (e.g. Downing 1977). Although it

questions begged by such vague characterizations, I attempt in my discussion of blends to address explicitly how each coinage functions in whatever can be recovered of its context.

1.1 ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

Positing the existence of any significant number of lexical blends in classical languages is already a controversial hypothesis. Since this category of word formation has not, to my knowledge, been generally recognized either by ancient grammarians and rhetoricians or by the more modern tradition of classical scholarship, there is no convenient reference tool or data-set to assist one in the search for blend candidates. In this dissertation I do not claim to have identified all the lexical blends that may be attested in Greek and Latin literature. I do, however, believe I have identified enough clear examples to prove that this category of word formation did exist and was exploited for humorous purposes in both languages.

In order to locate blend candidates I began my search with two assumptions. First, as formally unique nonce formations, blends would tend to be largely avoided

cannot be denied that naming is a central function of words, especially from the point of view of building a lexicon, some scholarship on the functional aspects of word formation has considered functions that are not easily subsumed under “naming” (e.g. Dederding 1983; Kastovsky 1978; Lipka 2000. 171–3; Wladowa 1975). Moreover, other functions are connected to naming but clearly go beyond that function: for example, in the world of drama where *ad-hoc* speaking names are not uncommon, naming itself falls short as an explanation for these instances of word formation. Thus, without denying the saliency of this simple, monolithic function of word formation, what else does word formation *do*? And what are some of the fundamentally pragmatic, communicative aspects of nonce formations such as blends, apart from naming?

in the higher genres of classical literature. More likely they would be found, if anywhere, in the stylistically more fluid and exuberant genres, such as Old Comedy, Plautine Comedy, iambography, mime, epigram, satire, and perhaps epistolography. Even in these more fluid genres, however, blends would still be relatively rare because of their novelty. It hardly needs to be said that classical literature was generally not a demotic art-form, while blends generally are a form of demotic speech. As we shall see, at least two non-literary blends (Latin *Rabienus* and *Biberius*) arose in a demotic context. Second, as neologisms, blends would likely be *hapax legomena*, unless perhaps the word is repeated in the same context as its first attestation. Working from these assumptions I went about finding blend candidates in Greek and Latin two ways: by perusing LSJ and the *OLD* for *hapax* and *bis legomena* (an onerous task, indeed); and by reading through comedic texts (not just Greek and Latin comedy proper, but also, for example, mime, iambic poetry, and satire), singling out *prima facie* curious words. Considerations of time precluded extending the search to epistolography and epigram. Once I had compiled a list of candidates, I analyzed the etymology and derivational structure of each. Those that plausibly combined two or more lexemes but could not be explained as compounds or morphological derivatives of either source were considered serious candidates for blends. Thereafter, I sought to clarify the formal structure of each putative blend, to consider and control for the possibility of textual inaccuracy, to define the word's semantic reference(s), and to assess its pragmatic function(s) in context.

CHAPTER 2. COMPOUNDING AND BLENDING

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Traditional analyses of word formation in Greek and Latin focus on two processes: derivation and compounding, both of which are regular, systematic, and widely productive in both languages.¹⁶ Yet there are words in Greek and Latin whose formations cannot be well explained through derivation or compounding because they contain non-morphemic constituents: derivation and compounding operate on morphemic constituents such as lexical roots, stem-formants, prefixes, and affixes. Blends, however, combine source-words at points of phonetic overlap rather than at morphemic boundaries: for example, English *chortle*, as a blend of “ch-ck-le” and “sn-ort”, is comprised of elements that have no grammatical function or semantic content in themselves.¹⁷

This chapter has two aims. The first is to introduce concepts that are used for the analysis of compounds in Greek and Latin to make clear what compounds are. The second is to demonstrate how blends differ from compounds. Compounds and blends are formed, it will be seen, through different yet not wholly dissimilar

¹⁶ On compounding in Latin, e.g. Bader 1962; Benedetti 1988; Lindner 1996, 2002; Balles 2008; Brucale 2012. In Greek, e.g. Sommer 1948; Schwyzler 1953 I.425–55; Balles 2008; Tribulato 2015, esp. 13–132.

¹⁷ While it is possible that the word *chortle*, once formed, could subsequently be re-analyzed into a lexical root (*chort-*) and a derivational suffix (*-le*), thereby giving rise to a back-formed verb *to chort*, that would be a separate and further development in the evolution of the lexeme. Currently, a putative word *chort* is not listed in dictionaries of standard English usage, such as the *OED* and *AHD*.

processes. Since blends have been unstudied in Greek and Latin, a conceptual framework for investigating their structure, meaning, and function is lacking, but the framework used in reference to compounding will be a useful starting point. Grammatical derivation is different from both compounding and blending, but it is relevant to accounting for the form of lexemic constituents and thereby distinguishing stems from splinters.

2.2 COMPOUNDS AND COMPOUNDING

A compound is a word in which “zwei (oder mehr) erkennbare Wortstämme oder Wörter als sog. Kompositionsglieder unter einem einzigen Akzent zu einer Worteinheit zusammengefasst sind” (Leumann 1977. 383).¹⁸ Compounding is a well-attested and widely-exploited process of word formation cross-linguistically,¹⁹ which has been studied from a wide range of methodological perspectives.²⁰ Even so, a

¹⁸ No definition of a compound is entirely unproblematic, and this one is no exception: for example, the definition of a word is not a simple matter; and some compounds are no longer recognizable as such to speakers. On definitional problems generally, see e.g. Olsen 2000. 897–903.

¹⁹ Although it has been suggested that compounding is a linguistic universal (e.g. Libben 2006. 2), there is no consensus as to whether it is or not (cf. Bauer 2017. 1). It is, however, attested in very many typologically-diverse languages around the world: for example, in Chinese (cf. Sun 2006. 49–55; Ceccagno–Basciano 2007), Maori (cf. Harlow 2007. 130), and Lango (cf. Noonan 1992. 115). See in general Bauer 2001, 2017 (each with numerous examples from dozens of typologically diverse languages).

²⁰ As is the case with blends, the study of compounds and their classification has seen English attain a prominence in recent decades. This is the consequence of two facts: (1) the high productivity of compounds in English, which has prompted in-depth studies of their characteristics; and (2) the development of new linguistic approaches in English-speaking countries. As a result, the bulk of recent bibliography on compounding has engaged with

definitive definition of a compound remains elusive, primarily because the boundary between compounding and other syntactic and morphological constructions, such as derivation and prefixed verbs, is not always clear.²¹

2.3 ANCIENT GREEK AND LATIN COMPOUNDING AS STEM²² COMPOUNDING

Modern English, as opposed to older bibliography that engaged with the older Indo-European languages. There is sometimes tension between current approaches and the approaches traditional to Indo-European studies. For a general overview of the different perspectives from which compounding has been studied, see Olsen 2000. For overviews of various perspectives, see Lieber–Štekauer 2009a.

²¹ Although both derivation and compounding often involve bound elements such as root or stem allomorphs, in those cases where unbound elements are involved there is no formal criterion to make a distinction between a derivational and a compounding process (e.g. is “comfort-able” a derivative or a compound?). Even if a distinction is made between derivation as involving one lexical morpheme and a grammatical morpheme, and compounding as involving at least two lexical morphemes, the status of prepositional elements in combination with lexical morphemes is still ambiguous: are they to be considered prefixes (i.e. grammatical affixes), giving rise to a derivational result, or are they to be regarded as prepositions with some lexical content, forming a compound with the lexical morpheme (e.g. “with-stand”)? I see little to be gained by making a further distinction between compounds and “parasyntetic compounds,” defined by Melloni–Bisetto 2010. 199 as “a word-formation ... consisting of the merger of two lexical stems (forming a non-existent compound) with a derivational suffix.”

There is also the related issue that many derivational suffixes originate historically as the second constituent of compounds: e.g. Eng. *-ly* and Ger. *-lich* < PGmc. **-līkaz* “having the body or form of” < PGmc. **līka* “body” (cf. Eng. *lich* and Ger. *Leiche*); or perhaps Grk. *-ποιος* (e.g. *δολοποιός* “treacherous”; *τυφλοποιός* “blinding”). On affixoids, see e.g. Booij–Hüning 2014. 77–106.

²² In its basic definition, a stem is: “a word-class-specific lexeme representation stripped of any inflectional endings, which has to combine with additional derivational and/or inflectional morphemes in order to function as a word” (Kastovsky 2009. 324).

According to Ralli 2009. 457, the use of stems rather than full words is connected to the fact that certain languages, Greek and Latin included, have stem-based inflectional morphology: the exclusion of inflectional markers from the first constituent is a defining characteristic of compounding in these languages.

A characteristic that distinguishes compounds in Greek and Latin from those in many other languages is that Greek and Latin compounds typically involve a first constituent that does not correspond to a full word but rather to a stem and a second constituent that may consist of either another stem (plus inflectional morpheme) or an independently attested word, which often shows special derivational suffixes when used in compounding. So, while the English compounds *bookbag*, *baseball*, and *tablecloth* can each be described as composed of two otherwise free-standing words (*book*, *bag*, etc.), the same is not true of typical Greek compounds, such as νεβρο-φόνο-ς “fawn-killing” and θηρ-ο-δίωξ (< -δίωκ-ς) “hunter” (lit. “animal-chaser”), and Latin compounds, such as *bi-form-is* “two-shaped” and *arti-fex* (< *-fec-s*) “artisan”.

In νεβροφόνοϛ the first constituent νεβρο- corresponds to a stem, not to a full word, which in its nominative singular is νεβρός; the second constituent -φόνοϛ corresponds to the autonomous word φονός “killer”, but it should be noted that the compound does not retain the accent of the simplex. In *biformis*, the first constituent *bi-* corresponds to a stem, rather than a full word (cf. the adverb *bis* “twice”); the second constituent *-formis* is not attested as an independent word but corresponds to the stem *form-* (cf. *forma* “shape”), to which third declension endings have been added. In θηροδίωξ, the first constituent θηρο- is a stem (cf. θήρ “wild animal”) plus a “linking-vowel” (on which, see below); the second constituent consists of the verbal root διωκ- (cf. διώκω “chase”), to which the nominative singular ending -ς has been added, but the form *δίωξ is not attested independently as a word, only as the second

constituent of this compound.²³ Similarly, in *artifex*, the first constituent is a stem rather than an autonomous word; the second constituent *-fex*, a bound form found only in compounds, consists of the verbal root *fec-/fac-* to which the nominative singular ending *-s* has been added.²⁴

The general principle to be derived from these examples is that Greek and Latin compounding is typically stem compounding and that the first constituent is typically a stem (possibly with linking vowel).²⁵ And as for the second constituents of compounds, it is possible to distinguish between bound and unbound forms. The former do not appear as independent words, whereas the latter can do so, although sometimes with a difference of accent.

2.4 THE LINKING VOWEL²⁶

²³ But this may be due to the limited extents of the Greek and Latin corpora.

²⁴ Therefore, if one chooses to make the distinction, this would be an example of a “parasynthetic” compound; cf. n. 21 above.

²⁵ Some compounds in Latin show syncope of a stem-final vowel in the first constituent, especially compounds of *manu-* “hand”, such as *mancipium* “taking in hand”, *mantelium* “towel”, and *malluviae* “hand-washing water”.

²⁶ Ralli 2009. 455–7 argues that the *-o-* of Modern Greek is a marker whose “primary function ... is to indicate the process of compound formation.” Furthermore, she argues that the presence of such marking is explained by the inflectional richness of Greek and the fact that its compounds are stem-based: thus, in languages with no inflection (e.g. English) or in languages where compounding is based on autonomous words (e.g. German), this marking is not needed. But the absence of such marking in English, however, cannot seemingly be explained merely by appeal to English’s lack of inflection, since although Old English was richly inflected, it still lacked such marking (e.g. *dōmhūs* “court” < *dōm* “judgement” and *hūs* “house”).

In Greek, the first constituent of many compounds is a noun-stem, which is to say that the nominative marker, if one exists in the free-standing noun, has been removed: for example, ξενοφόνος “guest-killing” < ξενο- “guest”; βουληφόρος “advice-bearing” < βουλη- “advice”; συφορβός “swine-feeder” < συ- “swine”; πολίαρχος “city-ruling” < πολι- “city”. If the noun-stem forming the first constituent ended in a consonant, a linking vowel was commonly introduced between the two constituents of the compound: for example, παιδοφόνος “child-killing” < παιδ- “child”; πατρόφονος “father-slaying” < πατρ- “father”. The linking vowel is normally -o-, which has been extended by analogy from the *o*-stem declension.

In Latin, historically, the pattern is the same but has been obscured by vowel weakening in non-initial syllables.²⁷ Thus, *o* and *a* have been weakened to *i*, thereby obscuring the original distinction between *o*-stems, *a*-stems, and *i*-stems, as well as consonant stems employing the -*o*- linking vowel that was extended analogically from the *o*-stem declension. For example, compare *equiferus* “wild horse” < *equo*- “horse”; *terrigena* “earth-born” < *terra* “earth”; *anguigena* “snake-born” < *angui*- “snake”; *paludigena* “marsh-born” < *palud*- “marsh”; *patricida* “father-killer” < *patr*-.²⁸

²⁷ On vowel weakening in non-initial syllables, see Weiss 2010. 116.

²⁸ Occasionally one finds compounds in Latin whose linking vowel is -*u*- (e.g. *quadrupes* “quadruped”) or -*e*- (e.g. *legerupus* “law-breaking”), but both of these are morphophonemic variants of /i/ that appear in certain environments (cf. Chase 1900; Weiss 2010. 264). Further exceptions may be due to “sporadic” (i.e. non-rule-governed) alteration of a constituent: e.g. *homi-cida* (vs. **homini*-). Descriptively *homicida* could be considered a blend since its first constituent (*homi*-) is not a morphological stem. If the word did indeed originate as a blend, it was perhaps modeled after *parricida* (the first constituent of which is itself formally obscure); but if instead *homicida* is ultimately derived from a now unattested **homini-cida*, then the word will have originated as a compound. This and a handful of other

2.5 THE SPELLING OF COMPOUNDS

In the Greek and Latin texts printed in modern editions, all the forms identifiable as compounds are written as one word and, in Greek, show only one accent which, in keeping with the rules of accentuation, falls on one of the last three syllables. However, there is no certainty that these texts faithfully represent the situation in spoken Greek and Latin. The way in which compounds were written, namely in capitals and continuous script, leaves room for ambiguity and allows for error on the part of ancient scribes and modern editors in the transmission and editing of texts.

A surer criterion than spelling for determining compoundhood in Greek and Latin is that the inflectional nature of the languages often allows for a distinction between compounds and syntactic phrases. In syntactic phrases, the relationship between the constituents can be made clear by inflectional markers, as in *bello potens* “powerful in war” (Apul. *Soc.* 17). On the other hand, in compounds, the inflectional element indicating the relationship between the constituents is lost, as in *bellipotens* “powerful-in-war” (e.g. Verg. *A.* 11.8). Thus, the difference between *bello potens* and *bellipotens* is morphological rather than purely graphic.

However, Greek and Latin still contain ambiguous cases. Consider the Plautine adjective *turpilucricupidus* “ill-gotten-gain-desirous” (*Trin.* 100). Its second constituent corresponds to the autonomously attested adjective *cupidus* “desirous”, which requires a genitive complement. However, in many cases, the ending of the

“Besonderheiten” noted by Leumann 1977. 390 are rare exceptions to the general transparency of compound-formation.

genitive is orthographically the same as the linking vowel of Latin compounds, although the difference in quantity between the long genitive ending *-ī* and the short linking vowel *-i-* can differentiate them and thus provides a formal criterion with which to classify this adjective as a compound or not. Yet, it is still possible to doubt that *turpilucricupidus* is a compound, since *-cri-* occupies an anceps syllable and its quantity cannot be determined.²⁹ Thus, the sequence <TURPILUCRICUPIDUS> can be rendered as a compound *turpilucricupidus* or as a phrase *turpilucricupidus*, in which *turpilucricri*³⁰ is a genitive dependent on the adjective *cupidus*. Compare, for example, the Plautine phrase *auri cupidus* “desirous of gold” (*Poen.* 179), which is written and regarded as a phrase rather than as a compound **auricupidus*, since the meter guarantees that *auri* has a long *-ī*.

As we shall see, there exists the possibility that the vicissitudes of transmission, the conventions of writing and scribal and/or editorial judgements may have produced or effaced possible blends in the textual record.

2.6 BASIC CRITERIA FOR CLASSIFICATION OF COMPOUNDS

Ancient Greek grammarians did not provide their own classification of compounds, being content with a simple distinction between compounds and derivatives.³¹ The

²⁹ In iambic senarius in Roman comedy, the anceps in the 3rd position is long only about 60% of the time (cf. Gratwick 1993. 44).

³⁰ *turpilucricri* itself is unambiguously a compound. Otherwise the text would read **turpis lucricupidus*.

³¹ Vaahtera 1998

result of this is that most traditional accounts of Greek and Latin compounding have relied on the classification used in the grammars of Classical Sanskrit, which follow Pāṇini, a 4th-century BCE Sanskrit grammarian. The Sanskrit tradition classified compounds according to semantic criteria, distinguishing between: (1) compounds in which both constituents carry the meaning (so-called *dvandvas*, from Sanskrit *dvandva-* “two-two; pair”); (2) compounds in which the second constituent carries the meaning (so-called *tatpurushas*, from Sanskrit *tatpuruṣa-* “that (person’s) man; servant”); and (3) compounds in which an external referent carries the meaning (so-called *bahuvrihis*, from Sanskrit *bahuvrīhi-*, literally “much-rice” but denoting a rich man). The Sanskrit tradition further subdivided *tatpurushas* into three subtypes: (1) *karmadharaya* compounds (from Sanskrit *karmadhāraya-* “work-bearing”), in which the first constituent is an adjective modifying the second; (2) *tatpurushas* proper, in which the first constituent is a noun modifying the second; and (3) *dvigu* (“two-cow”) compounds, in which the first constituent is a numeral.³² As Bauer 2017. 110 notes,

³² Cf. Whitney 1896. 481–515; Burrow 1973. 208–19; Lowe 2015. Franz Bopp 1827. 311–24 introduced the terms “copulative Composita” for *dvandvas*; “possessive Composita” for *bahuvrihis*; “determinative Composita” for *karmadharayas*; “abhängigkeits-Composita” for *tatpurushas*; and “collective Composita” for *dvigu*. His “abhängigkeits-Composita” was, however, short-lived, being already abandoned in Müller 1866. 326–31 and yoked together with his “determinative Composita” under the umbrella term “Determinativkomposita”. Alexandrow 1880. 110 had suggested the term “exocentrische Composita” for Bopp’s “possessive Composita”, which later Wackernagel 1905. 273 criticized as too restrictive, arguing that such compounds were not possessive but rather metonymic; he returned to calling them *bahuvrihis*. Wackernagel 1905. 308–21 also discussed a class of compounds not singled out in the Sanskrit tradition, namely those with a governing first constituent, under the heading “Komposita mit regierendem Vorderglied”; Brugmann 1906. 61 called these “Rektionskomposita”. Monier Williams 1846. 159 coined the terms “descriptive compound” for *karmadharaya* and “dependent compound” for *tatpurusha*. Despite the existence of various other, competing terms, the essential distinctions of the Sanskrit system continue to

the Sanskrit system is descriptively inadequate since it is based on a single language and therefore provides no name for certain kinds of compounds attested in other languages but not in Sanskrit (e.g. compounds like English *killjoy* and Italian *lavapiatti* “wash-plates”, i.e. “dishwasher”). More recent scholarship has aimed to produce a set of universally applicable descriptors that take account of how a compound’s meaning is a function of semantic, syntactic, and formal characteristics.³³

The meaning of a compound is usually compositional but can be unpredictable.³⁴ The unpredictability arises mainly from two characteristics of compounds. First, there are many possible syntactic relations between the constituents of a compound, but those relations are often not overtly marked by formal criteria.³⁵ So, for example, in English *headstone* the first constituent is a locative modifier of the second; in *headlock* it is accusative; in *headphone* it is dative; in *headstand* it is perhaps instrumental; etc.³⁶ Second, compounds and their individual constituents are, like all words, subject to processes of semantic drift. As a metaphor,

be found in standard reference works on Greek and Latin. Thus, for example, in Schwyzer 1953 I.427–55 we find discussed *Kopulative-, Determinative-, Rektions-, and exozentrischen Komposita*; in Smyth 1952. 252–3, determinative, descriptive, dependent, and possessive compounds; in Leumann 1977. 393–403, *Rektions-, Determinativ-, Possessiv-, and Kopulativkomposita*.

³³ Cf. Tribulato 2015; Bauer 2017.

³⁴ On the (un)predictability of novel compounds, e.g. Renouf–Bauer 2000; Štekauer 2009; Bauer 2017. 71–9.

³⁵ As Smyth 1956 § 895 notes, “the logical relation between the parts of compounds varies so greatly that the boundary-lines between the different classes are difficult to set up, and a complete formal division is impossible. The poets show a much wider range of usage than the prose-writers”.

³⁶ Lexicalized phrases are relatively rare exceptions to this formal ambiguity: e.g. Eng. *deathhead*; Grk. Διόσκουροι; Lat. *aquaeductus*.

for example, English *headstart* does not denote a start at the head or with the head or of the head, but an early start, especially one that will expedite further progress. Metonymy accounts for another wildcard in the semantics of compounds. For example, English *redbreast* is a kind of bird and English *blockhead* a kind of person.³⁷ A further factor contributing to the unpredictability of a compound's meaning is loss of compositional saliency.³⁸ This is especially prone to happen in cases where diachronic changes in phonology, morphology, or the lexicon render one or more of the of the compound's constituents opaque. Thus, for example, English *lady* has long been unrecognizable as originating in the compound *hlæfdige* "bread-kneader" (lit. "loaf-dey"). Likewise obscured are the compound origins of Greek δεσπότης "master" (< **dems-pot-eh₂-s* "house-master") and Latin *hospes* "host" (< **hosti-pet-s* "guest-master"). In any event, a descriptively adequate system of classifying compounds must take account of not only their lexical semantics but also syntactic and formal criteria.

2.7 BAUER'S SYSTEM OF CLASSIFYING COMPOUNDS

Bauer 2017. 112–5 classifies compounds within a matrix of four parameters: (1) according to the syntactic-semantic relationship between their constituents, which divides compounds into coordinative and subordinative compounds; (2) according to a morphosyntactic analysis of their constituents, which divides compounds into

³⁷ On semantic drift in compounds, see Spencer 1991. 312.

³⁸ Cf. Olsen 2000. 901

attributive and relational compounds; (3) according to the presence or absence of a semantic head, which divides compounds into endocentric and exocentric compounds; and (4) according to the relative orientation of their heads, which divides compounds into right-oriented, left-oriented, or right-and-left-oriented compounds.

The application of these four categories can be seen by considering the following set of compounds. The Greek examples will be especially illuminating, since each conveniently has as its second constituent the noun πόλις “city”:

English	Greek³⁹	Latin⁴⁰
1. <i>hunter-gatherer</i>	κωμόπολις “town”	<i>suovetaurilia</i> “sacrifice”
2. <i>chalkboard</i>	νεκρόπολις “necropolis”	<i>domuitio</i> “journey home”
3. <i>blackboard</i>	ἀκρόπολις “acropolis”	<i>angiportus</i> “alley”
4. <i>starboard</i>	κοσμόπολις “a magistrate”	<i>nocticolor</i> “night-colored”
5. <i>braveheart</i>	μεγιστόπολις “who makes the city greatest”	<i>siccoculus</i> “dry-eyed”
6. <i>killjoy</i>	ἀρχέπολις “who rules a city”	<i>versipellis</i> “werewolf”

(1) and (2) are formally identical, each having a noun as its first constituent, but the relationship between their constituents differs and their overall semantics differ: (1) describes something that is equally both of its constituents, whereas (2) merely describes a subset of its second constituent. This pair shows the need for a division between coordinative compounds akin to (1) and subordinative compounds akin to (2).

³⁹ In descending order, lit. “village-city”; “corpse-city”; “high-city”; “order-city”; “greatest-city”; “rule-city”.

⁴⁰ In descending order, lit. “pig-sheep-bull-sacrifice”; “home-journey”; “narrow-passageway”; “night-color”; “dry-eye”; “change-skin”.

(2) and (3) are similar in that each describes a subset of its second constituent, but because they differ formally ((2) has a noun as its first constituent, whereas (3) has an adjective), they differ in the grammatical relationship between their constituents. This pair shows the need for a division between attributive compounds akin to (3) and relational compounds akin to (2).⁴¹

(2) and (4), on the one hand, and (3) and (5), on the other, are formally identical and similar relationships obtain between their constituents, but (2) and (3) each describe a subset of their second constituent, whereas (4) and (5) each describe something outside of themselves that is entirely different from either of their constituents. This pair shows the need for a division between endocentric compounds akin to (2) and exocentric compounds akin to (4).

(6) differs formally from (1)–(5) since it has a verbal first constituent, but yet like (2)–(5) it is subordinative, like (2) and (4) it is relational, and like (4) and (5) it is exocentric. While no examples are shown above, compounds with verbal second constituents are well attested in each language (see below), so what is noteworthy about (6) is not that it contains a verbal constituent itself, but that it is left-oriented—that is, the second constituent is subordinate to the first.

In the following sections we consider more general patterns of how Greek and Latin compounds are distributed according to Bauer’s four parameters.

⁴¹ This distinction is essentially the same as that between the traditional “descriptive” vs. “dependent” subsets of “determinatives”. Tribulato 2015, for example, abandoned this distinction, although I think it is useful.

2.7.1 COORDINATIVE AND SUBORDINATIVE COMPOUNDS

A principal syntactic-semantic criterion for classifying compounds is either subordination, which identifies compounds in which one of the constituents is semantically subordinated to the other as if functioning syntactically as either a modifier or complement, or the lack of subordination, namely coordination.

Coordinative compounds are those in which the two constituents are syntactically coordinate; in an uncompounded form, the constituents could just as well be conjoined by the conjunction “and”.⁴² Both constituents of a coordinative compound typically belong to the same lexical category, and virtually any category is permissible. For example, English *hunter-gatherer*, *blue-green*, and *drop-kick*; Greek κωμόπολις “town”, a settlement that in ways is simultaneously akin to a κώμη “village” and a πόλις “city”; Latin *suovetaurilia* (lit. “pig-sheep-bull-sacrifice”) is equally a sacrifice of each of those three animals.

Coordinative compounds are relatively underrepresented in classical Greek⁴³ and Latin⁴⁴, a state of affairs opposite that of, for example, Celtic, Germanic, and Indo-Iranian.⁴⁵ However, in Latin the existence of an unattested coordinative compound

⁴² For a more precise definition of coordinative compound, see Renner 2008. Such a definition is, however, entirely adequate for the present purpose. For Indo-European coordinative compounds generally, see Richter 1898. 23-47; Wackernagel 1905. 149-73.

⁴³ Although they become frequent in Medieval Greek (cf. Browning 1983. 67).

⁴⁴ Coordinative compounds exist in all the major, modern Romance languages and in e.g. Spanish those consisting of two adjectives (e.g. *blanco-amarillento* “white-yellow”) are among the most productive kind (cf. Forza-Scalise 2016). A study of their development from Latin into Romance, however, seems lacking.

⁴⁵ Burrow 1973. 217-9 seems to suggest that *dvandva* compounds, at least of the noun-noun kind, were a development unique to the historical period of each individual Indo-European

can sometimes be inferred from a derivative thereof, as with *strufertarius* “an official who carries the *strues* and the *fertum* (both kinds of sacrificial cake)”. While such compounds were the least common of the two types in both languages, a monstrous example from Aristophanes (*Ec.* 1169–74) contains no fewer than 26 constituents: λοπαδο-τεμαχο-σελαχο-γαλεο-κρανιο-λειψανο-δριμυπο-τριμματο-σιλφιο-λιπαρο-μελιτο-κατακεχυμενο-κιχλεπι-κοσσυφο-φαττο-περιστερ-αλεκτρουον-οπτο-πιφαλλιδο-κιγκλο-πελειο-λαγωο-σιραιο-βαφη-τραγαλο-πτερυγών, a dish consisting of all kinds of foodstuffs. Some Greek personal names are likewise coordinate compounds: for example, Ἀρκόλυκος “Bear-Wolf” (e.g. *IG II²* 2097, from 169/70 CE).

Subordinative compounds, on the other hand, are those compounds in which, as the name suggests, one constituent is syntactically subordinate to the other. In an uncompounded form, the relationship between the constituents of such compounds could be expressed through either the use of prepositional phrases or oblique case forms or with modifying adjectives: for example, *chalkboard* is more-or-less equivalent to “a board for chalk”; νεκρόπολις to ἡ πόλις τῶν νεκρῶν (“a city of corpses”); and *domuitio* “homeward journey” to *itio domum* “a journey homeward”.

2.7.2 ATTRIBUTIVE AND RELATIONAL COMPOUNDS

Another criterion for classifying compounds is attribution, which separates compounds in which one constituent is an adjectival modifier of the other from those

language, but that *dvandva* compounds of the adjective-adjective kind may have been inherited from PIE. An early example in Greek is γλυκύπικρος “bittersweet” (*Sapph. fr.* 130.2).

in which one constituent is a noun standing in some grammatically dependent relationship to the other. This amounts to a formal analysis of constituents, but it would be equally possible to think of this division syntactically, as well, and to separate compounds in which one constituent is an adjunct of the other from those in which one constituent is a complement of the other.

Attributive compounds are those in which one constituent is an adjectival modifier of the other. In an uncompounded form, the relationship between the constituents of such compounds as *blackboard*, ἀκρόπολις, and *angiportus* could be expressed in the noun-phrases *black bird*, ἄκρη πόλις (“high city”), and *angustus portus* (“narrow passageway”).⁴⁶

Relational compounds, on the other hand, are those in which one constituent is a noun standing in some grammatically dependent relationship to the other. In an uncompounded form, the relationship between the constituents of such compounds as *killjoy*, ἀρχέπολις, and *versipellis* could be expressed using verb phrases with the second constituents as direct objects⁴⁷ of the first: for example, *killjoy* is roughly equivalent to *someone who kills joy*; ἀρχέπολις to ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἄρχων (“someone who rules the city”) and *versipellis* to *qui pellem vertat* (“someone who changes skins”).

⁴⁶ The positive adjective **angus* “narrow” is unattested.

⁴⁷ In terms of grammatical relationships at least. It would be equally possible to think about these in terms of thematic relationships, on which see Carnie 2006. 221, 232–3, and consider *-joy*, *-πολις* and *-pellis* patients.

2.7.3 HEADS⁴⁸

The head of a compound is the constituent that determines the semantic category of that compound: for example, the head of the compound noun *chalkboard* is its second constituent *board*, since a *chalkboard* is a kind of *board*, not a kind of *chalk*. This is the case with all the compounds in (2) and (3) above, which are therefore “headed”. The compounds in (4)–(6) above are “headless”, since in none does either constituent determine the semantic category of the compound: for example, a *starboard* is neither a plank of wood nor something with which one steers, but instead refers metonymically to the side of the ship from which one steers;⁴⁹ a *κοσμόπολις* is neither a kind of orderliness nor a kind of city, but rather a magistrate who maintains orderliness for the city in some way; and *nocticolor* is neither a kind of night nor a color, but instead refers to the dark-skinned Memnon.⁵⁰ Semantically headed compounds are “endocentric”, whereas semantically headless compounds are “exocentric”.

2.7.4 ENDOCENTRICITY AND EXOCENTRICITY⁵¹

⁴⁸ See in general Tribulato 2015. 43–4, 117–8; Bauer 2017. 29–41 (each discussing some problems with the notion of a “head” as applied to compounds).

⁴⁹ *starboard* < ME *sterbord* < OE *stēor* “rudder” and *bord* “board used on the side of a hull; side of a hull”

⁵⁰ Laev. fr. 12

⁵¹ See in general, Tribulato 2015: 44–5; Bauer 2017. 64–71

Endocentric compounds have a semantic focus that lies within themselves: for example, *blackboard* refers to a kind of board, just as ἀκρόπολις refers to a kind of πόλις and *angiportus* refers to a kind of *portus*. In other words, endocentric compounds are merely hyponyms of their heads.

Exocentric compounds, on the other hand, have a semantic focus that lies outside of themselves: for example, *braveheart* refers semantically not to a kind of heart, but to a person characterized by a brave heart, an idea not contained in the compound itself, just as μεγιστόπολις in Pindar refers not to a kind of city, but to a person who makes a city a very great, and *siccoculus* refers not to a kind of eye, but to a person characterized by dry eyes.

In both *braveheart* and the endocentric *blackboard*, *heart* and *board* are affected by the same kind of modification through *brave* and *black*, but with the difference that *blackboard* does not manifest the same semantic shift as *braveheart*: *blackboard* has a semantic head, while *braveheart* does not and is thus exocentric. The exocentricity acquired, however, by *braveheart* is neither intrinsic to the words *brave* or *heart* nor, of course, to the formal makeup of the compound itself; rather, it emerges as a matter of convention after *braveheart* is used to refer to a person with a brave heart, an entity that lies outside of what either of its constituents denote. The same is true of μεγιστόπολις and *siccoculus*, which are formally identical to the endocentric ἀκρόπολις and *angiportus*, but conventionally exocentric nevertheless.⁵²

⁵² The endocentricity and exocentricity of ἀκρόπολις and μεγιστόπολις do not arise from anything intrinsic to the constituent -πολις, as is obvious now, nor, it is perhaps worth pointing out, do they arise from anything intrinsic to ἀκρο- or μεγαστο-, since endocentric compounds in μεγαστο- (e.g. μεγαστοάνασσα “greatest mistress”, an epithet of Hera) and

By contrast, *nocticolor* (discussed in the previous section) is endocentric because, although it describes Memnon, it does not itself refer to him.

A class of compounds, however, that is seemingly always exocentric is those with a verbal first constituent:⁵³ for example, *killjoy* refers to a person who prevents others from having fun, *ἀρχέπολις* to a kind of ruler, and *versipellis* to a kind of shapeshifter, ideas which are semantically contained neither in the compounds themselves nor in either of their constituents individually. Nevertheless, the relationship between the two constituents in each is like that found in *chalkboard*, *νεκρόπολις*, and *domuitio*.

2.7.5 ORIENTATION

A final criterion useful for classifying and understanding Greek and Latin compounds is the orientation of their constituents. The compound systems of Greek and Latin are predominantly right-oriented:⁵⁴ in subordinative compounds, the semantic head is typically the second constituent, but there are some left-oriented compounds that are exceptions to this tendency, such as verb-initial compounds and, in Greek, compounds in for example *ἀξιο-* and *ἴσο-*.⁵⁵

exocentric compounds in *ἀκρο-* (e.g. *ἀκροθώραξ* “drunken” but lit. “high-thorax”) are also attested.

⁵³ On which in general, see Tribulato 2015.

⁵⁴ Using Bauer’s terminology, although “right” and “left” obviously presume a left-to-right system of writing. A less culturally and historically bound terminology would be “post-positioned” and “ante-positioned” *vel sim*.

⁵⁵ Cf. Tribulato 2015. 112–3.

In summary, the model adopted here classifies compounds using a set of non-hierarchical features, according to which compounds may be (1) subordinative or coordinative, depending on the syntactic-semantic relationship between their constituents; (2) attributive or relational, depending on their formal makeup; (3) endocentric or exocentric, depending on their semantic focus; and (4), right-oriented or left-oriented, depending on the relative position of their heads. The following table shows the primary combinations in Greek and Latin with English given for the sake of comparison:⁵⁶

Coordinative Compounds			
[A A] _A ⁵⁷	<i>bittersweet</i>	[N N] _N	<i>hunter-gatherer</i>
	γλυκύπικρος “bittersweet”		κωμόπολις “town”
	<i>dulcacidus</i> “bittersweet”		<i>suovetaurilia</i> “sacrifice”
Subordinative Compounds			
Relational			
Right-oriented		Left-oriented	
Endocentric		Endocentric	
[N N] _N	<i>chalkboard</i>	[N N] _N	<i>endgame</i>

⁵⁶ Not shown, however, are compounds with prepositional or numerical constituents, which of course exist, but since they bear less resemblance to blends, I have chosen not to take up space with them. Otherwise, the list for Greek and Latin is as comprehensive as I could make it, even though there are occasional gaps, especially among left-oriented categories. This is not to say that there are no compounds attested that could fill these gaps, but I have not been able to find any.

⁵⁷ The formalism [A A]_A means that the resulting compound is an adjective (A) whose constituents are an adjective and another adjective ([A A]).

	νεκρόπολις “necropolis”		ἵππαγρος “wild horse” ⁵⁸
	<i>domuitio</i> “journey home”		<i>sacciperium</i> “purse” ⁵⁹
[N A] _A	<i>money-hungry</i>	[A N] _A	<i>worthwhile</i> ⁶⁰
	ὕλακόμωρος “always barking” ⁶¹		δικαίολις “faithful to the city” ⁶²
	<i>damnigerulus</i> “pernicious” ⁶³		—
[N V] _N	<i>taxi-driver</i>	[V N] _{N/A}	<i>shakedown</i>
	πολίχοχος “city-protector”		μισόπολις “hating the city” ⁶⁴
	<i>bustirapus</i> “grave-robber”		<i>poscinummius</i> “money-seeking” ⁶⁵

⁵⁸ Lit. “horse-field”

⁵⁹ Lit. “bag-wallet”

⁶⁰ This compound is perhaps only possible because of the argument-structure of the adjective *worth*, which requires an object (e.g. Paying that much is worth it; It is worth paying that much), just as do Grk. ἄξιος and Lat. *dignus* (of which there are no compounds), and Maling 1983. 268 has gone so far as to argue that *worth* is in fact a preposition.

⁶¹ Lit. “barking-foolish”

⁶² Lit. “just-city”. Whether the adjective is endocentric or exocentric at Pi. *P.* 8.22–4 (its first attestation, where it describes Aegina) is unclear: ἡ δικαίολις...νᾶσος. Is it “the fair-to-cities island”, in which case it is endocentric and left-oriented, or is it “the island having just cities”, in which case it is exocentric and right-oriented? The latter seems more plausible. But as the personal name of the hero of Aristophanes’ *Acharnians*, it is seemingly endocentric and left-oriented: “he who is just to the city” *vel sim*. Highlighting the unpredictability of the meaning of compounds is the fact that there were two cities in antiquity called Δικαίολις “The Fair City”, in which case the word is unambiguously endocentric and right-oriented (Harp. δ 65).

⁶³ Lit. “(financial) loss-carrying”

Oniga 2014. 170 notes that in Latin “combinations of a noun and an adjective and verb-initial combinations are rarely attested [because], in Archaic Latin, adjectives typically precede nouns, and verbs are placed in final position. This implies that verb-initial compounds and adjective+noun (*sic*) compounds are structurally incoherent to the parameters of early Latin syntax.” Nevertheless, both kinds of compounds *are* attested, so how incoherent could they have been?

⁶⁴ Lit. “hate-city. Tribulato 2015 evidently misses the word in her corpus.

⁶⁵ Lit. “seek-money”

Exocentric		Exocentric	
[N N] _{N/A}	<i>starboard</i>	[N N] _N	<i>center stage</i>
	κοσμόπολις “magistrate”		θυμολέων “lion-heart” ⁶⁶
	<i>nocticolor</i> “night-colored”		—
[N V] _{N/A}	<i>buzzkill</i>	[V N] _N	<i>killjoy</i>
	οίκοφόρος “house-carrying”		φερέουκος “house-carrying” ⁶⁷
	<i>domiporta</i> “house-carrier” ⁶⁸		<i>versipellis</i> “shapeshifter”
Attributive			
Right-oriented		Left-oriented	
Endocentric		Endocentric	
[A N] _N	<i>blackboard</i>	[N A] _{N/A}	<i>attorney general</i> ⁶⁹
	ἀκρόπολις “acropolis”		—

⁶⁶ I.e. one who has the heart of a lion. However, Tribulato 2015. 108–9 argues for a right-oriented interpretation of this and similarly-formed compounds.

⁶⁷ The word means “nomads” *vel sim.* at Hdt. 4.46.3 (of the Scythians), but “snail” at Hes. *Op.* 571.

⁶⁸ I.e. a snail

⁶⁹ Bauer 2017. 120 disputes its status as a compound. That English may actively avoid such compounds may be suggested by the following anecdote: in an episode of the PBS Kids show *Odd Squad* (season 2, episode 13), a villain named “Backwards Bob” has caused people to walk and talk backwards. When the show’s protagonists first confront him, as he is seated backwards at his desk and wearing his clothes—shirt, hat, glasses, and all—backwards, and address him as “Backwards Bob”, he swivels in his chair to face them and says, “I prefer ‘Bob Backwards’”. One of the protagonists retorts, “Yeeeah, we’re not going to call you that,” since it, like walking and talking backwards, is presumably anomalous.

	<i>angiportus</i> "alleyway"		<i>equiferus</i> "horse-wild"
[A A] _A	<i>blue-green</i>	[A A] _A	— ⁷⁰
	όξύμωρος "pointedly foolish" ⁷¹		άξιόπιστος "worth trusting" ⁷²
	<i>multiloquax</i> "much-talkative"		—
[A V] _A	<i>sweet-talking</i>		
	κακόλογος "evil-speaking"		
	<i>multiiloquus</i> "much-speaking"		
	Exocentric		Exocentric
[A N] _N	<i>braveheart</i>	[NA] _A	<i>armstrong</i>
	μεγιστόπολις "making the city greatest"		—
	<i>siccoculus</i> "dry-eyed"		—

Two further observations: (1) nearly all the compounds here consist of only two constituents, as do most compounds in Greek and Latin. However, both languages can form more elaborate compounds with more than two constituents: for example, Greek λαλοβαρύοψ "chattering-deep-voiced" and παραμελορυθμοβάτας "out-of-time-with-the-music-going" (both, Pratin. *PMG* 708.13); συλλαβοπευσιλαλητής "a philosopher who examines each syllable before pronouncing it" (Ath. 4.162a); and

⁷⁰ It is possible that such compounds do not exist in English (or Latin?), since being formally identical to their right-oriented counterparts, they would be especially ambiguous.

⁷¹ Lit. "sharp-foolish"

⁷² Lit. "worth-credible"

Latin *subductisupercilicarpator* “someone who criticizes and furrows his brows” (Gel. 19.7.16), but compounds consisting of more than two constituents tend to be marked, often comic, formations.⁷³ (2) Despite the variety of lexical classes permitted as the constituents of the above compounds, all the compounds themselves are either nouns or adjectives. This tendency for compounds to be nominal is observed cross-linguistically,⁷⁴ although there are certainly examples of denominative compound verbs in English (e.g. *strongarm*, *sidestep*). Both Greek and Latin also have compound verbs such as ἀγαθοποιέω “make good” and *benedico* “praise”, but such formations in Greek are generally thought to derive from pre-existing nominal compounds, in this case ἀγαθοποιός “beneficent”, while many in Latin are explainable as having arisen from juxtapositions. For example, *benedico* is originally two words: *bene dico* “I speak well”.⁷⁵

2.8 THE USE OF COMPOUNDS

Compounding, along with derivation, was a principal means of enlarging the lexicon of both Greek and Latin beyond the stock of inherited Indo-European words and borrowings from other languages. In Greek especially, compounding has a long history as a productive and vital process for building the lexicon, with compounds

⁷³ Compounds consisting of more than two constituents are said to be “recursive” (cf. Bauer 2017. 43–6.) Mukai 2008. 193 alleges that Latin has no recursive compounds but is mistaken.

⁷⁴ Guevara–Scalise 2009.

⁷⁵ Buck 1966. 363; Oniga 2007. 166–7; Brucale 2012. 111

already attested in Mycenaean: for example, *qo-u-qo-ta* “ox-herd”.⁷⁶ The Mycenaean examples suggest, in addition to hinting at the longevity, productivity, and vitality of compounding, that compounding was a ubiquitous feature of everyday language.⁷⁷ Latin, too, from its earliest attestations yields examples of compounds: for example, *meridies* “mid-day” in the Twelve Tables. However, from these earliest attestations, it is apparent that compounding in Latin is relatively constrained vis-à-vis other Indo-European languages.⁷⁸

In the histories of the Greek and Latin languages, compounding, although it extended and differentiated the general lexicon of each language, and even though some Roman grammarians groused about neologisms,⁷⁹ played an important role in

⁷⁶ On compounds in Mycenaean, see Chadwick 1976. 43; Meissner–Tribulato 2002; Waanders 2008.

⁷⁷ *pace* Meillet–Vendryes 1960. 421: “La langue populaire n’emploie guère la composition. Les textes littéraires présentent en général d’autant plus de composés qu’ils s’éloignent davantage de l’usage courant. Le composé a le plus souvent quelque chose d’artificiel; il convient aux langues spéciales et techniques de la philosophie, de la science ... auxquelles il confère à la fois précision et gravité. C’est surtout la langue poétique qui en fait usage. Les poètes qui se piquent d’un langage noble et veulent atteindre un ton élevé, obtiennent l’effet cherché en employant des composés.”

⁷⁸ Cf. Fruyt 2003; Brucale 2012.

⁷⁹ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1.70.5 *sed res tota magis Graecos decet, nobis minus succedit: nec id fieri natura puto, sed alienis favemus, ideoque cum κερταύχενα mirati simus, incurvicervicum vix a risu defendimus* (“but the whole thing [*sc.* compounding] suits the Greeks better. It is less successful with us. Nor do I think it happens because of the nature of our language, but we favor foreign words, so although we admire *kurtauchena* (‘with a curved neck’; *adesp. trag.* fr. 438a) we can hardly defend *incurvicervicum* (‘with a curved neck’; *Pac. trag.* 408) from ridicule”); Gel. 1.10.4 *vive ergo moribus praeteritis, loquere verbis praesentibus atque id, quod a C. Caesare, excellentis ingenii ac prudentiae viro, in primo de analogia libro scriptum est, habe semper in memoria atque in pectore: ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum* (“Live therefore according to the manners of the past, but speak in the language of the present, and always remember and take to heart what Gaius Caesar, a man of surpassing talent and wisdom, wrote in the first book of *On Analogy*: avoid, as you would a rock, a strange and unfamiliar word”). For ancient attitudes toward novel words, see Vaahtera 1998. 28-46.

creating the specialized vocabularies of religion and poetry, where compounding was amenable to a condensed style of expression (a compound could be used in place of a phrase or vice versa in order to suit the needs to poetic meter: for example, the use of πόδας ώκύς “(in respect to his) feet swift” versus ποδώκης “swift-footed”), as well as, for example, the vocabularies of science (for example, the learned *plenilunium* “full moon” used in place of the conventional phrase *luna plena*), rhetoric, grammar, and philosophy.⁸⁰ In addition, compounding was a productive, inherited mechanism for creating proper names.⁸¹

The lexicon-building function of compounding correlates with its stylistic uses. Alongside highly productive patterns, there are less common, even idiosyncratic patterns of compounding: the more productive kinds are most frequently used with no stylistic intentions, whereas certain stylistic effects can be achieved with less productive kinds. Thus, for example, compounding can be a means of marking a text or passage as belonging to a certain genre (e.g. tragedy) or stylistic register (e.g.

⁸⁰ On the specialized vocabularies of individual Greek genres, see e.g. Willi 2003.

⁸¹ Many personal names in the older Indo-European traditions are compounds: e.g. Eng. *Roger* “whose spear is famous” is < PGmc. **hrôþigaizaz* (a compound of **hrôþiz* “fame” and **gaizaz* “spear”); Greek Ἀριστοκλῆς “whose fame is best” (a compound of ἄριστος “best” and κλέος “fame”). Italic seems to have broken with this tradition and developed a unique system of personal names. In Roman comedy Greek-style names are found, such as *Virginesvendonides* “Girlseller’s son” (Plaut. *Pers.* 702), but these obviously parody the patronymic formations so common in its new comedy sources. Greek comedy itself exploited personal names for humorous ends, and some blends are also names and play on this tradition, as discussed in Chapter 3. On the Indo-European names generally, e.g. Pulgram 1947.

paratragedy). In the presence of less productive processes then, one enters the field of literary idiolects: for example, the language of epic⁸² or the language of comedy.⁸³

2.9 HOW BLENDS DIFFER FROM COMPOUNDS AND HOW THEY ARE ANALOGOUS

Having now reviewed the characteristics of compounds in Greek and Latin we are able to note how lexical blends are a different kind of formation. Let us return to the example with which we began Chapter 1: *madulsa*. The context of this Plautine *hapax* makes clear that the basic meaning of the word is something like a “state of drunkenness”, as glossed by the *OLD s. v.* whose editors suggest the word is “from MADEO, perh. influenced by *mulsa*.” This suggestion, however, is not intended to claim that the formation corresponds to any known kind of derivational process. It merely recognizes the saliency of the root that underlies the verb *madere* and acknowledges the hint of the word *mulsa* that also fits the textual context.

If *madulsa* evokes two lexical constituents, the root of *madere* and the word *mulsa*, it is natural to think it may be a compound. Yet the word’s structure cannot be paralleled by any known compound formation. Compounds in Greek and Latin, it will be remembered, are derived initially or, in rare cases, secondarily from lexical roots and stems. The sequence *-uls-* is neither a root nor a stem. If Plautus had wished to coin an adjective meaning, say, “drunk on *mulsa*,” it was perfectly possible to do so with a “normal” compound such as **mulsa-madidus* or **mulso-madidus*. Had he

⁸² On the language of Greek epic, see Risch 1974.

⁸³ See e.g. Costa Ramalho 1952.

wished to coin a noun meaning “*mulsa* drunkenness,” a compound like **mulsa-mador* or **mulsa-ebrietas* would have served—or, even more Plautine in its linguistic innovation, something like **mulsa-maditio*. Had he wished to create a noun meaning something like “drunkenness-inducing *mulsa*,” admittedly unlikely, a compound like **made-mulsa* or **madido-mulsa* was possible. But the word is not a compound. It is a lexical blend and, as such, has been formed utterly free of any stem constraints based upon its constituents. Its sources are splinters, not stems; and as splinters they open the door to other possible lexical associations including, as suggested earlier, *(in)sulsus*.⁸⁴

Although blends are formally distinguishable from compounds, let us consider next whether there are syntactic and/or semantic similarities between blends and compounds. Focussing again on *madulsa*, whether we utilize the traditional typology of compounds or Bauer’s, we are immediately confronted with an analytical problem. In this, as in most blends, where does the first constituent end and the second begin? In a pinch we might consider that the word should be divided as follows: *mad-ulsa*. Yet such a division leaves us with no meaningful second constituent. If indeed this word is a blend of the root in *madere* and the noun *mulsa*, then the initial /m/ of *madere* presumably plays some role in making *m...ulsa* recognizable as a constituent. On the other hand, if we take the /m/ to belong to the *mulsa* constituent, then the root of *madere* becomes opaque. In fact, however, the /m/ plays a role in communicating

⁸⁴ A corollary to the absence of stem-constraints in blends is the absence of any need for a linking vowel.

both constituents, forcing us at most to limit our analysis to analogies in applying either the traditional typology or Bauer's.

Is *madulsa* analogous to a coordinative or a subordinative compound under Bauer's first parameter? Taking the word's primary meaning to be "drunkenness from drinking *mulsa*," the relationship between the putative constituents is subordinative. Under Bauer's second parameter, is *madulsa* a kind of drunkenness (attributive relationship) or a statement of the particular circumstances that surround this drunkenness (relational)? Either would be possible, but the formal blending of the constituents makes it difficult to decide. Applying Bauer's last two parameters is also problematic. The notional head of "drunkenness from drinking *mulsa*" is the concept of drunkenness, despite the absence of a nominal source word meaning drunkenness. Formally, because the *hapax* ends in *-ulsa*, we might have expected *m...ulsa* to be the head, in which case the meaning would be "*mulsa* that makes one drunk."⁸⁵ Regardless of which constituent we take to be the head, this blend is analogous to an endocentric compound. The lack of formal clarity also frustrates application of Bauer's fourth and last parameter: orientation. Even if we decide that the notional head of the composition is unambiguously either "drunkenness" or *mulsa*, it is impossible to situate that head definitively in the sequence of the word's constituents. We might consider *madulsa* to be left oriented, since it begins with the syllable *mad-*, which evokes the root of the lexeme *madere*. On the other hand, the

⁸⁵ Perhaps a less likely meaning for the object of *habeo* in the context, but not impossible.

constituent *m...ulsa* actually begins at the same point as *mad-*. This fact would make a bidirectional orientation the better analogy.

In conclusion, while blending and compounding in Greek and Latin both involve the combination of two or more lexical items, formally they are entirely distinct. Whereas the constituents of compounds are morphemic, being either root or stem morphemes, typically at least one and often all the constituents of a blend are non-morphemic. Whereas the constituents of compounds are typically joined by a conventional linking vowel, the constituents of blends overlap with one another at points of phonetic overlap. Blending, although relying on the same stock of lexical items for input as compounding, outputs neologisms whose lexical category and formal makeup are not typical of compounding. Finally, the syntactic-semantic criteria used for classifying compounds fail in many cases to capture the relationship between a blend's constituents. In fact, the syntactic relationship between the constituents is sometimes of little significance to the meaning(s) of the blend.

As we shall see in the following chapters, blends typically originate as nonce-forms for the sake of a quick verbal joke. As such they rarely have an afterlife beyond the specific context of the coinage. This gets at one of the functional differences between compounds and blends: the latter are "short-lived, nonce formations—a property that would set them apart from the true process of compounding, which is an abundant source of regular input to the permanent lexicon. Thus, even though some blends do indeed enter the vocabulary as usualized words, cf. e.g., *motel*, *smog*, *brunch* and *chunnel*, the true distinction between blending and composition must be

in the conscious creative process associated with blending vs. automatic, unobtrusive and purely concatenative nature of productive composition” (Olsen 2000. 901).⁸⁶

⁸⁶ In Greek and Latin comedic idiom, compounding can also be a source of short-lived, nonce formations that were surely never intended to enter the permanent lexicon.

CHAPTER 3. ONOMASTIC BLENDS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The playful use of proper names of various sorts—personal names, theonyms, patronymics, ethnonyms, demotics, toponyms—is one of the most salient and entertaining aspects of Greek and Roman comedic literature.⁸⁷ As Barton 1990 states in her study of proper names in Greek comedy: “[a]lmost every page is crowded not only with the names of gods and heroes ... but with those of contemporary Athenian politicians, demagogues, and generals, together with the names of their fathers and sons, names of notorious Athenian eccentrics, scoundrels, fops, pederasts and drunks, of philosophers, rival dramatists, and poets, and also names recorded as those of ordinary, contemporary Athenians, Attic farmers and slaves” (19).

Since many personal names in Greek and Roman literature, both those borne by real persons and those coined as speaking names, are etymologically meaningful and transparent, their meaning can be exploited in comedic and satiric contexts to characterize their bearers. Thus, for example, in *Acharnians* Aristophanes riffs on *Λαμαχος*,⁸⁸ painting him as the vigorous proponent of continued war between Athens

⁸⁷ Apart from Kanavou 2011 (on personal names in Aristophanes), 2015 (on personal names in Homer), there are no large-scale systematic studies of personal names in Greek. On names and naming in general see e.g. Marzullo 1953; Olson 1992; Willi 2010. 487–8. Likewise, apart from Austin 1922 (on personal names in Terence), there are no large-scale systematic studies of personal names in Latin, although see various remarks in Duckworth 1952. 345–56 (on Plautus); Ferris-Hill 2015. 240 (on Persius); Cucchiarelli 2001. 23–5 (on Lucilius).

⁸⁸ *PA* 8981; *PAA* 601230

and Sparta that he apparently was:⁸⁹ at 269–70 the chorus of Acharnians sings of the joy of returning home after being released from bothers and battles (*machōn*) and Lamachuses (*Lamáchōn*), the wordplay facilitated by contriving that both “battles” and “Lamachuses” end up as genitive plurals, where the endings are similar among the grammatical genders, although they differ in accent. Similar wordplay is repeated at 1071: “alas, hardships and battles (*máchai*) and Lamachuses (*Lámachoi*).” At Plaut. *Ps.* 665, the parasite Harpax “Snatchy” (= Ἄρπαξ, attested at *IG* XII,8 276 < ἀρπάζω “snatch”) calls attention to the meaning of his own name: *hostis vivos rapere soleo ex acie: eo hoc nomen mihi est* (“I normally snatch enemies alive from battle: that’s why I have this name”).

Even names that are etymologically ambiguous or opaque can be fodder for puns. At *AP* 12.11 (Strato), for example, for the sake of a joke about his own sexual inadequacy, the poet reanalyzes the name Astyanax “lord of the city” (< ἄστυ “city” and ἄναξ “lord”) as “lord of impotence”, as though it were < ἄ- “not” and στύω “make erect” and ἄναξ “lord”.⁹⁰ The name of Aeneas’ helmsman Palinurus is punned on at *Mart.* 3.78 *minxisti currente semel, Pauline, carina. / meiere vis iterum? iam Palinuris eris* (“You peed once, Paulinus, as the ship sailed. Do you want to pee again? Then you’ll be Palinurus”), as though the name were < πάλιν “again” and ούρέω “pee”.

⁸⁹ See Olson 2002 on *Ar. Ach.* 266–70.

⁹⁰ ἐχθὲς ἔχων ἀνὰ νύκτα Φιλόστρατον οὐκ ἐδυνήθην / κείνου—πῶς εἶπω;—πάντα παρασχομένου. / ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μηκέτ’ ἔχοιτε, φίλοι, φίλον, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ πύργου / ρίψατ’, ἐπεὶ λίην Ἄστυάναξ γέγονα (“Yesterday I had Philostratus for the night, but was incapable, though he—how should I say it?—made every possible offer. No longer, my friends, count me your friend, but throw me off a tower, since I have become too much of an Astyanax”)

Names borne by historical or literary characters can also be modified, through either the substitution or addition of various types of elements, for the sake of a joke. Thus, for example, at Ar. *Ach.* 1080 Λάμαχος serves as the basis of the elaborate adjective πολεμολαμαχαϊκόν “war-Lamachus-like”,⁹¹ which further underscores his hawkishness, and at 1206 his name becomes Λαμαχίππιον, which with the element -ιππ- (“horse”), typical of aristocratic names, and the diminutive -ιον belittles him and his humble family origins.⁹² At Ar. *V.* 592 Κλεώνυμος “Famously-named” becomes Κολακόνυμος “Flatterer-named”, which pokes fun at Cleonymus,⁹³ another 5th-century politician, who was notorious for his pandering to the public.⁹⁴ At Cratin. fr. 281 Ἄνδροκλῆς “Famed-man” becomes Ἄνδροκολωνοκλῆς “Famed-Colonus-man”, thereby ridiculing Androcles,⁹⁵ yet another 5th-century Athenian politician, for earning his wealth instead of inheriting it.⁹⁶ Akin to this kind of onomastic modification is the riddling AP 11.231 (Ammianus) θηρίον εἶ παρὰ γράμμα, καὶ ἄνθρωπος διὰ γράμμα· / ἄξιος εἶ πολλῶν, ὧν παρὰ γράμμα γράφη (“you are a beast but for a letter, and a man by one: you deserve many of those which your name spells but for that letter”). The wordplay is apparently between the personal name *Markos* and *arkos*, the late spelling of *arktos* “bear”.

⁹¹ Adjectives in -αῖκός are typically formed by adding the suffix -ικός to a noun in -αῖος or -αῖα (e.g. ἀρχαῖκός “archaic” < ἀρχαῖος “old-fashioned”; and see Chantraine 1933. 393). The word πολεμολαμαχαϊκόν is thus perhaps meant to echo the lofty Ἀχαῖκός “Achaean” (e.g. A. *Ag.* 624; E. *Hec.* 287, 521; *Tr.* 236, 657, 863; all either of στρατός “army” or στρατεύμα “host”) < Ἀχαῖα “Achaea”, making the compound mockingly pretentious and high style.

⁹² See Olson 2002 *ad loc.*; Kanavou 2011. 29.

⁹³ PA 8880; PAA 579410

⁹⁴ See Biles–Olson 2015 *ad loc.*

⁹⁵ PA 870

⁹⁶ For the connection between Colonus and earned wealth, see Bakola 2010. 227 n. 105.

In Latin, Quintilian (*Inst.* 6.3.53), disapproving of the practice, gives several examples (from sources unknown): *haec tam frigida quam est nominum fictio adiectis detractis mutatis litteris, ut Acisculum, quia esset pactus, Pacisculum, et Placidum nomine, quod is acerbis natura esset, Acidum, et Tullium cum fur esset, Tollium dictos invenio. sed haec eadem genera commodius in rebus quam in nominibus respondent.*⁹⁷ Note that the first and third of these examples are also blends: *Pacisculus* of *Acisculus* and the stem of *pacisci* “make a pact”; *Tollius* of *Tullius* and *tollere* “take”. I have refrained from including them in my main discussion of individual examples because they are without context, but discuss them briefly in Appendix II. However, they do illustrate a disapproval of blending as a “frigid” rhetorical device and how the formal characteristics of lexical blends were described by the ancients. Ancient analysis of blends is discussed more fully in Appendix I.

Seneca (*Con.* 10 pr. 11), likewise disapproving of the practice, offers another especially rich example: [*Pacatus*] *ipse ab eloquentia multum aberat; natus ad contumelias omnium ingeniis inurendas, nulli non impressit aliquid quod effugere non posset. ille Passieno prima eius syllaba in Graecum mutata obscenum nomen inposuit.*⁹⁸ Although Seneca (perhaps for decency’s sake) declines to say what punning nickname

⁹⁷ “Equally frigid is inventing names by adding, removing, or changing letters: I have found, for example, *Pacisculus* for *Acisculus* because he made a pact, *Acidus* for *Placidus* because of his acidic nature, and *Tollius* for *Tullius* because he was a thief. This kind of joke works better with things than with names.”

⁹⁸ “[*Pacatus*] himself was far from eloquent; born to brand insults on the talents of all, he saddled everyone with something that could not be escaped. He gave Passienus an obscene name by changing the first syllable of his name into Greek.”

Pacatus gave to Passienus, it was perhaps “Paschienus” from Greek πάσχω,⁹⁹ typically “suffer” but often used of pathetic homosexuality.¹⁰⁰ And Cicero (*Ver.* 2.4.148), again not claiming credit for the witticism but attributing it to the Sicilians, offers one more: *retinere incipit tabulas Theomnastus quidam, homo ridicule insanus, quem Syracusani Theoractum vocant.*¹⁰¹ That is, instead of the man being “remembered by the gods”¹⁰² he is the man “stricken mad by the gods”.¹⁰³

More frequently entire names are invented, usually as speaking names. Many speaking names include hints about the character, gender, ethnicity, family and social status, and the literary role of the bearer. Thus, for example, the titular Λυσιστράτη of Aristophanes *Lysistrata* is she who releases (λύω) the army (στρατός), and Πεισέταρος of *Birds* is the sophistic orator who persuades (πείθω) his companions (ἑταῖροι).¹⁰⁴ And in Plautus there are the names of his braggart soldiers (e.g. Pyrgopolynices “Son of Many-towers-taker”; Polymachaeroplages “Son of Many-sword-strokes”); the name of the tricky slave Pseudolus (“tricky”) of the self-same

⁹⁹ If this is right, then the word is a bilingual onomastic blend, but because this blend would be reconstructed based on Quintilian’s comment rather than attested, it is not discussed in detail in this chapter but rather briefly in Appendix II.

¹⁰⁰ Henderson 1991 § 242.

¹⁰¹ “A certain man called Theomnastus took the tablets and held onto them, an amusingly crazy man whom the Syracusans call Theoractus.” Although this alleged witticism is a play on the man’s name, the coinage is a compound and not a blend.

¹⁰² Θεόμναστος < θεός “god” and μμνήσκω “remember”. The name is attested 34 times in the *LGPN*.

¹⁰³ Θεόρακτος < θεός “god” and ῥάσσω “strike”. Neither this name itself nor any in -ρακτος is attested in the *LGPN*.

¹⁰⁴ For other more elaborate invented personal names, e.g. Eup. fr. 190; 424 with Olson 2014 *ad loc.*; Ar. *Eq.* 247; *V.* 220. 505, 1357; *Av.* 491; *Lys.* 457–8; *Ec.* 1169–75; Ephipp. fr. 14.3; Plaut. *Per.* 702–5. For more examples, see van Leeuwen 1902 on Ar. *Av.* 491.

play; or the name of the *adulescens amator* Argyrippides (“Silver-horse-son”) of *Asinaria*. None of these is a genuine Greek name, each seemingly having been coined by Plautus.

Since full Greek names also often included patronymics and/or demotics, comedic writers had free range to coin these as well: for example, Διάγορος ὁ Τερθρεύς “Diagoras from Quibblec” (Hermipp. fr. 43); Πείσανδρος ὁ Ὀνοκίνδιος “Peisander, the son of Mule-driver” (Eup. fr. 195); Κλωπίδαι “Crimeans” (Ar. *Eq.* 79); ἀνὴρ Κόπρειος “a man from Excremento” (899); Προξενίδης ὁ Κομπασεύς “Proxenides from Boaston” (Av. 1126).¹⁰⁵ While many of these nonce forms are wholesale creations that bear little similarity to any real demotics or the like, Κλωπίδαι (discussed more below) is only a letter away from the real Κρωπίδαι, inhabitants of the real Attic deme Κρωπία (between Mt. Aegaeus and Mt. Parnes).¹⁰⁶

Invented toponyms are also found in both languages (e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 185-7; Luc. *VH* 2.4 Φελλώ (“Cork-land”); Plaut. *Mil.* 43 *Scytholatronia* (“Scythia-bandit-land”); *Cur.* 444 *Peredia* (“Eats-a-lot-land”) and *Perbibesia* (“Booze-ton”).

Non-personal names also take aim at gods and prayer. Real theonyms, together with divine epithets and invocations, become the source of jokes: for example, at Ar. *Av.* 873 the theological Φρύγιος Σαβάζιος (“Phrygian Sabazius”) becomes the ornitheological φρύγιλος Σαβάζιος (“the bird Sabazius”) in the new pantheon of Cloud-Cuckooland.¹⁰⁷ But equally theonyms are entirely invented. Some

¹⁰⁵ For more examples, see van Leeuwen 1896 on *Ra.* 427; 1902 on Ar. *Eq.* 79.

¹⁰⁶ Th. 2.19.2

¹⁰⁷ See Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* Not discussed by Kanavou 2011.

wholly fictitious divine personal names include the divinities prayed to at Ar. *Eq.* 634–5 ἄγε δὴ Σκίταλοι καὶ Φένακες, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, / Βερέσχεθοί τε καὶ Κόβαλοι καὶ Μόθω (“Come on, you demons of Puffery, Quackery, Foolery, Chicanery, and Debauchery (trans. Henderson)”) or Cratinus’ Δεξώ “Receiver” (fr. 435) and Δωρῶ “Giver” (fr. 70), gods respectively of taking and offering bribes.

Most of the examples of proper names discussed so far are analyzable as conventionally formed derivatives or compounds. Given the wealth of comedic potential offered by plays on proper names, it is no wonder that onomastic coinages also include blends.

3.2 βδεῦ

Anon. *de. Com.* 8 p. 16 Koster

πέμπτον (sic Janko : ἕκτον codd.) κατὰ παρωδίαν (sic Janko : ἐξαλλαγίην codd.)

ὡς τὸ ὦ βδεῦ δέσποτα (adesp. com. fr. 83) ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ Ζεῦ

Bδεῦ] ζεὺς Θ : ζεῦ (scr. m² βεῦ) U : δεῦ V⁵⁷ : βδῆ Chis

fifth (thus Janko : sixth codd.) is from parody (thus Janko : alteration codd.) as in **O Lord Bdeus** (adesp. com. fr. 83) instead of O Zeus

3.2.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

The various paradoseis of ΘΥV⁵⁷Chis are all likely misspellings introduced by copyists dealing with a difficult nonce word. They highlight that the novelty and formal peculiarity of blends could easily lead to their erasure as copyists sought to “correct” and regularize ancient texts.

3.2.2 FORMATION

Βδεῦ, as though the vocative of *Βδεύς, is a blend of βδέω “fart” and Ζεῦ “Zeus (voc.)”, a source that is guaranteed by the context of the word, which mimics an invocation to Zeus. βδεῦ is not a compound nor is it likely a derivative. Nouns ending in -εὺς are typically denominative *nomina agentis* (e.g. φθορεὺς “destroyer” < φθορά “destruction”; σφαγεὺς “slayer” < σφαγή “slaughter”).¹⁰⁸ There is no noun *βδός “fart”, although as *LIV s. v. *pesd-* n. 3 notes, “the aorist βδέσαι (unless secondary) speaks for a (nominal?) base *βδέσ- (trans.)”, that is an *s*-stem noun anomalously in zero-grade.¹⁰⁹ There is thus the possibility that an unattested noun *βδός underlies the formation Βδεῦ. Yet if the unattested *Βδεύς were truly a derivative of the unattested *βδός, it would be the only monosyllabic *nomen agentis* in -εὺς. It thus

¹⁰⁸ On nouns in -εὺς, see in general Chantraine 1933. 125–31; Perpillou 1973; Santiago Álvarez 1987.

¹⁰⁹ *LIV* reconstructs βδέω as a zero-grade present with the suffix -έγε/ο-. Although the same suffix on the *o*-grade makes causative-iterative verbs (e.g. compare φέρω “carry” and φορέω “habitually carry; wear”; φέβομαι “be scared” and φοβέω “make someone scared”), the semantics of it on the zero-grade are unclear; Kölligan 2002 and Willi 2018. 273–9 argue that zero-grade presents with the suffix -έγε/ο- are iterative. Pokorny derives βδέω from *βzdέω, positing an allomorph of the same root as *LIV* but in *e*-grade (“umgestellt von *pezdō”).

seems easier to assume that a comic poet created a funny blend than that Βδεῦ has anything otherwise to do with Zeus.

The theonym Ζεύς is a root noun derived from the root **dyew-* “bright” rather than a *nomen agentis* in *-εως*. The only other etymologically-transparent monosyllable in *-εως* is likewise a theonym: Φλεύς, an epithet of Dionysus at Chios (*EM* p. 796.43–4), from φλέφω “teem with abundance”.¹¹⁰ *Βδεύς cannot be a root noun after the manner of Ζεύς and Φλεύς, since this would require that βδέω were in fact *βδέφω from a root **bdew-*, for which there is otherwise no evidence¹¹¹ and which in any case would be unlikely.¹¹²

3.2.3 INTERPRETATION

Bentley 1816. 145 and Studemund 1882. 10 both tentatively suggested that the fragment referred to Ar. *Lys.* 940 ὦ Ζεῦ δέσποτα, with Bentley going so far as to suggest emending the passage in *Lysistrata* to ὦ βδεῦ δέσποτα. Kock 1888 III.403, however, dismisses the reference without explanation (but presumably because ὦ Ζεῦ δέσποτα is so banal as to preclude reference to any specific passage of literature).

¹¹⁰ Herodian (*Grammatici Graeci* III.1 p. 400.27–32) also notes as examples of monosyllables in *-εως*: Νεύς, a river; Δνεύς, an ethnic, citing μὴ Δνεὺς χίμαιραν, ἄγριον ὀφλήσεις “lest Dneus [deserve] the chimaera, you will deserve something wild” (obscure but perhaps proverbial?), though according to Choeroboscus (p. 213.8–9) it is a city in Lycia where the Chimaera lived. Neither of these, however, has a clear etymology, and both are likely substrate vocabulary.

¹¹¹ This assumes that the late aorist βδεῦσαι (e.g. *Facet.* 233 ἐβδεύσας (printed by Boissonade 1848 and Eberhard 1869, while Dawe 2000 prints ἔβδεσας without comment in his apparatus) is in fact analogical, cf. πλέω “sail” and πλεῦσαι; ῥέω “flow” and ῥεῦσαι.

¹¹² A PIE root beginning in **bd-* would be unlikely since the co-occurrence of two plain voiced stops in a root is not otherwise attested (cf. Fortson 2010. 72).

Beyond that, the blend βδεϋ has chiefly been treated as incidental evidence for the pronunciation of *zeta* as [zd] in the classical period,¹¹³ but the arguments that follow are not particularly strong and so the purported evidence here for the pronunciation of *zeta* is best disregarded.

Blass 1882. 97 was seemingly the first use the word as evidence for the pronunciation of *zeta*, arguing that “the distortion of *ὁ zeu despota* into *ὁ bdeu despota* by an Athenian comic poet would be very harsh if the pronunciation were *dseu*, but quite easy if it were *sdeu* (trans.).”¹¹⁴ Allen 1968. 56 followed suit, claiming that “[zd] value also incidentally adds point to the comic ὦ Βδεϋ δέσποτα cited by Tzetzes, possibly referring to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 940, where the MSS have Ζεϋ.” Janko 1987. 183 likewise took the fragment to “presuppose a pronunciation of ζ as [zd],” and on this ground assigned the fragment to Old or Middle comedy. However, the use of βδέω already assigns the fragment to Old or Middle comedy.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ The *communis opinio* is that *zeta* was pronounced as [zd] in the 6th and 5th centuries BCE, becoming [z] sometime in the 4th century BCE. For discussions of the pronunciation of *zeta*, e.g. Sturtevant 1940. 92; Rohlf’s 1962. 3–8; Allen 1968. 53–6; Lejeune 1972. 112–6; Threatte 1980 I.546; Méndez Dosuna 1993. 82–114; Hinge 2001. 212–34. For an argument in favor of a pronunciation [dz], e.g. Teodorsson 1993. 305–21.

¹¹⁴ According to Papademetrakopoulos 1889. 590, the pronunciation of *zeta* was the cause of something of feud between Blass and his mentor Curtius.

¹¹⁵ βδέω is a crude *vox propria* for farting, confined in the classical period to comedy (Ar. *Ach.* 256; *Eq.* 898, 900; *Pax* 151, 1077; *Pl.* 693, 703; Timocl. fr. 18.2). It is attested later in satiric epigram (*AP* 11.242.2; 415.3 (both jokes about bad breath)); the *Philogelos*, a 4th-century CE collection of jokes (233; 237; 24; (all jokes about bad breath); 241 μωρὸς κωφῶ συγκαθεύδων ἔβδεσε. τοῦ δὲ τὴν δυσωδίαν αἰσθομένου καὶ κατακράξαντος ἔφη· Ἴδε, πῶς ἀκούεις· ἀλλ’ ἐμπαίζεις μοι (“An idiot, sharing a bed with a deaf man, farted. When the deaf man noticed the odor and shouted, the idiot said, ‘Hey, how did you hear that? You’re playing a trick on me’”)); and in a proverb at Apostol. 12.4 νεκρὸς κεῖται βδέων· ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπόρων, εὐπορεῖν δὲ προσποιουμένων (“The corpse lies there farting: used of those who have no idea what they’re doing but pretend they’re experts”). This means not that the word was rare or

Allen seems to assume that, were the substitution [bd] for [dz] rather than for [zd], the fragment's dysphemism would have somehow fallen on deaf ears, as though the fragment were not patently a scatological parody of an oath to Zeus regardless of the precise pronunciation of *zeta*. No point is thus added by supposing a pronunciation of [zd]. And Blass, on the other hand, casts his argument in impossibly vague, subjective terms: what does it mean precisely that one substitution is harsh, the other easy? Certainly, the swapping of [bd] for [zd]—or, rather, simply [b] for [z], since the second element of the cluster [d] remains unchanged—is more economical, since it requires, as it were, only one step, whereas swapping [bd] for [zd] is a two-step process requiring both the substitution of [b] for [z], as well as metathesis of the resulting cluster [db]. But how economical does paronomasia need to be?

As discussed below in Appendix I, there is some “wobble room” allowed for how similar a pun and its target needed to be, and so in each case the argument is heavy-handed and exacting to an extent that the Greeks themselves do not seem to have been. Moreover, as Jaech-Koncel-Kedziorski-Ostendorf 2016 show, while “lower phonetic edit costs in puns correlate with pun goodness” (that is, the less the difference between a pun and its target, the more people like it), a pun with especially

unfamiliar, but only that authors working in other genres judged it too ugly for their purposes. According to Moeris β 4, the word was general Greek vocabulary, as opposed to the specifically Attic βδύλλω (Ar. *Eq.* 224; *Lys.* 354; adesp. com. fr. 1040).

βδέω exists alongside πέρομαι “fart” (< **perd-*), another crude *vox propria* for farting, likewise attested before the Roman period only in comedy (e.g. Eup. fr. 99.10; Pherecr. fr. 93; Ar. *Ach.* 30; *V.* 1177; Crates Com. fr. 20; Timocl. fr. 18.8) and at Sophr. fr. *136; fr. mimorum papyr. 6.22 Cunningham. However, there is seemingly no semantic distinction between them, and the use of one or the other may simply have been a matter of metrical convenience. (Although, the two words are maintained in Slavic but with narrowed meanings, e.g. Ru. *bzdet'* “fart silently” (< **pesd-*) versus *perdet'* (< **perd-*) “fart noisily”).

interesting semantics can succeed despite its “high phonetic edit cost”. Thus, in their study, the pun “They say a Freudian slip is when you say one thing but really mean your mother” was well-rated even though “your mother” is not especially close to its target “another”. Perhaps then βδεῦ owed its success, in part, to its interesting semantics, although this begs the question of its success.¹¹⁶

At any rate, farting in comedy can indicate a wide range of character traits or emotions, including rusticity, fear, arrogance, or happiness, although it can also be counted on to get a laugh regardless.¹¹⁷ There is also frequent comparison between farting and thundering, as at E. *Cyc.* 327; Ar. *N.* 293, 389–94. Thundering is, of course, the domain of Zeus. The blend βδεῦ is thus doubly pointed, taking and perverting not

¹¹⁶ This same heavy-handedness when it comes to Greek and Latin puns persists, however. For example, Fontaine 2010. 41 n. 7 (discussing a pun between *Sosia*, the name of a character, and *socius* “ally”) follows Alinei 1980. 274, Rosén 1991. 27, and Petersmann 1996–7. 204 in assuming that, for the sake of the pun, the speaker momentarily adopts a “pseudo-Umbrian ‘accent’”, pronouncing *socium* as *sochium*. Fontaine says that if the speaker does not do this, “we must conclude that Romans tolerated equivocations on words as different as /sōkium/ and /sōsiam/, a conclusion which would entail other interesting implications.” Although Fontaine is perhaps right to ignore the difference of vowels between the two words, since puns, at least in English, more often entail changes to vowels than to consonants, since, according to Sobkowiak 1991, vowels’ contribution to “target recoverability” (i.e. the ability of the audience to figure out the pun) is lighter. But in this case the target of the pun is explicitly stated, thereby aiding its “recovery”, and there is really no reason to assume a fudged pronunciation of any consonants. It is also not clear what “interesting implications” arise from acknowledging that ancient puns also worked on spectrum of heterophony. Moreover, Fontaine assumes that this pun was successful. Did Plautus never write a bad pun? Surely there were terrible, poorly received puns also in antiquity.

Similarly, Dover 1968 on Ar. *N.* 394 (discussing Strepsiades’ comment that πορδή “fart” and βροντή “thunder” are similar) suggests that the latter may have been pronounced βορ[ν]τή to help the joke land, but as Henderson 1991. 195 n. 14 notes, this suggestion surely misses the point that the words are not in fact that similar and that Strepsiades is just a terrible etymologist.

¹¹⁷ See in general Henderson 1991 §§ 422–34.

only the name of Zeus but also one of his principal functions as the chief Greek deity. No longer do the heavens resound with the thundering of Zeus, but rather with the farting of Bdeus.

The fragment plays on the formulaic language of prayer and religious ritual. Zeus himself is first called δεσπότης in Pindar (*N.* 1.13–4), and thereafter referred to as such at *Ar. Lys.* 940; *adesp. com. fr.* 258.25 Kock; *AP* 11.258.3; *Themist. Ep* 8.22; *Longus* 4.21.2 (regarding the phrase as an Atticism?); *Lamelles Oraculaires* 23.2 δέσποτα ἄναξ Ζεῦ Ναϊε (ca. 350–200 BCE); *Ephesos* 2062.2 δέσποτα Ζεῦ Κτήσιε (1st century CE). Although “Despot Zeus” is apparently used as an invocation in these epigraphic examples, in the literary examples the phrase is merely used, as it were, in vain; and although Willi 2003. 20 tallies in Aristophanes seven instances of δεσπότης as an epithet for six different gods in either prayers or hymns, it is never used of Zeus.¹¹⁸ This is also true outside of Aristophanic comedy, the epithet being used of Hermes at *Telecl. fr.* 35 and of Apollo at *Pherecr. fr.* 87.1. Likewise, in comedy, ὦ Ζεῦ either without or with some other epithet is typically a (mildly blasphemous?) expression of excitement, frustration, surprise, or the like¹¹⁹, and is often accompanied by an additional exclamation¹²⁰ or a deliberative question.¹²¹ It is

¹¹⁸ He cites *Ach.* 247 (Dionysus); *Nu.* 264 (Air); *V.* 389 (Lycus), 875 (Apollo); *Pax* 385, 399 (both Hermes); *Th.* 989 (Dionysus). However, his catalog is idiosyncratic. For example, *Pax* 385 (ὦ δέσποθ’ Ἑρμῆ, “o master Hermes”) and 398–9 (ὦ / δέσποτ’, “o master”; Hermes) count, but 390 (ὦναξ δέσποτα, “o lord master”; Hermes) does not.

¹¹⁹ E.g. *Ar. Ach.* 223–4, 435; *Eq.* 1188, 1390; *Nu.* 153; *V.* 624 with Biles–Olson 2015 *ad loc.*; *Av.* 223, 667–8; *Lys.* 967; *Ra.* 1278; *Pl.* 1, 1095; *fr.* 336.1; *Men. Mis.* 284; *Sam.* 487

¹²⁰ E.g. *Ar. Nu.* 2; *Pl.* 1095; *fr.* 73; *Philet. fr.* 5.1; *Men. Sam.* 487; *fr.* 249

¹²¹ E.g. *Ar. Pax* 58, 62; *Lys.* 476–7; *Th.* 71; *Antiph. fr.* 26.6; *Eub. fr.* 116–7.6; *Men. Asp.* 420; *Mis.* 210; *Prk.* 779; *Euphro fr.* 5.1

seldom used in invocations of Zeus himself and followed by prayers or requests.¹²² It would seem then that the fragment is not to be taken as an address of Zeus himself, but that it is simply a sacrilegious and scatological apostrophe—whatever the opposite of a minced oath is.

The epithet δεσπότης often emphasizes the superiority of the deity addressed,¹²³ which here would lend the fragment an ironic tone. Plausibly therefore the addressee is either recognized as a superior farter (a dubious distinction!) or the addressee is being taken down a peg. Instead of being heralded as the lord of gods and men, as they perhaps think themselves to be, they are mocked as some inferior being, smelly and, given the range of emotions capable of being conveyed by farting, either crude or cowardly or lazy. A similar joke is attested at *Facet.* 232 ὀζόστομος συνεχῶς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καταφιλῶν ἔλεγεν· ἡ κυρία μου, ἡ Ἥρα μου, ἡ Ἀφροδίτη μου. κάκείνη ἀποστρεφομένη ἔλεγεν· ὀζεύς μου, ὀζεύς μου (“a man with bad breath used to say, while constantly trying to kiss his wife, ‘My mistress, my Hera, my Aphrodite.’ And she, turning away, used to say, ‘My stinker, my stinker’), where ὀζεύς μου [ozeusmou] is *para prosdokian* for ὁ Ζεύς μου [hozeusmou]. Instead of heralding her husband as the god-like lover with a fabulous back-catalog of sexual conquests that he evidently thinks he is, the wife rebuffs his advances and takes her husband

¹²² But cf. Cratin. fr. 118 μὲν ὦ Ζεῦ ξένιε καὶ καραιέ (“Come, O Zeus, protector of strangers and head of state”) with Bakola 2010. 172–3.

¹²³ Cf. Barrett 1984 on E. *Hipp.* 88–9.

42 σκαταιβάτου Σ^R et fort. R^{ac} : καταιβάτου R^{pc}, cett.

{A} That thing is filthy, smelly and voracious, a visitation from I don't know which divinity. Apparently not from Aphrodite, or the Graces either. {B} Then who's it from? {A} There's no way it's not from Zeus of the **Thunder Crap** (trans. Henderson)

3.3.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

σκαταιβάτου is transmitted by Σ^R 42c¹²⁵ and perhaps by R^{ac} and adopted by, for example, Meineke 1860 and Wilson 2008. Olson 1998 *ad loc.*, however, notes that it “seems more likely that σ was added to R by the copyist (perhaps from a superlinear note) and then erased than that it fell out everywhere else” and prints καταιβάτου. Yet it seems at least plausible that the difficult σκαταιβάτου was simply “corrected” in other manuscripts, as also eventually in R, and scholia to produce a known word. However, as Olson also notes, it is “in one sense irrelevant” whether one form or the other is read, “since the joke depends on the latter being heard in either case (cf. Threatte [1980 I.]529 for the gemination of σ before κ).” But if σκαταιβάτου is in fact correct, then this is another example of the attempted erasure of a blend.

¹²⁵ In Rutherford's edition of the R scholia, at least: Διὸς σκαταιβάτου (sic R : κ- VLhC)· παίζει σκαταιβάτην (sic R : κ- VLhC) αὐτὸν καλῶν, ἐπεὶ σκάτοις τρέφεται ὁ κἀνθαρος, “Zeus *Skataibatês* (thus R: *Kataibatês* VLhC): he jests by calling him *Skataibatês* (thus R: *Kataibatês* VLhC), since the beetle is fed shit”).

3.3.2 FORMATION

σκαταιβάτης is a blend of the stem of σκῶρ (gen. σκατός) “shit” and καταιβάτης “descender”, itself a compound of κατά “down” and βαίνω “come” and a cult title of Zeus referencing his descent to earth as the personification of lightning.¹²⁶ σκαταιβάτης is not a derivative and it can be ruled out as a compound on formal and semantic grounds. As discussed in Chapter 2, Greek compounds typically involve a first constituent that does not correspond to a full word but rather to a stem and a second constituent that consists of either another stem or an independently attested word; these two constituents are typically linked together by the linking vowel *-o-*, which has been extended by analogy from the *o*-stems. Thus, we would expect *σκατ-ο-βάτης here.¹²⁷

Moreover, in compounds in *-βάτης*, the first constituent typically describes the location¹²⁸ or manner¹²⁹ of one’s going. Yet σκαταιβάτης describes not one who goes into or upon shit or in a shitty manner. Rather, σκαταιβάτης describes “one who descends [to earth] as shit”, just as a καταιβάτης is “one who descends [to earth as

¹²⁶ In fact, the word is first attested describing his thunderbolt: [A]. *PV* 358–9 ἀλλ’ ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος, / καταιβάτης κεραυνὸς ἐκπνέων φλόγα (“but the wakeful missile of Zeus came to him, the descending lightning breathing out fire”).

¹²⁷ Cf. σκατόφαγος “shit-eating” (*Epichr.* fr. 56.2; *Ar. Pl.* 706; *Crob.* fr. 7.2; *Men. Dysc.* 488; *Prk.* 394; *Sam.* 550; fr. 571); σκατοφαγέω “eat shit” (*Antiph.* fr. 124.4); σκατοφόροι “shit-carriers” (*Poll.* 7.134).

¹²⁸ E.g. ἐλειοβάτης “marsh-going” (*A. Pers.* 39); ἀεροβάτης “air-going” (*Plu. Mor.* 952f)

¹²⁹ E.g. ταχυβάτης “swift-going” (*E. Rh.* 134); κιγκλοβάτης “moving like a dabchick” (*Ar.* fr. 140K); λοξοβάτης “crookedly-going” (*Batr.* 295)

lightning]”. The word therefore blends not just the two source words at a point of phonetic overlap σ(κατ-) + (κατ)αιβάτης, but also crucially blends the semantics of the two source words.

3.3.3 INTERPRETATION

σκαταιβάτης, just like βδεῦ, blends together the sacred and the profane. σκῶρ is a crude *vox propria* for “shit” attested only in 5th- and 4th-century comedy and mime,¹³⁰ whereas καταιβάτης is an elevated poetic epithet attested in literature only at [A]. *PV* 358–9; *E. Bacch.* 1361 (Acheron); *Lyc.* 382, 1370 (both Zeus) and in inscriptions (e.g. *IG II²* 4965 Διὸς Κα[τ]- / αιβάτο[υ] / ἄβατον (“sacred precinct of Zeus *Kataibatês*”), found on the Athenian Acropolis, from perhaps the 4th century BCE).¹³¹

Aristophanes’ *Peace*¹³² opens (1–49) with an unnamed slave on stage kneading cakes in a mixing bowl. Another slave enters from indoors and, speaking the

¹³⁰ Epich. fr. 54.3; Stratt. fr. 8; Sophr. fr. 12; *Ar. Ra* 146, 305.

¹³¹ Inscriptions mentioning Zeus *Kataibatês* sometimes marked a site as having been stricken by lightning, but sometimes marked a site as hoping not to be stricken by lightning, i.e. the inscription served an apotropaic function (cf. Nilsson 1908). Thus, Zeus *Kataibatês* both descended to the earth as lightning to sanctify it and protected the earth from lightning strikes. On Zeus *Kataibatês* in general, see Cook 1925 I.13–35.

¹³² The comedy was produced at the Dionysia in 421, only weeks before the Athenians and Spartans ratified the Peace of Nicias, thereby ending ten years of war. Negotiations for peace had begun the previous summer, after Cleon and Brasidas (the Athenian and Spartan commanders) were both killed in battle of Amphipolis, which removed two of the greatest obstacles to peace. But even at the time of *Peace*’s production, peace was hardly guaranteed, since the negotiations had been dragging on for months, with opposition from Sparta’s two most powerful allies, Corinth and Thebes, and Athenian politicians like Hyperbolus, so that eventually Sparta asked its allies to prepare for an invasion of Attica, “so that the Athenians

first line, calls out (innocuously, it seems) αἶρ' αἶρε μᾶζαν ὡς τάχιστα κανθάρῳ ("Give me, give me a barley cake as quickly as possible for Cantharus"), but three lines later he asks for another cake made from donkeys' dung, at which point it becomes clear that the slaves are working frantically, not at making a simple, basic foodstuff for a man named Cantharus,¹³³ but at making dung-cakes for a dung-beetle. Amid the first slave's subsequent and repeated calls for more cakes made from different kinds of dung, the second slave, complaining of the smell and general foulness of the work, remarks that no one would accuse him of eating the food that he makes (14) and that there is no work more wretched than kneading cakes for a dung-beetle to eat (22–3). Eventually the first slave takes the tub of dung inside, at which point the second slave addresses the audience, explaining that his master is mad at Zeus for letting Greece get swept away in war and that he plans to fly the dung-beetle to Olympus to speak to Zeus directly (50–81). Suddenly confirming this revelation, the master and protagonist of the comedy Trygaeus, appears onstage atop the giant dung-beetle, steadying it and reassuring his slaves, children, and neighbors of his plan (82–148), before asking the audience not to fart or shit for three days so as not to distract the dung-beetle (150–4) and flying off to Olympus.

It is amid this sustained scatological riff that the dung-beetle is said to be an omen from *Zeus Skataibatês* and the blend is thus a throwaway joke, tossed in amid a long series of scatological remarks. The blend also perhaps sets us up to think of the

would take their proposals more seriously" (Th. 5.17.2). On the Peloponnesian War generally, see Kagan 2004. On the Peace of Nicias, see Kagan 2004. 187–94.

¹³³ Cantharus is attested 11 times in the *LGPN*.

comedy's protagonist as getting dumped on both literally and metaphorically, as getting a mouthful when giving Zeus a mouthful, when at 56–8, the second slave tells us that his master Trygaeus, “δι’ ἡμέρας γὰρ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν βλέπων / ὠδὶ κεχηνῶς λαιδορεῖται τῷ Διὶ / καὶ φησιν, “ὦ Ζεῦ, τί ποτε βουλευεῖ ποιεῖν; (“All day long he looks at the heavens and, with his mouth agape like this, he upbraids Zeus and says, “O Zeus, what in the world are you trying to do?”). However, the blend Σκαταιβάτης is more pointed than this, and the epithet *Kataibatês* was not chosen simply because it sets up the wordplay. The blend is part and parcel of the comedy's gradual reveal of a world in which civic and religious life has been perverted by a period of prolonged war: a world in which humans themselves no longer make and eat simple foodstuffs, in which some giant dung-beetle eats shit rather than excretes it, and in which Zeus has seemingly failed in his duties as the arbiter of justice and, instead of consecrating the earth with his thunderbolts, defiles it with his shit. Σκαταιβάτης distorts both the name and a function of Zeus to call attention to his alleged deficiencies.

Henderson 1991 § 418 suggests that Σκαταιβάτης may pun on the sexual meaning of βαίνω¹³⁴ and that the word may thus refer to Zeus as a pederast, especially since references to excrement and anal intercourse often co-occur, but notes that “the insult need not have a specific sexual reference” and compares ὦ βδεῦ δέσποτα.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ For other compounds in -βάτης with an explicitly sexual sense, cf. αἰγίβάτης “goat-mounting” (e.g. Pi. fr. 201.2; Theoc. *Ep.* 5.6; *AP* 6.31.1, 99.3); ἀρσενοβάτης “male-mounting” (Hsch. π 77); ἀνδροβάτης “men-mounting” (Hsch. π 77); κτηνοβάτης “animal-mounting” (ΣthTrVatLvMt *Ar. Ra.* 429c).

¹³⁵ Walin 2012 42 n. 129 follows Henderson in suggesting that there may or may not be a sexual reference here, but is mistaken on several accounts when he says: “The choice of the epithet ‘Zeus the Descender’ (καταιβάτης), normally used to refer to lightning strikes, is probably meant to evoke καταβαίνειν in a sexual sense (penetration; see the many κατα-

He is probably right, however, to see in it a reference to pederasty, since this would not be the only such reference in the world-building first scene of the comedy. At 11–2, the one slave returns from indoors, saying ἐτέραν ἐτέραν δός παιδὸς ἡταιρηκότος· / τετριμμένης γάρ φησιν ἐπιθυμῆν (“another one, give me another one from a boy prostitute, since it says it wants a well-pounded one”). These two references perhaps point to another disruption of civic and religious life at the beginning of the comedy: pederasty is seemingly the only sexual activity taking place. A sexual reference in Σκαταιβάτης would moreover foreshadow references to Zeus, his lightning, and pederasty later at the turning point of the comedy, where the beetle seems to have gotten its wish at 720–4:

Τρ. ὦ κἀνθαρ', οἴκαδ' οἴκαδ' ἀποπετώμεθα.

Ερ. οὐκ ἐνθάδ', ὦ τᾶν, ἐστι.

Τρ. ποῖ γὰρ οἴχεται;

Ερ. “ὕφ' ἄρματ' ἐλθὼν Ζηνὸς ἀστραπηφορεῖ.”

verbs with this meaning in Henderson 1991) as well as sound like σκαταιβάτης (“Shit-Walker”) when pronounced closely with the final sigma of Zeus' name (Διὸς καταβάτου)."

First, the verb καταβαίνω seemingly nowhere means “penetrate” *vel sim.*, and accordingly neither does LSJ *s. v.* attest such a sense nor does Henderson 1991 discuss the word. Even in comedy (Ar. *Ach.* 409; *Nu.* 237, 508; *V.* 347, 397, 979, 980, 981; *Pax* 725; *Lys.* 864, 873–4, 880; *Th.* 482–3; *Ra.* 35; *Ec.* 1152; fr. 504.8; Aristopho fr. 12.1; Mnesim. fr. 4.7; Timocl. fr. 14.2; Diph. fr. 89.1; Men. *Dys.* 598, 627, 633; *Sam.* 232), the word simply means “come down; descend”, even in the sexually suggestive context of Ar. *Av.* 556–8 καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσιν ἀπειπεῖν / διὰ τῆς χώρας τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐστυκόσι μὴ διαφοιτᾶν, / ὥσπερ πρότερον μοιχεύσοντες τὰς Ἀλκμήνας κατέβαινον (“Don’t let the gods travel through your land with erections, just as they used to descend (*katebainon*) to commit adultery with Alcmena”). Second, the fact that Henderson 1991 catalogs several verbs with the prefix κατα- is irrelevant. The prefix κατα- does not confer a sexual sense upon a verb which otherwise has none.

Τρ. πόθεν οὔν ὁ τλήμων ἐνθάδ' ἔξει σιτία;

Ερ. τὴν τοῦ Γανυμήδους ἀμβροσίαν σιτήσεται.¹³⁶

Thus, at the turning point in the comedy, where Trygaeus, having freed Peace from prison, is ready to go back to start setting things right and to celebrate his marriage to Theoria, all the shitty perversion of the comedy's opening is recalled and bundled up in Ganymede's "ambrosia."

Mention above was made of the "alleged deficiencies" of Zeus conjured up by the blend Σκαταιβάτης in the opening scene of *Peace*, but once Trygaeus successfully flies to Olympus and finds only Hermes left there, Hermes tells him that it is the Athenians and the Spartans themselves who are in fact responsible for prolonged war. It is here in Hermes' speech that we find another blend discussed next.

3.4 ἈΤΤΙΚΩΝΙΚΟΙ

Ar. *Pax* 211–9

Ερ. ὅτι ἡ πολεμεῖν ἠρεῖσθ', ἐκείνων πολλάκις
σπονδὰς ποιούντων· κεί μὲν οἱ Λακωνικοὶ
ὑπερβάλοιντο μικρόν, ἔλεγον ἂν ταδί·
"ναὶ τὼ σιῶ νῦν Ἰαττικίων δωσεῖ δίκαν."
εἰ δ' αὖ τι πράξαιτ' ἀγαθόν, Ἀττικωνικοί,

215

¹³⁶ "{Tr.} O beetle, let's fly home, home. {Her.} It's not here, buddy. {Tr.} Well, where's it gone to? {Her.} 'After coming under the yoke of Zeus, he bears the lightning.' {Tr.} But where's the poor thing going to get food here? {Her.} He'll feed on Ganymede's ambrosia." That *ambrosia* here means "shit", see Henderson 1991 § 418; Olson 1998 *ad loc.*

κᾶλθοιεν οἱ Λάκωνες εἰρήνης πέρι,
έλέγετ' ἄν ὑμεῖς εὐθύς· “έξαπατώμεθα
νῆ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν.”—“νῆ Δί', οὐχὶ πειστέον.
ἤξουσι καὶ ἄθις, ἦν ἔχωμεν τὴν Πύλον.”

215 Ἀττικωνικό[ι] Ἀττικωνικοί Σ^v

{Her.} Since you kept choosing war, though they often tried to arrange a truce. If those Laconics achieved a small advantage, they'd say this: “by the twin gods, that puny Attic will pay.” And if you Atticonics ever did something good, you'd immediately say, “We're being duped, by Athena.”—“Yes, by Zeus, it's not to be believed. They'll be back, if we hold onto Pylos.”

Phot. α 3138

ἀττικωνικός· ἡ τοιαύτη παραγωγή τῶν ὀνομάτων παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις
ἱκανῶς λέγεται. Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀλκάσι (fr. 437)

ἀττικῶνικος Phot.^z

Ὀλκάσι in marg. Phot.^z

attikōnikos: this formation from the nouns is aptly said about the Athenians. Aristophanes in *Holkades* (fr. 437)

3.4.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

The paradosis of Σ^v is easily taken as a simple error: because the form is vocative, there is no reason to suppose a contraction between the article οἱ (not needed here with the vocative) and ἄττικωνικοί, which would result in ἄττικωνικοί. The same error likely lies behind the ἄττικῶνικός (also with incorrect accent) of Phot.^z. However, neither error affects understanding the word as a blend.

3.4.2 FORMATION

Ἀττικωνικοί is a blend of Ἀττικός “Attic, Athenian” and Λακωνικός “Laconic, Spartan”. Although the word looks *prima facie* to be a derivative formed just as λακωνικός “Laconic” is from Λάκων “Laconian” and Ἴωνικός “Ionic” is from Ἴων “Ionian,” there is no attested base *Ἀττίκων- “Athenian” to which -ικός could be added. Nor is there any derivational suffix -ωνικός that could be added to Ἀττικός. At any rate, the context of the passage makes it clear that the word is to be understood as combining the senses of Ἀττικός and Λακωνικός. As a compound of Ἀττικός and Λακωνικός, however, we would have expected the word to be *ἄττικ-ο-λακωνικός. The word is thus formally only explainable as a blend.

3.4.3 INTERPRETATION

The word attracted little attention in antiquity, being commented upon only at Σ^V Ar. *Pax* 214 οὕτως ἔλεγον ἐνυβρίζοντες καὶ εὐτελίζοντες καὶ εἰς ἥττον φέροντες ὑποκοριστικῶς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, ἐν ᾧ καὶ Ἴωνες ἔγκεινται. παίζει δέ, ἐπειδὴ εἶπεν ἄνω Λακωνικοί ὑποκοριστικῶς· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Ἀττικωνικοί (“so they said, ridiculing and disparaging and belittling the Athenians with a diminutive name that also involves the Ionians.¹³⁷ But it is a joke, since he said *Lakōnikoi* as a diminutive: in this way also *Attikōnikoi*”). The word Λακωνικός as a substantive in the sense “a Laconic man”—and thus used in place of the usual Λάκων “a Laconian man” (cf. LSJ s. v.)—is attested first in Aristophanes (*Ar. Nu.* 186; *Lys.* 1115, 1226; *Ec.* 356, 405) and thereafter before the Roman period only at X. *HG* 4.8.35, 37; *An.* 7.3.8; *Arist. Oec.* 1344b31. The word is typically an adjective or, when used as a substantive elsewhere, refers to Laconia or a kind of Laconian shoes (cf. LSJ s. v.), hence the scholiast’s comments here. Although the word Λακωνικός is not formally a diminutive, the scholiast explains Aristophanes’ use of it by assuming that it is a diminutive parallel to Ἀττικίων (214). This is likewise how he explains Ἀττικωνικοί, an explanation that misses both what makes it unusual and that the blend pokes fun at *both* the Athenians and the Spartans.

More recent commentators, if they comment on the word at all, have generally limited themselves to noting that Ἀττικωνικοί is unusually formed and likely meant as funny. Thus, for example, writes Bergler 1760 *ad loc.* “correctly, however, and

¹³⁷ That is, the scholiast takes the diminutive ending -ίων of Ἀττικίων (214) to evoke Ἴων “Ionian” and thus the stereotype of Ionians as cowardly and feminine. For the suffix, cf. *Ar. Ec.* 1058 μαλακίων “lil’ softie (a term of endearment)”; and see Chantraine 1933. 165. For the stereotype, see Olson–Seaberg 2018 on Cratin. fr. 460.

analogically said is Λακωνικός, since it is from Λακών ... But Ἀττικωνικός is not likewise, for there is no ὁ Ἀττίκων (trans.);” Bothe 1828 *ad loc.* that “it is surely funny, since from Λάκων rightly is derived Λακωνικός, but not so Ἀττικωνικός from Ἀττικός (trans.);” Green 1873 *ad loc.* that “Ἀττικωνικός does not come naturally from Ἀττικός, as does Λακωνικός from Λάκων. Hence it was meant to be a curious word, which probably the rhyme and the convenience of metre led Aristophanes to coin for the nonce;” Olson 1998 *ad loc.* that “Ἀττικωνικοί is a comic coinage that echoes Λακωνικοί.” That the blend pokes fun at both the Athenians and the Spartans has been noted more recently by Henderson 1998 453 n. 12, who says that the word is “coined to emphasize that the Athenians were just as culpable as the Spartans.” Most recently, Willi 2010. 497 (commenting on the form as attested in fr. 437, as well as on fr. 100; 270) notes that the word is “combined from Ἀττικός and Λακωνικός”, but dismisses it and other “comic neologisms in Aristophanes [as] not spectacular” and “colorless”.

After Trygaeus has asked the audience not to fart or shit for three days lest they attract the attention of the giant dung-beetle, upon which he is currently flying (151–2), he manages to steer the buggy steed successfully to Zeus’ house on Olympus so that he can have his hearing with Zeus (154–78). After Trygaeus knocks on the door to Zeus’ house (179), an irascible Hermes answers and demands to know who Trygaeus is and why he has come to Olympus (180–93). Eventually, Trygaeus asks that Hermes fetch Zeus (195), to which Hermes responds that, since the gods were angry with the Greeks, they have moved to a new home where they will neither see humans fighting nor hear them praying (204–9). In the next line, Trygaeus asks τοῦ

δ' οὐνεχ' ἡμᾶς ταῦτ' ἔδρασαν; εἰπέ μοι ("Why have they done this to us? Tell me."), still clearly thinking that the gods are at fault.

Hermes' matter-of-fact response (quoted above) states that the gods have forsaken men because men keep choosing to fight, even though they keep agreeing to truces. It is thus not the case, as Trygaeus has thought, that men continue to fight because the gods have forsaken them (211–2). Hermes continues, further showing how Trygaeus has reversed cause and effect, by pointing out that the Laconians (οἱ Λακωνικοὶ), if ever they achieved anything, were emboldened to keep fighting (212–4), but likewise that the "Atticonians" (Ἀττικωνικοί), if ever the Spartans petitioned for peace, were convinced that it was a trap and remained on the defensive (215–9). There are several takeaways from Hermes' response:

(1) Hermes' use of the word Λακωνικοί, which a scholiast had taken to be a joke itself, is shown rather to be the part of the *setup* for the joke. The form Λακωνικοὶ is there chiefly to prime the audience for the blend. That this is so is suggested by the fact that, after the blend has been introduced, Hermes refers to the Laconians as οἱ Λάκωνες, the usual word for the Laconians, as mentioned above.¹³⁸

(2) Ἀττικίων is likewise part of the setup for the joke, but is also itself a joke. Hermes, by using Ἀττικίων shortly after the word Λακωνικοί and by using both before the blend, gives the audience the pieces needed to solve the puzzle: Λακωνικοί + Ἀττικίων = Ἀττικωνικοί. In addition, the word

¹³⁸ Metrical considerations also perhaps played a role. Hermes could conceivably have used οἱ Λάκωνες ahead of the blend and then coined the blend *Ἀττικώνες instead.

Ἀττικίων is a diminutive, and diminutives are often pejorative in sense. Hermes thus, by putting the word in the mouths of his hypothetical Laconians, has them engaging in a bit of name calling.

(3) The facetious blend Ἀττικωνικοί calls attention to the serious suggestion that the Athenians are also guilty of prolonging the war, but not of course as guilty as the Spartans. Given the rarity of the coordinative compounds in Greek, it would perhaps be advisable not to take the blend as coordinative, that is, as putting the Athenians and Spartans on equal footing, but as making the Athenians somewhat Spartan-like in their behavior.

If the marginal note at Phot.^z α 3138 is right in attributing ἄττικωνικός to *Holkades*, then we are probably to imagine a similar joke there as well, namely that the Athens and Sparta are two *poleis*, both alike in malignity. A testimonium (test. i) to *Holkades* suggests that the comedy attacked Cleon and Lamachus (both hawkish politicians in favor of the Peloponnesian War; see above), which points to a production date in 420s, that is around the time that *Peace* was produced, while two other fragments from the comedy suggest an acknowledgement that Sparta might only *share* blame for the Peloponnesian War and that Sparta might also be pitiable: fr. 415 βαβαί, Λάκων· ὡς ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν ἄρ' ἦν / τὰ πράγματ' οἴσπηρὰ καὶ βαρύσταθμα (“Dang, Spartan, how greasy and burdensome our mutual troubles have been!”); 420 ἰὼ Λακεδαῖμων, τί ἄρα πείση τήμερον; (“Oh Sparta, what then shall you suffer today?”). At any rate, the attribution of fr. 437 to *Holkades*, if right, means that

Aristophanes was not above recycling a facetious nonce formation that he thought was especially good. This would not be the only time that he does so.

3.5 ὨΤΟΤΥΞΙΟΙ

Ar. Av. 1040–2

Ψη. χρῆσθαι Νεφελοκοκκυγιάς τοῖς αὐτοῖς μέτροισι
καὶ σταθμοῖσι καὶ ψηφίσμασι καθάπερ Ὀλοφύξιοι.

Πε. σὺ δέ γ' οἷσίπερ ὠτοτύξιοι χρήσει τάχα.

1042 ὠτο- Dindorf : ωτο- R : ω τὸ τύξιοι V : ὠτο- AtH : ὀτο- EMΓUp

Ps. The Cloudcuckoolanders are to use the same measures,
weights, and decrees as the Olophyxians.

Pe. And you'll soon be used to same ones as the Ototyxi-ans.

3.5.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

The *paradoxeis* of REMΓUp are best regarded as crude copyists' errors reflecting an uncertainty about the result of contraction between the definite article οἱ and a following word beginning with ὀ-. The *paradosis* of V, however, is nonsense but again points to the difficulty that blends faced in the hands of copyists.

3.5.2 FORMATION

The word Ὀτοτύξιοι blends together ὀτοτύξομαι, the future of ὀτοτύζω “cry ὀτοτοῖ”¹³⁹ and Ὀλοφύξιοι “Olophyxians.” The word is not a compound and is unlikely as a derivative. Ὀλοφύξιοι is derived regularly from Ὀλόφυξος (a city in Thrace) with the suffix -ιος,¹⁴⁰ which was used *inter alia* to form nouns and adjectives indicating origin from place-names.¹⁴¹ However, there is no known place Ὀτότυξος from which Ὀτοτύξιοι could be derived with this suffix. It is also unlikely that Ὀτοτύξιοι is derived from the verb ὀτοτύξομαι with the suffix -ιος: although -ιος once played a role in forming primary deverbal adjectives, such formations were based on verbal roots, not verbal tense-stems; as a productive formant the suffix is used to form secondary denominative adjectives. Thus, we must conclude that formally the word is only explainable as a blend.

One further matter here requires comment: although it may perhaps be objected that Ὀτοτύξιοι could just as well blend together the present-tense ὀτοτύζω and Ὀλοφύξιοι, there is good reason to claim that the future-tense ὀτοτύξομαι specifically is one of the blend’s source words. The verb ὀτοτύζω is first attested at A. Ch. 327 ὀτοτύζεται δ’ ὁ θνήσκων (“the dead man is lamented with cries of ὀτοτοῖ”) with much the sense we would expect the interjection ὀτοτοῖ verbalized with the

¹³⁹ ὀτοτοῖ “alas!” is an exclamation of grief confined to tragedy (e.g. A. Ag. 1072; S. El. 1245; E. Ph. 1530).

¹⁴⁰ On which, see Chantraine 1933. 33–8; Schwyzer 1953 I.466

¹⁴¹ Cf. Τάφιοι “Men from Taphos”; Ἐπικνημίδιοι, a Locrian tribe living on the slopes of Mount Knemis.

suffix -ύζω to have,¹⁴² and thereafter it seems to mean much the same thing at Ar. *Pax* 109–11 κᾶτα Μελάνθιον / ἤκειν ὕστερον εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν, / τὰς δὲ πεπρᾶσθαι, τὸν δ' ὀτοτύζει (“and may Malanthius come late to the Agora, when everything’s been sold, and lament with cries of ὀτοτοῖ”) and fr. 234 καὶ τὴν Ἑκάβην ὀτοτύζουσαν καὶ καίμενον τὸν ἀχυρμόν (“and Hekabe wailing and the straw on fire” or perhaps “[the woman] bewailing Hekabe and the straw on fire”); at *Th.* 1081, where the speaker is yelling at Echo for repeating what he says, ὀτότυζ(ε) (“go to hell” or the like) seems really only to be a vague, general curse. However, at Ar. *Lys.* 520–1 ὁ δὲ μ' εὐθύς ὑποβλέψας <ἄν> ἔφασκ', εἰ μὴ τὸν στήμονα νήσω, / ὀτοτύξεσθαι μακρὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν (“And right away he’d glare at me and tell me that, unless I got back to my sewing, I’d very much lament my head”), the only attested future form of the verb,¹⁴³ it has a sense over and above what it typically does: it does not simply mean “will lament with cries of ὀτοτοῖ” but rather “will lament with cries of ὀτοτοῖ (because of physical violence done to one).”¹⁴⁴ Whether this use of the future was an established idiom not otherwise attested or a one-time thing is uncertain, but at any rate it is certain that the blend ὀτοτύξιοι relies on this sense. The ὀτοτύξιοι are not those who do say “ὀτοτοῖ” but those who will say “ὀτοτοῖ” because they have been stricken.

3.5.3 INTERPRETATION

¹⁴² For the suffix, e.g. βάζω “say bow-bow”; γρύζω “make a peep”; λύζω “hiccough”; μύζω “whine”; and see in general Perpillou 1982. 239–41, 260–3; Tichy 1983. 256–63.

¹⁴³ But cf. the augmentless aorist at E. *Hel.* 371 ἀνοτότυξεν “raised up a lament” *vel sim.*

¹⁴⁴ Cf. the English idiom “I’ll give you something to cry about!”

The word featured in several scholarly comments or discussions already in antiquity:

- ΣΕΓ Ar. Av. 1043 Ὀτοτύξιοι· ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀτοτύζειν ἐσχημάτισεν¹⁴⁵
- Eust.¹ p. 318.3–6 = I.494.17–20 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι συντελεῖ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς γνῶσιν συγγενείας τοῦ ζ καὶ τοῦ δ. ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ ἀλαπάζω γίνεται ἀλαπαδνός, ὡς παίζω παιδνός, ὀλοφύζω ὀλοφυδνός· ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὀλοφύζειν ὡς ὀτοτύζειν, καθὰ ὁ κωμικὸς ἐμφαίνει ἐν τῷ Ὀτοτύξιοι, οὗ πρόκειται τὸ Ὀλοφύξιοι¹⁴⁶
- Eust.² p. 594.24–9 = II.171.7–13 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τοῦ ὀλοφυδνόν προϋπόκειται θέμα τὸ ὀλοφύζω ... εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἔθνος οἱ Ὀλοφύξιοι ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτου παράγεται ῥήματος, ἀφ' ὧν παίζει τοὺς Ὀτοτυξίους ὁ Κωμικός, οὐκ ἔστι στερεῶς εἰπεῖν¹⁴⁷

The scholiast straightforwardly derives the blend Ὀτοτύξιοι from the verb ὀτοτύζω, but whether Eustathius does so too is unclear. The argument of Eustathius¹ that ὀλολύζω has the same meaning as ὀτοτύζω based on the parallelism between Ὀλοφύξιοι and Ὀτοτύξιοι in Aristophanes suggests an analogy ὀλοφύζω : Ὀλοφύξιοι :: ὀτοτύζω : Ὀτοτύξιοι. This analogy seemingly suggests that Ὀτοτύξιοι was thought of as deriving from ὀτοτύζω; it also seems to suggest that Ὀλοφύξιοι and Ὀτοτύξιοι were understood here as more-or-less synonymous, which is to miss the joke. More

¹⁴⁵ “*Ototyxioi*: is formed from *ototyzein* (‘wail’)”

¹⁴⁶ “Let it be known that this also constitutes an investigation into the kinship between *zeta* and *delta*, since *alapadnos* (‘worn out’) comes from *alapazô* (‘wear out’), just as *paizô* (‘play’) and *paidnos* (‘childish’), *olophyzô* and *olophydnos* (‘lamenting’). Moreover, *olophyzein* also means *ototyzein* (‘wail’), as the comic poet shows in the word *Ototyxioi*, before which comes the word *Olophyxioi* (‘Olophyxians’)”

¹⁴⁷ “Let it be known that the word *olophydnon* (‘lamenting’) is derived from the primary form *olophyzô* ... but if the ethnonym *Olophyxioi*, on which the comic poet puns when he says *Ototyxioi*, is also derived from a such a verb, it is not possible to say for sure”

noteworthy here, however, is that Eustathius¹ is using the blend as evidence that the verb ὀλοφύζω means “lament”. This is quite remarkable, since it means that a facetious nonce formation in Aristophanes was used to explain the meaning of the putative verb ὀλοφύζω, which is otherwise attested only in ancient scholarly sources¹⁴⁸ and is in fact merely an *ad-hoc* back-formation from the adjective ὀλοφιδνός¹⁴⁹ on the model of, for example, παίζω and παιδνός! Eustathius², however, is skeptical of his own proposition that the ethnonym Ὀλοφύξιοι derives from the verb ὀλοφύζω. He only mentions the blend Ὀτοτύξιοι when he again comments on the wordplay between it and Ὀλοφύξιοι, but his apparent lack of similar skepticism that Ὀτοτύξιοι likewise derives from the verb ὀτοτύζω is probably to be taken as evidence that he assumed the derivation.

More recent commentators have not much advanced beyond the ideas of the scholiast and Eustathius. Thus, Bergler 1760 *ad loc.* notes that Aristophanes “coined a similar word from ὀτοτύζειν ... which is from ὀτοτοῖ (trans.)”; Beck 1782 *ad loc.* that “Ὀλοφύξιοι and Ὀτοτύξιοι are made-up names. The former alludes to ὀλοφύρομαι or ὀλόφους, while the latter is drawn from ὀτοτύζω, which the poet often uses (trans.),” although why he thinks that Ὀλοφύξιοι is made-up is unclear; Bekker 1829 *ad loc.* that “in similarity to Ὀλοφύξιος, the comic poet facetiously coined the gentilic Ὀτοτύξιος, as though from the city Ὀτότυξος, alluding to ὀτοτύζειν (trans.);” Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* that the “pun is well translated by Sommerstein’s ‘the Asphyxians.’”

¹⁴⁸ E.g. Hdn. *Grammatici Graeci* III.1 p. 444.16; Theognost. *Can.* p. 860.4

¹⁴⁹ Beekes s. v. ὀλοφύρομαι relates the adjective to ὀλοφύρομαι (“lament”) and suggests that it has been innovated on the model of other adjectives in -δνός.

Kanavou 2011. 123 likewise mentions the punning between it and Ὀλοφύξιοι, but has nothing to say about its formation.

In Aristophanes' *Birds* (produced in 414 at the tail end of the Peace of Nicias), two Athenians, Peithetaerus and Euelpides, have fled Athens to avoid politics and law-courts, and are seeking Tereus, a mythical human, who was transformed into a hoopoe and who they hope will help find them a new place to live. Upon meeting with the hoopoe, Peithetaerus has the idea to found a city in the clouds and intercept the worship and sacrifices of humanity to the gods to starve them into submission (as the Athenians had done to Melos), and he eventually persuades the chorus of birds that birds once ruled the universe and can do so again. Thereafter, after some deliberation, they decide to call their new city Cloud-Cuckooland.

Immediately after the founding of Cloud-Cuckooland, the first visitors to the new city arrive: an oracle-monger (958–91), an astronomer (992–1020), an inspector (1021–34), a decree-seller (1035–57), a poet (1372–1409), and a sycophant (1410–69). As Dunbar 1995. 4 notes, these visitors represent undesirable types familiar in Athenian political and intellectual life. The inspector and the decree-seller represent “Athenian imperialist officialdom”. The decree-seller, like the inspector, seeks to impose Athenian patronage on the city, and mentions the Olophyxians (located near Mount Athos in northern Greece¹⁵⁰) as another town under such patronage and using Athenian weights, measures and—*para prosdokian*—decrees. It is at this point that

¹⁵⁰ IACP # 587

Peithetaerus threatens the decree-seller with the blend Ὀτοτύξιοι (text quoted above).

On the one hand, the decree-seller's provision, which, as Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* notes, "would have been familiar to many of the audience from their service on the Boule, [since] all *bouletai* had to swear to uphold a measure upholding a decree imposing the use of Athenian coinage, weights, and measures on all allied states," is meant as a parody of the recent "Athenian Coinage Decree" (*IG I³ 1453 = ML 45*). The decree, dated variously to the period between 440 and 420 BCE,¹⁵¹ orders in clause 12 that a member of the Boule punish an allied city, *ἐάν ... μὴ χρῆται νομ[ίσμασιν τοῖς Ἀθηνα]ίων ἢ σταθμοῖς ἢ μέτρ[οις]* ("if any should not use the same laws, measures, and weights as the Athenians"). The humor depends in part on the reminder of Athens' *polypragmonsynê*, of how meddlesome and overbearing Athens had been.

However, this reminder cannot be the sole purpose of the reference because the decree-seller does not say the same weights, measures, and decrees as the Athenians but rather the same ones as the Olophyxians. Olophyxus had been an on-again-off-again ally of Athens,¹⁵² but was otherwise an economically and politically insignificant city on the Acte Peninsula mentioned elsewhere only incidentally in lists of cities (Th. 4.109.3; Hdt. 7.22.3; Scyl. 66; Str. 7 fr. 33, 35) and tributes.¹⁵³ That an inconsequential Thracian city should seek to impose its laws, measures, and weights

¹⁵¹ See Lewis 1997. 116–30 for a history attempts to date the decree.

¹⁵² The Olophyxians are mentioned in Athenian tribute lists. However, they defected to Sparta between Brasidas' Thracian campaign (423 BCE) and the Peace of Nicias (421 BCE).

¹⁵³ Olophyxus is recorded as giving 33 drachmas and 2 obols at e.g. *IG I³ 262.I.26* (451/0 BCE); *280.II.55* (432/1 BCE).

on the new Cloud-Cuckooland is certainly part of the humor here as well, but there was no shortage of inconsequential cities that the decree-seller could claim to have represented. Thus, it seems that the chief motive in having the decree-seller mention the Olophyxians is to set up the blend Ὀτοτύξιοι and its threat of physical violence against the decree-seller, who shortly runs off stage.¹⁵⁴ That the threat of physical violence must have been accompanied by actual violence is suggested by the decree-seller's οὔτος, τί πάσχεις; (“Hey! What are you doing?”) in the next line.

3.6 ΚΛΩΠΪΔΑΙ

Ar. Eq. 74–9

ἀλλ’ οὐχ οἷόν τε τὸν Παφλαγόν’ οὐδὲν λαθεῖν·
έφορᾷ γὰρ οὔτος πάντ’. ἔχει γὰρ τὸ σκέλος
τὸ μὲν ἐν Πύλῳ, τὸ δ’ ἕτερον ἐν τήκκλησίᾳ.
τοσόνδε δ’ αὐτοῦ βῆμα διαβεβηκότος
ὁ πρωκτός ἐστιν αὐτόχρημ’ ἐν Χάοσιν,
τὼ χεῖρ’ ἐν Αἰτωλοῖς, ὁ νοῦς δ’ ἐν **Κλωπιδῶν**.

75

But nothing can get past Paphlagon; he keeps an eye on everything. He has one foot in Pylos, and the other in the Assembly. He’s spread his legs so far apart

¹⁵⁴ Other possible blends here include the metrically identical Ὀλοφεύξιοι (< Ὀλοφύξιοι and φεύξω, the future of φεύζω “cry φεῦ (another primarily tragic exclamation of grief)) and Ὀλολύξιοι (< Ὀλοφύξιοι and ὀλολύξομαι, the future of ὀλολύζω “ululate”). But neither of these carry with them the threat of violence necessary for the joke here.

that his asshole's in Gapetown, his hands're in Askville, and his mind's in **Stealattle**.

3.6.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

There are no textual problems affecting this blend.

3.6.2 FORMATION

Κλωπιδαί is a blend of the stem of κλωψ (gen. κλωπ-) ¹⁵⁵ and Κρωπίδαι, inhabitants of the real Attic deme Κρωπία (between Mt. Aegleus and Mt. Parnes). The word is not a compound and, although it could perhaps be formally analyzed as a derivative of a stem κλωπ-, the context strongly suggests that pragmatically it functions here as a blend and serves as the punchline of a joke: that Cleon is a grasping, begging, thievish busybody.

3.6.3 INTERPRETATION

¹⁵⁵ Whence the long *ô* is uncertain. Chantraine *s. v.* κλέπτω suggests that the *ô* of the nominative might result from lengthening in a monosyllable, in which case the *ô* of the monosyllabic nominative singular would then have been generalized throughout the paradigm. At any rate, although many other derivatives of the root **klep-* “steal” with *ô* are easily explained as errors influenced by κλωψ (e.g. at *X. An.* 6.1.1 manuscripts are divided between κλωπεύω and κλοπεύω, which is probably right (cf. σκοπεύω < **skep-*), the existence of κλωπικός (*E. Rh.* 205, 512), with *ô* guaranteed by the meter, seemingly points to a productive stem κλωπ-. But cf. *AP.* 9.348.1 (Leon.) σταφυλοκλοπίδας “grape-stealer-son”.

Verse 79 is oft-quoted in antiquity, especially among ancient discussions of παραγραμματισμός (on which, see Appendix I below) and much of what needs to be explained here has already been explained by, for example, Σ^{VEΓΘMVatLh} *ad loc.*: ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος τὸ ὄνομα λέγει· οὐκ ἐν Αἰτωλίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ αἰτεῖν. τὸ δ’ ἐν Κλωπιδῶν ἐναλλαγῇ πάλιν στοιχείου, τοῦ ρ εἰς τὸ λ. Κρωπίδαι γὰρ δῆμος τῆς Λεοντίδος φυλῆς. ἔπαιξεν οὖν παρὰ τὸ κλέπτειν;¹⁵⁶ and Eustathius (p. 1764.32–40 = ii.78.20–4): κάντεῦθεν καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς εἶτε καὶ ἄλλως ἢ παροιμία ὠφέληται εἰπεῖν (Ar. Eq. 79). — —. εἶτα κατὰ παραγραμματισμὸν Κλωπιδῶν, ἵνα σκωπτικῶς δηλώσῃ τὸν ταῖς χερσὶ μὲν αἰτοῦντα καὶ οἶονεὶ καὶ αὐτὸν λαλοῦντα ἔμβαλε κυλλῆ, τῷ δὲ νῶ κλέπτοντα. ὅτι δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ κατὰ παραγραμματισμὸν τραυλισμοῦ ἐκωμώδουν δηλοῖ μὲν καὶ τὸ Κλωπιδῶν. Κρωπιδῶν γὰρ ὠφειλεν εἶναι ὡς ἀπὸ γένους ἢ τόπου.¹⁵⁷ However, Eustathius is mistaken that the *kômôidoumenos* here is Alcibiades, whose lisp is made fun of elsewhere in comedy, and that the play between *Krôpidai* and *Klôpidai* here results from the same kind of paragrammatic lip-sing as does the play between *korakos* (“crow”) and *kolakos* (“flatterer”) at Ar. V. 42–5.¹⁵⁸ In fact, the *kômôidoumenos* here is Cleon.

¹⁵⁶ “He says the name from the matter: not in Aetolia but in *aitein* (‘begging’). The phrase *en Klôpidôn* involves the change of a letter, of *rho* into *lambda*, since *Krôpidai* is a deme in the phyle Leontis. Thus he jokes that it comes from *kleptein* (‘steal’).”

¹⁵⁷ “Thus, both the comic playwright and the proverb elsewhere ought to say (Ar. Eq. 79): — —. And by *paragrammatismos Klôpidôn*, to show mockingly that he begs with his hands and takes alms with crooked fingers and lisps and intends to steal. The word *klopidae* shows that the ancients made fun of speech impediments by using *paragrammatismos*, since it should be *Krôpidai* after the people or place”.

¹⁵⁸ On which, see Appendix II.

As Rosen 1988. 66 notes amid a lengthy discussion of the conventionally iambic nature of Aristophanes' invective against Cleon in *Knights*, the latter three toponyms here exist solely for the sake of wordplay between Χάονες and χανεῖν ("Chaonians" and "gape"), Αἰτωλοί and αἰτεῖν ("Aetolians" and "beg"), and Κρωπίδαι and κλωπ-. In fact, Rosen suggests that this passage exists solely for the sake of delivering this wordplay, since Cleon had no special relationship with either Chaonia, Aetolia, or Cropia, and Aristophanes could equally have used the same joke to imply that anyone was gasping, begging, and thievish. This Rosen takes as evidence of the generically iambic nature of the humor here and notes that there are similar puns on toponyms in Hipponax.¹⁵⁹ However, while Hipponax certainly puns on toponyms, nothing in what remains of him seemingly compares to Aristophanes' toponymic blend here.

3.7 ὈΙΚΙΤΙΕΥΣ

Ath. 4.162d

... ὡς ὁ σοφὸς πάντως ἂν εἶη καὶ στρατηγὸς ἀγαθός, μόνον τοῦτο διὰ τῶν ἔργων διαβεβαιωσάμενος ὁ καλὸς τοῦ Ζήνωνος ὁ κιτιεύς. χαριέντως γὰρ ἔφη Βίων ὁ Βορυσθενίτης (fr. 73 Kindstrand) θεασάμενος αὐτοῦ χαλκῆν εἰκόνα, ἐφ' ἧς ἐπεγέγραπτο "Περσαῖον Ζήνωνος Κιτιέα," πεπλανῆσθαι τὸν

¹⁵⁹ E.g. 95.15 Πυγέλησι ("Pygelians (dat.)") seemingly puns on the name of the inhabitants of Pygela, a city in Ionia near Ephesus, and the word πυγή "buttocks"; there are several other πυγ- words attested in what remains of the poem.

ἐπιγράψαντα· δεῖν γὰρ οὕτως ἔχειν, Περσαῖον Ζήνωνος **οἰκιτιέα**. ἦν γὰρ ὄντως οἰκέτης γεγονὼς τοῦ Ζήνωνος, ὡς Νικίας ὁ Νικαεὺς ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ Περὶ τῶν Φιλοσόφων Ἱστορίᾳ καὶ Σωτίων ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐν ταῖς Διαδοχαῖς (fr. 21 Wehrli)

2 ὁ κιτιεύς ABP : οἰκιτιεύς edd. 3 Κιτιέα P, edd. : Κιτία B (-ιᾶ Meineke, Kaibel) 4 οἰκιτιέα P, edd. (-αία AB) : οἰκετιᾶ Kaibel

... that the wise man would necessarily be a good general as well, which is the only point the actions of Zeno's noble Citian established. When Bion of Borysthenes (fr. 73 Kindstrand) saw a bronze statue of him on which the words "Persaeus (the student) of Zeno of Citium" (*Zênônos Kitiea*) had been inscribed, he wittily remarked that the stonemason had made a mistake, since it should have been as follows: Persaeus the Citian **house-slave** of Zeno (*Zênônos oikitiea*), since he was in fact Zeno's slave, according to Nicias of Nicaea in his *Inquiry Concerning the Philosophers* and Sotion of Alexandria in his *Successions* (fr. 21 Wehrli)

3.7.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

In 2, editors since Musurus 1514 (the *editio princeps*) have printed οἰκιτιεύς in lieu of the paradosis, presumably on the assumption that copyists, who missed the joke, had attempted to "correct" the difficult and unusual word here. But the text is grammatical

as-is and needs no emendation. Moreover, the emendation is all the more unlikely, since there is no good reason for the facetious nonce formation, which is in fact the punchline of the joke that the speaker is about to tell, to show up before, or otherwise outside of, the joke here.

In 3, manuscripts and editors are divided as to whether the ending of the word should be contracted (-ἰᾶ) or uncontracted (-ιέα). However, since the uncontracted ending is normal after 300 BCE (cf. Threatte 1996 II.254) and since the word is elsewhere attested with the uncontracted ending (e.g. *IG II³,1 980.12* ap. D.L. 7.11 Ζήνωνα Μνασέου Κιτιέα), Κιτιέα is probably to be preferred here.

In 4, manuscripts and editors are likewise divided as to whether the ending of the word should be contracted or not, but the uncontracted ending is likewise probably to be preferred here; the paradosis of AB shows the confusion of αι and ε common in the Roman period, after αι monophthongized and merged with ε (cf. Threatte 1980 I.294). But whether -ιέα or -ἰᾶ is printed is to an extent irrelevant here in that it has no bearing on understanding the word as a blend.

Somewhat more relevant, however, is the fact that the manuscripts (followed by Kaibel)¹⁶⁰ read οἰκετ-, whereas other editors since Musurus, as well as LSJ *s. v.*, print the οἰκίτ-. But οἰκίτ- seems considerably more clever, especially in light of ancient discussions about comedic word formation, in which the change of a single letter in a word for the sake of a joke is well recognized, discussed, and documented:¹⁶¹ descriptively at least οἰκίτιεύς entails adding only a single sound (the

¹⁶⁰ How Kaibel reconciles printing οἰκίτιεύς in 2 but οἰκετιᾶ in 4 is unclear.

¹⁶¹ See Appendix I.

diphthong *oi* to the beginning), whereas οἰκετιεύς would involve both adding *oi-* and changing the first *iota* to *epsilon*. It is also easy to imagine that οἰκιτ- could have been “corrected” in light of the following οἰκέτης. For these reasons, I follow earlier editors in printing οἰκιτ- here, although the word is still understandable as a blend in either case.

3.7.2 FORMATION

οἰκιτιεύς blends together οἰκέτης “house-slave” and Κιτιεύς “Citian, from Citium (a city on Cyprus)”. The form of οἰκιτιεύς cannot be accounted for as a conventional compound or grammatical derivative, since there is no base *οἰκιτ- to which -εύς could be added; nor is there a prefix *οἰ- which could be added to Κιτιεύς, and it is not a compound. As a blend, however, its form and meaning are clear. The phonetic overlap between the two words (-κετ- and κιτ-) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that again serves as the punchline of a joke: that Persaius is not a Kitian student of Zeno (Ζήνωνος Κιτιέα) but a Kitian house-slave of Zeno (Ζήνωνος οἰκιτιέα).

3.7.3 INTERPRETATION

LSJ *s. v.* write that οἰκιτιεύς is a “com(ic) word for οἰκέτης, with play on Κιτιεύς, Bion ap.Ath.4.162d (ὁ κιτιεύς cod. A, οἰκετιεύς Kaibel)”, which seems to give the misleading impression that the word is formally unremarkable if punny. Montanari *s. v.* οἰκετιεύς

gives a similar impression with the gloss “Bion¹ (Ath. 4.162d: *acc.* -ετιᾶ *or* -ιτιᾶ *corr.*), see οἰκέτης”. On the other hand, Kindstrand 1976 *ad loc.* notes that the word is “created by Bion *ad hoc*”, which is to say that it is a facetious nonce formation, and cites it as example of what Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1412^a29) calls σκῶμμα περὶ γράμμα (“a joke depending on (the change of) a letter; a pun”).¹⁶² Kindstrand also suggests that the quip may have been retaliation for similar insults made about himself by Persaeus, which is possible but not necessary.

Whether Persaeus was really Zeno’s slave is unclear, since all that is known for sure about his life is that he was a pupil of Zeno; that, after Zeno was invited to Pella by Antigonus II Gonatus of Macedon (a philosophy buff), he and Philonides of Thebes were sent there in his stead in *ca.* 274 BCE; and that, after Antigonus recaptured Corinth in *ca.* 244 BCE, he was made archon of Corinth and died a year or so later defending the city from Aratus of Sicyon (a former pupil of his); sources calling him a slave of Zeno are generally hostile to the Cynics.¹⁶³ Remarks here and there, however, suggest that he may have been engaged in personal and professional rivalries with

¹⁶² As an example of this kind of humor, Aristotle (^a30–1) cites *adesp. parod. fr.* 5 ἔστειχε δ’ ἔχων ὑπὸ ποσσὶ χίμεθλα (“and he strode on having beneath his feet—chilblains”) with χίμεθλα allegedly *para prosdokian* for πέδιλα “sandals”. The anonymous commentator on ^a29 says: οἱ γὰρ κωμικοὶ χρῶνται τοῖς τοιούτοις ἦτοι τοῖς σκώμμασι τοῖς παραπεποιημένοις παρὰ γράμμα ἔν καὶ παρεφθαρμένοις· τὸ γὰρ (Ar. V. 45) — οὐχὶ νοεῖται οὕτως, ὡς ὑπέλαβε καὶ ἐνόησεν αὐτὸ κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ὁ ἀκροατής, ἀλλ’ ὀνειδισμόν τινα παρεμφαίνει πρὸς τραυλόν (“The comic poets use such devices as jokes in which a single letter is altered and corrupted. (Ar. V. 45) — is not understood as is, since the hearer understands it a certain way and takes it at face value, but it suggests some criticism of someone with a lisp). This same line of Aristophanes is cited variously by ancient sources as an example of either *παρωδία* or *παραγραμματισμός*, and discussed more fully in my Appendix I.

¹⁶³ Cf. D.L. 7.36 (amid the biography of Zeno; Persaeus did not evidently warrant his own biography); and see Erskine 2011. 177–94.

other philosophers invited to the court of Antigonus, since Menedemus of Eretria allegedly “waged a harsh war with Persaeus alone” (μόνῳ Περσαίῳ διαπρύσιον εἶχε πόλεμον; D.L. 2. 143) and, after Perseus allegedly thwarted his efforts to get Antigonus to restore the Eretrians to democracy, remarked about Persaeus: “Sure, he’s a philosopher, but he’s also the worst of those men who currently do or ever will exist” (φίλόσοφος μέντοι οὗτος, ἀνὴρ δὲ καὶ τῶν ὄντων καὶ τῶν γενησομένων κάκιστος; D.L. 2.144).

Bion, evidently at Pella in the court of Antigonus around the same time as Persaeus and Philonides, seems likewise to have quarrelled with Persaeus, since Diogenes Laertius (4.46–7) quotes Bion as saying ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ κατ’ ἐμέ. ὥστε παυσάσθωσαν Περσαῖός τε καὶ Φιλωνίδης ἱστοροῦντες αὐτά· σκόπει δέ με ἐξ ἑμαυτοῦ (“That’s my story. It’s time that Persaeus and Philonides stop telling it. Judge me by myself”), after telling Antigonus that he was born in Olbia to a fishmonger and a prostitute, sold into slavery with his whole family; and that thereafter having been bought by a rhetorician, who upon his death freed Bion and left him his estate, he went to study philosophy, jumping around from school to school: according to Diogenes Laertius (4.51–2), he first studied under Crates the Academic, whose views he criticized while still his pupil, before converting to Cynicism and thereafter to Theodorean Atheism, before ending up at the lectures of Theophrastus the Peripatetic. Whether there was in fact a feud between Persaeus and Bion is in one sense irrelevant, however, since Bion seemingly turned his wit against many

conventional targets regardless: for example, marriage,¹⁶⁴ Alcibiades,¹⁶⁵ and other philosophers.¹⁶⁶

This fragment of Bion is quoted in Book 4 of Athenaeus by Magnus, one of the *deipnosophists*, amid a lengthy discussion of philosophers. Magnus begins his speech by quoting a fragment of Sopater (fr. 6), in which the speaker jests that he will sell someone Ζηνωνικῶ κυρίῳ (“to a Zenonian master”; 4.160f), a likely reference to the meager subsistence and harsh lives deliberately led by some philosophers and allegedly imposed on their pupils. Diogenes Laertius also comments on this lifestyle, saying that Zeno was καρτερικώτατος καὶ λιτότατος, ἀπύρῳ τροφῇ χρώμενος καὶ τρίβωνι λεπτῶ (“capable of the greatest endurance and very frugal, making due with uncooked food and a thin, thread-bare cloak”; 7.27) and quoting Philemo.¹⁶⁷ Thus, Bion seems to be picking up this same thread, namely poking fun at Cynic philosophers for their frugal lifestyle,¹⁶⁸ but to be doing so in an especially novel and verbally dextrous way.

¹⁶⁴ fr. 61b ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος, εἰ γήμαι, ἔφη, ἐὰν μὲν γήμῃς αἰσχρὰν, ἔξεις ποιήν· ἂν δὲ καλήν, ἔξεις κοινήν (“After being asked by someone, ‘Should I get married?’ he said, ‘if you marry an ugly woman, she’ll be a pain (*poinë̄n*), but if you marry a pretty woman, she’ll be shared (*koinê̄n*)”).

¹⁶⁵ fr. 60 τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην μεμφόμενος ἔλεγεν ὡς νέος μὲν ὦν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀπάγοι τῶν γυναικῶν, νεανίσκος δὲ γενόμενος τὰς γυναῖκας τῶν ἀνδρῶν (“He said that Alcibiades as a young child loved wives’ men, but as a youth loved mens’ wives”).

¹⁶⁶ E.g. fr. 59 (mocking Socrates)

¹⁶⁷ fr. 88 εἷς ἄρτος, ὄψον ἰσχάς, ἐπιπιεῖν ὕδωρ. / φιλοσοφίαν καινὴν γὰρ οὗτος φιλοσοφεῖ, / πεινῆν διδάσκει καὶ μαθητὰς λαμβάνει (“one loaf of bread, figs as dessert, water to drink. He preaches a new kind of philosophy, teaches hunger and still attracts students”).

¹⁶⁸ Although sometimes considered a Cynic himself, Bion was at best an unorthodox Cynic (cf. Navia 1996. 151–6).

As far as we can tell from the scant remains of Bion, he does not seem otherwise to have been lexically inventive;¹⁶⁹ rather, his vocabulary is mostly prosaic.¹⁷⁰ He makes up for his lexical sparseness, however, with frequent rhetorical flourishes and a fondness for paronomasia,¹⁷¹ as did the Cynics generally, it seems.¹⁷² Wordplay is attested in many of Bion's fragments: for example, in one fragment (fr. 39), he quips that fate has not given (δεδώρηκεν) the rich money, only lent (δεδάνεικεν) it to them; in another (fr. 20), he quips that opinion is the hindrance of progress (προκοπῆς ἐγκοπὴν); and in yet another (fr. 5), that scholars investigating Odysseus' wandering (πλάνης) fail to notice their own, since they wander (πλανῶνται) in the same way when they toil over something of no use whatsoever.¹⁷³

The set-up for the joke is provided by the Greek onomastic convention of identifying an individual by their given name, the genitive of their father's (and sometimes also, mother's) name, and their ethnonym: for example, Anon. *de Com. pr.* Ἀριστοφάνης Φιλίππου Ἀθηναῖος ("Aristophanes, of Philipp, from Athens"). This is already how characters in Homer ask others to identify themselves,¹⁷⁴ and this is how

¹⁶⁹ Kindstrand 1976. 25–39

¹⁷⁰ Kindstrand 1976. 29

¹⁷¹ Cf. D.L. 4.54; Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.60; and see Dudley 1937. 64–6.

¹⁷² For example, Diogenes Laertius (4.47) records that Diogenes of Sinope, when asked where a child engaged in prostitution had come from, remarked that he was "from Tegea" (*Tegeatês*): *Tegea* is both a city in the Peloponnesus as well as the plural of *tegos* "brothel". See in general Kindstrand 1976. 33.

¹⁷³ The remark cuts close to the Classicist's home. Cf. Priapus' ridicule of Homeric scholarship in Chapter 5 *s. v. merdaleus*.

¹⁷⁴ *Il.* 21.150 τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν ὃ μιν ἔτλης ἀντίος ἐλθεῖν ("Who among men and from where are you who dared to come against me?"); *Od.* 10.325 = 14.187 = 15.264 = 19.105 = 24.298 τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες ("Who among men and from where? Where your city and parents?").

Diogenes Laertius introduces nearly all the philosophers about whom he writes, when he has that information.¹⁷⁵ However, when he introduces these philosophers as pupils of other philosophers, he does so explicitly with the terms μαθητής (“student”)¹⁷⁶ and ἀκροατής (“listener”)¹⁷⁷ or says that they listened to another philosopher,¹⁷⁸ presumably because the ellipsis of such a word could lead to ambiguity whether the individual described was the son or the pupil of another.¹⁷⁹ What this perhaps means is that the set-up to this particular joke deviates deliberately from the conventions of identifying someone as the pupil of a certain philosopher to create the ambiguity needed for the punchline of the joke.

Thus, the blend is the result of a (quasi-)Cynic’s typically punning disposition and reliance on an established rhetorical scheme (σκῶμμα περὶ γράμμα), facilitated by the (deliberate?) ambiguity of Ζήνωνος in the original inscription and put to work in ridiculing another philosopher in otherwise conventional ways—calling them a slave and riffing on their name.

3.8 Λακιδάιμονος

¹⁷⁵ E.g. 3.1; 5.1; 6.1; 7.10; 7.36.

¹⁷⁶ 2.16; 6.82; 6.102; cf. D. 35.15; Pl. *La.* 180d; D.S. 12.20; Paus. 1.26.4.

¹⁷⁷ 4.21; cf. Philostr. *VS* 1.567; 569; and in Latin, Suet. *Pers.* 1 *Annaeum Lucanum aequaevum auditorem Cornuti* (“Annaeus Lucanus, an agemate and pupil of Cornutus”).

¹⁷⁸ 2.3; 4.6; 5.75; 8.78; 9.21; 9.24.

¹⁷⁹ Likewise, slaves were typically introduced explicitly as slaves, in the event that they were introduced at all (cf. D.L. 6.99 Μένιππος, καὶ οὗτος κυνικός, τὸ ἀνέκαθεν ἦν Φοῖνιξ, δοῦλος “Menippus was also a Cynic and by descent a Phoenician, a slave”), but cf. And. 1.17 Λυδὸς ὁ Φερεκλέους (“Lydus, (a slave) of Pherecles”).

Hsch. λ 199

λακιδάιμονος (adesp. com. fr. 381)· ψοφοῦντος, ἤχοῦντος

laikidaimonos (gen.) (adesp. com. fr. 381): making noise (gen.), ringing (gen.)

3.7.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

There are no textual issues with this reading, which is preserved in Hesychius, a late antique lexicographer whose work is devoted to the definition of difficult poetic words.

3.8.2 FORMATION

λακιδάιμονος, as though the genitive of *λακιδάιμων, is a blend of the stem of λακίς (gen. λακίδος) “tear; tatters”¹⁸⁰ and Λακεδαίμων “Lacedaemon; Lacedaemonian”.

That the blend is an adjective rather than a noun, as might be expected since the source word Λακεδαίμων is usually a feminine noun referring to the geographical

¹⁸⁰ λακίς is poetic vocabulary, first attested at Alc. fr. 208a.8 and thereafter in Aeschylus (e.g. *Pers.* 125; *Supp.* 120 = 131, 904; *Ch.* 29; all of tears in clothing as a result of violent grief) and at Ar. *Ach.* 423 ποίας ποθ' ἀνήρ λακίδας αἰτεῖται πέπλων; (“what sort of tears of robes is the man seeking?”; Euripides asks what kind of stage costumes Dicaeopolis wants).

λακίδες in the sense “tatters; torn clothing” is attested only in lexicographic sources and the like (e.g. Hsch. λ 198; Σ^{RLh} Ar. *Ach.* 423; *Suda* λ 53). However, it is less likely that the sense “tatters” was ever really current than that it developed in lexicographers either from a misapprehension of Ar. *Ach.* 423 (i.e. they understood λακίδας ... πέπλων as “tatters of robes” instead of as a poetic periphrasis “tears of robes”) or from an over-abbreviation of a note.

region of Lacedaemon, is suggested by the glosses (both masculine/neuter singular genitive participles), but the glosses are likely no more than shots in the dark at a difficult word. Thus, λακιδαίμονος could be either an adjective (“Tatterdemonian”) or a noun (“Ragchester”; “Tatterhassee”).

λακιδαίμονος is not a derivative and it can be ruled out as a compound on formal grounds. Were the word a compound, it could seemingly only be a compound of λακίς¹⁸¹ and δαίμων “spirit”,¹⁸² in which case, however, we would expect *λακιδοδαίμων. On the other hand, Hesychius—again, likely guessing¹⁸³—takes λακιδαίμονος to be a compound of either λάκος “noise”¹⁸⁴ or λακεῖν “ring (when

¹⁸¹ λακίς and its derivatives are the only words in Greek beginning with λακι-.

¹⁸² Such compounds, already attested in Homer (cf. *Il.* 3.181 ὀλβιοδαίμων “blessed”), are abundant in comedy, e.g. Eup. fr. 187 κοιλιοδαίμων (“someone who makes his belly a deity”); Ar. *Nu.* 296 τρυγοδαίμων (“wretched comic poet”); *Ec.* 1102 βαρυδαίμων (“luckless”); adesp. com. fr. 433 τυραννοδαίμων (“a slightly godlike tyrant”); 610 κρονοδαίμων (“someone old and foolish”); 660 σοροδαίμων (“someone so old that they ought to be in a grave”); 749 βλεπεδαίμων (“someone who looks like a ghost”); and cf. Ath. 8.352b νακοδαίμων (“currier”). Although -δαίμων retains its literal sense “deity; luck” in many of these compounds, in others it is seemingly reduced to the status of an (intensifying?) affixoid: compare σοροδαίμων and σορός, lit. “coffin” but as a nickname of an old person at Ar. *V.* 1365; κρονοδαίμων and Κρόνος, the father of Zeus but as a nickname of an old and foolish person at e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 929; *V.* 1480. On the development of intensifying affixoids from oft-used constituents of compounds generally, cf. n. 21.

¹⁸³ It is possible, however, that the entry in Hesychius has been much abbreviated. It is also possible that it drew on earlier material on Hes. *Th.* 694 λάκε δ’ ἀμφὶ περι μεγάλ’ ἄσπετος ὕλη (“and the unspeakably large woods crackled thereabout”), whence also Orion λ p. 96 λακίδες. ἐπὶ σχίσματος ἱματίου. παρὰ τὸ λακεῖν καὶ ψοφεῖν· ἡρέμα ἐνσχίζεσθαι. οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν τοῖς Σημείοις Ἡσιόδου (“*lakides*: used of a tear in a cloak. From *lakein* and *psophein*: it is torn softly. Thus Aristarchus in his *Critical Signs on Hesiod*”). At any rate, the connection between λακίς and λακεῖν here is probably folk-etymology; the etymology of both words is uncertain (cf. Beekes s. vv. λακίς, λάσκω).

¹⁸⁴ Attested only at Hsch. λ 215 λάκος· ἤχος, ψόφος (“*lakos*: ringing sound, noise”).

struck); shriek”¹⁸⁵ and δαίμων, although his brief note is not explicit about the formation. We would expect such a compound, however, to be *λακοδαίμων and to mean, if -δαίμων were treated as an affixoid, something like “noisy”, which is in fact how he glosses it.

3.8.3 INTERPRETATION

Beyond Hesychius, the word was not otherwise commented on in antiquity. Schmidt 1860. 8 n. had suggested that the λακιδαίμονος might be a comic adespoton, while Kock 1888 III.585 (following Schmidt and taking the word as a comic adespoton) suggested that it was “no doubt like Λακεδαίμονος from the word λακίς (trans.)” and doubted whether Hesychius’ gloss was right.

Since Hesychius cites the word with no context and with an (almost certainly) incorrect gloss, much about the word and its referent must remain obscure. However, it perhaps refers to stereotypes about Sparta as a land of shabby dressers. Several anecdotes bespeak the Spartans’ sartorial sparseness: for example, Plutarch (*Lyc.* 50; *Mor.* 237b) and Xenophon (*Lac.* 2.4) report that Lycurgus introduced some policy whereby young men were given only one garment per year, whereas parents in other Greek *poleis* pampered their children with changes of clothing (*X. Lac.* 2.1). Plutarch (*Mor.* 229a) also tells how Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse, sent Lysander, an

¹⁸⁵ Hsch. λ 187 λακεῖν· ψοφῆσαι (“*lakein*: to make noise”), cf. λ 184 λάκε· ίδίωμα ἤχου. ἐθλάσθη, συνετρίβη. ἤχησεν (“*lake*: a unique property of an echo. He/she/it is crushed, is worn down. He/she/it made a noise”), which however seems garbled.

admiral of Sparta, two costly garments, but that Lysander would not accept them for fear lest they make his daughters appear ugly. And so great was the Spartans insistence on simple clothing that, according to Plutarch (*Mor.* 239c), they once arrested a man for sewing a hem on his course garment. In addition, Pausanias (7.14.2), although he does not mention *how* the Spartans dressed, speaks to the fact that Spartans dressed distinctly when he tells how the Corinthians once arrested anyone dwelling in Corinth known to be a Spartan or even suspected to be a Spartan because of their haircut, shoes, clothes, or name (κουρᾶς ἢ ὑποδημάτων ἔνεκα ἢ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐσθῆτι ἢ κατ' ὄνομα προσγένοιτο ὑπόνοια). There may also be here a reference to “Lacedaemonizing” or “Laconizing”, that is the practice of adopting Spartan dress and manners, which men in Athens did as a show of contempt for Athens and its customs and institutions. Both Plato and Demosthenes specifically mention that Laconizing entailed *inter alia* wearing short, threadbare cloaks.¹⁸⁶ Thus, the blend here may have called someone out for wearing shabby Spartan clothes as part of their “Laconizing”.

Alternatively, the blend λακιδαίμονος may have little or nothing to do with Lacedaemon itself or any Lacedaemonian. That is, the source word Λακεδαίμων may have been merely a convenient source with which to blend λακίς and thus have been incidental to the joke that somewhere or someone is raggedy and thus perhaps poor. That such “punching down” at the poor was common in Attic comedy is suggested at *Ar. Pax* 739–40 when the chorus says in the parabasis πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἀντιπάλους μόνος ἀνθρώπων κατέπαυσεν / εἰς τὰ ῥάκια σκώπτοντας ἀεὶ καὶ τοῖς

¹⁸⁶ Pl. *Prt.* 342b–c; D. 54.34. For “Laconizing” generally, see Dunbar 1995 on *Ar. Av.* 1281–3; Olson 2014 on *Eup.* fr. 385.

φθειροῖν πολεμοῦντας (“In the first place, he was the only man on earth to stop his rivals from making jokes about rags and battling lice”), thereby criticizing Aristophanes’ rivals for their tired, trite humor and their attacks on inappropriate targets.

However, the target of the joke need not necessarily have been raggedy and poor; they may have been raggedy and paratragically lamenting. Since λακίς typically refers to a tear in clothing made as a result of grief or mourning in tragedy and is picked up in Aristophanes as a bit of paratragedy amid a long conversation with Euripides, where he enumerates all the of the bathetic, shabbily-dressed characters from mythology that he has put on stage, perhaps the blend is a remark calling attention to the fact that someone’s grief and mourning would be better suited to a more tragic context. Or, since λακίς in Aeschylus can refer to a tear in clothes because of violence done to one,¹⁸⁷ perhaps we are to imagine here a quippy threat of violence like Aristophanes’ Ὀτοτύξιοι, something along the lines of “I’ll do such violence to you that you turn from a Lacedaemonian into a Lakidaemonian”.

3.9 ΔΟΡΙΑΛΛΟΣ OR ΔΟΡΥΑΛΛΟΣ

Et.Gen. AB (*EM* p. 283.45 = *Et.Gud.* p. 375.8–9) ≈ *Suda* δ 1383

¹⁸⁷ At *A. Supp.* 904 a messenger from Egypt threatens the Danaids that, unless they get on the boat back to Egypt, λακίς χιτῶνος ἔργον οὐ κατοικτιεῖ (“a tear will not pity the work of your robe”).

δορίαλλος· λέγεται καὶ δόριλλος. Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 382)· αἱ <δε> γυναῖκες τὸν δορίαλλον φράγγνυνται. ἔστι δὲ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον, ἐφ' ὕβρει τραγωδιοποιοῦ Δορίλλου

δορίαλλος] δορίαλος B, *Et.Gud.* : δόριλλος *Suda*

doriallos: *dorillos* is also said. Aristophanes (fr. 382): <and> the women guard their *doriallon*. It is the female pudenda, said in mockery of the tragic poet Dorillus

Hsch. δ 2230

δορύαλλος· τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν μόριον, ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρειν, ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ τραγωδοποιοῦ Δορύλλου, οὗ μέμνηται ἐν Λημνίαις (Ar. fr. 382)

doryallos: the part of women, from the verb *derein*, said in mockery of the tragic poet Doryllus, whom he mentions in *Lemnian Women* (Ar. fr. 382)

Σ^v Ar. *Ra.* 516

καὶ **δορία<λ>λος** τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον, ὡς παρὰ τῷ αὐτῷ ποιητῇ (fr. 382)· αἱ <δὲ> γυναῖκες τὸν δορία<λ>λον φράγγνυνται

And **doria<l>los** is the female pudenda, as in the same poet (fr. 382): <and> the women guard their *doria<l>on*

3.9.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

The meter of the fragment (anapests) demands that the blend be spelled δορίαλλος or δορύαλλος with two *lambdas*. The *Suda*'s δόριλλος is unmetrical and is most likely an attempt to “correct” a supposed misspelling of the personal name, thus missing the joke, whereas the δορίαλος of the *Et.Gen. B*, *Et.Gud.*, and the Aristophanic scholion likely just shows the simplification of the geminate -λλ- frequent in inscriptions and papyri from the 4th century BCE on.¹⁸⁸

Whether the name of the tragic playwright is in fact Δόριλλος (as in the *Et.Gen.*),¹⁸⁹ Δόρυλλος (as in Hesychius),¹⁹⁰ Δορίλαος (as at Satyr. *Vit.Eur.* fr. 39.15.32, likely referring to the same tragic playwright), or Δορύλαος¹⁹¹ is unclear, although in one sense it is irrelevant here, since it does not affect understanding the word as a blend. The witticism perhaps works best, however, if the name is Δορίλλος, since in this case the blend entails—descriptively, at least—a change of only a single letter.

¹⁸⁸ Threatte 1980 I.511–2, 517–8

¹⁸⁹ Elsewhere (not referring to the tragic playwright) at e.g. *Ét. Thas.* 3 p. 266 no. 29.7 (5th/4th century BCE, from Thasos).

¹⁹⁰ Nowhere else attested evidently.

¹⁹¹ Elsewhere (not referring to the tragic playwright) at e.g. *ID* 1572.1 (1st century BCE, from Delos); *St.Pont.* III.160.1–4 Δορύλαος / Δορυλλάο- / -υ ένθάδ- / -ε κίτε (“Doryllaos son of Doryllaos lies here”; 130 CE, from ChilioKOMON), where the name has one *lambda* in one line but two in the next! For variation between -λλ- and -λ- in other personal names, cf. Βάθυλλος (34 times in *LGPN*) and Βαθύλος (5 times); Ἄστυλλος (twice) and Ἄστυλος (13 times); Βράχυλλος (18 times) and perhaps Βραχύλα (not in *LGPN* but at *I. Akrai* 19 (late 6th century BCE; from Sicily).

3.9.2 FORMATION

δορίαλλος blends Δόριλλος, the name of a tragic poet, and περίαλλος “groin”.¹⁹² The word is not a compound nor is it likely a derivative, since there is no suffix *-ιαλλο- or *-υαλλο- that could be added to a base δορ- nor is there any suffix *-αλλο-¹⁹³ that could be added to either δορυ- or δορι-.¹⁹⁴ As a blend, however, the form and meaning of the word are clear. The phonetic overlap between nearly the whole of the two words is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that Dorillus is kind of a cunt.

3.9.3 INTERPRETATION

Maas 1973. 200 (followed by Henderson 2007 *ad loc.*) had, without clarifying the form of the word, already suggested that δορίαλλος was a pun on περίαλλος intended to make fun of the tragic poet Dorillus. Kanavou 2011. 196 n. 9, however, contends

¹⁹² Attested only at Arc. p. 61.2 = Hsch. π 1572 = *Synag.* π 320 = Phot. π 635 = *Suda* π 1063 περίαλλος· τὸ ἰσχίον (“*periallos*: the hips”) and perhaps Alciphrr. 4.14.6 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ περιάλλων συγκρίσεις καὶ περὶ μασταρίων ἀγῶνες (“And there were also comparisons of hips (περιάλλων) and competitions of boobies”; courtesans compare physiques at a party), where the word is presumably an Atticism.

¹⁹³ *pace* Chantraine 1933. 247 who alleges that -αλλο- is a variant of -αλο- with “expressive gemination” attested in only four words: κορυδαλλός “crested lark”; κρύσταλλος “crystal”; νεκύδαλλος “silkworm cocoon”; and ὄκταλλος, a Boeotian form of ὄφθαλμός. To these four examples Schwyzer 1953 I.484 adds several others (all words for flora and fauna). However, these are all most likely substrate vocabulary (cf. Beekes s. vv.).

¹⁹⁴ At any rate, δόρι, the dative of δόρυ “spear”, would not serve as a base for derivatives.

that *περίαλλος* “does not seem to be close enough in sound” for the pun to work, but this misses the fact that the word is not just a pun but a blend and raises the question, “How close is close enough?” discussed above (n. 117).

At any rate, the blend *δορίαλλος* is also attested in a late list of terms for female genitalia at Σ^{Tz} Ar. Ra. 516b *κάρτι παρατετιλμένα· νεοξυρεῖς τὸν δορίαλον, τὸν μύρτον, τὸν χοῖρον, τὸν κύσθον, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ὁ Σώφρων (fr. novum) καὶ ὁ Ἰππῶναξ (fr. 183) καὶ ἕτεροι λέγουσι* (“and recently having been depilated: having recently shaved their *dorialos*, myrtle, piggy, cunt, and all the sorts of things that Sophron (fr. novum) and Hipponax (fr. 183) and others say”), which suggests that the joke had been lost on Tzetzes in the 12th century and that a facetious nonce formation may have been enshrined in scholarship as yet another coarse, colloquial word for “cunt”. That the gradual misunderstanding of abbreviated scholarly notes could lead to the blend being taken as “just another word” can already be seen to an extent at Σ^V Ar. Ra. 516, which, having stripped away the etymology and the exegetical remark that the word made fun of Dorillus given by the *Et.Gen.* AB and Hesychius, misleadingly suggests that the word is just another euphemism. At the risk of pressing this little evidence farther than it can be pressed: Tzetzes’ inclusion of *δορίαλλος* in a list of obscene terms without comment hints at the possibility that blends and other facetious nonce formations could enter ancient lexica and other scholarly discussions as regularized words either because of (a series of) ancient scholarly misunderstandings and/or abbreviations of notes.¹⁹⁵ This fact combined with the

¹⁹⁵ On this point, we might briefly compare: Hsch. κ 3584 *Κοραξοί· Σκυθῶν γένος. καὶ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον* (“Coraxians: a tribe of Scythians. And the female pudenda”), which is

vagaries of textual transmission already discussed above underscores the fact that ancient Greek blends would have faced numerous hurdles in reaching us.

The fact that nothing more is known about Dorillus¹⁹⁶ than that he was mocked by Aristophanes here in this fragment means that it is hard to know why exactly Aristophanes mocked him and what the precise joke behind the blend was. It may, however, go no deeper than that calling someone a “cunt” could be expected to get a laugh, and on this point we can compare Ar. *Ec.* 95–7 ούκοῦν καλά γ’ ἂν πάθοιμεν, εἰ πλήρης τύχοι / ὁ δῆμος ὧν κάπειθ’ ὑπερβαίνουσά τις / ἀναβαλλομένη δείξειε τὸν Φορμίσιον (“Wouldn’t we be in a fine fix if the citizenry’s all there and then some woman has to climb over them, hitching up her clothes and flashing her—Phormisius (trans. Henderson)”; the protagonist Praxagora is explaining that if the women are going to sneak successfully into the Assembly dressed as men to vote that control of the city be handed over to women, they must arrive early and get seats lest they arrive late and suffer some wardrobe malfunction while climbing over other, already-seated members of the Assembly). Phormisius was an Athenian politician, active around the end of the 5th century and mocked elsewhere in comedy as long-bearded (Ar. *Ra.* 966) and for accepting bribes from the Persian king Artaxerxes (Pl. Com. fr. 127) and is said to have died “while fucking” (βινοῦντα; Philet. Com. fr. 6.2). His named is used here unchanged at the end of the line instead of a word for “cunt”

likely a garbled reference to Hippon. fr. 4a Κοραξικόν μὲν ἡμφιεσμένη λώπος (“having put on a Coraxian robe”; for the sexual sense of which, see Henderson 1991. 20); Hsch. π 2487 πλατίστακος· γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον. καὶ ἰχθὺς ποιός (*platistakos*: female pudenda. And a fish of some kind”; ≈ Phot. π 922), which is not discussed by Henderson 1991 and is perhaps to be taken as a comic adespoton.

¹⁹⁶ *TrGF* 41; *PAA* 372870

para prosdokian perhaps for no other reason than that he was well-known and known to be hairy. A similar joke likely lies behind Hsch. ι 835 Ἴπποκλείδης· οὕτω κακοσχόλως τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς μόριον Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 721) εἶπεν (“Hippocleides: thus Aristophanes (fr. 721) mischievously called a woman’s part”) and Phot. ι 179 Ἴπποκλείδην· τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον· παρὰ τὸ ἵππεύειν (“Hippocleides: the female pudenda, from *hippeuein* (“to ride a horse”)”). Although the joke itself is no longer preserved, there was likely a pun, as Photius suggests, on the name Hippocleides¹⁹⁷ that had recourse to sexual sense of various ἵππ- words.¹⁹⁸

On the other hand, Dorillus may be the same person as the tragic poet Dorilaos,¹⁹⁹ about whom however nothing more is known than that he was a contemporary of Euripides whose popularity—along with that of the tragic poets Acestor,²⁰⁰ Morsimus²⁰¹ and Melanthius²⁰²—was allegedly part of the reason that Euripides left Athens resentful in 410 BCE. Dorillus may thus have belonged to a

¹⁹⁷ Perhaps Hippocleides (*PA* 7617; *PAA* 538230), the 6th-century Athenian nobleman who, according to Herodotus (6.129), had been engaged to the tyrant Cleisthenes’ daughter, but who, after acting in such a drunken and disgraceful way at a dinner party that Cleisthenes called off the marriage, proclaimed, οὐ φροντῖς Ἴπποκλείδη (~ “Hippocleides doesn’t give a shit”). For other possibilities, see Bagordo 2017 on Ar. fr. 721.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Henderson 1991§§ 274–8.

¹⁹⁹ In which case, “Dorillus” would simply be a hypocorism for Dorilaos; cf. Ἀρχύλος for Ἀρχέλαος; and see Buck–Petersen 1945. 355.

²⁰⁰ Acestor (*TrGF* 25; *PA* 4474; *PAA* 116685) is mocked in comedy as a foreigner and a slave (Cratin. fr. 92; Eup. fr. 172.14–6 with Olson 2016 *ad loc.*; Ar. *Av.* 31; *V.* 1221; Call. Com. fr. 17; Metag. fr. 14; Theopomp. Com. fr. 61).

²⁰¹ Morsimus (*TrGF* 29; *PA* 10416; *PAA* 658815) is mocked by Aristophanes as not very good (*Eq.* 401; *Pax* 802; *Ra.* 151).

²⁰² Melanthius (*TrGF* 23; *PA* 9767; *PAA* 638275), perhaps the brother of Morsimus, is mocked in comedy as a glutton (Ar. *Pax* 803–5) and as an effeminate glutton as well as a pervert and a flatterer (Eup. fr. 178, on which see Olson 2016).

younger generation of tragic poets associated with the “New Music” movement²⁰³ and much maligned in comedy. The joke here may therefore have been in one way or another a lament about the alleged decline in musical tastes.²⁰⁴

In addition and more specifically, however, the joke may have been that Dorillus’ poetry and, by extension, Dorillus himself were obscene and perverted and feminine, and on this point we might compare the attacks made in comedy on the poets Ariphrades,²⁰⁵ Gnesippus,²⁰⁶ and Agathon.²⁰⁷ Ariphrades is mocked by Aristophanes in an ongoing personal and professional quarrel for his supposed fondness for performing cunnilingus in brothels (*Eq.* 1280–9; *Pax* 883–5; *V.* 1280–3). Gnesippus, whose music is attacked as being not very good (*Chion.* fr. 4), as being intended for obscene purposes (seducing married women; *Eup.* fr. 148), and as being both not very good and intended for obscene purposes (celebrating the Adonia; *Cratin.* fr. 17), is himself mocked for allegedly devoting his time to adultery (*Telecl.* fr. 36) and as being an effete composer of effete music (*Cratin.* fr. 276). And Agathon is mocked in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae* as being a cross-dressing composer of obscene verses. Agathon is rolled out on stage in drag (97–8) and sings an aria (101–

²⁰³ On “New Music” in general, see West 1992. 356–72.

²⁰⁴ For the theme, cf. *Eup.* fr. 148 with Olson 2016 *ad loc.*; 398; *Pl.Com.* fr. 138 (decline in taste in dancing); *Antiph.* fr. 207; and see in general Dover 1993. 10–36.

²⁰⁵ Ariphrades (*PA* 2201; *PAA* 202305) was perhaps a comic poet. He is not given a place in Kassel–Austin, but is by Storey 2011 who notes that “Ariphrades may claim a place here on the basis of Aristotle’s discussion of the critics of tragedy at *Poetics* 1458^b31” (121).

²⁰⁶ This Gnesippus (Stefanis #556; *PAA* 279690), who according to Athenaeus 14.638d wrote “little witty pieces of humorous poetry” is likely the same as the tragic poet Gnesippus (*TrGF* 27; *PAA* 279690), cf. Welcker 1841. 1024–9.

²⁰⁷ Agathon (*TrGF* 39; *PA* 83; *PAA* 10185) was a musically innovative tragic poet associated with the “New Music” movement.

29), to which Euripides' Kinsman responds critically by saying (130–3) ὡς ἠδὺ τὸ μέλος ... καὶ θηλυδριῶδες καὶ κατεγλωττισμένον καὶ μανδαλωτόν, ὥστ' ἔμοῦ γ' ἀκροωμένου ὑπὸ τὴν ἔδραν αὐτὴν ὑπῆλθε γάργαλος ("How sweet the song ... and effeminate and lascivious and wanton. Hearing it brought a tingle to my butt") and mocking his effeminate clothing. Agathon responds defensively that a poet must behave like a woman if he is going to write about women. In each of these three cases there is an intertwining of the personal and the poetical and the idea that "Ye shall know them by their flutes" and *vice versa*. It is no great leap from the idea that a poet allegedly lusts after women's genitals in an inappropriate way and that his poetry is therefore no good or from the idea that a poet allegedly depilates himself as though he were a woman or a woman's genitals and that his poetry is therefore no good or from the idea that a poet allegedly presents physically as having a woman's genitals and that his poetry is therefore no good to the idea that a poet *is* a woman's genitals and that his poetry is therefore no good.

3.10 ΦΑΛΛΗΝΙΟΣ

Phot. ε 1785

ἐπὶ **Φαλληνίου**· Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (fr. 244) πέπλακεν ὡς ἄρχοντά τινα ἀπὸ τοῦ φαλλοῦ κακοήθως

ἐπὶ Φαλληνίου] ἐπιφαλληνίου Phot.^z φαλλοῦ] φαλοῦ Phot.^z

during the archonship of **Dicklander**: Aristophanes in *Banqueters* (fr. 244) coined it as the name of some archon, meanspiritedly from *phallus*

Hsch. ε 5373

ἐπὶ **Φαληνίου**· τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην φησὶ ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 244) ἐπὶ Φαληνίου γεγενῆσθαι, σκώπτων παρὰ τὸν Φάλητα

ἐπὶ Φαληνίου] ἐπιφαλινίου

ἐπὶ Φαληνίου] ἐπὶ Φαλινίου

during the archonship of **Dicklander**: Aristophanes (fr. 244) says that Alcibiades was born during the archonship of Dicklander, joking that it came from *Phalês*

3.10.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

The variant readings of Phot.^z and the parodoseis of Hesychius are all probably best regarded as crude copyist's errors. For the simplification of -λλ- and -λ-, see above (s. v. *Doriallos*). For the confusion of *eta* and *iota* (as in Hesychius' ἐπιφαλινίου and Φαλινίου), cf. Threatte 1980 I.165–6.

3.10.2 FORMATION

Φαλλήνιος is a blend of φαλλός²⁰⁸ and Παλλήνιος “Pallenian, from Pallene,” a source that is explained in my “Interpretation” section below. Φαλλήνιος cannot be accounted for as grammatical derivative, since there is there no suffix *-ήνιος²⁰⁹ which could be added to φαλλ- nor is there any way to derive the word regularly from the stem of φαλῆς (gen. φαλλῆτος), as Hesychius suggests.²¹⁰

However, Kassel–Austin *ad loc.* (following Lobeck 1829 Epim. 15 p. 1086–7) derive Φαλλήνιος from φαλλήν (gen. φαλλῆνος), evidence for the existence of which, however, is uncertain and late. It is conjectured as an epithet of Dionysus at Paus. 10.19.3²¹¹ and Eus. *PE* 5.36.1 (quoting Oenom. fr. 13.25–6 amid criticism of pagans

²⁰⁸ The word φαλλός (“phallus”) is attested in literature before the Roman period only in Herodotus (2.48.1; 49.1) and Aristophanes (*Ach.* 243, 260), where it describes a phallus borne in a procession for Dionysus.

²⁰⁹ Many words ending in -ήνιος are ethnics or personal names formed from nouns in -ήν (cf. Εὐμήνιος “guy born in a good month?”; Λιμήνιος “guy from the harbor?”) or toponyms in -ήνη (e.g. Ἀθήνιος “guy from Athens”; Κυρήνιος “guy from Cyrene”) with the ubiquitous adjective-forming suffix -ιος.

²¹⁰ Hesychius nevertheless presumably attempts to connect his Φαλλήνιος with Φαλῆς since each has only one *lambda*.

²¹¹ ἀλιεῦσιν ἐν Μηθύμνῃ τὰ δίκτυα ἀνείλκυσεν ἐκ θαλάσσης πρόσωπον ἐλαίας ξύλου πεπονημένον· τοῦτο ἰδέαν παρείχετο φέρουσαν μὲν τοι ἐς τὸ θεῖον, ξένην δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ θεοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς οὐ καθεστῶσαν. εἶροντο οὖν οἱ Μηθυμναῖοι τὴν Πυθίαν ὅτου θεῶν ἢ καὶ ἡρώων ἐστὶν ἢ εἰκῶν· ἢ δὲ αὐτοὺς σέβεσθαι Διόνυσον Κεφαλήνα (sic VFP : Φαλλῆνα Lobeck) ἐκέλευσεν (“The nets of fisherman from Methymna drew from the sea a mask made of olive wood. This looked a smidge divine but was strange and unlike the Greek gods. The Methymnians therefore asked the Pythia of which god or hero it was a likeness. And she told them to worship Cephallenian Dionysus (thus VFP : *Phallen* Lobeck”).

for worshipping inanimate objects)²¹² by Lobeck;²¹³ and in a fanciful etymology at Orion ο p. 116.24–27 ὁμφαλός· οἱ μὲν παρὰ τὸ φαλλήν, ὡς εἰκέναι, ὃ ἔστι τὸ μόριον

²¹² “ἀλλά κε Μηθύμνης ναέταις πολὺ λώϊον ἔσται, / φαλληνὸν τιμῶσι Διωνύσοιο κάρηνον.” διὰ τί; θύουσι γὰρ αἱ πόλεις καὶ τελετὰς ἄγουσιν οὐ μόνον φαλληνοῖς Διωνύσοιο κάρηνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ λιθίνοις καὶ χαλκείοις καὶ χρυσείοις, καὶ οὐ μόνον φαλληνοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς Διωνύσοις καὶ ἄλλοις παμπόλλοις Ἑσιοδείοις θεοῖς (“But it will be far better for the inhabitants of Methymnê, [if] they honor the *phallênos* head of Dionysus.’ But why? For the cities make sacrifices and carry out rites not only with the *phallênois* heads of Dionysus, but also with stone and brazen and golden ones, and not only with *phallênois* but with actual Dionysuses and all the very many other Hesiodic gods”).

²¹³ Lobeck emends the text of text of Pausanias as indicated above in n. 211, claiming that a story about the Methymnians pulling an olive-wood mask of Dionysus from the sea has nothing to do with Cephallenia and that no one could believe that an adjective κεφαλήν (gen. κεφαλήνος; “head-shaped?”) could be derived from κεφαλή (“head”). First, however, there is nothing formally objectionable about deriving κεφαλήν from κεφαλή (cf. Chantraine 1933. 167), and as Frontisi-Ducroux–Casevitz 1989. 117 note, this is “a plausible denomination, all things considered, for the mask of a god (trans.)”. Second, although nothing is known of a “Cephallenian Dionysus”, nothing is known of a *Phallen* Dionysus either. Thus, his emendation runs the risk of attempting to explain *obscurum per obscurius*.

As for the text of Eus. *PE* 5.36.1, Lobeck, claiming that “since it is impossible that the adjective φαλληνός is derived from φαλλός, I substitute the genitive Φαλλήνος, as though an epithet of Dionysus, an example of which form is not attested but a similarity appears in ἔρπη, ἔρπητος and ἔρπην, ἔρπηνος, whence also the name Φαλλήνιος facetiously coined by Aristophanes (trans.)”. He rewrites the whole of Eusebius’ sentence as: ... τελετὰς ἄγουσιν οὐ μόνον Φαλλήνος Διωνύσοιο κάρηνοις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις παμπόλλοις Ἑσιοδείοις θεοῖς, οὐδὲ μόνον ἐλαίνοις ἀλλὰ καὶ λιθίνοις καὶ χαλκείοις καὶ χρυσείοις (“they carry out rites not only with heads of Dionysus *Phallen* but also all the very many other Hesiodic gods, not only those of olive-wood but also those of stone, bronze and gold”). First, however, there seemingly is a suffix -ηνο- with which an adjective φαλληνός (“phallic” *vel sim.*) could be derived from φαλλός (cf. σκαληνός “uneven” < σκάλλω “dig” (e.g. Pl. *Euthphr.* 12d); ὑηνός “swine-ish” < ὑ- “swine” (Pl. *Lg.* 819); ἀμενηνός “feeble” < μένος “might, although this is an *s*-stem noun, which might account for the lengthened stem-vowel of ἀμενηνός (often in Homer in the line-final formula νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα “the feeble heads of corpses”; and see Schwyzler 1953 I.490), so this objection of Lobeck’s is perhaps moot.

If we accept Lobeck’s conjecture of φαλληνός, however, what does it mean? The parallelism of οὐ μόνον φαλληνοῖς Διωνύσοιο κάρηνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ λιθίνοις καὶ χαλκείοις καὶ χρυσείοις suggests that φαλληνός is an adjective of material, not an adjective meaning “phallic” *vel sim.*, and that, given its contrast with λιθίνοις καὶ χαλκείοις καὶ χρυσείοις, a reasonable assumption is that φαλληνός means something like “wooden”. Eusebius corroborates this idea with subsequent remarks that such objects as the heads of Dionysus

(“*omphalos* (‘navel’): some authorities say that it comes from the *phallên*, as seems likely, which is the private parts”). However, Sturz 1890 *ad loc.* dubs φαλλήν, ὡς εἰκέναι a “monster of a reading (trans.)” and compares a fuller version of the same note preserved at *Et.Gud.* ο p. 482.15–29 that has ὀμφαλός, οἱ μὲν παρὰ τὸ φάλλω εἰκέναι (“*omphalos* (‘navel’), some authorities say that it derives from its looking like a *phallos*”), which he takes to be the correct reading.

Thus, since it is unlikely that there was in fact a word φαλλήν from which Aristophanes could have derived Φαλλήνιος, the word cannot be formally explained as a derivative. As a blend, however, its form and meaning are clear, and the phonetic overlap between the two words (φαλλ- and παλλ-) is exploited to meld the two

are “not immortals, but stone and wooden masters of mankind” (οὐκ ἀθάνατοι, ἀλλὰ λίθινοι καὶ ξύλινοι δεσπύται ἀνθρώπων; 5.36.2); that “no one of the Olympian gods would come to such a point of madness as to deify an olive-wood stump” (οὐδ’ ἂν εἶς τις τῶν Ὀλυμπίων εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθε παρανοίας, ὥστε ἐλάϊνον κορμὸν θεῶσαι; 5.36.3); and that the object fished up by the Methymnians was a “stump shaped like a head at the top” (ἐξ ἄκρου κεφαλοειδῆς ὁ κορμὸς; 5.36.4). Recall too that Pausanias said the object pulled from the sea was an olive-wood mask. But there is no obvious word meaning “wood” generally or “olive-wood” specifically whence the adjective φαλλήνιος could be derived. The likeliest solution is that the adjective just means “phallic” and that the Methymnians are parading around a phallus-shaped stump with what resembles the head of Dionysus at the tip, but that Eusebius has misunderstood it, guessing that it means “wooden” from what he knows about pagan statues. Alternatively, Frontisi-Ducroux–Casevitz 1989. 120 have suggested a derivation from the same root as φάλλη “whale” (perhaps < **b^hel-* “swell up”) and suggest that the mask of Dionysus, after being pulled from the sea, was called “a swollen thing” *vel sim.*

Lobeck’s desire to find a way to unite both the texts of Pausanias and Eusebius, each recounting a version of the same story, is understandable, but his solution—to emend and rewrite—seems dubious, and it would be better simply to accept Pausanias’ Κεφαλήνα (either emphasizing the head-shaped-ness of the xoanon or referring to an otherwise unknown Cephallenian Dionysus) and Oenomaus’ φαλλήνιος (emphasizing instead the phallus-shaped-ness of the xoanon).

source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of an elaborate joke.

3.10.3 INTERPRETATION

The blend Φαλλήνιος takes aim not only at the alleged sexual behavior of Alcibiades,²¹⁴ as Kassel–Austin *ad loc.* note, by associating him with the *phallus*, but also his associations with Socrates and thus his sophistry by recalling the only experience hitherto on his resume: his participation in the late 330s BCE in the siege of Potidaea on Pallene, where he was rescued by, and thus began his lifelong association with, Socrates. This reminder of his relationship with Socrates—whatever it really was—underscores both Alcibiades’ alleged pathic tendencies and Socrates’ corrupting influence as a teacher (which Aristophanes would go on to ridicule several years later in *Clouds*). In addition, by riffing on Pallene, Aristophanes undercuts the honor that Alcibiades was awarded for his conduct there.

If, as Hesychius says, Aristophanes specified that Alcibiades was born “in the archonship of Phallenius”, then the joke is perhaps in part that this eponymous archon, whose name bears no likeness to that of any known eponymous archon,²¹⁵ is somehow like an astrological sign allegedly determining the disposition of those born thereunder and that therefore Alcibiades was doomed from birth to become a

²¹⁴ On Alcibiades (*PA* 600; *PAA* 121630) in general, see Davies 1971. 9–22, esp. 18; Gribble 1999.

²¹⁵ The eponymous archon of 451/0 BCE, when Alcibiades was likely born, was Antidotus.

phallus-obsessed, Dionysian devotee, which is to say that he was probably doomed from birth to become both pathic and adulterous. He is ridiculed elsewhere in comedy as pathic (Ar. *Ach.* 716; fr. 338) and as otherwise libidinous and perhaps adulterous (Pherecr. fr. 164; Eup. fr. 171).

The fact that we are probably meant to understand Alcibiades' archonological sign as indicating his pathic tendencies is underscored by its allusion to his first encounter with Socrates at Potidaea in Pallene. Pallene was the small, westernmost peninsula extending from the south of Chalcidic peninsula in the northern Aegean. According to Herodotus (7.123.1), there were eight *poleis* on the peninsula, each of which had supplied Xerxes with ships or troops in 480 BCE: Aige, Aphytis, Mende, Neapolis, Potidaea, Sane, Scione, and Therambos.²¹⁶ All were small, relatively insignificant *poleis* with the exception of Potidaea. Potidaea was an early member of the Delian League and appears in Athenian tributes lists from 446/5 BCE until 433/2 BCE, when Athens asked that Potidaea destroy part of its city walls, give hostages and refuse to accept the *epidemiourgoi* (Corinthian magistrates sent to Potidaea each year). Potidaea instead allied itself with the Bottiaeans and the Chalcidians and revolted against Athens (Th. 1.56–8). Potidaea was then besieged by Athens from 432 until 430 (Th. 1.59–67; 2.58; Pl. *Chrm.* 153a–b), when it finally capitulated (Th. 2.70.1–3).²¹⁷ When *Banqueters* was produced in 427 BCE, Alcibiades was in his early

²¹⁶ In order, *IACP* nos. 556, 563, 584, 586, 598, 601, 609, 616.

²¹⁷ Pallene was also a deme in Attica, where there was a well-established cult of Athena Pallenis and where Megacles III, the great-grandfather of Alcibiades, had fought against Pisistratus. This battle gave rise to two idioms: Paus.Gr. τ 35* τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Παλληνίδος· τὸ φοβερόν· ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Παλληνίδι μάχης, ἐν ᾗ ἠττήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι (“the thing from Pallênis: what is scary, from the battle at Pallênis, in which the Athenians were defeated”); βλέπειν

20s and had done nothing much military-wise except participate in this Athenian siege of Potidaea in Pallene. It was there that, according to Plutarch (*Alc.* 7.2–3) and Plato (*Sym.* 221a), he met Socrates and, after falling wounded in battle, was saved by him. Plutarch (*Alc.* 7.3) tells how Socrates, although he deserved the honor for this, nevertheless convinced everyone to give Alcibiades the honor instead, because he wanted to increase Alcibiades' ambitions.²¹⁸ By blending together references to Alcibiades' military service in Pallene and his sexual proclivities, Aristophanes underscores the dubiousness of Alcibiades' honor: instead of fighting bravely on the battlefield with Socrates, he was phallus-ing in his tent with Socrates.

Elsewhere in *Banqueters* (fr. 205.6), Alcibiades is mentioned by a disapproving father as one of the sources of the neologisms used by his son, who has dropped out of school to study with the sophists. That Alcibiades is mentioned here alongside the sophists Lysistratus and Thrasymachus, whom Plato in the *Republic* makes an intellectual opponent of Socrates, is, as Moorton 1988. 345 notes, "evidence that he had already acquired a reputation for that rhetorical facility and avant-garde intellectualism which characterized him throughout his life. The precocity implied in this mild slight (to give it its worst construction) is therefore in itself a backhanded compliment." This and other fragments (e.g. 206; 226) suggest an overriding concern throughout the comedy with a similar kind of education as Pheidippides receives at

Παλληνικόν ("to give a Pallenic look"), which meant γενναῖος ("noble"), according to Σ^{REF2} Ar. *Ach.* 234.

²¹⁸ That Alcibiades won honor in the battle is also noted by Isocrates (16.29), who however fails to mention Socrates at all.

Socrates' phrontistery in *Clouds*, although Socrates is not mentioned by name in the remaining fragments of *Banqueters*.²¹⁹

Many references to Alcibiades in comedy refer either to his sexual behavior or to his rhetorical abilities. The blend Φαλλήνιος refers directly and obliquely to both by alluding to *phalloi* and the place where he first fell under Socrates' influence. The protagonist of Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* links pathic sexuality and a skill for public at Ar. Ec. 112–33 λέγουσι γὰρ καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων ὅσοι / πλεῖστα σποδοῦνται, δεινοτάτους εἶναι λέγειν (“They say that those youths who’ve been reamed the most, are the cleverest at speaking”). With Φαλλήνιος in this fragment of *Banqueters*, Aristophanes suggests that the Alcibiades whom Athens knew had in a sense been born at Pallene when he became Socrates' ἐρώμενος.²²⁰

3.11 RABIENUS

Sen. *Con.* 10 pr. 5

color orationis antiquae, vigor novae, cultus inter nostrum ac prius saeculum medius, ut illum posset utraque pars sibi vindicare. libertas tanta ut libertatis nomen excederet, et quia passim ordines hominesque laniabat Rabienus vocaretur. animus inter vitia ingens et ad similitudinem ingeni sui violentus et qui Pompeianos spiritus nondum in tanta pace posuisset.

²¹⁹ For Socrates' education of Alcibiades, see in general Helfer 2017.

²²⁰ Φαλλήνιος seems to be the only facetiously coined name of an archon, but Kassel–Austin *ad loc.* compare in Latin the fictitious consuls Clibanatus and Piperatus (“Potted and Peppered”) in the *testamentum porcelli* (Bücheler 1912. 268).

Rabienus] *Rabies* CDP

His tone was that of the old oratory, his vigour that of the new, his ornament midway between our age and the preceding one: so that he could be claimed by both sides. His freedom of speech was so great that it passed the bounds of freedom: and because he savaged all ranks and men alike, he was known as *Rabienus*. Amid all his faults, he had a great spirit—one that was, like his genius, violent; despite the depth of the prevailing peace, it had not yet laid down its Pompeian passions.

3.11.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

CDP have dealt with the difficult nonce word by replacing it with a common one.

3.11.2 FORMATION

Rabienus blends together *rabies* “madness” and *Labienu*s, the name of a Roman orator discussed in my “Interpretation” section below. The word is not a compound nor can its form be accounted for as a grammatical derivative. Words ending in *-ienus* are, except for *alienus* “belonging another” < *alius* “other”²²¹ and *lanienus* “of a butcher <

²²¹ The suffix in *aliēnus* is disputed. Leumann 1977. 323 suggests that it arises from dissimilation of *-i-īno-* (as also he suggests in *laniēnus*, on which see n. 222 below, and in

lanius “butcher”,²²² cognomina derived either from praenomina (e.g. *Catienus* < *Catius*; *Lucienus* < *Lucius*; *Publienus* < *Publius*) or gentilics (e.g. *Nasidienus* < *Nasidius*; *Tullienus* < *Tullius*).²²³ These cognomina are secondarily derived from praenomina and gentilics in *-ius*, which were all, however, seemingly reanalyzed as stems ending

gentilics such as *Labiēnus*), which suggestion is rejected by Walde-Hofmann s. v. without comment and by de Vaan s. v. *alius* because “nouns in *-ium* normally take *-īnus*: compare *Samnium* > *Sabīnus*. One would expect a Latin outcome **alīnus* or (**alio-no-* >) **alienus* (cf. *pīus* ~ *piētās*.)” First, however, *alius* is neither a noun in *-ium* nor a toponym, so the equivalence between it and *Samnium* is false. And while it is true that some adjectives in *-īnus* are formed to nouns in *-ium* and/or toponyms, some are not (e.g. *Plautīnus*, *dīvīnus*, *bovīnus*). Second, that the productive stem of *alius* is **ali-* rather than *al-* or *alio-* is suggested by *alibi* “elsewhere”, *aliquis* “anyone”, *aliter* “otherwise”, etc. Thus, his putative **alienus* < **alio-no-* (presumably meant to show the expected development of *-io-* > *-ie-* rather than *-iē-* in an open, medial syllable?) and the comparandum *pīus* ~ *pietas* (presumably adduced as another example of the development of *io-* > *ie-* in an open, medial syllable?) are strawmen. However, the pair *pīus* (< **pū-i-o-*, but synchronically analyzable as *pi-o-*) and *pietas* (< **pi-o-tas*) may show much the same dissimilation (*-ie-* < **-ii-* instead of the *-iē-* < **-ī-* that Leumann posits for *aliēnus*) that he is trying to disprove here, if, since short vowels in open, medial syllables typically become *i*, *-io-* first develops as expected to *-ii-* and then dissimilates to *-ie-*. Thus, *pietas* would develop from **pi-o-tas* via an intermediary **pi-i-tas*. Third, although hiatus at morpheme boundaries may be eliminated via contraction (as he seems to suggest with his **alīnus*), hiatus often remains when the second syllable is heavy and bears penultimate stress, as would be the case in **ali-īno-* (cf. Weiss 2010. 132).

de Vaan also cites the suggestion of Nussbaum ap. Livingston 2004. 53 that *aliēnus* might reflect **aliai-no-* and thus be an alleged “decasuative” (i.e. a noun or adjective derived directly from an inflected nominal case form) adjective from an (unattested) locative singular **aliai* “at somewhere else”. However, the existence of “decasuative” formations is controversial (cf. Lundquist-Yates 2018. 22).

²²² The suffix in *laniēnus* is also disputed. Leumann 1977. 323 suggests that it arises from dissimilation of *-i-īno-* just as in *aliēnus*, whereas Walde-Hofmann s. v. take the suffix to be Etruscan and, since *lanista* (“trainer of gladiators”) is explained as Etruscan by the Romans, regard the whole family words in *lani-* as Etruscan. This same last-ditch appeal to an Etruscan origin for difficult words or suffixes was mentioned in Chapter One on the blend *madulsa*.

²²³ Examples culled from Schulze 1904.

in *-i-*. Thus, the suffix in all of them is in fact **-ēno-*.²²⁴ We would therefore expect *Rabienus* likewise to be secondarily derived from *rab-* through **rabius*, but there is no **rabius* from which this *rabienus* could be comparably formed. But as a blend its form and meaning are clear. The phonetic overlap between the two words (*Rabie-* and *Labie-*) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that Labienus is rabid.

3.11.3 INTERPRETATION

Titus Labienus was an orator and historian active in the time of Augustus, whose work survives only in a few meager fragments and about whom nothing much is known beyond what little Seneca the Elder, a rough contemporary of Labienus and our primary source for his life, relates in *Con.* 10.

Seneca (*Con.* 10 pr. 4) brings up Labienus, imagining his interlocutor asking about him: *de T. Labieno interrogatis? declamavit non quidem populo, sed egregie. non admittebat populum et quia nondum haec consuetudo erat inducta et quia putabat turpe ac frivola iactationis. adfectabat enim censorium supercilium, cum alius animo esset: magnus orator, qui multa impedimenta eluctatus ad famam ingeni confitentibus magis hominibus pervenerat quam volentibus. summa egestas erat, summa infamia, summum odium. magna autem debet esse eloquentia quae invitis placeat, et cum*

²²⁴ Presumably dissimilated from **-īno-*, as also in *aliēnus* and *laniēnus*, as Leumann 1977. 323 suggested. The suffix *-īno-* is well attested in cognomina (e.g. *Calvīnus* < *Calvus*; *Crispīnus* < *Crispus*), which parallel those in *-āno-* (e.g. *Clodianus* < *Clodius*; *Decianus* < *Decius*).

*ingenia favor hominum ostendat, favor alat, quantam vim esse oportet quae inter obstantia erumpat! nemo erat qui non, cum homini omnia obiceret, ingenio multum tribueret.*²²⁵ In addition, Seneca relates that Labienus, whose works were first burned as a punishment by a decree of the senate (*Con.* 10 pr. 6, 8), thereafter walled himself up in the tomb of his ancestors and committed suicide (*Con.* 10 pr. 7). Labienus also seems to have been engaged in a professional (and personal?) feud with Asinius Pollio: according to Seneca (*Con.* 4 pr. 2), *Asinius Pollio numquam admissa multitudine declamavit, nec illi ambitio in studiis defuit; primus enim omnium Romanorum advocatis hominibus scripta sua recitavit. et inde est quod Labienus, homo mentis quam linguae amarioris, dixit “ille triumphalis senex ἀκροάσεις suas numquam populo commisit.*²²⁶ According to Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.3.13), Asinius Pollio made petty criticisms of Labienus’ work: *nam in receptis etiam vulgo auctore contenti sumus, ut iam evaluit “rebus agentibus”, quod Pollio in Labieno damnat.*²²⁷ He also seems to have engaged in

²²⁵ “Do you ask about Titus Labienus? He declaimed exceptionally but not in public. He didn’t let the public in, both because this custom had not yet been introduced and because he thought it shameful and indicative of a frivolous boasting. For he feigned the severity of a censor, although he was otherwise at heart. He was a great orator who fought his way through many obstacles to arrive at a reputation for genius, which men begrudgingly acknowledged. He was very poor, very notorious, very hated. Yet great indeed must be the eloquence that pleases even the unwilling, and since the favor of men marks out genius, their favor nourishes it, how great must be the force that breaks through whatever stands in its way! There was no one who did not grant much to his talent, while accusing the man of every crime.”

²²⁶ “Asinius Pollio never admitted an audience when he declaimed, but he was not without ambition in his studies. Indeed, he was the first of all the Romans to recite what he had written before an invited audience. Hence Labienus, who had a sharper mind than tongue, said, “That old man, hero of triumphs, never put his *akroaseis* (‘recitations’) into battle against the people.”

²²⁷ “Once a usage has been accepted, we are content with the people being the authority, just as now *rebus agentibus* (‘with matters underway’) is fine, but which Pollio condemned in Labienus”, which is remarkable for its descriptivist attitude. The phrase *rebus agentibus* is

a feud by proxy with Maecenas (Sen. *Con.* 10 pr. 8): *monstrabo bellum vobis libellum quem a Gallione vestro petatis. recitavit rescriptum Labieno pro Bathyllo Maecenatis, in quo suspicietis adolescentis animum illos dentes ad mordendum provocantis.*²²⁸

All this taken together—that he was from a poor, undistinguished family; that his reputation for talent was therefore hard-won; that he unwisely feuded with Asinius Pollio and Maecenas, both tastemakers of the day and allied to some extent with the Augustan regime; that he was still a supporter of Pompey decades after his death—suggests that his nickname may have owed as much to his political discontent as to his propensity for harsh invective. The nickname is also perhaps an indication that whatever criticisms Labienus lobbed could be reasonably ignored, since he himself was unreasonable: although *rabies* could be a positive motivator of corrective invective,²²⁹ it could be taken too far²³⁰ and was often described as a vicious motivation for various acts of violence;²³¹ at Sen. *Dial.* 4.12.6 it is mentioned alongside other abject moral failings: *maximum malum, iram, et cum illa rabiem saevitiam crudelitatem furorem* (“the greatest ill—anger—and therewith madness, savageness, cruelty, and fury”). At any rate, what is perhaps most interesting about the blend *Rabienus* is that Seneca credits its creation to no one in particular: it is simply what Labienus “is called”. This fact puts

nowhere else attested, although *rebus actis* (“with matters having been done”) is attested in Cicero (*Ver.* 5.120; *Att.* 4.15.5; 9.19.4) and Livy (4.37.3; 10.46.13).

²²⁸ “I’ll recommend a fine little book to you, which you should ask our Gallio for. He once read aloud a reply to Labienus on behalf of Bathyllus, Maecenas’ freedman, in which you will admire the spirit of a youth provoking those teeth to bite.”

²²⁹ Cf. Hor. *Ars* 79; S. 2.3.323

²³⁰ Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.148–50

²³¹ E.g. Liv. 6.33.6 (murder); 21.48.3 (armed revolt?); [Quint.] *Decl.* 312.7 (murder); 372.1 (assault).

a blend in the mouths of everyday Latin speakers of the earliest days of imperial period and is thus a small piece of evidence that blends could be a colloquial, witty feature of everyday Latin.

3.12 BIBERIUS

Suet. *Tib.* 42

in castris tiro etiam tum propter nimiam vini aviditatem pro Tiberio Biberius, pro Claudio Caldius, pro Nerone Mero vocabatur

At the outset of his military career, because of his excessive lust for wine, he was called Biberius instead of Tiberius, Caldius instead of Claudius, and Mero instead Nero

3.12.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

There are no textual issues affecting this blend.

3.12.2 FORMATION

Biberius blends the stem of *bibere* “drink” and *Tiberius*, the *nomen* of emperor Tiberius. The form of *Biberius* cannot be accounted for as a grammatical derivative, since there is no base **biber-* to which the suffix *-ius* could be added; nor is there a

suffix **-erius*²³² which could be added to **bib-*, and it is not a compound. As a blend, however, its form and meaning are also clear. The phonetic overlap between the two words (*bib-* and *tib-*) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that Tiberius is a drunkard.

The other two nicknames given to Tiberius here—*Caldius* and *Mero*—can, on the other hand, be accounted for as grammatical derivatives, although they are of course also facetious nonce formations: *caldius* is derived from *caldum* “a hot mixture of water and wine” (Plaut. *Cur.* 293; Var. *L.* 5.127; Mart. 14.113.1) with *-ius*, while *Mero* is derived from *merum* (*vinum*) “unmixed (wine)” with the suffix *-ōn-*, used regularly to form nicknames.²³³

3.12.3 INTERPRETATION

Suetonius reports that Tiberius, whose full name at the relevant time was Tiberius Claudius Nero, had been dubbed *Biberius Caldus Mero* (approximately, “Drinker of hot, unmixed wine”) in the first days of his military service because of his fondness for drink. This is the first in a series of anecdotes meant to show that all the many and vicious proclivities that Tiberius allegedly indulged after he returned from Campania

²³² Latin words ending in *-erius* are typically traditional names: *Faberius*, *Galerius*, *Laberius*, *Numerius*, *Staberius*, *Valerius*, and *Tiberius* itself. Many if not most are old *s*-stems augmented by the *-ius* formant: e.g. archaic *Numisios*, *Valesios*. Thus, *Biberius* is fashioned after *Tiberius*, not a morphological derivative of the stem *bib-*.

²³³ E.g. *Varro* from *varus* “bent; bow-legged”; *Cato* from *catus* “sharp”; and cf. below *s. v. mantiscinari*.

(whither he had withdrawn after the death of his sons) had always been present in his character. Suetonius straightaway thereafter tells how Tiberius, when he was emperor and hypocritically engaged in correcting public morals, spent a day and a night and another day drinking with friends.

What is most interesting about the blend *Biberius*, however, is that Suetonius credits its creation to no one in particular: it is simply what Tiberius “was called”. This anecdote therefore puts another blend in the mouths of everyday Latin speakers of the early imperial period and is thus another small piece of evidence that blends were a colloquial, witty feature of everyday Latin. Also interesting is the fact that the full nickname *Biberius Caldius Mero* suggests that the blend, while certainly a self-consciously facetious formation, was not self-consciously a *blend*. That is, that the same process of παραγραμματισμός could give rise to both *Biberius* (swap a *b* for the *t* of *Tiberius*) and *Mero* (swap an *m* for the *n* of *Nero*) but with different formal results.

One further take-away from the full nickname *Biberius Caldius Mero*, as well as the blend *Rabienus* discussed above, is how they show that a degree of heterophony was allowed between a punny word and its target in Latin: *b* and *t* are, for example, apart from both being stops, not alike, and there is seemingly no amount of fudged pronunciation that could reasonably make them closer. But despite the difference, we probably do not need to imagine that when someone jested, “Well, looks like ol’ *Biberius Mero*’s at it again,” anyone was confused as to the target and point of the joke.

3.13 CONCLUSION

We have discussed in this chapter several onomastic blends: Βδεῦ, Σκαταιβάτης, Ἀττικωνικοί, ὀτοτύξιοι, οἰκετιεύς, Λακιδάιμονος, Δορίαλλος, Φαλλήνιος, *Rabienus*, and *Biberius*. All together these comprise many of the categories of onomastic humor discussed above: personal names, theonyms, ethnics, and demotics. They all assume the significance of a name and rework that name to reveal the “true” character of the person or group or god and thereby expose the divine, moral, political, and artistic failings of the renamed.

Beyond continuing to demonstrate the existence of blends in Greek and Latin, several other significant observations have been made. First, as noted in the section on Βδεῦ and as will be discussed more fully in Appendix I, the ancient scholarly tradition apparently did not think of blends as a distinct kind of word formation separate from grammatical derivatives or compounds. To the extent that one can generalize, blend formations were seen as forms of parody created by adding, deleting, and/or exchanging letters in a word. Second, two of the Latin blends discussed above—*Rabienus* and *Biberius*—are simply reported by Seneca and Suetonius as being said by people, which is to say that they do not occur in a literary context as credited to a particular author’s wit. Although it is hard to draw many firm conclusions about the existence or prevalence of blends outside of comedic literature from only two examples, these two are at least an *indication* that blends could find their way into the vernacular. These may be taken as a suggestion that blending might have been a source of “colloquial compounding” in the face of Latin’s general tendency to avoid classical compounds.

CHAPTER 4. NON-ONOMASTIC BLENDS IN GREEK AND LATIN

The previous chapter collected and discussed onomastic blends in Greek and Latin comedic literature. This chapter extends the collection to non-onomastic blends. It will be recalled that we have already examined an archetypal example of such a blend in the Plautine coinage *madulsa*.²³⁴ As the examples below will demonstrate, *madulsa* is hardly unique.

4.1 BOMBAYΛΙΟΣ

Ar. *Ach.* 862–6

Bo. ὑμῆς δ', ὅσοι θεΐβαθεν ἀύλειται πάρα,
τοῖς ὀστίνοις φυσεῖτε τὸν πρωκτὸν κυνός.

Δι. παῦ', ἐς κόρακας. οἱ σφῆκες οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν;
πόθεν προσέπτανθ' οἱ κακῶς ἀπολούμενοι
ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν μοι Χαριδῆς **βομβάλιοι**;

865

{Bo.} And all you flute-players here from Thebes, play “The Dog’s Asshole” on those bone-flutes. {Di.} Knock it off, dammit! Won’t these wasps get away from my door? Whence have these unkempt followers of Chaeris flown to my door, these **bug-pipers**?

²³⁴ Discussed above at pp. 1–2, 8–10, and 40–2.

4.1.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

There are no textual issues affecting this blend.

4.1.2 FORMATION

βομβάυλιοι is a blend of βομβυλιός “buzzing insect” and αὐλός “flute”. The word is unlikely a derivative, since there is no suffix *-αυλιος which could be added to the base βομβ-. Although the word could be formally analyzed as a compound of βόμβος “hum” and αὐλός and could thus mean “having a buzzing flute” or the like, since βόμβος can denote the low, buzzing sound of *inter alia* musical instruments,²³⁵ this would seemingly amount to a compound meaning “having a flute with the sound of a flute”. At any rate, that the word is a blend is strongly suggested by the context of the passage in which both flautists and wasps are mentioned. Moreover, the form and meaning of the word are thus clear, with the phonetic overlap (-βυλ- and αυλ-) exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that the Theban flute-players are noxious, buzzing pests.

4.1.3 INTERPRETATION

²³⁵ E.g. Arist. *Resp.* 475^a15–7; Ach.Tat. 1.8.3; Ath. 8.361e; 14.433e.

The blend βομβάυλιος piqued lexicographic interest in antiquity. The best ancient discussion of the word is Σ^{REF} Ar. *Ach.* 866b βομβάυλιοι· αὐληταί. τὸ δὲ βομβύλιος ἐν προσθέσει τοῦ α ἔφη βομβάυλιος, παίζων παρὰ τὸν αὐλόν. βομβύλιος δὲ εἶδος μελίσσης, καὶ εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ βομβεῖν (*bombaulioi*: flute-players. He said *bombaulios* by adding an *alpha* to *bombulios*, punning on *aulos*. *bombulios* is a kind of honey-bee and it comes from *bombein* ('buzz')).²³⁶ The scholiast understood that the word plays on βομβυλιός and αὐλός respectively and accordingly suggested that Aristophanes simply added an extra *alpha* to βομβυλιός to facilitate the wordplay. Although it is not in fact the case that Aristophanes has simply added an extra *alpha* to a word here, descriptively at least it seems to be so, and this kind of *ad-hoc* appeal to an epenthetic *alpha* to explain otherwise unexplainable forms is seen elsewhere in ancient lexicographic discussions.²³⁷ This is to say that this scholiast, while ultimately offering the wrong explanation of the word's formation, understands that for the sake of a joke, Aristophanes has had recourse to a kind of poetic license with which he can alter or form words in ways that ordinary language perhaps cannot, namely παραγραμματισμός. An alternative definition and etymology are proposed by Hesychius β 788 βομβάυλιος· ὁ αὐλητής. ἀπὸ τοῦ βομβεῖν (*bombaulios*: a flute-player. From *bombein* ('buzz')), which seemingly gives the impression that he

²³⁶ Abbreviated versions of this note are preserved at Zonar. p. 396.6 and *Suda* β 371.

²³⁷ E.g. Phryn. *PS* p. 2.8–10; Sophronius *Grammatici Graeci* IV.2 p. 419.13–44. Essentially the same *ad-hoc* method is how lexical blends in general were analyzed and explained in antiquity. See Appendix I.

regarded the word as an unremarkable derivative of βομβέω and term for a flute-player.

Some modern lexical authorities and commentators have likewise understood the word to be punny nonce formation in need of comment, but have been more on the mark with their comments about its formation than the Aristophanic scholiast or Hesychius: for example, LSJ *s. v.* gloss the word as “(βομβέω, αὐλός) comic comp(oun)d for ἀσκαύλης, *bagpiper*, with play on βομβυλιός,” although they recant their assertion that the word is a compound in the Supplement, noting that it is instead a “comic conflation of βομβύλιος and αὐλός”.²³⁸ Similarly, Merry 1887 *ad loc.* notes that “in βομβαύλιοι, ‘bumble-bee pipers,’ we have a fancy word fashioned from βομβυλιός, ‘the bumble-bee’”, while Van Leeuwen 1901 *ad loc.* notes that “βομβυλιοί, a word from everyday life, is comically changed (trans.)”. Despite their terminology (“conflation,” “comically changed”, and “fashioned from”), it is clear that all three have recognized βομβαύλιοι as the kind of non-canonical formation that it is but that they simply lacked the terminological wherewithal to call it a blend.

The five lines quoted above are a riff on the alleged mediocrity of Boeotian and Theban musicians generally and specifically of Chaeris,²³⁹ a singer and musician disparaged elsewhere in comedy.²⁴⁰ These lines harken back to an earlier remark (15–6), where the protagonist of the comedy Dicaeopolis, at the time a passive citizen waiting for the assembly to convene, complains that he died on the rack when he saw

²³⁸ The correction in the Supplement has evidently been overlooked by Montanari *s. v.*

²³⁹ Stephanis #2593

²⁴⁰ Ar. *Pax* 950–5; *Av.* 858; Pherecr. fr. 6; and most likely Cratin. fr. 126.

Chaeris slink on stage to play an Orthian tune. The blend is reserved here for the end of the line as a surprising and thus amusing alteration of the expected βομβυλιός, thereby serving as a *paraprosdokian* joke about worthlessness of these noisy Boeotian pests. The blend is therefore but one of Aristophanes' manifold lampoons of contemporary musicians.

At the point in the comedy when the anonymous speaker comes on stage at 860, Dicaeopolis, previously frustrated that the on-going Peloponnesian War had hindered his ability to get his hands on luxury goods, has secured a private treaty with Sparta, has established a kind of black market, and has already been visited by a Megarian merchant attempting to sell his daughters, whom he had disguised as piglets (to facilitate a pun on the word χοῖρος: "piglet" and "cunt"). Everything about this anonymous newcomer at 860 and following screams, "Theban": for example, the dialect he speaks (e.g. Boeotian ἴττω for Attic ἴστω), the pennyroyal (γλάχων) he brings,²⁴¹ and the annoying flute-players said explicitly to have come from Thebes, a city evidently home to many famous 5th- and 4th-century flute-players.²⁴² These two flute-players seemingly serve no other purpose in the comedy than to help characterize the anonymous entrant as a Boeotian merchant and to set up a quick gag about Boeotian musicians, since after Dicaeopolis mocks them and the Boeotian complains that they have been ruining his wares, they are never mentioned again.

²⁴¹ According to Phrynichus (*PS* p. 53.16–7), γλάχων is the Doric form of the word; γλήχων, the Ionic form; and βλήχων, the Attic form. In addition, at *Ar. Lys.* 87–9, pennyroyal is associated with Boeotia.

²⁴² Cf. West 1992. 366–7.

Rhetorically, the blend is first set up when the Theban merchant complains at 862 that flute-players have followed him from Thebes. The second step in setting up the joke is when Dicaeopolis pops back on stage at 864 and demands that the “wasps” knock it off and get away from his door. Calling these Theban flute-players “wasps” not only establishes them as worthless and harmful insects whose “attempts to transfer their nests to a new place ... require vigorous resistance,”²⁴³ that is as pests whose attempt to come from Thebes to Athens should be violently thwarted, but also adduces the sonic connection between flute-players and insects on which the humor of the blend in part depends,²⁴⁴ priming the audience to expect the regular βομβυλιόι at 866. With the Boeotian flute-players already so-called and the sonic connection between some insects and some instruments already adduced, the stage is set, as it were, for Dicaeopolis to double down on the insect/instrumentalist imagery and hammer home the joke with an unexpected, elaborate coinage emphasizing that the wasp-like flute-players are in fact lousy, worthless, annoying Chaeridean drones needing to be driven off-stage by whatever means necessary. In setting up an

²⁴³ Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 864

²⁴⁴ The likeness of wasps’ and flute-players’ buzzing is elsewhere noted at Hsch. σ 2886. In addition, although βομβυλιός is used of buzzing insects of one kind or another (cf. Hsch. β 802), it could according to Erot. p. 59.2–3 also be used metaphorically of flute-players: βομβυλιοῦ· ἔστι μὲν τὸ βομβυλιὸν εἶδος μελίσης. σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀυλητὴν, παρὰ τὸ τοῖς ἀυλοῖς βομβεῖν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ βικίου εἶδος στενοστόμου (“*bombyliou* (gen.): it is the buzzing kind of honeybee, but it also denotes a flute-player because they buzz (*bombein*) with their flutes. It’s also a kind of narrow-mouthed vessel”).

Another sense of βομβύλιος is attested at Zenob. 2.80: βομβύλιος ἄνθρωπος· ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκάρπου· παρόσον ὁ βομβύλιος καρπὸν οὐ φέρει. ἔστι δὲ μελίττης εἶδος ἐκ πηλοῦ τὰ κηρία πλαττούσης (“a *bombylios* man: used of someone fruitless, since someone who is *bombylios* does not bear fruit. It is also a kind of honeybee that makes *keria* from clay”).

elaborate joke that equates Theban flute-players with noxious wasps and chasing them off-stage, Dicaeopolis gets to do what he perhaps wishes he could have done at 15–6. The joke thus also highlights Dicaeopolis’ transition from passive audience member and citizen at the beginning of comedy to the active stage-director and peace-broker that he is at this point in the comedy.

4.2 ΜΕΣΟΠΈΡΔΗΝ

Poll. 3.155

καὶ πλαγιάζειν δὲ καὶ κλιμακίζειν παλαισμάτων ὀνόματα· μοχθηρὸν γὰρ τὸ **μεσοπέρδην** (adesp. com. fr. 775) ἐν τῇ κωμῳδίᾳ σχῆμα παλαίσματος

τὸ μεσοπέρδην Dobree : τὸ μέσον ἔρδειν Poll.^A : τὸ πέρδην Poll.^{FC} : τὸ πέρδειν Poll.^{SB}

And both *plagiazein* (“throw sideways”) and *klimakizein* (“hold one’s ground”) are names of wrestling moves. But unsuitable is the word **mesoperdên**, a kind of wrestling move in comedy

Hsch. μ 928

μεσοπέρδην· μεσοφέρδην τὸν μέσον φερόμενον· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν τῷ π ἄντι τοῦ φ ἐχρῶντο προστιθέντες τὸ τῆς δασύτητος σημεῖον

μεσοπέρδην· μεσοφέρδην] μεσόπερα ἦν· μέφερα ἦν mss.

mesoperdên: (they say that) *mesopherdên* (is) one who is being carried in the middle. In antiquity they used *pi* instead of *phi*, adding the mark of rough-breathing

Phot. μ 302

μεσοπέρδην· ἐκ τῶν μέσων· ἀντὶ τοῦ μεσοφέρδην μεμενηκότων τῶν ἀρχαίων χαρακτήρων

μεσοπέρδην] μεσομερδην Phot.^g : μεσομέρδην Phot.^z

mesoperdên: from the middle; instead of *mesopherdên*, recalling the ancient characters

4.2.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

Dobree 1874. 44 (comparing the text of Photius) corrected the text of Pollux, the manuscripts of which offer nonsense here, the copyists having misunderstood the word. The manuscripts of Hesychius likewise offer nonsense presumably for the same reason. The paradosis of Phot.^{gz} likely shows minuscule confusion between *mu* and *pi*.

4.2.2 FORMATION

μεσοπέρδην is a blend of μεσοφέρδην “(borne) by the middle”²⁴⁵ and πέρδομαι “fart”. The word is unlikely as an adverb in -δην. Although a sequence of two dental stops typically simplifies to /s + dental/²⁴⁶ and we might therefore perhaps have expected a putative *-πέρδ-δην to have become *-περζδην and, with the loss of z between two consonants,²⁴⁷ *-πέρδην, there are evidently no examples of -δδ- etymologically.²⁴⁸ As such, the outcome of an otherwise unparalleled -δδ- is uncertain and positing such a derivation for -πέρδην seems imprudent.²⁴⁹ At any rate, the context of wrestling would seem to suggest that the word functions as a blend. And as a blend, the form and meaning of the word are clear, with the phonetic overlap (-φερδ- and περδ-)

²⁴⁵ Not otherwise attested. Adverbs in -δην are typically of two kinds: those formed directly from the root in zero-grade (e.g. μίγδην “mixedly”; φύγδην “in flight”; βάδην “step by step”) and those formed from the root in *o*-grade with -α- added before the suffix (e.g. λογάδην “picked”), with the two kinds sometimes coexisting (e.g. ἀμβλήδην and ἀμβολάδην “bursting”). This -άδην allomorph presumably originates in reanalysis of *o*-grade roots ending in *-h₂ (e.g. *bolh₂-dēn). However, some such adverbs are nonetheless seemingly formed from roots in *e*-grade (e.g. κλέβδην “stealthily” < κλέπτω “steal”; ὀρέγδην “by reaching” < ὀρέγω “reach”; περιπλέγδην “closely entwined” < πλέκω “entwine”; no zero-grade forms of which are attested) and can likewise coexist with the latter of the other two kinds (e.g. περιπλοκάδην “closely entwined”), although it is possible that these could be analogical reformations of the zero-grade with an anaptyctic vowel. At any rate, there thus seems no reason that there could not have been alongside φοράδην “borne alone” a *φέρδην of the same meaning (likewise analogically reformed from the zero-grade with an anaptyctic vowel), whence μεσοφέρδην. On adverbs in -δην generally, see Frohwein 1868. 39–60; Haas 1959; Rau 2006.

²⁴⁶ E.g. ἰστός “seen” < *wid-to-; and cf. Sihler 1995. 202 with further examples.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Sihler 1995. 218–9

²⁴⁸ Rix 1992. 96: “für Dental vor /d/ fehlen Beispiele”.

²⁴⁹ This would also be the only such adverb formed from a dental-final stem (*pace* Frohwein 1869. 44–5, none of whose few examples are in fact from dental-final stems).

exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that one may cause an opponent to fart (πέρδομαι) while carrying (φέρω) him by the middle (μέσος).

4.2.3 INTERPRETATION

The blend μεσοπέρδην is attested only in the three lexicographers cited above, all of whom either lived in or drew on sources from the 2nd century CE,²⁵⁰ which is thus the earliest date at which we have evidence of scholarly interest in this word. Pollux cites the word amid a large discussion of terms for wrestling moves, censuring it as improper Greek and attributing it to comedy without commenting otherwise on its meaning or etymology. Both Hesychius and Photius, on the other hand, although the brevity of their notes renders each difficult, seemingly regard μεσοπέρδην as the older spelling of μεσοφέρδην.²⁵¹ At any rate, Hesychius' gloss of μεσοφέρδην as "one who is borne by the middle (acc.);" seems like an attempt to etymologize the word rather than its actual meaning and, moreover, suggests that he takes μεσοφέρδην to be the accusative singular of masculine first-declension noun *μεσοφέρδης. Yet, a

²⁵⁰ Pollux lived in the 2nd century CE. The material in Hesychius has been traced back to 2nd-century CE grammarian Herodian by Lentz (*Grammatici Graeci* III.2 p. 550.12–3), while the material in Hesychius and Photius has been traced back to the 2nd-century CE grammarian Diogenianus by Theodoridis.

²⁵¹ Photius' μεμενηκότων τῶν ἀρχαίων χαρακτήρων in particular suggests he may have had in the mind the spelling conventions of the Old Attic Script used before 403 BCE, where φς was used to render the sequence /ps/, although φ was used for /p^h/ and π was used for /p/. However, confusion between the two was rare and mostly limited to cases of aspirate dissimilation and assimilation in inscriptions from after 403 BCE (cf. Threatte 1980 I.449–69).

putative compound *μεσοφέρδης is unlikely, since there is no base φερδ- whence it might be formed. Photius' gloss of the word as "from the middle" suggests he took μεσοφέρδην as an adverb. That μεσοφέρδην is an adverb was also the opinion more recently of Dobree 1874. 44: "the adverb μεσοφέρδην is from φέρω, like ἄρδην, φύρδην, σύρδην, etc., which a comic poet has distorted into a dirty joke (trans.)". This is certainly right, and Poliakoff 1981. 48-9 thought that the dirty joke here was specifically about squeezing a fart out of someone while wrestling.

4.3 τρυγωδία / τρυγωδός / τρυγωδικός / τρυγωδοποιουσική

Ar. *Ach.* 497-501

μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι,
εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν ἔπειτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν
μέλλω περὶ τῆς πόλεως, **τρυγωδίαν** ποιῶν.
τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ **τρυγωδία**.
ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μὲν, δίκαια δέ.

Don't get mad at me, gentleman spectators, if I, though a beggar, am about to speak to the Athenians about the city, while making a **tragedy**. For **tragedy** also knows what's right. What I'll say will be terrible but right.

Ar. *Ach.* 628-9

ἐξ οὗ γε χοροῖσιν ἐφέστηκεν **τρυγικοῖς** ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν,

οὐπω παρέβη πρὸς τὸ θέατρον λέξων ὡς δεξιός ἐστιν

Never, since our producer first directed **trugic** choruses, has he stepped forward to tell the audience that he's clever.

Ar. *Ach.* 885–7

ὦ φιλτάτη σὺ καὶ πάλαι ποθουμένη,
ἤλθες ποθεινὴ μὲν **τρυγωδικοῖς** χοροῖς,
φίλη δὲ Μορύχῳ

O you dearest and long desired, you have come, longed-for by **trugedic** choruses, and dear to Morychus”

Ar. *V.* 650–2

Bδ. χαλεπὸν μὲν καὶ δεινῆς γνώμης καὶ μείζονος ἢ ’πὶ **τρυγωδοῖς**
ιάσασθαι νόσον ἀρχαίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐντετακυῖαν.
ἀτάρ, ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη—

Φι. παῦσαι καὶ μὴ πατέριζε.

{Bd.} It's difficult and requires more and greater intelligence than **trugedians** must heal an old sickness inveterate to the city. But, o father of ours, son of Cronus—{Ph.} Knock it off and stop “o father”-ing.

Ar. V. 1535–7

ἀλλ' ἐξάγετ', εἴ τι φιλεῖτ', ὀρχούμενοι, θύραζε
ἡμᾶς ταχύ· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδεὶς πω πάρος δέδρακεν,
ὀρχούμενον ὅστις ἀπήλλαξεν χορὸν **τρυγωδῶν**.

But lead us out of here dancing, if you please, quickly. For no one has ever done this before, who led off a dancing chorus of **tragedians**.

Ar. fr. 156.8–10 (from *Gerytades*)

A. καὶ τίνες ἂν εἶεν;

B. πρῶτα μὲν Σαννυρίων
ἀπὸ τῶν **τρυγωδῶν**, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν
Μέλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλίων Κινησίας

10

{A} And who might they be? {B} First, Sannyrio represents the **tragedians**; and the tragic choruses, Meletus; and the dithyrambic ones, Cinesias.

Ar. fr. 347 (from *Thesmophoriazusae* II)

ἧ μέγα τι βρῶμ' † ἐστὶ ἡ † **τρυγωδοποιομουσική**,
ἡνίκα Κράτης τό τε τάριχος ἐλεφάντινον
λαμπρὸν ἐνόμιζεν ἀπόνως παρακεκλημένον,
ἄλλα τε τοιαῦθ' ἕτερα μυρὶ' ἐκιχλίζετο.

Indeed, the **trugic poet's art** † is † some great feast, when Crates considered his smoked fish “ivoried”, “splendid” and “summoned without effort”, and a thousand other such things got a laugh.

Eup. fr. 99.28–9 (from *Demoi*)

τῆς ἑταιρείας δὲ τούτων τοὺς φίλους ἔσκ[– ∪ –

ταῖς στρατηγίαις δ' ὑφέρπει καὶ **τρυγωδο**[– ∪ –

But their friends from their club ... and he sneaks up on the generalships, and the **trugedian** ...

4.3.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

In each of the passages quoted above, the paradoseis in τρυγ- have been “corrected” to τραγ- in at least one manuscript. However, because of the relative rarity of issues here and because of the obvious source of the issues (attempting to “correct” a nonce word), I have chosen not to clutter the text above with apparatus.

4.3.2 FORMATION

τρυγωδός is a blend of the stem of τρύξι (gen. τρυγός) “new wine; lees” and τραγωδός “tragedian”. Although it is formally analyzable as a compound, that is a consequence of the fact that one of its source words is itself a compound. When one of the source

words of a blend is already a compound, it can be clipped at the morphological boundary between its constituents and be reduced to a splinter that is formally identical to a constituent of the source-word. Yet although the resultant blend may be formally analyzable as a compound, it will not be semantically analyzable as such, since the new coinage draws on the blended semantics of its sources rather than the unblended semantics of the source-word(s)'s constituents.²⁵² At any rate, the contexts suggest blending, especially in fr. 156 where the blend is explicitly contrasted with a τραγ- word, and as a blend its form and meaning are clear. The phonetic overlap (τρυγ- and τραγ-) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that comedy *qua* tragedy is a wine-soaked, poor man's genre that parodies and otherwise engages with tragedy in an agonistic relationship and claims the same right as tragedy to dispense advice.

²⁵² For example, English *chicksand* exists as the name of a village in Bedfordshire, England, which Skeat 1906. 42 takes to be a compound of Old English *Cic* or *Cicc*, a personal name otherwise unknown, and *sand* in the sense "sandy region". Thus, as a compound, *chicksand* means "Cic's Place". But the word *chicksand* has been more recently coined (*Happy Endings*, "The Quicksand Girlfriend". Directed by Jeff Melman. Written by Josh Bycel. 13 April 2011) as a blend of *chick* (in the sense "girl, woman") and *quicksand* to describe a situation in which a young man unwittingly finds himself drawn deeper and deeper into a romantic relationship with a young woman instead of, as he had previously thought and hoped, merely having a one-night stand with her. That is, the quicksand-like chick has sucked him down into a relationship. Although this second *chicksand* looks like a compound, the context of the coinage, where the witticism is even called out as "Not a word", suggests blending, and its intended meaning requires the blended semantics of both source words.

Two other such blends in English are the relatively recent *vaguebook* "elicit attention by posting intentionally vague statements on Facebook or other social media", which blends *vague* and *facebook* "use Facebook" and the relatively old *dumbfound*, a blend of *dumb* and *confound*.

4.3.3 INTERPRETATION

Ancient grammarians and commentators took the word *τρυγωδία* as a straightforward synonym for “comedy”, or at least what later came to be called “comedy”,²⁵³ with some having accordingly concocted various reasons for dubbing comedy “tragedy”. According to most ancient grammarians and commentators, comedy was also called “tragedy” either because wine lees were offered as a prize or because they were smeared on the comic actors’ faces in place of masks,²⁵⁴ but there is no evidence otherwise that either supposition is true, and this line of thinking is perhaps best regarded as a humorless attempt to tease out the meaning of difficult word by etymologizing it. Yet underpinning the guesswork of these ancient commentators is the tacit recognition that *τρυγωδία* would be semantically peculiar as a compound and that it does not have the same sense as most other compounds in *-ωδία*.²⁵⁵ Alternatively, according to Athenaeus (2.40a), comedy was also called “tragedy” because comedy was performed at the time of the vintage (*τρύγη*). However, this seems implausible, since dramatic festivals took place in the winter and

²⁵³ Theognost. *Can.* 134

²⁵⁴ E.g. Σ^{REF} *Ar. Ach.* 499a; Σ^{EF} *Ar. Ach.* 398a

²⁵⁵ Apart from the much-discussed *τραγωδός*, the precise meaning and etymology of which remains unclear (the first constituent is traditionally taken to be from *τράγος* “goat” but what “goat-singer” really means is disputed; cf. Pickard–Cambridge 1966. 112–24) and the verb-initial *ῥαψωδός* “rhapsode” (< *ῥάπτω* “sew” and *ῶδή* “song”) compounds in *-ωδός* typically denote a subtype of *ῶδός* “singer”, with the first constituent specifying either which kind of song the singer sings (e.g. *θρηνωδός* “dirge-singer”; *ὑμνωδός* “hymn-singer”) or which musical instrument accompanies the singer (e.g. *αὐλωδός* “singing to the flute”; *κιθαρῶδός* “singing to the cithara”).

spring,²⁵⁶ whereas the harvest took place in the fall,²⁵⁷ and his suggestion is best regarded as another shot in the dark.

The culmination of this same kind of etymologizing guesswork is on full display in a long note at *EM* p. 793.58–794.24, which reads like something of an overview of previous research into the names of the dramatic genres:

τραγωιδία· ἔστι βίων τε καὶ λόγων ἠρωϊκῶν μίμησις. κέκληται δὲ τραγωδία, ὅτι τράγος τῆ ὠδῆ ἄθλον ἐτίθετο· ὠδὴ γὰρ ἡ τραγωδία. ἢ ὅτι τρύγα ἄθλον ἐλάμβανον οἱ νικῶντες· τρύγα γὰρ ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸν νέον οἶνον. ἢ ὅτι τετράγωνον εἶχον οἱ χοροὶ σχῆμα· ἢ ὅτι τὰ πολλὰ οἱ χοροὶ ἐκ σατύρων συνίσταντο· οὐς ἐκάλουν τράγους σκώπτοντες, ἢ διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος δασύτητα, ἢ διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια σπουδήν· τοιοῦτον γὰρ τὸ ζῶον. ἢ ὅτι οἱ χορευταὶ τὰς κόμας ἀνέπλεκον, σχῆμα τράγων μιμούμενοι. ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς τρυγῆς τρυγωδία. ἦν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο κοινὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμωδίαν· ἐπεὶ οὐπω διεκέκριτο τὰ τῆς ποιήσεως ἐκατέρας· ἀλλ’ εἰς αὐτὴν ἔν ἦν τὸ ἄθλον, ἢ τρύξ· ὕστερον δὲ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν ὄνομα ἔσχεν ἡ τραγωδία· ἡ δὲ κωμωδία ὠνόμασται, ἐπειδὴ πρότερον κατὰ κόμας ἔλεγον αὐτὰ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ τῆς Δήμητρος· ἢ παρὰ τὸ κωμάζειν, ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ κώματι ὠδὴ· ἐπειδὴ

²⁵⁶ The Rural Dionysia was held in December/January, while the City Dionysia was held in March/April (cf. Mikalson 1975. 97, 128).

²⁵⁷ The vintage took place in the fall (cf. Var. *R.* 1.1.63 *vindemiam fieri oportere inter aequinoctium autumnale V kal. Octobres et vergiliarum occasum VI idus Novembres*, “the vintage should happen between the autumnal equinox on 27 September and the setting of the Pleiades on 8 November”; and see Sacks 2005. 132), and accordingly the Oscophoria was celebrated in Dionysus’ honor, after the vintage, in October/November (cf. Mikalson 1975. 67–9; Isager–Skydsgaard 2001. 164).

ἐπὶ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ὕπνου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐφευρέθη· ἢ ἡ τῶν κωμητῶν ὠδή· κῶμαι
γὰρ λέγονται οἱ μείζονες ἀγροί²⁵⁸

The variety and number of hypotheses, each seizing on a different facet of the genre to explain its name, show a deep and abiding interest in figuring out why these important dramatic genres were called what they were. Noteworthy here however is that “tragedy” is simultaneously invoked as both the original name of tragedy (with an unexplained change of *upsilon* to *alpha*)²⁵⁹ and as the original name of comedy, which perhaps indicates that the scholarly tradition, of which the *EM* is an inheritor, had no idea what to make of a facetious coinage that looked like the word “tragedy” but was used of comedy and that the precise Aristophanic joke had been lost. However, the fact that tragedy is thought to have been both a name for tragedy and for comedy may perhaps suggest that the scholarly tradition had some vague sense that Aristophanes had used the term “tragedy” as a generic term for something

²⁵⁸ “Tragedy: it is the imitation of heroic lives and words. It is called tragedy because a goat (*tragos*) was awarded as a prize for the song, since the song is tragedy. Or because the victors got as a prize wine lees (*truga*), which the ancients used to call new wine. Or because the choruses used to have a tetragonal arrangement. Or because very often the choruses were comprised of satyrs, which they used to call goats (*tragous*) in jest either because of the hairiness of their body or because of their lust for sex, since they were creatures this kind. Or because the members of the chorus plaited their hair in imitation of the manner of goats. Or (the term) tragedy (derives) from wine-lees (*trugos*). This name was also commonly applied to comedy. When each production was judged, there was but one prize for it, wine lees. Later, tragedy had its common name. Comedy was so-called since they formerly said these things in villages (*kômas*) at festivals for Dionysus and Demeter. Or it is from the verb ‘to revel’ (*kômazein*), or it is the song at deep sleep (*kôma*): since it found its beginning at the time of sleep. Or it is the song of villagers (*kômêtai*), since larger fields were called villages (*kômai*).”

²⁵⁹ Also postulated at Comm. on Dion. Thrax. p. 475.4 and Diomedes *Grammatici Latini* I p. 487, whose source here Meuli 1955. 228–9 took to be Varro; implied at Porph. Hor. *Ars*. 277.

halfway between tragedy and comedy (i.e. semantically, if not also formally, a blend) as modern scholars have thought.

This relatively tin-eared etymologizing of the word persisted well into 19th and the 20th centuries, with for example Reisch 1902. 467 averring:

“Unklar ist leider Geschichte und Bedeutung des Wortes τραγωδοί. Die Vermutung, dass das Wort erst von den Komikern gewissermass parodisch als Gegenstück zu τραγωδοί gebildet worden sei, findet an den aristophanischen Stellen, in denen das Wort ohne scherzhafte Spitze gebraucht ist, keine Stütze. Man müsste also annehmen, dass ein ursprünglich scherzhaft gebildetes Wort späterhin auch ohne parodischen Beigeschmack geläufig geworden sei. Dem gegenüber muss die andere Möglichkeit betont werden, dass τραγωδοί eine alte volkstümlich Bezeichnung eines Komödenchors sei, der ursprünglich einem anderen Feste als der Chor der κωμωδοί zukam. Als für die Kuntsform der Komödie die κωμωδοί massgebend geworden waren, könnten die τραγωδοί in diesen aufgegangen sein, so dass späterhin die alte Bezeichnung eine Zeitlang als gleichbedeutung mit κωμωδοί sich erhielt, dann aber ganz verschwand. Im Alterum wurde das Wort in der Regel von τρύξ abgeleitet, indem man entweder τρύξ als jungen Wein verstand, der also Preis gegeben wurde—das ist die häufigste Erklärung—oder an die Hefe dachte, mit der das Gesicht der Komöden beschmiert war; daneben findet sich auch die Ableitung von τρύγη. Wie immer man sich entscheiden möge für “Wein-Lied”, “Hefe-Spiel”, “Weinlese-Lied” für volkstümlichen oder für scherzhaften Ursprung

des Wortes, sicher ist, dass die Bildung von τρυγωδία keine Analogie zu der postulierten Etymologie von τραγωδία bilden kann.“

Reisch's comment is worth singling out and quoting because not only does he uncritically parrot the etymologies given by ancient grammarians and commentators, which we have already disputed above, but he also seemingly glosses over the fact that the word is all but confined to Aristophanes and works hard to find no humor in the passages of Aristophanes in which the words occur. While Reisch is right in one sense that the word, originally humorous, eventually lost its humor, it was not however in Aristophanes that it did so but among later grammarians and commentators like the *EM* and himself. And Reisch, rather than taking the word's recurrence as evidence of Aristophanes recycling a joke, takes it as evidence that the word is some folksy old term harkening back to an otherwise unknown dramatic festival. That is, a facetious coinage has been so misconstrued as a serious generic term over the millenia that we have gone from actors smearing their faces with lees to the *ex nihilo* creation of a now-lost dramatic festival to explain it.

Despite the obvious problems with his take, Reisch was nonetheless followed in the main by Pickard-Cambridge 1966, who mentioned the word τρυγωδός briefly amid a lengthy discussion of the term τραγωδός and its origins, suggesting that if τρυγωδός “is not a parody word (and therefore not to be too minutely scrutinized), it may mean the ‘singer at the vintage’, just as well as ‘singer stained with wine lees’” (123) and that “there may have been an autumn festival including both tragic and comic elements, but, as has been said, *trygoidia* was probably in origin simply a comic parody of *tragoidia*, giving to comedy a name which was both ludicrous and

suggestive of wine ...” (186). Although he is at least skeptical of Reisch’ putative autumn festival, he does not outright dismiss the idea, and his declaration that the word is “simply parodic” along with his evident unwillingness to say more about it than that it is funny and evocative gives short shrift to what is ultimately a rich joke delivered in a novel coinage. Fortunately, understanding and appreciation of the word has improved significantly in the decades since Pickard-Cambridge wrote.

Taplin 1983, picking up on Pickard-Cambridge’s suggestion that *τρυγωδία* may be parodic but ignoring his dictum that the word not be too minutely scrutinized, entered the word as evidence into the long-standing debate whether (Aristophanic) comedy was meant to be didactic. After briefly examining the other attestations of the various *τρυγ-* words and reasoning that “it seems clear beyond dispute that in three of them [Ar. *Ach.* 886; *Nu.* 296;²⁶⁰ fr. 156] the *τρυγ-* word is chosen primarily in order to make some wordplay with *τραγωδία*. It seems to me likely that this verbal association is also intended in three of the others [Ar. *Ach.* 628; *V.* 650, 1537]. There does not seem to be any such homeophonic point in the other two fragments [Ar. fr. 349; Eup. fr. 99.29], though we cannot be sure” (333), Taplin concludes that at Ar. *Ach.* 500 Aristophanes has coined²⁶¹ and used the word *τρυγωδία* instead of *κωμωδία* “to

²⁶⁰ οὐ μὴ σκώψει, μηδὲ ποιήσεις ἄπερ οἱ τρυγοδαίμονες οὔτοι (“Don’t make fun or do what those *trygodaimones* do”). However, *τρυγοδαίμονες* is not a blend, even if the humor of the word is similar.

²⁶¹ Sommerstein 2007 rejects Taplin’s suggestion that the word *τρυγωδία* was coined by Aristophanes and first used at *Ach.* 500, claiming that “if that had been the first time it was used, no one would have understood it; rather, at its first appearance, the word must have stood in explicit contrast with *τραγωδία*.” But the logical conclusion of this line of thinking is seemingly that any punny nonce formation will necessarily be misunderstood unless it is used near the target of its punning. This is, however, an absurd conclusion. *τρυγωδία* and *τραγωδία* are, despite the similarity that is the natural and intended result of blending,

allude to *tragedy*” (333)—the audience, he thinks, will have found the pun obvious and taken “the comic ‘etymology’ to be from either τρυγάω ‘to gather a crop’, or τρύξ ‘unfermented wine’” (333)—and thus to assert for comedy an equal acquaintance with what is right and a didactic or curative function on par with that of tragedy.²⁶²

By suggesting that Aristophanes coined the word to “allude” to tragedy and that the audience will have understood its “comic ‘etymology’”, Taplin seems rightly to imply that the word is formally and semantically peculiar, and accordingly he does not suggest, as others do, that the word means “harvesting-song” or “wine-song” or the like. As for why Aristophanes coined τρυγωδία as a pun on “tragedy” at *Ach.* 500 (where we should recall that the the protagonist of the comedy is dressed as a beggar

different words, and there seems no obvious reason to assume that the first τρυγωδία, even used apart from τραγωδία, would have dumbfounded an ancient audience any more than modern scholars. And as discussed in Chapter 3 *s. v.* Βδεῦ, modern commentators and scholars have at times been overly demanding as to the phonetic similarity between a pun and its target, arguing implicitly that some pun violated some unspecified and perhaps unspecifiable maximal phonetic difference and therefore supposing a fudged pronunciation to aid in the recovery of the pun’s target. Here, however, Sommerstein seems to be arguing that they are *too* similar, that the minimal phonetic difference is *too* minimal.

²⁶² Taplin has been followed by e.g. Edwards 1991, who notes that “through this comic expression [τρυγωδία] Aristophanes claims for his genre the same prerogative to high themes of civic importance as that conceded to tragedy. The conflicting implications built into the word epitomize the general tension in Aristophanes’ plays between comedy as low and vulgar, rustic buffoonery, and comedy as a sophisticated dramatic form utilizing public-spirited themes and offering timely political advice” (157), but he explicitly calls the word a compound (157); Panagiotarakou 2009, who argues that tragedy is “a new type of drama that is neither tragedy nor comedy ... [which aims] to delve into the civic sphere with the intention of engaging matters that, up to that point, were beyond the intellectual and philosophical jurisdiction of comedy” (251), but she does not take into consideration any of the τρυγ- words attested outside of *Acharnians*; Biles–Olson 2015 on *Ar. V.* 650, who claim that the word “pleads for comedy’s right to attempt something unexpectedly ambitious by referring to its putatively more august sister genre”, but leave aside the issue of the word’s formation; Sells 2018. 41–7.

in rags borrowed from Euripides!), Taplin seeks an answer by briefly comparing *Pax* 1337–40, where the verb τρυγάω is used in a ribald metaphor about “harvesting” Oporia (“bounty”), the wife of Trygaeus (“harvester”), the protagonist of the comedy. Taplin’s unspoken assumption here seems to be that just as Trygaeus harvests and shares his bounty in *Peace*, so too does Aristophanes harvest and share with the Athenian audience his knowledge of what is right in his comedies.²⁶³

The idea that tragedy is Aristophanes’ term for his curative, politically engaged comedy seems to apply equally well at *Ach.* 628–9, the beginning of the parabasis wherein the chorus goes onto explain how the poet deserves rich rewards for preventing the city from being fleeced by foreigners and flatterers (633–5) and how he will keep ridiculing in pursuit of the right (κωμωδήσει τὰ δίκαια; 655) to teach the audience what is good so that they might flourish (656). This, however, is one of the passages where Taplin for some reason thinks that a “verbal association” with tragedy is only likely, even though the language of 628 riffs on the language of producing tragic choruses²⁶⁴ and the rest of the parabasis makes the exact point, which Taplin alleges Aristophanes is making at *Ach.* 500, quite explicitly: here comes comedy to save the day.

Yet at *Ach.* 885–7, a passage where Taplin thinks wordplay between τρυγωδικός and τραγωδικός is certain, this larger point about the curative function of Aristophanic comedy or its acquaintance with justice seems entirely to be missing.

²⁶³ Rather than (or in addition to?) the fact that comedy *qua* tragedy is tragedy with dirty jokes. Taplin is not explicit here.

²⁶⁴ Cf. Hdt. 5.67.5; D. 21.58.

Here, Dicaeopolis rapturously addresses some Copaic eels sold by the Theban merchant visiting his black market; he uses elevated language paratragically and parodies tragic recognition scenes.²⁶⁵ Moreover, his address ends at 893–4 with a comically distorted quotation of Euripides and had been preceded at 883 by the Theban merchant’s comically distorted quotation of Aeschylus. In each case, the ends of the lines from the venerable tragedians are altered to make a *paraprosdokian* reference to the eels. Although the word τρυγωδικός has some “homeophonic point”, as Taplin observes, the joke must be something other than that this drama or this chorus will teach the audience anything. Instead, the humor here seems to be that the trugedic choruses are in the business not only of misapplying and distorting the desires and language of tragedy, but also of misapplying and distorting the name of tragedy itself. As Aristophanes changes the trappings of tragedy into paratragedy so too does he change the name of tragedy itself into something parodic.

Likewise, there is no trace of this curative function or bold ambition at Ar. fr. 347, one of the two passages where Taplin admits that he sees no indication of wordplay between *trugedy* and *tragedy*. Rather, the trugic poet’s art here seems to be, as it was at *Ach.* 886, paratragedy, namely the use of elevated vocabulary²⁶⁶ to describe something prosaic in comedy: seafood. The idea that τρυγωδία is a term rather for comedy engaged in some way with tragedy seems to hold as well at Ar. fr.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Olson 2002 *ad loc.*

²⁶⁶ The adjective ἐλεφάντινος is attested only lyric poetry (e.g. Alc. fr. 350.1–2 (of a sword handle); Anacr. *PMG* 388.11 (of an umbrella)) and comedy (Ar. *Eq.* 1169 (lyric; of a hand); *Pl.* 815 (of a lantern)), before being picked up by prose authors from Plato onwards, while the adverb ἀπόνως is all but confined to speeches in 5th-century historians (e.g. Thuc. 1.122.2; Hdt. 9.2.3).

156, where Sannyrio is chosen as the tragic ambassador for a trip to the Underworld. If tragedy were Aristophanes' term for his own unique brand of didactic, ambitious, politically-engaged comedy, then surely it would be high praise for him to single out Sannyrio as its representative here. Of Sannyrio, we know little more than that he was an Athenian comic playwright with at least four comedies to his name (test. i), that he was active probably toward the end of the 5th century (test. ii), and that he was mocked for being thin (test. iii). Nothing in the testimonia or in the scant remains of his comedies suggest anything of the high-minded engagement with justice and civic affairs or bold ambition or generic novelty other scholars have attached to the word *tragedy*. There are, however, indications that he parodied tragedy.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁷ On this fragment, see Hall 2006. 179–80; Farmer 2017. 197–212. Farmer also discusses the two relevant passages from *Wasps* amid his discussion of that comedy generally (117–53). He argues that *Wasps* can be read as a story about comedy overcoming tragedy, wherein Philocleon—who quotes and acts out scenes from tragedy throughout—is ultimately won over by his son “Bdelycleon, a character markedly associated, like Dicaeopolis in *Acharnians*, with comedy, repeatedly wards off the influence of tragedy on his father with the unique resources of comic dramaturgy, staging a series of metatheatrical events to avert tragedy’s intrusions into the play. Finally successful in winning his father over to comedy, Bdelycleon unwittingly releases an unstoppable comic force, and Philocleon, inspired by wine and comic madness, takes over the stage, transforming the confrontation between tragedy and comedy from metaphor to reality by staging a dancing competition with a family of tragic performers” at the close of the comedy (118).

At 650–1 (the first passage from *Wasps* quoted above), as Bdelycleon begins to explain to his father how populist politicians have hoodwinked him and others like him, he styles himself a tragedian, saying that although healing the city of an old disease is a task beyond the power of tragedians, he has to try anyway by telling his father terrible truths about the political life of Athens. The sentiment here is similar to that at *Ach.* 497–501, where Dicaeopolis steps forth to offer Athens advice, claiming that comedy *qua* tragedy is acquainted with what is terrible but just. And Farmer suggests that Aristophanes, by ending the comedy with the word τρυγῶδων, since 1536–7 are in fact the final two lines of the comedy, “encapsulates this narrative of generic competition between comedy and tragedy” and “emphasizes for the audience at the very end of the play that *Wasps* has been a drama not

But why does Aristophanes coin the specific term *trugedy* to refer jocularly to comedy as engaged variously with tragedy? Equally, he might have coined instead *τρωγωδία “nibble-song” (< τρώγω “gnaw, nibble”), since comedy is obsessed with food and one aspect of its engagement with tragedy is, as we have seen, misapplying the language of tragedy to foodstuffs, or *κραγωδία, “shout-song” (< κραγός “bawling”), since certainly comedy is a more raucous dramatic form than tragedy; τρώγω and κράζω, both words well-attested in, if not confined to comedy, provide the needed phonetic overlap and render tragedy somehow comic. However, that comedy has the same utility as tragedy and that it is therefore engaged in an agonistic relationship with tragedy that often takes the form of paratragedy and parody is only evidently part of the point; the other part of the point is that comedy is humbly rustic and productively drunken. At Ar. *Pax* 572–81, Trygaeus sings, enumerating the delights of the countryside, among which is τρὺξ γλυκεῖα (“sweet *tryx*”) and at Theopomp. Com. fr. 63.4 an unknown speaker advises a young man: ἡ τρὺξ ἄριστόν ἐστιν εἰς εὐβουλίαν (“*trux* is the best thing for clear thinking”). These two points are equally well expressed in the blend τρυγωδία.

Although τρυγωδία is not alone among Greek blends in enjoying a life beyond its initial context (recall that Aristophanes had twice used his Ἀττικωνικοί), it does however seem alone in being picked up by another author. While most of the reoccurrences of the word come from elsewhere in Aristophanes himself, one comes from Eupolis’ *Demoi*. Although much remains unclear about Eup. fr. 99, given the

merely of the court system, of education, of generational conflict, but also and especially of literature, of the confrontation between Athens’ two theatrical genres” (153).

fragmentary and mutilated state of the text, the fact that the passage likely comes from a parabasis paired with the passage’s abuse of some contemporary politician points at least to the possibility that the term τρυγωδός still retained something of the sense “comic poet with the same utility as a tragic poet” or the like. What has perhaps made the word’s afterlife possible is that it by chance looks like a well-formed compound and that it moreover fulfills some denotational need. In addition, although τρυγωδία and τρυγωδός are both plausibly coined independently by blending, τρυγωδοποιουσική seems to be a secondary formation: a compound of a blend rather than a blend itself, since there is no attested word *τραγωδοποιουσική (~ “tragic poet’s art”); in fact, there are no attested compounds of μουσική otherwise. There is, however, a τραγωδοποιός (“tragic poet”), first attested at *Ar. Th.* 30,²⁶⁸ whence a putative blend *τρυγωδοποιός (“tragic poet”) could have been fashioned and thereafter compounded with μουσική. At any rate, τρυγωδός is then also alone among Greek blends in establishing itself well enough to be used as the basis for secondary formations.

4.4 TRAGICOMOEDIA

Plaut. *Am.* 50–63

nunc quam rem oratum huc veni primum proloquar;

50

²⁶⁸ That the blend τρυγωδοποιουσική (from *Thesmophoriazusae* II) seemingly presupposes the existence of τραγωδοποιός (from *Thesmophoriazusae* I) lends some credence, slight though it may be, to Austin–Olson 2004b’s argument that *Thesmophoriazusae* I was the first written of the two comedies.

post argumentum huius eloquar tragoediae.
quid? contraxistis frontem quia tragoediam
dixi futuram hanc? deus sum, commutavero.
eandem hanc, si voltis, faciam <iam> ex tragoedia
comoedia ut sit omnibus isdem versibus. 55
utrum sit an non voltis? sed ego stultior,
quasi nesciam vos velle, qui divos siem.
teneo quid animi vestri super hac re siet:
*faciam ut commixta sit; <sit> **tragicomoedia.***
nam me perpetuo facere ut sit comoedia, 60
reges quo veniant et di, non par arbitror.
quid igitur? quoniam hic servos quoque partis habet,
*faciam sit, proinde ut dixi, **tragicomoedia***

59 *ut c. sit; sit tragicomoedia* Leo : *c. ut haec sit tragicomoedia* Pareus
 1641 : *ut c. sit tragicocomoedia* P 63 *tragicomoedia* Pareus 1610 :
tragicocomoedia P

Now I'll tell you first what I've come here to ask, after I tell you the plot of this tragedy. What? Are you frowning because I said that this would be a tragedy? I'm a god, I'll change it. If you want, I'll make this tragedy a comedy with all the same verses. Do you want this or not? But I'm being foolish, as if I didn't know you want this; I *am* a god. I know what your thoughts are on this matter: I'll

make it mixed; let it be a **tragicomedy**. Well, I don't think it'd be right to make it totally a comedy, since regal persons and gods come on stage. What then? Since a slave has a role here as well, I'll make it, as I said, a **tragicomedy**.

Lactant. Plac. Stat. *Theb.* 4.147

*(Tirynthia deus) Iuppiter mutatus in Amphitryonem concubuisse cum Alcmena Eletryonis filia dicitur in urbe Tirynthia. unde natus est Hercules, unde et Tirynthius dicitur. de qua Plautus **tragicocomoediam** dixit*

(the Tirynthian goddess) Jupiter, after changing himself into Amphitryon, is said to have lain with Alcmena, the daughter of Electryon, in the city of Tirynthia. Whence was born Hercules, so he is also called Tirynthius. Plautus wrote a **tragicocomedy** about it.

4.4.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

63 is hypermetric, hence the emendation of Pareus 1610. However, 59 is metrical as transmitted, so if its *tragicocomoedia* is changed to *tragicomoedia*, as presumably it should be, the line is a syllable short, hence the additions of Pareus 1641, whose transposition of *commixta* and *ut* however seems unnecessary, and Leo 1895.

Leo's addition seems the more plausible, since it is easy to imagine that the second *sit* might easily have dropped out of the text via a simple *saut du même au même*; there are several other such errors in the prologue of this comedy. Moreover,

such a loss provides a likely path for the ultimate corruption of *tragicomoedia*, since it is also easy to imagine that after this loss resulted in a metrically deficient line, an attempt was made to restore the meter by “correcting” *tragicomoedia*, making it look more like a proper Greek compound, and that finally the *tragicomoedia* of 63 was “corrected” in light of the new *tragicocomoedia* of 59, which made that line hypermetric.

The paradosis of Lactantius Placidus (identity uncertain, but variously dated to the 4th to 6th centuries CE) is perhaps best taken not as evidence that Plautus in fact wrote *tragicocomoedia*, but rather as a *terminus ante quem* for that corruption in Plautus’ text here.

4.4.2 FORMATION

tragicomoedia is a blend of *tragicus* “tragic” and *comoedia* “comedy”. The word is not a derivative nor is it likely a compound, since a putative compound of the two words should have yielded either *tragicicomoedia* (with *-i-*, the linking vowel characteristic of Latin) or *tragicocomoedia* (with *-o-*, the linking vowel characteristic of Greek). Moreover, that the word is a blend is strongly suggested by the context, where both its source words are used repeatedly, and as a blend its form and meaning are clear. The phonetic overlap (*-co-* and *co-*) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke on the audience: that the drama about to be enacted really is a comedy, but with elements of

tragedy. Unfortunately, the freshness of this clever blend has long since faded due to its ubiquitous adoption by European vernaculars.

4.4.3 INTERPRETATION

From the Renaissance until relatively recently, the word was of interest chiefly to Plautus' many editors, whose arguments for and against accepting neither, only one, or both of Pareus' emendations are hardly worth rehashing in detail here. Suffice it to say that the first editor to follow Pareus in printing *tragicomoedia* in both lines was Lindemann 1834.²⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the matter does not seem to have been entirely put to rest, since Lindsay 1904 prints in both lines "tragico[co]media" with nary a comment in the apparatus²⁷⁰ and the *OLD s. v.* hedges its bets by adding "N.B. in codd. *tragicocomoedia*", but there seems no good reason that it should not have been.

In 1916/7, Schwering took up again the argument that only one of Pareus' emendations should be accepted,²⁷¹ writing that "[e]s is klar, daß im zweiten Verse aus metrischen Gründen nur *tragicomoedia* gelesen werden kann; aber die Gelehrten, die diese haplogische Form nun auch im ersten eingeführt haben, sind von einer falschen Voraussetzung ausgegangen ... Die Form *tragicomoedia* wird erst hier neu eingeführt und zugleich als haplogische Verkürzung aus *tragico comoedia* erläutert.

²⁶⁹ Soon confidently following suit were Fleckeisen 1850, Ritschl 1882, and Leo 1895. A brief survey of this textual debate up until 1876 is offered by Goetz 1876.

²⁷⁰ de Melo 2011 likewise prints "*tragico[co]moedia*" in both lines, but credits Pareus and other editors in his apparatus.

²⁷¹ As had, for example, Bothe 1810 *ad loc.*, Ussing 1875 *ad loc.*, and Grenier 1912. 184 earlier, albeit unconvincingly.

Daß im ersten Vers dies die richtige Lesung ist, geht auch daraus hervor, daß *commiscere* selten absolut gebraucht wird ..." (140). This is, however, the flimsiest of arguments in favor of retaining the paradosis in 59, since Plautus—as also, for example, Vergil and Suetonius—uses *commiscere* both absolutely and with an ablative.²⁷² At any rate, the point here is not to lend any credence to his argument nor necessarily to chastise him for taking up again an issue that Plautus' editors had more-or-less settled decades earlier, but to point out that Schwering calls the word *tragicomoedia* a "haplogistic form", as had also Grenier 1912. 184. Goetz 1876. 358 had earlier referred to it as the result of "Zusammenziehung".

Perhaps independently, Algeo 1977 (a seminal, early article on blends and blending mostly in English) adduced *tragicomoedia* as an example of what he called "haplogistic" blends, contending that "[s]ome blends ... may have been semiconscious in origin. Thus, later Latin *tragicomoedia* from earlier *tragicocomoedia* is clearly the result of haplology. We may suppose that the syllable repetition was eliminated by a kind of reverse stuttering effect that was neither wholly conscious and deliberate, nor purely the result of automatically applied phonological rules" (56). However, while Algeo may have in mind here the fact that the *tragicocomoedia* of earlier Latin—that is, of Plautus, after his text was "corrected," and of Lactantius Placidus?—became evidently in the hands of 15th- and 16th-century humanists the generic term *tragicomoedia*, this assessment hardly applies to Plautus himself, since centuries of editorial work have confirmed that *tragicomoedia* is the best reading in

²⁷² Cf. *OLD* s. v.

both lines. Moreover, the context of the two *tragicomoediae*—namely, the prologue of a comedy, where speakers often try *inter alia* to capture the audience’s attention and goodwill and identify the author, sources, setting, and important background information of the comedy, all the while weaving throughout “familiar colloquy with the audience, jokes and elaborate word-play, overt recommendations of the play and playwright, and direct appeals for attentiveness” (Christenson 2000. 131)—points fairly clearly to their being occasional witticisms with which Plautus may have primed the audience for the unorthodox drama that they were about to behold.²⁷³ Thus, to assert that Plautus’ *tragicomoedia* is a haplogistic form produced by either conscious haplogy or unconscious stuttering from an earlier *tragicocomoedia* would be to ignore the obviously humorous context of the word and to deny Plautus his gambit in captivating the audience with his lexical inventiveness with which he alerts the audience to his inventiveness in other realms.²⁷⁴ It also overlooks the narrative context, which lays out both the motivation and the steps through which the blend is created.

However, in what precisely this comedy’s inventiveness, to which Plautus calls attention here with the extended, jocular digression whose highlight is the blend

²⁷³ Christenson 2000. 24.

²⁷⁴ This would be neither the first nor the last time that scholars have denied Plautus this. Returning briefly to Schwering 1916/7, he began his conclusion, “Damit gewinnen wir das Resultat, daß die griechische Vorlage des *Amphitruo* die erst unter diesem Name auf die Bühne gekommene τραγικωμωδία war” (140). With this he seems to allege both that Plautus’ word *tragicomoedia* is merely a borrowing of an otherwise unattested Greek word and that Plautus’ tragicomedy is merely adapted from an otherwise unknown Greek comedy. That Plautus adapted his *Amphitruo* from a now lost Greek text that was already tragicomic was more recently also the opinion of Blänsdorf 1979.

tragicomoedia, lies is much debated. Plautus himself seems to suggest that it lies in his admitting both high- and low-status characters to the comedy. However, in the 16th century, the term *tragicomedy* was adopted as the moniker of a new dramatic genre that blended together the happy and the sad,²⁷⁵ whereas in this and the last century it has been variously suggested that the *Amphitruo* may be admitted as evidence that Roman comedy was a mixed genre, its conventions as-yet still fluid;²⁷⁶ that it is paratragic;²⁷⁷ that it is an adaptation of a tragedy;²⁷⁸ or even that it was an instantiation of a new, hybrid genre—that is, of tragicomedy—for which Plautus needed the new, hybrid term *tragicomoedia*.²⁷⁹ Although I am neither inclined to dip into debates of genre nor to deny either the contributions of scholars who have done so or the term *tragicomedy*'s “heuristic value,”²⁸⁰ I should like to say that I find the prospect of fabricating a whole, new genre from what is a joke, which moreover Plautus drops once it has been made, a dubious overcorrection from the ideas of scholars like Schwering and to quibble briefly with Manuwald 2014. 583–4:

“The term *tragicomoedia* in this passage was apparently coined as a generic term for the occasion ... An expression describing a mixture of “tragedy” and

²⁷⁵ Cf. Pareus 1614 s. v. *Tragico-comoedia*: “in which the dignity of persons and the magnitude of comedy are humbly admitted or in which the sad is mixed with the happy. *Am.* 63 where it is changed into the by-form *tragi-comoedia*. Such is human life as well as marriage (trans.)”. On renaissance tragicomedy and Plautus’ influence thereon, e.g. Foster 2004, esp. 9–34; Hardin 2018, esp. 31–52.

²⁷⁶ E.g. Chiarini 1980. 94–9, 123–4; Sheets 1983. 204–9; Oniga 1985. 206–8.

²⁷⁷ E.g. Sedgwick 1927; Thierfelder 1939; Cèbe 1966. 103–115.

²⁷⁸ E.g. Stewart 1958; Lefèvre 1982, 1999; Slater 1990; contra Braun 1991.

²⁷⁹ E.g. Lefèvre 1982, 1999; Blänsdorf 1993; Flores 1998; Bond 1999; Manuwald 1999, 2014. 580–98; Schmidt 2003.

²⁸⁰ Mastronarde 1999/2000. 36.

“comedy” has possible Greek forerunners such as *hilarotragoedia*; yet the inversion of the order of the two parts of the determinative compound presents Plautus’s play as a special type of “comedy,” including “tragic” elements. This weighting is confirmed by the fact that the play is referred to as *comoedia* (*Amphitruo* 88; 96; 868) or (without specification) as *fabula* (*Amphitruo* 94) elsewhere in the script.”²⁸¹

But *tragicomoedia* is not a determinative compound; it is a blend. As such, the sequence of its constituents is constrained by the point of phonetic overlap between *tragico-* and *comoedia*. The relative ordering of the source-words in the blend thus implies nothing certain about the syntactic-semantic relationship between them. Likewise, it seems tendentious to infer a gloss on the word from the fact that Plautus afterwards refers to the *Amphitruo* as a *comoedia* or a *fabula* rather than repeating the blend. However, given the rarity of coordinative compounds in Latin, Manuwald is probably right to think that the word is, in Bauer’s terminology, subordinative and right-oriented. And just as in the blend the word *tragicus* is subordinate to the word *comoedia*, so too throughout the *Amphitruo* are tragic language and scenes secondary to the comedy.²⁸²

Other aspects of this passage complement the ordering of the blend’s constituents. First, the prologue speaker mentions *tragoedia* before *comoedia*, which

²⁸¹ Although Manuwald (who argues the same point also at Manuwald 2011. 314) is not the only one to have called the word a compound (e.g. Hatcher 1951. 78–9; Christenson 2000 *ad loc.*), she is as far as I can tell the only one to have argued anything from the relative ordering of its “constituents”.

²⁸² Moore 1995.

doubtless would have confused the audience, creating a way to set up the culminating blend. Second, the prologue speaker, when he doubles down and explains his rationale for making it a tragicomedy rather than simply a comedy, mentions tragic characters (*reges ... et di*) before comic characters (*servos*). All this hemming and hawing about generic propriety gives the appearance of extemporaneousness, while being in fact quite calculated, since the drama about to be performed has of course already been written and rehearsed. Plautus thus has this *captatio benevolentiae* seem like a negotiation, resulting in a resolution that is mutually agreeable: this is a new kind of play, one that requires a new kind of word to describe it!

4.5 TUBURCINARI

Plaut. *Pers.* 120–2

nihili parasitus est, cui argentum domi est:

lubido extemplo coepere est convivium,

***tuburcinari** de suo, si quid domi est.*

tuburcinari FZ : turbucinari BC : turbicianari D

A parasite who has money at home is worthless: suddenly there's a desire to start a feast, to **gourdge** himself at his own expense, if there's anything at home.

Titin. *com.* 83 ap. Non. p. 179 M.

tuburcinari sine me vultis reliquias

You want to **gourdge** yourself on the leftovers without me

Turpil. *com.* 1 ap. Non. p. 179 M.

Melesia, intus cessas? credo hercle helluo / tuburcinatur

cessas H¹, Müller, Ribbeck : *cessat* cett., Rychlewska 1971

Melesia, are you dawdling inside? I think, by Hercules, that the glutton is **gourding** himself

Cato *or.* 253.1 ap. Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.42

tuburchinabundum, lurchinabundum

“**gourding**, gorging”

Apul. *Met.* 6.25

prandioque raptim tuburcinato

after lunch was greedily **gourded**

4.5.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

Plaut.^{FZ}, as well as the texts of Nonius and Apuleius, agree that the word begins with *tubur-*, which editors have unanimously accepted. The *paradoseis* of Plaut.^{BCD} are perhaps best regarded as either crude errors or attempts to “correct” a word assumed to be formed somehow from *turba* “crowd”.

In Turpilius, manuscripts and editors are divided over whether to read *cessas* (“you are dawdling”), in which case the sentence is most likely a question directed at Melesia, or *cessat* (“is dawdling”), in which case the sentence is directed at an unknown interlocutor about Melesia. Although this affects the interpretation of the fragment somewhat, it has no bearing on the blend.

4.5.2 FORMATION

tuburcinari is a blend of *tuber* “tuber; growth”²⁸³ and *lurcinari* “eat greedily”.²⁸⁴ The word is neither a derivative nor a compound, since we would expect a putative compound whose first constituent is the word *tuber* to begin with either **tuberi-* or more likely **tubi-*.²⁸⁵ As a blend, however, its form and meaning are clear. The phonetic overlap (*-ber-* and *lur-*) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a

²⁸³ The stock of *tub-* words in Latin is limited to *tuba* and *tuber* and their derivatives

²⁸⁴ Although *lurcinari* is not itself attested, it can be inferred from Cato’s *lurcinabundus* and Apuleius’ *conlurcinationes* “extreme gluttony” (*Apol.* 75). Also attested, however, are a related verb *lurcare* “eat greedily” (*Var. Men.* 136; *Lucil.* 2.79; *Pompon. com.* 169) and a noun *lurco* “glutton”, always used amid strings of insults and alongside another word for “glutton” (*Plaut. Per.* 421; *Lucil.* 2.75; *adesp. sat. fr.* 1 Blänsdorf; *Apul. Apol.* 57).

²⁸⁵ Cf. *astrificus* “star-making” from *aster* (gen. *asteris*) “star”. For the clipping of 3rd-declension nouns in compounds, see Chapter 5 *s. v. mantiscinari*.

blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punchline of a joke: that a parasite eating at another's expense eats until he resembles a diseased growth.

4.5.3 INTERPRETATION

Apart from the inclusion of *tuburcinari* in a dictionary of Republican Latin compiled by the 4th-century CE grammarian Nonius, who glosses the word *raptim manducare* ("eat greedily") and quotes the above fragments of Tintinius and Turpilius, as well as the passage of Plautus, there is no direct evidence of the fact that the word *tuburcinari* otherwise attracted the attention of Latin grammarians. However, there is indirect evidence of earlier interest in the word, since Lindsay 1901. 57 traces Nonius' quotation of Titinius here to an earlier, now-lost glossary: either his "Gloss. i", a glossary of words taken mainly from Titinius and other dramatists, or his "Gloss iv", a glossary of words taken mainly from Varro. Nonius evidently had access to the comedies of Plautus and Turpilius and could therefore have supplied the quotations of these two authors himself.

A millennium later, Perotti 1506. 972 interested himself in the word and suggested that it derived from *tumere* "swell", explaining that "a glutton eats greedily. This makes it so that his stomach swells (trans.)"; Lewis-Short *s. v.* adopt this derivation as well. According to Vossius 1662 *s. v.*, Scaliger had suggested that the word derived from "*tu, voce nutricularum pro cibo*",²⁸⁶ whereas unspecified other

²⁸⁶ I have been unable to trace the reference to Scaliger, a shame, since I am unsure what Vossius means: does he suggest that Scaliger took *tu* to be a word meaning "food" which

scholars reportedly suggested that the word was either a compound of *tu* and *bucca* “mouth”²⁸⁷ or a derivative of *tuber*.²⁸⁸ It is this latter suggestion that has been followed more recently by, for example, Walde–Hoffmann s. v., who compare the formation of the word to that of *sermocinari* and *lenocinari*,²⁸⁹ and de Vaan s. v., who notes however that the word is “of uncertain appurtenance”.

In the 20th century, a handful of other etymologies were put forth, each formally or semantically unsatisfactory and evidently winning no support. Fay 1904. 462–3, although he noted that the word may just as well have been formed from *tuber* as *mantiscinor* was allegedly from *mantis*, had three further tentative suggestions. First, he suggested that the word may be a coordinative compound of *tu-* (the root allegedly of *tumere* “swell”, *obturare* “stuff”, and *tomentum* “stuffing”)²⁹⁰ and *-burcinari*, allegedly a by-form of *farcinare* “stuff”,²⁹¹ showing the development of PIE **b^h* to Latin *b* medially, and that it may thus mean “cram-stuff oneself”. However, the rarity of coordinative compounds in Latin and the fact that the [V V]_v structure posited here is otherwise unattested for compounds in Latin count against this

nurses used and for which there is seemingly otherwise no evidence? If so, what do we make of *-burcinari*?

²⁸⁷ Formed from Scaliger’s *tu* “food” and thus having the sense “put food in one’s mouth”?

²⁸⁸ Martinius 1655 s. v. seems to have been the first to connect the word with *tuber*.

²⁸⁹ As discussed below in Chapter 5 (s. v. *mantiscinari*), although *sermocinari* and *lenocinari* appear to be anomalously formed from the nominatives *sermo* and *leno*, they are better regarded as coming from the regularly formed **sermonicinari* and **lenonicinari* with clipping of their first constituents. Accordingly, if **tuburcinari* were similarly formed, we would have expected a putative **tubericinari* to become **tubicinari*.

²⁹⁰ All three of which may or may not be related (cf. de Vaan s. vv.).

²⁹¹ Attested only in the compound *suffarcinare* (e.g. Plaut. *Cur.* 289; Ter. *An.* 770; Apul. *Met.* 9.29).

suggestion. Presumably for this reason, Fay tried to hedge his bets, concluding this suggestion by further suggesting that “*tu-* might be regarded as nominal” (462). Second, Fay suggested that the word may be a compound of *trua* “ladle” and either *bucinare* “play the trumpet”, the compound thus meaning “slurp from a ladle so loudly that it sounds like someone is playing the trumpet”, or *bucca* “cheek”. However, this suggestion presupposes that *trubucinari*, found in just two manuscripts of the Plautus, is the correct form, which counts against it. And third, he suggested that the word may be dissimilated from an earlier **trubur-cinari*, a compound formed from an otherwise unattested instrument noun **tru-d^hro-*, to which he compares τρύω “rubs, wears down”, τρύμα “hole”, τρύπανον “augur”, and τρυηλίσ “spoon”. However, **tru-d^hro-* should have yielded a compound in **t(r)ubri-*.²⁹²

Other suggestions include that of Wood 1919. 249, who derived the word via a noun **tubur(i)co-* “voluptuary, glutton” from a stem **tubero-* “fat, rich, *pinguis*” ultimately from τύβαρις, a Doric word for pickled celery, which he however regarded as a by-form of Σύβαρις, the name of a Greek colony in Southern Italy that also served as shorthand for “luxury”. However, the connection between τύβαρις and Σύβαρις is doubtful.²⁹³ Most recently, Steinbauer 1989. 254 hesitantly suggested that *tuburcinari* could be formed from an earlier verb **tuburcare*, itself formed from an even earlier noun **tubVrco-*, “fat person”, and thus perhaps means “to become a fat

²⁹² *pace* Fay, **tru-d^hro-* should have meant “an instrument for piercing or rubbing” *vel sim.* rather than “spoon, ladle”, since the root in question means “rub”. τρυηλίσ, “spoon”, which he cites as evidence that words from this root could unexpectedly mean “spoon” *vel sim.* is borrowed from Latin *truella*, a diminutive of *trua* (etymology uncertain), and is thus not comparable for the allegedly unexpected sense of *trua*.

²⁹³ Cf. Beekes s. v. τύβαρις.

person”, although this is not at any rate what the contexts in which we find the word suggest it means.

The central conceit of Plautus’ *Persa* is that Toxilus, atypically both the clever slave and the young lover of the comedy, wishes to buy the freedom of his beloved courtesan. Yet, because he lacks the money to do so outright, he hatches a complicated scheme to get the money and the girl, after evidently having asked Saturio (~ “Mr. Stuffed”), his ironically named parasite, for a loan. His scheme ultimately involves selling to a pimp Saturio’s daughter, whom Saturio does in the end convince to go along with the ploy in a lengthy scene (329–99), dressed up as an Arabian slave-girl, taking the pimp’s money, and then having Saturio sue the pimp for his daughter’s freedom, since she is after all a free-born citizen (711–52). But Toxilus must first get Saturio on board.

At the beginning of the scene (81–167), whence the quotation from the *Persa* above, Toxilus, deliberately within earshot of Saturio, is ordering his staff to prepare for Saturio a feast, with which he will persuade him to let his daughter be part of the scheme. As Toxilus does so, Saturio comments to himself about the foods mentioned, before finally announcing himself to Toxilus at 99–100: *o mi Iuppiter, / terrestris te coepulonus compellat tuos* (“O my Jupiter, your earthly fellow feaster hails you”) with a *hapax* (*coepulonus*) and a “[j]ocular reference to the feast where Jupiter, together with his divine table companions Juno and Minerva, was presented with a meal” (de Melo 2011. 465 n. 15). Toxilus responds (101), *o Saturio, opportune advenisti mihi* (“Hey, Saturio, you’ve arrived just in time”), whereupon Saturio quips, punning on his name (102–3): *mendacium edepol dicis, atque haud te decet: / nam essurio venio, non*

advenio saturio (“By Pollux, you’re telling a lie and it’s not right of you: I’m coming starved, not arriving stuffed”).²⁹⁴

After some light banter, Toxilus asks Saturio whether he remembers his earlier request for a loan (116–8). Saturio responds that he does and that he still has no money to lend, before pontificating about the nature of being a parasite, as parasites are wont to do. Saturio says paradoxically that a parasite with money is “worthless”, elaborating in the next two lines that a parasite with money will readily spend it all hosting dinner and gorging himself at his own expense. That is, *tuburcinari de suo* is anathema to a parasite, and a parasite who not only eats but also feeds others at his own expense is worthless because he is no longer a parasite at all. As Tylawsky 1999 notes, a parasite “was preoccupied exclusively with food, other imperatives such as sex, money, and social status were of absolutely no interest. He had no wish or ability to provide his own food, but sought ever for a host to feed him and to whom he might permanently attach himself. By his nature the parasite must have somebody else’s food, he must find a way to somebody else’s dinner table”. This is not the only time that Plautus raises the question: Is a well-fed parasite still a parasite?

In order to secure the opportunity to eat as much as possible at someone else’s expense, however, it became, as Olson–Sens 1999 on *Matro* 1.8 note, a parasite’s job to flatter his host, to tell jokes, to endure abuse, and to be as physically presentable as possible; Plautus’ parasites often say as much.²⁹⁵ Hence, Saturio further pontificates

²⁹⁴ Plautus has similar wordplay at *Poen.* 6 *et qui essurientes et qui saturi venerint* (“both those who’ve come starving and those who’ve come stuffed”).

²⁹⁵ Cf. Duckworth 1952. 266.

that (123–5) *cynicum esse egentem oportet parasitum probe: / ampullam, strigilem, scaphium, soccos, pallium, / marsuppium habeat, inibi paullum praesidia / qui familiarem suam vitam oblectet modo* (“A parasite should be a needy Cynic: he should have a little oil-jar, a strigil, a little cup, slippers, a cloak, and a purse with a little in it, just in case, to take care of himself alone”).²⁹⁶ A parasite needs only enough to clean himself up, dress his part, and save up for emergencies.²⁹⁷ Thus, in these seven lines Saturio offers a brief manifesto, laying out the end and the means to that end for a parasite.

²⁹⁶ Although Conlon 2016 *ad loc.* rightly notes that the mention *socci* and a *pallium*, both part of a Roman comic actors costume, is likely a metatheatrical joke, he remarks on 124–6 that “the Cynics were known for neglecting hygiene and money, rendering the bathing paraphernalia and the wallet which Saturio mentions unnecessary”, before concluding that “[t]he most notable thing about the list is that almost all the items are Greek words. Maybe part of the joke is Saturio’s lack of understanding of Cynic philosophy, thinking instead that anything named with a Greek name is fitting for a philosopher.” However, why even a cynical parasite should own an *ampulla* and a *strigilis* is easily explained: a parasite has to be able to wash himself to be as physically presentable as possible for dinner. In addition, Conlon, although he notes on 124 that Plautus twice elsewhere uses the word *ampulla* (without however giving specific references), fails to note that one of those two passages is *St.* 230, where the parasite Gelasimus mentions an *ampulla*, a *strigilis*, and himself as his three salable possessions.

The only other reference to Cynicism in Plautus is at *St.* 703–4 (*potius quam in subsellio / cynice hic accipimur quam in lectis*, “We’re being entertained here like Cynics on benches rather than couches”), where *cynice* seems to be little more than a by-word for “meagerly, poorly”. Neither of Plautus’ references to Cynicism, seemingly the earliest thereto in Roman literature, give any real indication that he knew much about it other than that its practitioners were notoriously poor. Cynicism was foundering in the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, with little evidence of its practice then either at Rome or elsewhere (cf. Dudley 1937. 117–24). At any rate, compare Bion’s criticism of Cynics above in Chapter 3 s. v. οἰκτιεύς.

²⁹⁷ Evidently, however, a parasite also needed jokebooks: at 391–6, Saturio tells his daughter that he has hamper full of books to give her as a dowry with “600 jokes, all of them Attic”. Gelasimus also mentions his jokebooks (*St.* 221).

However, Toxilus, ignoring Saturio's little disquisition on parasite-hood, simply responds (127), *iam nolo argentum* ("I don't want the money anymore"), before trying to explain his scheme to the distracted parasite. Although Saturio, unlike most Plautine parasites,²⁹⁸ is integral to the plot of this comedy, his remarks at 120–26 are seemingly not. Had this scene been written without them, the plot of the comedy might have been unchanged. But Saturio's remarks at 120–6 are a repository of jokes of the kind often put in the mouths of parasites, and fittingly we find amid this repository the word *tuburcinari*, a colorful coinage for characteristically parasitic chowing down as part and parcel of the exuberant language of a low-status character. But is this repository of jokes "pointless" or, to put it another way, is Saturio's little disquisition just an attempt to delight the audience with his, as Tylawksy 1999 put it, "absurd embodiment of the exaggerated, the grotesque and the funny".

Of course, part of the humor of the scene lies in the fact that Saturio, parasite that he is, cannot refrain from talking about being a parasite. Asked simply whether he remembers a previous request for a loan, he says, "Yes," and uses the question to segue into his manifesto, where he declares *tuburcinari de suo* loathsome. It is a funny reminder of what kind of character Saturio is, but it also lays bare his enthusiastically parasitic disposition that Toxilus is coyly exploiting to get him and his daughter involved in his scheme and thus in the plot of the comedy. The essential nature of

²⁹⁸ Duckworth 1952. 266 says that "most parasites have an important part in the action", but apart from Plautus' *Curculio*, the titular parasite of the *Curculio* who orchestrates the goings-on of that comedy, his parasites in the *Asinaria*, *Bacchides*, *Captivi*, *Menaechmi*, *Miles Gloriosus*, and *Stichus* do little more than express a desire for free food, crack jokes, and relay information that motivates other characters.

Saturio as a parasite and his loathing of *tuburcinari de suo*, as expressed in this character-establishing speech, are the hook on which Toxilus can stick his bait. It allows Saturio to be brought into the plot of the comedy in a way that is natural and coherent with his character-type.

As Toxilus goes on to explain his plan, he asks whether the pimp, whom he hopes to defraud, knows (*novit*) Saturio (131), to which Saturio responds (132), *me ut quisquam norit nisi ille qui praebet cibum?* (“Would anyone know me, unless he gives me food?”). There is an equivocation here on *noscere* in the sense “to know (a person or thing) to be the same as one seen or known about previously, recognize” (*OLD s. v. 13*) and “to know the character of” (*OLD s. v. 10b*). Toxilus is asking whether the pimp will recognize him and Saturio is implying that the pimp will not, since only those who feed him and thus see him often can recognize him. However, the corollary to Saturio’s assertion that the pimp will not recognize him, because he does not feed him, is the fact that Toxilus, because he does feed Saturio, not only recognizes him but also knows his character. This is why Toxilus had no reason to respond to Saturio’s disquisition before: he already knows Saturio’s character well and is, in fact, already attempting to capitalize on it with the lure of the feast.

Toxilus continues trying to explain his plan, before Saturio interrupts, thinking as always about food (138–9): *pereunt reliquiae. / posterius istuc tamen potest* (“The leftovers are going to waste. This plan of yours can wait till later”). Toxilus claps back (139–44), finally threatening to cut Saturio off and kick him out of the gang, unless he brings his daughter over, before Saturio, compelled by the loathesome prospect of having to feed himself, agrees (145–6): *quaeso hercle me quoque etiam uende, si lubet,*

/dum saturum uendas (“By god, please sell me too, if you want, so long as you sell me stuffed (*saturum*)”). Anything for a meal, apparently.

The fragmentary remains of Titinius’ *Prilia*, to which comedy Nonius attributes the fragment, give no precise indication who the speaker of this fragment might be nor who the addressee might be. However, given the fact that *tuburcinari* is used unequivocally of parasitic pigging out in the passage of Plautus, the fact that *reliquiae* in the sense “leftovers” in comedy is nearly always spoken—naturally enough—either by parasites (Plaut. *Cur.* 388; *Men.* 142, 462; *Per.* 77, 138; *St.* 231, 496) or to them (Plaut. *Cur.* 321; *Per.* 105) and the fact that Titinius does mention parasites by name in other fragments (*com.* 45; 47), it is at least plausible that the speaker here is likewise a parasite concerned about missing out on a meal at someone else’s expense. With such limited and fragmentary evidence for the word *tuburcinari* as this, it remains difficult to draw many firm conclusions about its history and usage. However, given the likelihood that Titinius overlapped with Plautus in time,²⁹⁹ as well as in dramatic plots and language,³⁰⁰ a reasonable, if unprovable, conclusion is that Plautus coined the word and that Titinius picked it up from him, thereby establishing what was in origin an ephemeral witticism as a fixture of the Roman comedic lexicon.

Nor do the fragmentary remains of Turpilius’ *Boethuntus*, to which comedy Nonius attributes the fragment, give any precise indication who either the speaker of

²⁹⁹ Titinius is conventionally thought to have been active shortly after the end of the Second Punic War (218–201 BCE), whereas Plautus lived *ca.* 254–184 (cf. Manuwald 2011. 261).

³⁰⁰ On Titinius’ language and style compared to that of Plautus, e.g. Daviault 1979; Guardì 1981; Minarini 1997.

this fragment is, who Melesia is, or who the *helluo* is. We know from the speaker of the fragment's use of *hercle* ("by Hercules!"), elsewhere an exclusively male exclamation, that he is likely male. The speaker is perhaps also a low-status character, although this presupposes that Turpilius followed Plautus and perhaps Titinius in giving the word to a low-status character and is therefore speculative. The speaker's addressee is likely male as well, since the personal name Melesia, not otherwise attested in Latin, is likely a rendering of the Greek male personal name Μελησίας (~ "Mr. Caring"). The fact that there are few, if any, Roman allusions of any kind in the remains of Turpilius and that nothing in the Latin language readily suggests itself as a possible source of such a name supports this supposition. In addition, Μελησίας was the name of *inter alios* an athletic trainer in Pindar (e.g. *Ol.* 8.54), an interlocutor in Plato's *Laches*, and an otherwise unknown man called out for being unmanly in Aristophanes (*Nu.* 686),³⁰¹ which suggests the name is respectable.

Unlike in the passages of Plautus and Titinius discussed above, the verb *tuburcinari* is not spoken here by a parasite nor even necessarily of a parasite,³⁰² since *helluo* means "glutton, wastrel" rather than specifically "parasite":³⁰³ in its first attestation, for example, in Terence's *Self-Tormenter*, which comedy in fact has no parasite, it is hurled at the feckless *adulescens amator* of the comedy. If the speaker of

³⁰¹ According to the *LGPN*, the name is attested 31 times between the 6th and 1st centuries BCE.

³⁰² Arnott 1968. 34, however, claims that "[t]he person described is clearly a parasite".

³⁰³ The word (etymology uncertain) is otherwise attested only in Terence in a string of insults (*Hau.* 1033–4 *gerro iners fraus helluo / ganeo's damnosu(s)*, "You're a useless, lazy, lying, gluttonous, debauched reprobate") and in Cicero (e.g. *Pis.* 22, 41; *Sest.* 26, 55), before it is picked up as an affectation by Apuleius (*Apol.* 59) and Aulus Gellius (6.16.2). *helluo* is thus insulting but perhaps somewhat politer than other terms for "glutton"?

this fragment is a low-status character (as his use of *tuburcinari* may suggest) and if Melesia is a respectable character (as his name may suggest) and *helluo* is used of a feckless *adulescens* (as it is in Terence), then perhaps we have here a slave addressing his *senex* master about about his gluttonous son.³⁰⁴ This is of course very speculative. At any rate, *tuburcinari* here still means “eat” and moreover, because of the speaker of this fragment’s apparent concern that Melesia is dawdling indoors while a *helluo* of all people eats, probably still has the sense “eat greedily (at someone else’s expense)”.

Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.6.42) attributes the two words (*tuburcinabundus* and *lurcinabundus*), stripped of their context, wherefore it is impossible to say *inter alia* whether the words belong together, to Cato in a short discussion of lexical authority amid a much larger discussion of the principles of correct speech (reason, antiquity, authority, and usage):

*nam etiamsi potest videri nihil peccare qui utitur iis verbis quae summi auctores tradiderunt, multum tamen refert non solum quid dixerint, sed etiam quid persuaserint. neque enim tuburchinabundum et lurchinabundum iam in nobis quisquam ferat, licet Cato sit auctor, nec hos lodices, quamquam id Pollioni placet, nec gladiola, atqui Messala dixit, nec parricidatum, quod in Caelio vix tolerabile videtur, nec collos mihi Calvus persuaserit.*³⁰⁵

³⁰⁴ In part anticipated by Rychlewska 1971 *ad loc.*, who speculated likewise that Melesia may be the name of an *adulescens*, that the speaker of the fragment may be a friend or slave “wanting to summon from the house a very young man”, and that Melesia may be one of the titular “Helpers”.

³⁰⁵ “Although anyone who uses the words recommended by the best authors is sure not to go astray, it matters a great deal not only what they said but what they made acceptable. No one

Quintilian's basic point here is that sometimes even the usage of "good" authors is not to be followed. Thus, Quintilian condemns the use of *hos lodices*, *gladiola*, and *collos* because *lodices* is typically feminine rather than masculine, *gladiolus* typically masculine rather than neuter, and *collum* typically neuter rather than masculine (at least in post- and classical authors), despite their allegedly aberrant use by Gaius Asinius Pollio, Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus, and Gaius Licinius Macer Calvus, all illustrious 1st-century BCE politicians and/or men of letters.

Quintilian, however, does not make clear why he condemns Cato's use of *tuburchinabundus* and *lurchinabundus*, but he perhaps does so because "good" authors such as Terence, Caesar, Tibullus, Seneca the Elder, and Perseus avoid adjectives in *-bundus* altogether. Yet, why they should do so? According to Aulus Gellius (11.15), there was much disagreement about the sense and suitability of such forms among grammarians in the 2nd century CE: Casellius Vindex argued that adjectives in *-bundus* had the same sense as present participles, thus *ridibundus* and *ridens* both meant "laughing", and were therefore redundant; Terentius Scaurus disagreed, arguing that adjectives in *-bundus* had the sense "imitating one who performs the action of the a verb", thus *ridibundus* meant "imitating one who laughs";³⁰⁶ and Sulpicius Apollinaris argued that such forms connoted a *largam et fluentem vim et copiam* ("a great and overflowing force and abundance"; 11.15.8), which is to say that *-bundus* was a kind

nowadays would put up with *tuburchinabundus* and *lurchinabundus*, although Cato is the authority for these words, or with *hos lodices* ('these blankets'), although Pollio approves, or *gladiola* ('small swords'), although Messalla used it, or *parricidatus* ('parricide'), which seems scarcely tolerable in Caelius, nor will Calvus persuade me to use *collos* ('necks')."

³⁰⁶ What this is supposed to mean was as lost on Aulus Gellius as it is on me.

of intensifying suffix, thus *ridibunda* meant “laughing excessively or for a long time” or the like.³⁰⁷ Perhaps such forms are therefore absent from some authors—and decried by others—because the force and abundance thereof were felt to be too emotional or intensive for their needs.

That such forms were, in fact, felt to be intensive seems borne out by Cicero’s usage. Although Cicero does use adjectives in *-bundus*, he nevertheless limits himself to fewer than ten instances of five words in his surviving speeches: *furibundus*, “raging” (*Sest.* 15, 117);³⁰⁸ *ludibundus*, “playful” (*Ver.* 2.3.156, thrice); *moribundus*, “dying” (*Sest.* 85); *queribundus*, “wailing” (*Sul.* 31); *tremibundus*, “trembling” (*Dom.* 134.10). These are moreover often reserved for moments of heightened drama or diatribe: for example, *moribundus*, which is first attested in Plautus (*Bac.* 192), features in a dramatic description of the attempted assassination of Sestius; and *furibundus* at *Sest.* 15, where the word is first attested, features in a nasty description of Clodius Pulcher.

It is thus plausible that Cato’s *tuburcinabundus* and *lurchinabundus* likewise belong to moments of heightened pathos or diatribe, and that moreover they are vocabulary imported from comedy. Only one other adjective in *-bundus* is attested in the fragmentary remains of Cato’s speeches (*or.* 43): *ridibundum magistratum gerere, pauculos homines mediocriculum exercitum obvium duci* (“that a ridiculous man performs the duties of this magistracy, that a scanty few men are led into the open as a rather middling army”). The fragment is cited without context by Festus (p. 154.33–

³⁰⁷ Compare, for example, the suffix *-ola* in English *crapola* and *payola*?

³⁰⁸ Dickey 2002. 328 considers this a high-register, literary insult.

6 M.) for its use of the word *mediocriculus*, although Festus says that Cato was speaking of the consulship. While this lack of context renders the fragment somewhat obscure, it is nevertheless clear that Cato the Censor is censuring someone.

In addition, it perhaps bears pointing out that the adjective *ridibundus* is first and only otherwise attested in Plautus (*Epid.* 413), where a *fidicina* (“lyre-playing slave girl”) is described as *ridibunda atque hilara* (“heartily laughing and cheerful”). This is not necessarily to claim that Cato has lifted the adjective *ridibundus* from comedy, although it is certainly possible that he did so. However, the fact that *tuburcinari* and *lurchinari*, whence Cato’s adjectives, are also otherwise confined to comedic authors and pertain moreover to particularly comedic imagery suggests at least that Cato was not averse to dipping his pen into comedy’s well, especially if he had wanted to ridicule someone as greedy like a comic parasite.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁹ The idea that Cato’s rhetoric may have been influenced by Roman comedy is briefly discussed by Barsby 2007, who notes that “[i]t is clearly possible, since the writing of Roman comedy and the development of Latin oratory were going on at the same time, that each influenced each other, and it may even be that the Roman orators learned more from the comic poets than the comic poets learned from Roman oratory. It has been argued, for example, that the rhythms of Cato’s prose *clausulae* were influenced by those of Plautus’ *cantica*” (39), although he concludes, “It is tempting to suggest that Cato was more influenced by [the rhetorical practices] of contemporary Roman comedy [*ed.* than by Greek rhetorical schools], but a moment’s reflection suggests that any such influence would have been informal and unsystematic. Later writers, like Cicero and Quintilian, do indeed recommend certain features of comedy as models for orators (e.g., Cic. *Inv. Rhet.* 1.27, *De Or.* 2.326–7; Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.58, 10.1.71), but they belong to an age when texts were readily available. If Cato learned from Plautus and Terence, we would have to envisage him sitting in the theatre in the seats reserved for senators listening to the plays ... Rather than postulating direct influence in one direction or the other, it seems better to think in terms of the development of a native Latin tradition of rhetoric in which the comic poets and the orators both shared” (52). But while chalking up Roman comedy and early Roman oratory’s use of rhetorical devices such as chiasmus, alliteration, and homoeteleuton to a shared, native tradition seems

Apuleius uses the adjective *tuburcinatus* in an ablative absolute as though it were from an active verb **tuburcinare* and uses it of bandits (*latrones*), who have just returned with some of the spoils of a fresh robbery and are eager to go fetch the rest, rather than of parasites, as Plautus had. Nevertheless, it would be unwise to think that Apuleius, unaware of the original context and sense of the word, had picked it out of Plautus merely as an archaic and colorful word for “eat greedily” or that he was merely mistaken when he used the word as though it were from an active verb.³¹⁰ None of the other words in the passage, with the exception of the diminutive *breviculus* (“rather small”) are genuine rarities, so it is not as though Apuleius is just piling up Plautus-isms. What he does do here is borrow a specific word from Plautus which he uses to underscore the bandits’ parasitic natures subtly: they eat greedily at another’s expense but without upholding the parasite’s end of the deal. In addition, the rapidity of the absolute phrase *prandioque raptim tuburcinato* seems intentionally to reflect the rapidity with which the bandits, eager to rush out and haul back the remaining loot, eat their meal. Apuleius thus makes the Plautine verb active to

reasonable enough, it nevertheless seems unreasonable to attribute what otherwise seems like exclusively comic vocabulary to this shared tradition.

³¹⁰ Butler–Owen 1917 on Apul. *Apol.* 57.6–7 suggest that the nouns *gumia* and *lurcho* (both “glutton”), attested otherwise only in Republican authors, come “into the vocabulary of Apuleius, probably not as literary reminiscences, but as surviving in the common speech”. However, while it is certainly possible that some words attested only in Plautus and Apuleius survived this way, others like *tuburcinari* and *examussim* “precisely” (e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 50; Apul. *Met.* 2.30.20) are probably better thought of as deliberately culled from Plautus. One of the hallmarks of 2nd- and 3rd-century CE authors of African origin like Fronto, Apuleius, Tertullian, and Cyprian was an archaizing style that looked back to the likes of Plautus, Ennius, and Cato the Elder (cf. Furguson 1961. 67). On aspects of Apuleius’ studied use of Plautine vocabulary, see Pasetti 2007.

accommodate the needs of his own passage, although this is hardly a radical accommodation, since the perfect participles of other deponent verbs could be treated as passive.³¹¹ Apuleius is not just mindlessly stealing from the comedies of Plautus, but actively adopting and adapting what he finds there to suit his own artistic purposes.

To reiterate, with such limited and fragmentary evidence as we have for the word *tuburcinari*, it remains difficult to draw many firm conclusions about its history and usage. However, from what evidence we do have it seems that Plautus coined the word as a kind of facetious *vox propria* for parasitic chowing down for use in a specific context (a brief parasite's soliloquy that provided the dramatic motivation for a parasite unusually to get involved in the plot of a comedy) and that Titinius thereafter used the word unchanged in the same metrical position also of a parasite, thereby confirming it as a "real" word and giving license ultimately to Turpilius, Cato, and Apuleius to adopt and adapt the word as suited their purposes.

4.6 VIRGINDEMIA

Plaut. *Rud.* 635–8

at ego te per crura et talos tergumque optestor tuom,

*ut tibi ulmeam uberem esse speres **uirgindemiam***

et tibi eventuram hoc anno uberem messem mali,

³¹¹ Allen–Greenough 1903 § 190b.

ut mi istuc dicas negoti quid sit quod tumultues

virgindemiam scripsi : *virgidemiam* FZ, *edd.* : *virgidem iam* B : *virgidemiam* CD

But I entreat you by your shins and your ankles and your back to expect to have a rich, elmy **whine vintage** and a rich harvest of ills this year, and to tell me what reason you have for making this disturbance.

Var. *Men.* 8 ap. Non. p. 187 M.

*virgindemiam*¹ *ut vindemiam, hoc est virgarum adparatum vel demtionem vel decerptionem ob verbera. Varro Agathone (Men. 8):*

*quid tristiolem video te esse quam antidhac,
Lampadio? numquid familiaris filius
amat, nec spes est auxili argentaria,
ideoque scapulae metuunt virgindemiam?*²

*virgindemiam*¹ Non. : *virgidemiam* Scaliger ap. Müller

*virgindemiam*² Jensen 1476 ap. Müller : *virgarumdemiam* Non.

virgindemiam like *vindemiam*, this is an application of elm rods (*virgarum*) or a removal or a harvesting on account of beatings. Varro in his *Agathon (Men. 8)*: Why do I see that you're sadder than before, Lampadio? Is the family's son

in love with no financial hope of assistance? And are your shoulders for that reason afraid of the **whine vintage**?

4.6.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

In the passage of Plautus, BCD have evidently tried to deal with the difficult nonce word by dividing it into two, separating out at least one recognizable word. However, while B's *iam* "now" is an actual word, its remaining *virgidem* is nonsense, as is CD's *virgi*, as though the genitive of **virgus*. At any rate, the manuscripts of Plautus altogether point to *virgidemiam*, either as one word or two, as the inherited reading there.

On the other hand, in the text of Nonius, Scaliger ap. Müller emended the paradosis *virgindemiam*¹ based on the passage of Plautus. Müller also notes that the paradosis *virgarumdemiam*, most likely an error introduced by a copyist under the influence of the word *virgarum* earlier in the text, was corrected "ed. a. 1476", that is by Nicolas Jenson in his 1476 edition of Nonius.

The evidence of Plautus and Nonius is split between *virgidemiam* and *virgindemiam*. However, on the principle of the *lectio difficilior* the more difficult *virgindemiam* is preferable. It is easier to assume that the word in Plautus had been early "corrected" rather than that an *n* had crept into Nonius's lemma under the influence of the comparandum *vindemiam*. In addition, Nonius's comparison of *virgindemia* and *vindemia* seems apter, if both forms under consideration are irregular—*virgindemia* because it is a blend, *vindemia* because it is syncopated—

rather than if both forms under consideration are compounds in *-demia*. For these reasons, I retain Nonius' *virgindemiam* and write the same also in the passage of Plautus. However, the word is understandable as a blend, whichever reading is adopted.

4.6.2 FORMATION

virgindemiam is a blend of *virga* "a branch (used for beatings)" and *vindemia* "grape-gathering".³¹² If *virgindemia* is the right form, the word could conceivably have originated as a compound: although *virga* and *vindemia* should have yielded a putative compound **virgivindemia*, which we might suppose to have undergone haplology and thus to be what Algeo 1977 called a "haplogistic blend."³¹³ However, in the case of a nonce formation such as this, there is really no meaningful difference between a "haplogistic blend" and just a blend.

On the other hand, if *virgidemia* is the right form, although the word could perhaps be formally analyzed as a compound of *virga* and *-demia*,³¹⁴ the contrast between *virgindemiam* and *messem mali* here strongly suggests that pragmatically it

³¹² The word, abundantly attested, is < *vin-o-de-em-ia* ("wine-away-take-ing"). This should have yielded **vinidemia*; however, the linking vowel of **vinidemia* has been syncopated (cf. Weiss. 2010. 123).

³¹³ See above *s. v. tragicomoedia*.

³¹⁴ Assuming *-demia* could be extracted from the formally anomalous *vindemia*. It is unlikely that *virgidemia* could be coined afresh from *virga* and *demere*, since deverbative abstracts in *-ia*, nearly all of which are compounds like *vindemia*, are "offenkundig alte Bildungen" (Wackernagel 1924 II.287) and since the only productive class of abstracts in *-ia* in Latin are deadjectival (e.g. *audacia* "boldness" < *audac-* "bold"; cf. Leumann 1977. 291–2; Weiss 2010. 301).

functions as a blend: *vindemia*, one of the source words of the blend, and *messis* are frequently contrasted elsewhere as the agricultural year's harvests of respectively grapes and grain,³¹⁵ and Plautus clearly has this contrast in mind.

4.6.3 INTERPRETATION

Apart from Nonius' inclusion of the word in his dictionary of Republican Latin, the word evidently garnered no other attestation of scholarly interest in antiquity. More recently, interest in the word has seemingly been limited to editorial conjectures about the texts quoted above. Lewis–Short *s. v.* contend that the word was “formed from *virga*, after the analogy of *vindemia*”, while the *OLD s. v.* notes that the word is “a comic formation from *VIRGA*, w(ith) term(ination) as in *vindemia*”, which is at least descriptively right.

At the beginning of the scene of Plautus' *Rudens*, whence the passage quoted above, Trachalio, the slave of the Athenian *adulescens* Plesidippus, exits a temple of Venus at Cyrene, shouting about injustice (615–26). Daemones, a Cyrenaean *senex* who happens to be standing near, asks, *quid istuc est negoti?* (“What's the matter”; 627), whereupon Trachalio prostrates himself and says, *per ego haec genua te*

³¹⁵ E.g. Lucil. 707 *non magno messe, non proba uindemia* (“with a not big harvest and a not good vintage”); Var. *R.* 1.27.3 *aestate fieri messes oportere, autumnosicis tempestatibus vindemias* (“harvests should happen in the summer, vintages during dry weather in the fall”); Plin. *Nat.* 10.157.1 *inter messis ac vindemiae tempus* (“between the time of the harvest and the vintage”); Fest. p. 202 *M. olivetam antiqui dicebant, cum olea cogebatur, ut messem cum frumenta aut vindemiam cum uvae* (“The ancients used to call it the *oliveta*, when olives were gathered; the *messis*, when grain was gathered; the *vindemia*, when grapes were gathered”).

optestor (“by your knees, I beg you this”; 627). Daemones asks that Trachalio let go of his knees and quickly explain why he is making such a tumult (*quod tumultues*; 628–9). Trachalio responds by rambling incoherently about silphium and Capua (629–34), with Daemones interrupting once to ask, *sanun es?* (“Are you sane?”; 633), before threatening him with the four lines quoted above. This finally prompts Trachalio to explain that two shipwrecked courtesans have sought refuge from their pimp in the temple of Venus, which ultimately leads Daemones to protect the two girls from the pimp and discover that one is his long-lost daughter.

Daemones’ four lines here are tightly constructed malediction. Structurally, each line begins with a two-letter conjunction ending in *-t* (*at, ut, et, ut*) followed by a form of a personal pronoun (*ego, tibi, tibi, mi*). The first and last line parallel each other in having a form of the first-person pronoun (*ego, mi*), while the middle two parallel each other in having the pronoun *tibi*. In fact, the two middle lines each effectively express the same idea: the discontinuous phrase *ulmeam uberem ... virgindemiam* (“a rich, elmy ... whine vintage”) in the second line is glossed in the next line by the phrase *uberem messem mali* (“a rich crop of ills”) lest anyone miss the joke. Here, as noted above, Plautus plays on the agricultural language and turns the words “vintage” (*vindemia*) and “harvest” (*messis*) into colorful threats of violence.

Rhetorically, the quatrain starts with an entreaty recalling Trachalio’s from a few lines prior, seemingly earnest at first with its *per crura et talos* (“by your legs and ankles”), but after the caesura it seems to be changing tack with its *tergumque* (“and your back”), since any mention of a back in connection with a slave can probably be safely assumed to refer to torture. This supposition is confirmed by the next line,

although we are made to wait till the end of the line for absolute confirmation, since Plautus draws out the phrase *ulmeam uberem ... virgindemiam*, reserving the blend for the end of the line as a humorous and unexpected conclusion; the adjective *ulmeus*, however, does also hint at this conclusion, since Plautus often uses the adjective *ulmeus* in connection with *virgae* and beatings (e.g. *As.* 341, 363; fr. 45). In the fourth line, after having parodied Trachalio's entreaty, threatened him with one image of agricultural violence, and then threatened him again with another image of agricultural violence, Daemones returns to the two questions that he has already asked: what's the matter and why are you making a tumult? Daemones has thus elaborately threatened a slave into plainly answering his questions, while Plautus has thus elaborated one of his go-to sources of humor: jocular references to servitude and torture expressed with the words *virga* and *ulmeus*. Nor is this the only time that he has coined a blend in service of a joke about beating slaves: see his blend *Crucisalus* below.

The fragmentary remains of Varro's *Agatho* give no precise indication who the speaker of this fragment is, although he is perhaps a slave: one of the slaves of Plautus' *Asinaria* twice refers to his young master as *familiaris filius* (267, 309). This is of course speculative. His interlocutor Lampadio, however, is undoubtedly a slave, as his name—Lampadio is the name of a slave in Menander's *Synaristosia*, Plautus' *Cistellaria*, and at *adesp. pall. fr.* 98, which is perhaps from the Naevius' comedy *Lampadio*—and the question posed to him make clear: do you fear a crop of beatings? While the overall plot of the satire is unclear, the situation described in this fragment is not. It seems one familiar from Plautine drama: a young master in love

with a courtesan and a slave who has failed to keep him on the straight and narrow; a lack of financial means, which is sure to lead to hijinx; taunts of torture. All of this, however, seems from what remains bereft of the wit and craft of Plautus' passage. While the word *virgindemia* has been likewise reserved for the end of the line here (and accommodated into iambic senarii), there is no suspense, no set up. Varro has simply picked it up, it seems, as a word that means "a heap of beatings".

4.7 PERENTICIDA

Plaut. *Epid.* 346–51

Str. *quantum hic inest?*

Ep. *quantum sat est et plus satis: superfit.*

decem minis plus attuli quam tu danistae debes.

dum tibi ego placeam atque obsequar, meum tergum flocci facio.

Str. *nam quid ita?*

Ep. *quia ego tuom patrem faciam **perenticidam**.*

Str. *quid istuc est verbi?*

Ep. *nil moror vetera et volgata verba;* 350

peratum ductarent: ego follitum ductitabo.

349 *perenticidam* Camerarius : *parenticidam* mss. : *parieticidam*

Ussing : *peraticidam* Grenier

{Str.} How much's in here? {Ep.} As much as is enough and more than enough: there's an excess. I brought ten minas more than you owe the moneylender. So long as I please and obey you, I care not a bit about my back. {Str.} How so? {Ep.} Because I'll make your father a **purse-icide**. {Str.} What's that mean? {Ep.} I don't care for common, proverbial expressions. People might lead him off pursed, but I'll lead him off sacked."

4.7.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

Camerarius 1552. 376 emended the paradosis *parenticida* to *perenticida*, a change of only a single letter, proposing that Plautus "*a pera fecit iocas, ut a parente fit parenticida*". It is easy to imagine that the facetious nonce formation *perenticida* could early have been replaced with the more regular looking *parenticida*.

Ussing 1887. 270, displeased with the paradosis because "in no way can it be brought about that Epidicus becomes Periphanes' father (trans.)"³¹⁶ and with Camerarius' emendation because "it is badly formed after the word *peratim*" (trans.), suggested emending to *parieticida* ("wall-killer") on the ground that Epidicus, "when the *senex* beats him, believes that a wall rather than a man kills him (trans.)". However, what precisely this emendation is supposed to mean is unclear.

Grenier 1912. 163 proposed instead *peraticida* on the grounds that Stratippocles' followup question "is hardly explainable after a compound as easy to

³¹⁶ That is, since the *senex* Periphanes is going to beat the slave Epidicus to death after discovering the ruse, he will be some kind of *-cida* but certainly not a *parenticida*.

understand as *parenticida* (trans.)” and that a copyist could easily have changed an original *peraticida* to *parenticida* under the influence of the word *pater*. However, Grenier’s suggestion makes more or less the same joke as Camerarius’ emendation but is farther from the *paradosis*.

4.9.2 FORMATION

perenticida is a blend of *pera* “wallet, purse” and *parenticida* “parricide”. The word is not a derivative nor is it likely a compound, since there is no base *perent-* to serve as the first constituent of the compound, and a putative compound of *pera* and *-cida* should be **pericida*.

4.7.3 INTERPRETATION

Although the *paradosis* *parenticida* seems a formally and semantically unobjectionable compound,³¹⁷ it is unclear how Epidicus, the titular *servus callidus* of the comedy, could make his young master Stratippocles’ father a parent-killer and unclear why such a seemingly unobjectionable compound as this should warrant the question, “What kind of word is that?” Hence the various emendations discussed above. Overall, the passage is difficult and has therefore been much emended

³¹⁷ For compounds formed from a noun in *-ens*, e.g. *tridentifer* “trident-bearing”. For compounds in *-cida*, e.g. *parricida* “parricide” and *homicida* “man-slayer”, on the anomalous forms of which, see n. 28 above; *matricida* “matricide”, which is formally regular.

elsewhere and discussed.³¹⁸ Camerarius' *perenticidam*, which was generally accepted by editors until Leo 1887/8 argued on behalf of the *paradosis* and which has had some supporters since,³¹⁹ seems to make the best sense here and receives confirmation from Plautine practice.

Supporters of Camerarius' emendation generally argue that, despite the textual difficulties of the passage, what Epidicus means here is, "I'll make your father cut open his purse. And while some would cheat him by the purse-ful, I'll cheat him by the sack-ful" and that this plays on the word *parenticida*, which is unattested if not read here but easily understandable, and the language of punishing parricides at Rome. That Epidicus would boast of cheating Stratippocles' father of an even greater amount makes sense, since a central conceit of the comedy is that Epidicus' young master Stratippocles had fallen in love with one courtesan, the money for whose freedom Epidicus had already scammed from his young master's father Periphanes, but that thereafter Stratippocles fell in love with another courtesan, the money for whose freedom he borrowed and then demanded that Epidicus find a way to pay back. At the point in the comedy whence the passage above, Epidicus has just returned with the second sum of money from Periphanes: Epidicus, although he had needed and gotten 30 minas for the first courtesan, and needed only 40 minas for this second courtesan, has gotten 50 minas from Periphanes this time.

On the other hand, Leo 1887/8 suggested that Plautus, playing here off of the Roman custom of punishing parricides by sewing them into a sack and tossing them

³¹⁸ See Duckworth 1940 *ad loc.* with discussion and earlier bibliography.

³¹⁹ Gray 1893 *ad loc.*; Mendelsohn 1907. 117; Brinkhoff 1935. 83-4.

into a river, coined the word *parenticida* as a calque of Greek πατροκτόνος before Latin had developed its own stock of legal terminology³²⁰ and that “the matter itself moves laughter, an old man as a patricide (trans.)”. As for the other two Plautine coinages in the passage (*peratus* and *follitus*), he proposed that the former “manifestly concerns the punishment of parricides (trans.),” whereas the latter is the joke (5). In support of this proposition, he marshalled a handful of passages from Greek and Roman authors that refer to punishing parricides by either leading them to prison with their heads covered or tossing them into the river in a sack, as well as another handful of passages showing that *follis* could refer to a purse. Thus, he argued that in the word *follitus*, “we hear the subtext that all the money put in the *follis* will be carried off (trans.)” (5). Ultimately, he interpreted Epidicus as saying here, *ego patrem tuum faciam parenticidam; scilicet si esset parenticida, pera obvolutus ductaretur, ego folle indutum ductitabo* (“I shall make your father a parent-killer. Certainly, if he were a parent-killer, he would be led away wrapped in a *pera*; I shall lead him away wearing a *follis* (‘leather purse’)”). Several things, however, seem problematic with this take. First, although Leo collected several passages that refer to either leading parricides to prison with their heads covered or tossing parricides into the river in a sack, none of them use the word *pera* (*pera* is seemingly nowhere attested in a sense other than “wallet”), although they do mention using a *folliculus* (a diminutive of *follis*) in such punishments.³²¹ Second, that the joke of *parenticida*, is apparently nothing more

³²⁰ This point seems dubious, since Latin already had *parricida* (e.g. Plaut. *As.* 362; *Rud.* 651).

³²¹ Duckworth 1940 *ad loc.* argued that it is the reverse, saying that “[*f*]ollis, not *pera*, would suggest the punishment of the sack, and the phrase *peratum ductare* is an instance of a *vetera et volgata verba*, and therefore cannot refer to *parenticida*, the newly coined word.”

*nata, inquam, meo ero est filia*³²²

Here the question, “What do you mean?” is not a response to a curious nonce formation, but to Lampadio’s deliberately riddling statement that sets up the rest of the scene’s humor: the pimp does not know that the master in question has another daughter with another woman, but after some humorous back and forth here figures it out. While this passage is not exactly parallel in that it does not involve a nonce formation, the set up is the same as in the passage from the *Epidicus*. There are, however, some more closely parallel passages.

At. *Cur.* 30–2, the *servus calidus* Palinurus has the following exchange with his young master Phaedromus:

Pal. *semper curato ne sis intestabilis.*

Ph. *quid istuc est verbi?*

Pal. *caute ut incedas via:*

*quod amas amato testibus praesentibus*³²³

Palinurus, encouraging his master to make sure that his dalliances are always on the up and up, warns against his being *intestabilis*, which typically means “unable to bear witness”. Phaedromus, puzzled as to why Palinurus is suddenly talking about his ability to bear witness in court, asks what he means and says, apparently still puzzled after the answer, *quin leno hic habitat* (“Well, a pimp lives here”; 33). Palinurus then

³²² “{Mel.} Hey there, what other daughter are you looking for now? {Lam.} I’ll tell you: his wife’s daughter who wasn’t born from his wife. {Mel.} What’s that mean? {Lam.} I mean, my master’s daughter was born from an earlier woman.”

³²³ “{Pal.} Always be careful that you aren’t unable to bear witness. {Ph.} What’s that mean? {Pal.} That you proceed carefully along the way: love what you love in the presence of witnesses.”

explains in plainer language that Phaedromus should never sleep with married women but that all other women are fair game. The joke all along has evidently been about castrating adulterers as punishment, with puns on *testes* (“witnesses” and “testicles”) and on *intestabilis* (“unable to bear witness” but here “without testicles”).

Likewise, at Plaut. *Ps.* 607–8, the slave Pseudolus, pretending to work for the pimp Ballio, and the slave Harpax, whom Pseudolus hopes to defraud, have the following exchange:

Harp. *tune es Ballio?*

Ps. *immo vero ego eius sum Subballio.*

Harp. *quid istuc verbist?*

Ps. *condus promus sum, procurator peni*³²⁴

Pseudolus plays off the question, “Are you Ballio?” by saying that he is “Under-Ballio” and explaining, after being asked what he means, that he is a Ballio’s undersecretary. After trading some insults, Pseudolus explains that he takes care of Ballio’s finances (628) and, after much arguing, convinces Harpax to give him money. In addition, Fontaine 2010. 219–20 argues that there is a series of jokes about pederasty here. Having previously argued that the name Ballio is a rendering of Greek Φαλλίων,³²⁵ he

³²⁴ “{Harp.} Are you Ballio? {Ps.} Actually, I’m his Subballio. {Harp.} What’s that mean? {Ps.} I’m a put-awayer and a take-outer, a superintendant of supplies.”

³²⁵ 79 n. 84, where he takes the pimp’s name to be rather Phallio = Φαλλίων (“big whale”), a “fish name, like Labrax ‘Bass,’ pimp in *Rudens*, and at the same time it suggests φαλλός”. He proposes that Ballio is not a “MS corruption, but merely a misanalyzed transliteration: Since Latin *b* occasionally transliterates Greek phi”, but also suggests that the “pun on *exballistabo* at *Ps.* 585 does arouse some suspicion that an ancient editor has adjusted the MSS to suit that ‘etymology’”. However, this argument is unnecessary, since the name βαλλίων is attested in comedy (Axonic. fr. 1.2) and inscriptions (e.g. *SEG* 49.1305.26; a 4th/3rd-century BCE epitaph from Sicily); the name moreover derives from βαλλίον = φαλλός (cf. Dubois 2005. 219–20;

thus takes the name Subballio to be a joke that Ballio pedicates his slave. *condus* and *promus* he likewise thinks may have a sexual sense (“he who puts *it* in” and “he who takes *it* out”), as may the phrase *procurator pēni* (“caretaker of the pantry”), if it were pronounced against the meter *procurator pēni* (“caretaker of the penis”), although the pun seems obvious enough here without having to assumed a fudged pronunciation.

And at Ter. *Ph.* 342–3, the parasite Phormio talks with the slave Geta about—what else—dinner at a rich man’s table:

Ph. *cena dubia apponitur.*

Ge. *quid istuc verbist?*

Ph. *ubi tu dubites quid sumas potissimum*³²⁶

Phormio then rhapsodizes briefly that a rich man provides such a sumptuous feast that his clients must surely think him a god. There is of course no curious nonce form here, only a riddlingly misapplied adjective, the confusion it causes feeding Phormio’s hyperbolic encomium of his rich host.

One more thing worth considering is that a *verbum vetus* (lit. “old word”) is typically a proverbial expression rather than simply an old-fashioned or common word in Plautus and elsewhere,³²⁷ and characters in comedy humorously comment on their present circumstances with proverbial expressions.

Beekes s. v.). Assuming that Ballio = Βαλλίων makes all the same jokes here and obviates the need to postulate an otherwise unattested name (Φαλλίων) and appeal to an *ad-hoc* transliteration of *phi* with *b* (on the manifest strangeness of which, cf. de Vaan s. v. *ballaena*) or scribal error.

³²⁶ “{Ph.} A doubtful dinner will be laid out. {Ge.} What’s that mean? {Ph.} It’s when you doubt what in particular you should take.”

³²⁷ Plaut. *Cas.* 969–73; *Cist.* 505–6; *Merc.* 771–2; *Poen.* 135–7; Ter. *Ad.* 803–4; Gel. 12.5.6.

All this has been to show that *perenticida* should itself be a joke of some sort—either a riddle or a pun or a punny nonce formation—used as a feed for further jokes, after Epidicus’ interlocutor asks, “What kind of a word is that?”, and that presumably, when Epidicus says, *nil moror vetera et volgata verba*, there is presumably also a play on a proverbial expression in what follows. Our not knowing exactly what that proverbial expression is, as well as the fact that there are textual problems, renders the passage more difficult. At any rate, despite being a nonce formation, the transmitted *parenticida* hardly seems sufficiently riddling or punny, for which reason I think that editors and scholars have been right to emend and that Camerarius’ emendation, which restores a blend, remains the most satisfactory.³²⁸

4.8 CONCLUSION

³²⁸ One of the interpretive cruxes of this passage are the futures *faciam* and *ductitabo*. Since at this point in the comedy Epidicus has already gotten the money, it is unclear how he will do anything further to Periphanes. Perhaps 348–51 belong earlier in the play after 150. This transposition of lines deals with the troubling futures (*faciam*, *ductitabo*) by inserting them into a scene where many of Epidicus’ verbs are also futures (*patiar*, *reperibitur*, *exsolvar*, *extricabor*) as he starts promising that he will take care of things. In addition, the transposition reads nicely in the context: the scene thus moves smoothly from Epidicus refusing to undertake anything that will bring him a beating, relenting in the face of Stratippocles’ melodrama, to his promising to get the money by cheating Stratippocles’ father, after he was just told to get the money from wherever, and promising that he will figure out how to deal with the flute-girl. This is then paralleled, when Epidicus returns in the later scene and announces that he has the money and that he has figured out how to deal with the flute-girl. In their original context, these four lines seemed somewhat out of place: why should Epidicus interrupt saying that he has brought 50 minas, ten more than is needed, and explaining what he intends to do with those extra minas with a line about not caring whether he is beaten and jokes about fleecing Periphanes, which he has already done? With the four lines transposed, at 346–7 Epidicus announces that he has returned with 50 minas and goes straight into explaining to Stratippocles what he plans to do with the money.

Unlike the blends discussed in the previous chapter that fell into a well-defined category and those to be discussed in the following chapter that also fall into a well-defined category, the blends discussed in this chapter are for the most part heterogeneous. Despite their heterogeneity, the blends of Plautus at least are in many cases the happy results of typical jokes. The exceptions to this heterogeneity are Aristophanes' *τρυγωδία* and Plautus' *tragicomedy*. With both terms, their respective coiners jokingly commented on some innovative aspect of their work and its relationship with tragedy. For better or for worse, these two terms have been amply discussed in scholarship in the last century or two.

That both an Aristophanic blend (*τρυγωδία*) should be both reused by its coiner and picked up by Eupolis and that three Plautine blends (*tuburcinari*; *virgindemia*; *tragicomoedia*) should be picked up by several subsequent authors, both comedic and otherwise, are testaments to, on the one hand, how much Aristophanes evidently admired his own witticism, and, on the other hand, the influence that the two comic poets wielded over the development of the genre and its lexicon in their respective cultures.

CHAPTER 5. BILINGUAL BLENDS IN LATIN

5.1 INTRODUCTION: EXCURSUS ON BILINGUALISM IN LATIN LITERATURE

The use of Greek in Latin literature is especially characteristic of low genres, whether that use consists of single words, phrases or—more inventively—bilingual derivatives and compounds. So too bilingual blends (as generally all Greek and Latin blends) are apparently confined to low genres. Greek words and phrases and bilingual derivatives and compounds are often found alongside their purely Latin equivalents, demonstrating that their use is not motivated by purely denotational needs. Plautus, for example, does not coin a bilingual compound such as *ferritribax* (“jailbird” < *ferrum* “iron” and τριβω “rub, wear-out”) for the sake of creating an epithet for which there is no Latin equivalent. He coins it as a jocular term of abuse that implies threats of violence and servitude in its imagery and presumably amuses the audience with its linguistic novelty. Beyond jocular references to torture and servitude, bilingual formations appear in scatological contexts, as sexual innuendoes, and in mockery of personal names. The functional restriction of bilingual blends in Latin to humorous contexts is perhaps due more to the relationship of Rome to Hellenic culture than to the social dynamics of real-world speech contexts.

Bilingualism³²⁹ in ancient Rome has been studied at length by Adams 2004, with smaller-scaled studies by, for example, Wenskus 1995, 1996, 1998; Jocelyn

³²⁹ On the problems of definition, e.g. Adams 2004. 3–8; Edwards 2004, esp. 7–11.

1999; and Dunkel 2000.³³⁰ Studies of “code-switching” between languages among modern bilingual speakers reveal various kinds of the phenomenon,³³¹ all of which can be documented in Roman writers too. These are:

1. intersentential switching, which occurs at sentence or clause boundaries: for example, Cic. *Att.* 173.2 is an entire paragraph in Greek of questions that Cicero says he has been pondering as a distraction amid a personal letter otherwise in Latin; 242 τὴν κρήνην, *ut scribis, hauriret in tantis suis praesertim angustiis*. ποῖ ταῦτα ἄρα ἀποσκήψει; *sed ipse viderit* (“He would drain the fount, as you say, especially when he needs money so badly himself. Where will it all end? However, it’s his affair”);³³²
2. intrasentential switching, which occurs within a sentence or a clause: for example, Olympio the slave’s “*enim vero* πράγματά μοι παρέχεις” (“Truly, you give me trouble”; Plaut. *Cas.* 728), to which his master Lysidamus responds, “*dabo tibi* μέγα κακόν” (“I’ll give you a big bad”; 729);
3. tag-switching is the insertion of a set phrase or a word from one language into an utterance in another: for example, Olympio’ exclamation “ὦ Ζεῦ” (“O Zeus!”; Plaut. *Cas.* 731); or Phaniscus the slave’s “μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω” (“by Apollo!”; Plaut. *Most.* 973);
4. intra-word switching occurs within a word itself, such as at a morpheme boundary. Intra-word switching typically involves a root or stem from one

³³⁰ Also note Rochette 1997, 2010; Lorenzetti 2014.

³³¹ McArthur 1998a.

³³² Trans. Shackleton Bailey.

language and an affix from another: for example, *hamiota* “fisherman” (< *hamus* “hook” and -ιώτης, a suffix used to form *nomina agentis*; Plaut. *Rud.* 310; Var. *Men.* 55). Intra-word switching gives rise to what I have been calling bilingual derivatives and compounds. It also includes bilingual blends, which are attested in modern spoken languages but typically as speech errors involving synonyms in a speaker’s native and second language.³³³ The bilingual blends that we will be examining in this chapter are not speech errors but studied coinages for humorous effect.

Generally speaking, the motivation for code switching is manifold and may vary from speaker to speaker and from context to context. However, common motivations include showing deference, anger, solidarity, distance, or eloquence.³³⁴ Another common motivation is either softening or intensifying abusive or obscene language.³³⁵

³³³ Pavlenko 2009. 112

³³⁴ Adams 2004. 297–305

³³⁵ Thus Pavlenko 2012. 461: “Codeswitching is also affected by perceived emotionality of the languages in question. L1 [*ed.* a speaker’s native language], for instance, is a common choice for expressions of positive affect and the use of endearments among parents who are raising their children in L2 [*ed.* a speaker’s second language] (Pavlenko 2004). Individuals who remain dominant in their L1 and perceive it as most emotional may also spontaneously revert to L1 to argue with spouses and partners, to scold and discipline their children, and to use taboo and swearwords to maximum effect and satisfaction (Dewaele 2004a, 2004b, 2006; Pavlenko 2004, 2005, 2008a). These switches are particularly interesting because some speakers choose L1 even though their partners have little or no proficiency in the language (Pavlenko 2005). In doing so, they go against the grain of linguistic theories such as the Gricean maxims and the Cooperation Principle (Grice 1975) that frame argument as cooperative activity (e.g. Walton 1998) and language choice as determined by the interlocutor’s competence. Their behavior suggests that internal satisfaction may be an additional factor in codeswitching.

Among elite Romans, Greek was something to be recommended to Roman children³³⁶ and something to boast of knowing well,³³⁷ but sometimes the use of Greek was regarded as something to avoid or use sparingly. Thus, an unknown speaker in a fragment of Afranius could fear being mocked for speaking Greek.³³⁸ Cicero was once maligned for having spoken Greek even before the Greek-speaking senate at Syracuse.³³⁹ The Augustan rhetorician Lucius Cestius, although Greek, never

“Code-switching may also take place in the direction of the language perceived as less emotional. Some multilinguals prefer to use taboo and swear words in later learned languages, because this choice allows them to avoid the guilt and discomfort associated with L1 words (Dewaele 2010; Ferenczi 1916; Koven 2006; Krapf 1955; Movahedi 1996; Pavlenko 2005).”

³³⁶ Cf. Quint. 1.1.12-14 *a sermone Graeco puerum incipere malo, quia Latinum, qui pluribus in usu est, vel nobis nolentibus perbibet, simul quia disciplinis quoque Graecis prius instituendus est, unde et nostrae fluxerunt. non tamen hoc adeo superstitiose fieri velim ut diu tantum Graece loquatur aut discat, sicut plerisque moris est. hoc enim accidunt et oris plurima vitia in peregrinum sonum corrupti et sermonis, cui cum Graecae figurae adsidua consuetudine haeserunt, in diversa quoque loquendi ratione pertinacissime durant. non longe itaque Latina subsequi debent et cito pariter ire. ita fiet ut, cum aequali cura linguam utramque tueri coeperimus, neutra alteri official* (“I prefer a boy to begin by speaking Greek, because he will imbibe Latin, which more people speak, whether we will or no; and because he will need to be taught Greek learning first, it being the source of ours too. However, I do not want a fetish to be made of this, so that he spends a long time speaking and learning nothing but Greek, as is commonly done. This gives rise to many faults both of pronunciation (owing to the distortion of the mouth produced by forming foreign sounds) and of language, because the Greek idioms stick in the mind through continual usage and persist obstinately even in speaking the other tongue. So Latin ought to follow not far behind, and soon proceed side by side with Greek. The result will be that, once we begin to pay equal attention to both languages, neither will get in the way of the other”).

³³⁷ Cf. Nep. Att. 4.1; Apul. Apol. 39

³³⁸ Afran. com. 273 *nam me pudet, ubi mecum loquitur Numerius, / aliquid sufferre Graece: irridet me ilico* (“I’m embarrassed, when Numerius talks to me, to undertake anything in Greek: he makes fun of me immediately”). However, it is equally possible that the speaker here is mocked not for speaking Greek at all, but for speaking Greek badly.

³³⁹ Cic. Ver. 2.4.147 *ait indignum facinus esse quod ego in senatu Graeco verba fecissem; quod quidem apud Graecos Graece locutus essem, id ferri nullo modo posse* (“He says that it was an indecorous crime that I had given a speech in the Greek senate. Moreover, the fact that I had

declaimed in Greek, and Sabinus Clodius (otherwise unknown) was ridiculed for declaiming in both Greek and Latin.³⁴⁰ Roman magistrates were required to reply in Latin to the Greeks who addressed them not only at Rome but also in Greece and the eastern provinces.³⁴¹ The emperor Tiberius, who knew Greek well,³⁴² once apologized to the Roman senate before uttering the word *monopolium*, and on another occasion ordered that the word ἔμβλημα, which he had used in drafting a decree, be replaced with a native word or, in the event that no suitable native word could be found, a periphrasis.³⁴³ This was, it seems, not done out of general disdain for Greek, but out of a sense of linguistic decorum that disapproved of mixing languages in official or elevated contexts. This taboo, however, was ignored by Claudius, who often delivered speeches in Greek.³⁴⁴

A tendency to minimize the use of Greek is also characteristic of much of Latin literature. As Sheets 2007. 197 notes, “[d]espite a few bold experiments by Ennius, elevated poetry in Latin was traditionally averse to admitting Greek words and

spoken Greek to a Greek audience was utterly unbearable”). In the same speech, however, Cicero pillories his opponent for not knowing Greek.

³⁴⁰ Sen. *Con.* 9.3.12–3

³⁴¹ Val. Max. 2.2.2; Suet. *Tib.* 71. However, cf. Just. *Dig.* 45.1.1 pr. 6 (on verbal contracts; drawn from Ulpian) *proinde si quis Latine interrogauerit, respondeatur ei Graece, dummodo congruenter respondeatur, obligatio constituta est: idem per contrarium. sed utrum hoc usque ad Graecum sermonem tantum protrahimus an uero et ad alium, Poenum forte uel Assyrium uel cuius alterius linguae, dubitari potest* (“Accordingly, if anyone interrogates in Latin and is answered in Greek, provided the reply is suitable, the obligation is satisfied. It is likewise in the opposite case. But it is doubtful whether we shall apply this only to the Greek language or also to others, for example, Punic, Assyrian, or any other language”).

³⁴² Suet. *Tib.* 70

³⁴³ Suet. *Tib.* 71; cf. D.C. 57.15

³⁴⁴ Suet. *Claud.* 42.1

morphology.” One of the faults that Horace therefore finds in other authors is the mixture of the two languages,³⁴⁵ and while Cicero himself is at times an outspoken proponent of pure Latin,³⁴⁶ when it comes to philosophical terminology, he nevertheless claims the right to supplement the poverty of his mother-tongue by borrowing a Greek word or phrase, as Lucretius likewise does,³⁴⁷ although not without apology.³⁴⁸

Writers on technical subjects are less hesitant to import Greek words and phrases as needed. Thus, for example, in the relatively small amount of Varro’s extant writings, Greek words and phrases outnumber all those used by Cicero in his vast corpus. They chiefly consist of grammatical, philosophical, and botanical terms.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁵ Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.20 *quod verbis Graeca Latinis miscuit* (“because he mixed Greek with Latin words”); 29-30 *Corvinus, patriis intermiscere petita / verba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis?* (“Corvinus, you prefer to intermix the words of your fatherland with those from abroad, in the manner of a bilingual Canusian [*ed.* Greek and Oscan were spoken at Canusium, in Apulia]”).

³⁴⁶ Cic. *Off.* 1.111 *sermone eo debemus uti, qui innatus est nobis, ne, ut quidam, Graeca verba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur* (“We should use our mother-tongue, so that we, like certain people who are continually dragging in Greek words, do not draw well-deserved ridicule upon ourselves”); *Tusc.* 1.15; and see Kaimio 1979. 295–315.

³⁴⁷ ND 1.830-832 *nunc et Anaxagorae scrutemur homoeomerian / quam Grai memorant nec nostra dicere lingua / concedit nobis patria sermonis egestas* (“Now let us also consider the *homoeomerian* (‘the homogeneity of the elements’) of Anaxagoras, which the Greeks mention and which the poverty of our mother-tongue does not allow us to say in our own language”). On Lucretius’ use and avoidance of Greek, see Sedley 1999.

³⁴⁸ Cic. *Acad. Post.* 1.25-26 *“quin etiam Graecis licebit utare cum voles, si te Latina forte deficient.” “Bene sane facis; sed enitar ut Latine loquar, nisi in huiusce modi verbis, ut philosophiam aut rhetoricam aut physicam aut dialecticam appellem, quibus ut aliis multis consuetudo iam utitur pro Latinis”* (“‘Indeed you shall be permitted to use even Greek words if Latin ones happen to fail you.’ ‘That is certainly kind of you, but I will do my best to speak Latin, except in the case of words of the sort now in question, to employ the term ‘philosophy’ or ‘rhetoric’ or ‘physics’ or ‘dialectic’, which like many others are now habitually used as Latin words”).

³⁴⁹ Gäbel-Weise 1893. 340.

Likewise, the technical vocabulary of the other sciences such as architecture and medicine—fields in which the Romans were especially indebted to the Greeks—is largely borrowed.³⁵⁰ Punctilious Latin authors do often provide translations,³⁵¹ and in the disciplines of rhetoric and grammar the Latin terms are mostly calques of their Greek sources.

The relative avoidance of Greek in the elevated genres of Latin literature stands in stark contrast to its acceptance in the *sermo plebeius*,³⁵² especially in southern Italy, a region pervaded by Greek culture.³⁵³ Even in the early Republican period, according to Livy (27.11.4), Greek compounds were a common feature of everyday speech. And in a famous passage Livy (7.2) also traces the origin of Latin drama in the Greek style to Livius Andronicus, a Greek freedman from Tarentum, whose works included the first comedies, a genre that is not only Greek in name but, prior to Terence, vernacular in language.

Inscriptions from southern Italy, the comedies of Plautus, the satires of Lucilius and Varro, and the picaresque novel of Petronius, all chock full of morsels of

³⁵⁰ On the Greek words in Latin scientific discourse generally, see e.g. de Meo 1983; Coleman 1989. On Greek words attested only in Apicius' cookbook, see Georgescu 2017.

³⁵¹ E.g. Cic. *Top.* 93; Hyg. *Astr.* 2.4.6; Gel. 2.25 pr. 1; Plin. *Nat.* 21.111.

³⁵² I.e. the Latin of the uneducated and lower social classes by as opposed to the Latinity of e.g. Cicero and Caesar.

³⁵³ According to Strabo (6.253), Greek manners and speech were still fashionable in Rhegium, Naples, and Tarentum even under the Roman Empire. The heavy Greek influence on the Latin of southern Italy is still felt in the presence of Greek words in the Italian dialects of the south: for example, Central-Southern Calabrian has *batràci* "frog" (cf. βάρτακος "frog") instead of *ranocchio*; *tuppitiàri* "hit" (cf. τύπτω "hit") instead of *battere*. See Dorsa 1876; Marzano 1928. xv–xxii; Rohlfs 1964.

Greek,³⁵⁴ afford good evidence of the extent of Greek's direct influence upon the popular speech of Latin speakers.³⁵⁵ Thus, for example, the parasite of Plautus' *Persa* uses *collyrae* = κολλύραι "vermicelli" (92) and *colyphia* = κωλύφια "choice morsels of meat" (92), and asks, πόθεν *ornamenta*? "Where will the costume come from?" (159);

³⁵⁴ This Greek reveals itself as derived from the spoken Greek of southern Italy, rather than from the Greek of the Attic plays which Plautus is adapting. Thus, for example, Ergasilus, the parasite of *Captivi*, exclaims ναὶ τὰν Κόραν, "yes by Kora!" (881), where are evident the long *alphas* of West Greek rather than the *etas* of Attic Greek, in which one would have said *ναὶ τὴν Κόρην!

³⁵⁵ The fragmentary remains of early Republican authors likewise attest numerous Greek words and phrases (e.g. Afran. *com.* 218 *panus* = πῆνος (Dor. πᾶνος) "thread"; Caecil. *com.* 222 *asticus* = ἀστικός "urban"; Naev. *com.* 103 *exbolus* = ἔκβολος "what is thrown out"; and see Tuchhaendler 1876. 34–60 for an extensive catalogue) and the letters of Cicero abound therewith (cf. Steele 1900; Baldwin 1992; Boldrer 2003), despite his claim (quoted above) that he avoids using Greek while using Latin. Horace, despite condemning Lucilius for using Greek words and phrases, also does so not only in his *Sermones* (e.g. 1.2.133 *puga* = πυγή "buttocks"; 1.10.91 *cathedra* = καθέδρα "seat") but also occasionally in his *Carmina* (1.36.14 *amystis* = ἄμυστις "a deep drink").

Even later under the Republic, Greek words and phrases evidently had such prestige in everyday speech, just as later French words and phrases had in other languages of Europeans, especially in the 17th and 18th centuries (cf. Blumenthal–Kahane 1979. 188–9; Kahane 1986. 495), that Martial (10.68) could chastise a well-born Roman woman for saying, allegedly like a Greek prostitute, "κύριέ μου, μέλι μου, ψυχή μου" ("my lord, my honey, my soul"). However, μέλι μου (nowhere attested in Greek) and ψυχή μου (nowhere attested as a direct address in Greek) seem to be hyper-Grecisms translating Latin *mel meum* (e.g. Plaut. *Bac.* 18; *Poen.* 367; Afran. *com.* 311) and *cor meum* (Plaut. *Bac.* 17; *Poen.* 367). And Juvenal, whose own use of Greek words and phrases is mostly confined to complaints about the use of Greek words and phrases (e.g. 3.76–7), could complain (6.185–7): *nam quid rancidius, quam quod se non putat ulla / formosam, nisi quae de Tusca Graecula facta est, / de Sulmonensi mera Cecropis? omnia Graece* ("After all, what's more nauseating than the fact that no woman thinks she's beautiful unless she's turned herself from a Tuscan into a Greeklette, from a woman of Sulmo into a pure Cecropian woman? Everything's in Greek"). Although the reference to beauty here may be to Greek-style adornment, the rest of the passage (188–99) clearly complains about Roman women's use of Greek, especially as an erotic language, and also cites ψυχή as a term of endearment (195).

For an extensive catalogue of Greek loanwords in Latin literature from the time of the Republic to late antiquity, see Weise 1882. 326–544.

the chorus of fishermen of Plautus' *Rudens* use, for example, *gymnasticus* = γυμναστικός "pertaining to exercise" (296) and *palaesticus* = παλαιστρικός "pertaining to wrestling" (296); and *lopades* = λόπαδες "limpets" (297). Among the fragments of Lucilius we find, for example, *eugium* = εὐγείος "female genitals" (fr. 940);³⁵⁶ a Greek comparative *rhetoricoterus* = ῥητορικότερος "more rhetorical" (fr. 86); and even the Greek genitive singulars *Ixionies alochoeo* = Ἴξιονίης ἀλόχοιο "of the wife of Ixion" (25).³⁵⁷ And among the fragments of Varro's *Menippean Satires* we find, for example, *phago* = φάγων "glutton" (529); *spatula* = σπατάλη "wantonness" (275); *strabus* = στραβός "squinty-eyed" (344); and *tracinus* = τρίχινος "meager" (159).³⁵⁸

And Petronius, the speech of whose freedman in the *Cena Trimalchionis* has been well studied,³⁵⁹ offers up such Greek words and phrases as *alogia* = ἀλογία "lack of reason" (58.7);³⁶⁰ *spatalocinaedus* "lascivious pervert" (< σπάταλος "wanton" and κίναϊδος "pervert"; 23.3); and *topanta* = τὰ πάντα "everything" (37.4).³⁶¹ Petronius

³⁵⁶ Also at Laber. *com.* 24, 139, another "low" author.

³⁵⁷ The phrase Ἴξιονίης ἀλόχοιο is attested at *Il.* 14.317.

³⁵⁸ The fragment of Varro (*quod tunc quaestus tracinus erat, nunc est uber*, "Because then the profit was meager, but now it's abundant") demands that *tracinus* (a *hapax*) mean "meager" *vel sim.* However, the Greek adjective τρίχινος typically means "of hair" (cf. LSJ s. v.) and is used of clothing at e.g. X. *An.* 4.8.3 (the Macronians are described as confronting the Greeks pathetically with wicker shields, lances, and hair shirts and throwing rocks); Pl. *Plt.* 279e (unstitched clothes made from plant fibers or hair and stuck together with water and mud). The word seems clearly pejorative at Hsch. θ 975 θύστινον· τρίχινον. οἱ δὲ μεσοτριβῆ ("thystinon: triximon, and those that are worn out in the middle"); σ 2810x <σύστ...· τρίχινος χιτών, ἢ ῥυπαρός. Ἀντίμαχος (fr. 125 West) ("syst...: a cloak made of hair, or filthy. Antimachus (fr. 125 West)"); Thom. *Laud.Greg.* col. 284.37 τρίχινα ῥάκια ("raggedy clothes made of hair"). Presumably, the sense of the word developed from e.g. "(meager) hair shirt" to "meager (hair) shirt".

³⁵⁹ Boyce 1997

³⁶⁰ Also at Sen. *Apoc.* 7, another "low" text.

³⁶¹ For a catalogue of Greek words in Petronius, see Segebade-Lommatzsch 1898. iv-v.

also yields some bilingual forms such as *apocularare* “make haste” or the like (62.3);³⁶² *percolapare* “to beat thoroughly” (< *per-* “thoroughly” and *colaphus* = κόλαφος “blow of the fist”); and *lupatria* (< *lupa* “she-wolf; whore” and *-τρια*, a suffix used to form (pejorative) feminine *nomina agentis*). Such bilingual forms as these are interesting because they show how naturalized certain Greek words may have become in popular speech and because they show the willingness and flexibility of Latin authors to accommodate and adapt foreign words and phrases as suits their needs.³⁶³ Also interesting is that, unlike the few Greek words from Plautus, Lucilius, and Varro cited above, which for the most part serve a denotational need and add to the Greek ambience of their works (for example, Latin appears to have no other adjective

³⁶² Etymology uncertain, but perhaps < *ἀπό* “away” and *oculus* “eye”.

³⁶³ In “classical” and “elevated” Latin there is a tendency to preserve Greek words, when used, as-is, even to the point of preserving Greek inflectional endings. Accius adopted this habit, according to Varro (*L.* 10.70), as did at times also Varro himself (e.g. *Men* 60.1 *Odyssian*; 198 *hectomben*; 399 *ethesin* = ἧθῆσιν, dat. pl. of ἧθος) and Lucretius (cf. n. 345). Even in the time of Quintilian, the habit was still in vogue, although Quintilian makes it known that he favors forms with Latin inflections (1.5.63). Bilingual forms nevertheless found their way into even good, classical authors: for example, Cicero, in his letters, uses the form *facteon* “it must be done” (*Att.* 1.16.13), from *facere* “do” but modeled after ποιητέον “it must be done”, and in his speeches uses the adverbs *tyrannice* “tyrannically” (*Ver.* 3.2.115) and *palaestrice* “in the manner of a wrestling school” (*Opt. Gen.* 3; against this hybrid form, however, cf. (*per*)*palaestricos* = παλαιστρικῶς “in the manner of a wrestling school” at Afran. *com.* 154)), just like the Plautine *basilice* “utterly” (e.g. *Pers.* 29); *dulice* “slavishly”; *comoedice* “comically”, and *euscheme* “becomingly” (all three, *Mil.* 213); *pugilice* “like a boxer” (e.g. *Epid.* 20); and *graphice* “nicely” (e.g. *Pers.* 306).

It should be noted, however, that *basilice* has diverged in meaning from that of the Greek word from which it is borrowed, βασιλικός “kingly”. At Plaut. *Epid.* 56, for example, *interii basilice* means “I have utterly perished” rather than “I have died in the manner of a king” *vel sim.*; the adverb is just an intensifier. *graphice* too has diverged in meaning from that of the Greek word from which it is borrowed, γραφικός “pertaining to the graphic arts”. At Plaut. *Per.* 306 *graphice facetus fiam* means “I’ll become nicely witty” rather than “I’ll become witty in the manner of the plastic arts”; again the adverb is just an intensifier.

meaning “pertaining to wrestling” or the like, although presumably it could have coined one from, for example, *luctare* “wrestle”), none of these bilingual forms serve a strictly denotational purpose: Latin has, for example, plenty of words meaning “beat” (for example, *battuare*, *converberare*, *percidere*). What the words do is add to the characterization of the guests at Trimalchio’s dinner party—which, it should be noted, takes place in a “Greek city” (81.3), likely Puteoli in Magna Graecia³⁶⁴—as parvenu freedmen. But notably, some of them are threatening or abusive words. The aim of using such words is probably not to achieve linguistic realism but “to bring this low stratum [of language] into the spotlight” (Conte 1994. 456) for comic effect.³⁶⁵

These bilingual forms from Petronius are all bilingual derivatives, either forms derived from a Greek lexical base by means of a Latin derivational suffix (e.g. *percolapare*) or, *vice versa*, forms derived from a Latin lexical base by means of a Greek derivational suffix (e.g. *lupatria*). *percolapare* represents a typical category of bilingual derivative in Latin: a first-conjugation verb formed from a Greek nominal. Of this latter category, early authors³⁶⁶ furnish the following examples: *exenterare* “disembowel” (Plaut. *Epid.* 185, 320, 511, 672; Lucil. 470; cf. ἔντερον “entrails”);³⁶⁷

³⁶⁴ Rose 1962; Courtney 2001. 40.

³⁶⁵ Boyce 1991; Clackson 2015. 114–8.

³⁶⁶ Many bilingual forms such as this are chronologically confined to ante-classical comedic authors, especially Plautus, and to post-classical technical authors.

³⁶⁷ Cf. Caper *Grammatici Latini* VII p. 109.13 *exenteravit* ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντέρων *a visceribus* (“*exenteravit* is from *apo tôn enterôn*, i.e. from the viscera”); Serv. *A.* 11.723 *ne vulgari verbo ex Graeco uteretur dicens “exenterat”, ait “pedibusque eviscerat”* (“Lest he use a vulgar word from Greek by saying ‘disembowels’, he says ‘eviscerates with his feet’”). The *OLD s. v.* suggests as an alternative that the verb is drawn direct from Greek *ἐξεντερίζω, which however is unattested (but cf. the middle ἐξεντερίζομαι “have the innards removed” (e.g. *Dsc.* 2.62.1, 4.162.4)) and would presumably have been rendered as **exinterissare* in early Latin.

parasitari “be a parasite” (Plaut. *Pers.* 56; *St.* 634; cf. παράσιτος “parasite”); *sycophantari* “be a trickster” (Plaut. *Trin.* 787, 958; cf. συκοφάντης “sycophant”); *thermopotare* “supply with hot drinks” (Plaut. *Trin.* 1014; cf. θερμοπότης “hot drink-seller”); *rhetoricare* “speak rhetorically” (Nov. *com.* 5; cf. ῥητορική “rhetoric”); *eunuchare* “make a eunuch” (Var. *Men.* 235; cf. εὐνοῦχος “eunuch”); *paedagogare* “educate” (Pac. *trag.* 192; cf. παιδαγωγός, a slave who accompanied a boy to school); *elutriare* “put in a vat” (Lab. *com.* 151; cf. ἔλυτρον “vat”);³⁶⁸ *moechari* “commit adultery” (Catul. 94.1; cf. μοιχός “adulterer”). The fragmentary state of the texts of Novius, Varro, and Pacuvius does not permit us to know who uses *rhetoricare*, *eunuchare*, or *paedagogare*, but in Plautus *parasitari* is, in both instances, spoken by parasites (Saturio in *Persa*; Gelasimus in *Stichus*); *thermopotare* is spoken by Stasimus, a drunken slave; *sycophantari*, however, is spoken first by Callicles and then by Charmides, two otherwise respectable old men, but there is, in both instances, the indication that playing the role of a sycophant is unusual and beneath them.³⁶⁹

Thus, the distribution of this sort of bilingual formation in Plautus does not appear to be rooted entirely in socio-linguistic reality: no one kind of person says such a word. But their attestation is mostly in ante-classical (mostly comedic) and post-classical (mostly technical) authors.³⁷⁰ In comedy, bilingual verbs also can serve as

³⁶⁸ Thus the *OLD*. However, de Vaan *s. v. lavo* lists it as a derivative of *lavare*.

³⁶⁹ E.g. Plaut. *Trin.* 787 *quamquam hoc me aetatis sycophantari pudet* (“although I’m ashamed to play a trickster at this point in my life”).

³⁷⁰ To be sure, nearly all of them denote the performance of actions germane to stock dramatic characters, and as such have no place, for example, in epic. The absence of others in elevated literature can be explained by their usage as technical terms, like virtually all post-classical denominatives formed from Greek words (e.g. *monodiaria* female solo singer” (*CIL* 6.10120.2,

metatheatrical jokes, a fact to which their novel formation draws attention. For example, the unnamed sycophant of *Trinummus* makes his entrance (843) disguised as an Illyrian messenger tasked with delivering some fraudulent letters (851-2). He comments metatheatrically on his own costume, saying that the man who hired him for the task had borrowed the costume from a stage-master (858). Thus, the sycophant calls attention to the fact that he is not playing the role of sycophant at that moment. He and Charmides begin to chat. Charmides, after learning that he has entrusted a great sum of money to the sycophant, says to himself, *enim vero ego nunc sycophantae huic sycophantari volo* (“I really want to play the role of trickster for this trickster”), but when he declares himself to be Charmides in order to get the money, the sycophant denies that he is Charmides, for in fact he is no longer playing the role of Charmides but of a sycophant.

lupatria, on the other hand, is unique among words formed from Latin bases and Greek suffixes in its application of *-tria* to a Latin base (likely modeled on borrowings from Greek in *-τρια*).³⁷¹ There are, however, a few Greek suffixes which became much used in Latin such as the patronymic suffixes *-ades* or *-ides*. Bilingual patronymics are mostly limited to Plautus, Lucretius, and Vergil: in the latter two authors such forms are presumably in imitation of Homeric phraseology, whereas in Plautus such formations are often preposterous and undoubtedly for comic effect.

a 1st-century BCE tombstone from Rome)); *pyxidatus* “box-like” (Plin. *Nat.* 31.57); *diphthongare* “pronounce with a diphthong” (Apul. *de diphth.* 21 Osann).

³⁷¹ E.g. *citharistria* = κίθαρίστρια “female cithara-player” (Ter. *Ph.* 82, 144); *cymbalistris* = κυμβαλίστρια “female cymbal-player” (Petr. 22.6, 23.1); *psaltria* = ψάλτρια “female cithara-player (e.g. Ter. *Ad.* 388, 405; Titin. *com.* 85t; Liv. 39.6.8).

Thus, Plautus has, for example, *loculiripida* “Purse-snatcher” and *cruricrepida* “Rattle-shins” (*Trin.* 1021), both spoken by the slave Stasimus alongside other facetious names of (Greek?) criminals (e.g. *Struthus* “lascivious”; *Cercobulus* “who thinks about penises”); *plagipatida* “Beating-bearer” (*Most.* 356), spoken by the slave Tranio alongside the bilingual compound *ferritribax*; *glandionida* “Porkson” and *pernonides* “Hamson” (*Men.* 210), both spoken by one of the Menaechmi; *rapacida* “Robberson” (*Aul.* 370), spoken by the slave Strobilus. There is a literary precedent for the way that Plautus uses his invented patronymics: Aristophanes before him had invented jocular speaking names for male characters in -δης (for example, Μαριλάδης “son of coal-dust”, the name of an Acharnian collier (*Ach.* 609); Αποδρασιππίδης “son of escapistes” (*V.* 185)). Such also are the Plautine *loculiripida* and *cruricrepida*; they are funny names that let us know that their bearers are crooks. On the other hand, *plagipatida* is not coined as a speaking name for any character but as a term of abuse that alludes to torture and servitude, and so the motives for its use are the same as those for the use of some of the other words discussed so far.

In addition to bilingual derivatives in Latin, there are also bilingual compounds. However, as with bilingual derivatives, such compounds are also all but limited to comedic and post-classical technical authors. Thus, in Plautus we find *antelogium* “prologue” (< *ante* “before” and λόγος “speech”; *Men.* 13); *biclinium* “love seat” (*Bac.* 720, 754);³⁷² *dismaritus* “husband of two wives” (< δῖς “twice” and *maritus*

³⁷² Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.5.68) cites the word as an example of a compound of a native and a foreign word alongside the Greek-Latin compounds *epitogium* “~ overcoat” (< ἐπί “upon” + *toga*; nowhere else attested) and *Anticato* (< ἀντί “against” and *Cato*; the title of a polemic by Caesar) and the Greek-Gallic compound *epiraedium*, a thong by which horses were attached

“husband”; *Cas.* 974); *ferritribax* “wearing out fetters” (< *ferrum* “iron” and τρίβω “wear out”; *Mos.* 356); *flagritriba* “who wears out whips” (< *flagrum* “whip” and τρίβω; *Ps.* 137); *inanilogista* “idle talker” (< *inanis* “inane” and λογιστής “talker”; *Ps.* 256); *ineuscheme* “unbecomingly” (< *in-* “not” and εὔσχημος “seemly”; *Trin.* 625); *pultifagus* “porridge-eating” (< *puls* “porridge” and φαγεῖν “eat”; *Mos.* 828); *Scytholatronia* “land of Scythian pirates” (*Mil.* 43); *ulmitriba* “who wears out elm switches” (< *ulmus* “elm” and τρίβω; *Pers.* 278b).

Outside of Plautus, we find *depugis* “without buttocks” (< *de-* “without” and πυγή “buttocks”; *Hor. S.* 1.2.93); *perpalaestricos* “thoroughly in the manner of a wrestling school” (< *per-* “thoroughly” and παλαιστρικῶς “in the manner of a wrestling school”; *Afran. com.* 154); *Scythalosagittipelliger* “club-arrow-and-skin-bearer” (< σκυτάλη “club”, *sagitta* “arrow”, *pellis* “skin”, and *gerere* “carry”; *adesp. pall. fr.* 74); *bilychnis* “with two lights” (< *bis* “twice” and λύχνος “lantern”; *Petron.* 30.3); as well as the uncertain *salaputtium* (*Cat.* 53.5)³⁷³ and *praeputtium* “foreskin” (< *prae-* “before” and πόσθιον “penis”; *Sen. Apoc.* 8.3); and *biurus* “two-tailed?” (perhaps < *bis* “twice” and οὐρά “tail”; *Cic. ap. Plin. Nat.* 30.146).³⁷⁴ And in

to a carriage (< ἐπί “upon” and *raeda* “four-wheel carriage”; *Juv.* 8.66), which he notes no Greek or Gaul uses but which Romans have made their own.

³⁷³ The precise meaning and etymology of the word is unclear. Adams 1990. 65 rejects the suggestion of Bickel 1953. 94-5 that the word is a compound of *salax* “lascivious” and πόσθιον “penis”, although presumably the suggestion is much older since Riese 1884 *ad loc.* had already declared that “the first half of the word, which has nothing to do with *salax*, is still unclear (trans.)”. At any rate, as Liberman 2008. 148 (with further discussion of the word) notes, the suggestion is at least plausible.

³⁷⁴ *Cicero tradit animalia biuros uocari, qui uites in Campania erodent* (“Cicero reports that there are animals called *biuri*, who gnaw on vines in Campania”). Noteworthy is that the animals inhabit Campania in Magna Graecia and that Cicero is only said to have said the word,

inscriptions, we find *larophorum*, a stand for images of the Lares (< *Lares* “household deities” and -φορος “holding”; *CIL* 3.1952, a 1st-century CE dedicatory inscription from Dalmatia); *lupinopolus* “lupin-seller” (< *lupinum* “lupin” and πωλεῖν “sell”; *CIL* 4.3483.3; 1st-century CE, from Pompeii); and *conphretor* “fellow member of a phratry” (< *con-* “with” and φράτωρ (Ion. φρήτωρ) “member of a phratry”; *A. Epig.* 1913 no. 134.60 = *I. Napoli* I 43 col. iii.16, a late 2nd-century CE dedicatory inscription from Naples, where *optimi viri et conphratores* translates the Greek ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φράτορες (“men noble and members-of-the-phratry”; col. ii.18)).

Notable is the fact that many of these bilingual compounds have a Latin word as their first constituent, and that they accordingly take the form required of first constituents in Latin, namely, a stem ending in *-i*.³⁷⁵ On the other hand, the examples, whose first constituent is a Greek word, take the form proper to Greek compounds, namely with a stem in *-o*.³⁷⁶ Thus, despite the novelty of bilingual compounds, they are nonetheless typically formed well according to the morphological rules of one language or the other. Another interesting detail is that the Greek constituent heads

not to have coined it. Cicero himself otherwise furnishes only two meager examples in his letters: *Pseudocato* “false Cato” (*Att.* 1.14.6) and *Pseudodamasippus* “false Damasippus” (*Fam.* 7.23.3), but these are deliberate Grecisms.

³⁷⁵ *larophorum* is presumably formed according to the same model as the many other Greek compounds imported into Latin ending in *-phorus* (e.g. *cistophorus* “box-bearing”; *machaerophorus* “sword-bearing”) or *-phorum* (e.g. *acratophorum* “vessel for unmixed wine”; *oenophorum* “wine-holder”; *trapezophorum* “table-leg”). *lupinopolus* is likewise presumably formed according to the same model as borrowed compounds in *-pola* (e.g. *pharmacopola* “drug-seller”; *myropola* “ointment-seller”) or *-poles* (*oenopoles* “wine-seller”).

³⁷⁶ Although *Scytholatronia* may be so formed according to the same Greek model as *Scythopolis* = Σκυθόπολις, a city in Palestine (*Plin. Nat.* 5.18.16), there is no obvious model in either Latin or Greek for *Scythalosagittipelliger*.

most of these compounds. This suggests not so much that their respective speakers' dominant language is Greek (their so-called Matrix language), while Latin is their non-dominant language (their so-called Embedded Language), but that Greek is more likely the Matrix Language of their creation.³⁷⁷

de Melo 2011. lxxvi notes that Plautus' use of Greek was often for the sake of servile and frivolous connotations.³⁷⁸ Presumably, this applies to Petronius as well and to other authors who depict characters speaking Greek, although this itself amounts to little more than a claim that authors document in a way the fact that Greek speakers sometimes speak Greek. But the fact that they can use Greek to characterize

³⁷⁷ Cf. Muysken 2004. 150, who cites several English-German compounds (e.g. *Beachhäuser*, "beach houses"; *Countryplatz*, "country place") and notes that "[t]he predominance of German headed compounds reflects the fact that German is the matrix language in this bilingual corpus. Several cases of English headed compounds are based on very specific English compounds".

³⁷⁸ While it has long been noted that most of the Greek in Plautus and Terence comes from the mouths of slaves and other low-status characters such as pimps and parasites (e.g. Tuchhaendler 1876. 70; Leo 1912. 106; Hough 1933, 1947; Shipp 1953. 112), recenter work has attempted to prove that this is not simply because most of the lines and words of all kinds in Plautus are voiced by such characters (e.g. Gilleland 1979. 84–178 on Plautus and Terence; Maltby 1985 on Terence). These recenter studies compare the number of Greek words and phrases of all kinds spoken by different character types against the total number of lines spoken relatively by these character types and find that low-status characters use proportionally more Greek words. However, their statistics seemingly do little more than quantify the old observation that low-status characters use more Greek than high-status characters, without really considering, e.g., whether the use of Greek words does anything more than simply contribute to the characterization of a character as low-status; whether all Greek words contribute equally to this kind of characterization; how the use of Greek words depends, not on the character speaking *per se*, but on the context and content of their speech and the kind of scene in which they speaking. Thus, although it is shown that low-status characters use relatively more Greek, because high-status characters also use Greek, a satisfactory analysis needs, it seems, to go beyond using simple statistical analysis to support claims about socio-economic characterization. This is, however, not to deny outright that the use of Greek words can contribute to the characterization of a character as low-status, but to point out that it is insufficient to account for the use of Greek words.

their characters thus is rooted in the realities of sociolinguistic variation at the time or at least in prejudices about variation at the time. And if we assume that the code-switching present in, for example, Plautus is not totally arbitrary (he is not picking words at random and using their Greek equivalents), then we can probe his use of Greek further, asking under which circumstances and to which effect his characters code switch.

Thus, although most of Plautus' bilingual compounds are in fact spoken by low-status characters (*biclinium* each time by the slave Pseudolus; *ferritribax* and *pultiphagus* each by the slave Tranio; *flagritriba* and *inanilogista* each by the pimp Ballio; *ineuscheme* by the slave Stasimus; *Scytholatronia* by the parasite Artotrogus; and *ulmitriba* by the slave boy Paegnium), since some are not (*dismaritus* is spoken by the *matrona* Myrrhina and *antelogium* is spoken by an anonymous prologue-speaker), it will not suffice to say that the sole point of such forms is to characterize their speakers at low-status.

In the final scene of the *Casina*, Myrrhina, with her *quid agis, dismarite?* ("What's up, you *zwei*-timer?"), snappily greets Cleostrata's husband Lysidamus. They have just succeeded in outwitting him and have caught him without his clothes on trying to philander with Casina, the girl whom his son wants to—and ultimately will—marry but whom he himself wants to marry off to his slave so that he can essentially have her as his second wife. The word literally encapsulates the theme of these double marriages. In addition, the whole final scene, playing for laughs Cleostrata's vituperation of her disgraced husband before their final reconciliation, also trots out several other Greek words: for example, when Cleostrata asks her

husband where his clothes are, Myrrhina retorts that he lost them *dum moechissat Casinam* (“while adulterously having sex with Casina”), before he fecklessly tries to pin the blame on *Bacchae* (“bacchant”). *dismaritus* and the other Greek words here, redound to the humor of the scene, in which Greek is trotted out in part as insults, rather than to their speakers’ status.

antelogium is likewise coined for the sake of a joke. The word, although it could have been so formed simply as a technical term for a prologue or preamble (Plautus never uses, for example, the word *prologus* of his prologues, as does Terence) on the model of other borrowed Greek words such as *prologium* “prologue” (*Pac. trag.* 383) and *elogium* “maxim; epitaph” (e.g. *Plaut. Mer.* 409), is better regarded as self-consciously facetious nonce formation coined in service of a metatheatrical joke. Although the prologue-speaker promises at 5–6 to summarize the plot of the play *in paucissima verba* (“in very few words”), he quickly veers off into metatheatrics, saying (8–12, with 72–6 transposed by de Melo 2011):

omnis res gestas esse Athenis autumant,
quo illud uobis graecum uideatur magis;
ego nusquam dicam nisi ubi factum dicitur. 10
haec urbs Epidamnus est dum haec agitur fabula: 72
quando alia agetur aliud fiet oppidum;
sicut familiae quoque solent mutarier:
modo hic habitat leno, modo adulescens, modo senex,
pauper, mendicus, rex, parasitus, hariolus. 76
atque adeo hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen 11

*non atticissat, uerum sicilicissitat.*³⁷⁹

He corrects course at 13–5:

huic argumento antelogium hoc fuit interim.

nunc argumentum uobis demensum dabo,

*non modio nec trimodio, uerum ipso horreo*³⁸⁰

It bears pointing out here that one of the senses attested in Latin for the Greek word *logos* is “joke, rubbish”.³⁸¹ Thus, Plautus’ *antelogium* describes not just material spoken prior to the plot summary but jokes delivered prior to the plot summary; it is not just a preamble but an *amuse-oreille*. In delivering jokes in a prologue, Plautus is seemingly doing something novel: the sole surviving prologue from a Greek new comedy (Menander’s *Dyscolus*) is rather staid and straightforward in relating the plot of the comedy, while those of Terence dwell on defending his work from criticism. Plautus thus perhaps coins a hybrid term to call attention to his hybrid prologue. As we saw in Chapter 4, this is not the only time that Plautus coins an elaborate and facetious metatheatrical term to refer to a novel aspect of his comedy.

³⁷⁹ “Poets claim that everything took place at Athens, so that it seems more Greek to you. I’ll say what happened nowhere except where it’s said to have happened. This city is Epidamnus while this play is being staged. When another’s staged, it’ll become another town, just as households also always change. At one time a pimp lives here, at another a young man, at yet another an old one, a pauper, a beggar, a king, a parasite, a soothsayer. And besides, this plot summary has a Greek air; nevertheless, it doesn’t have an Attic air, but a Sicilian one.”

³⁸⁰ “This was meanwhile the preamble to the plot summary. Now I’ll give you the plot summary rationed-out, not by the peck or the triple-peck, but by the granary itself”

³⁸¹ *OLD s. v.*

More commonly, however, bilingual compounds attested in Plautus are like his monolingual coinages in that most of them are insults.³⁸² Lucilius too, among whose extant work we unfortunately find no bilingual compounds to compare, nonetheless puts creative, entirely Latin, *ad-hoc* compounds to work in service of his diatribe: for example, *cibicida* “food-killer” (718); *vinibua* “wine-bibber” (302).³⁸³

A brief recap: bilingual compounds and derivatives in Latin literature are all but exclusively found 1) in post-classical technical authors, where such forms fill a gap in the technical lexicon; and 2) in comedic authors of all eras, where such forms are on the one hand “real” in that they are formed and used in ways in which such forms are used in modern languages, but on the other hand they are literary creations used to suggest the low status of their speakers and to call attention to jokes and insults: despite the elements of linguistic verisimilitude in the speech of Plautus’ characters, his aim is not that of a field researcher faithfully recording the speech of speakers, but that of playwright who intends to entertain.³⁸⁴ In both classes of authors, the use of bilingual forms is symptomatic of the “low” status of the genres.

³⁸² E.g. from one scene alone in his *Pseudolus* come *bustirapus* “tomb robber” (361), *sociofraudus* “cheater” (362), *legerupa* “law-breaker” (364), *furcifer* “yoke-bearer” (361).

³⁸³ Cf. Plaut. *Cur.* 77 *multibiba atque merobiba* “(an old woman) who drinks much and unmixed wine”

³⁸⁴ Hough 1934, in an article on Plautus’ use of Greek words, discounts the simplistic idea that there is Greek in the plays of Plautus simply for the sake of metrical necessity or because the Greek nature of the plays demands the inclusion of Greek, for as has already been mentioned the plays are of an Attic nature yet do not contain Attic Greek; nor is Plautus so poor a poet that he can only make the meter work by tossing in the occasional Greek word. Thus, Hough argues, that Greek in Plautus is due to necessity (for denoting Greek *Realien*) and for the sake of jokes (347).

5.2 BILINGUAL BLENDS

This at last brings us to bilingual blends. Low-status characters in low genres, as we will see, speak all of these blends, and so in that respect their use is appropriate and contributes to their characterization. Like other bilingual forms, bilingual blends are chiefly instantiations of humor rooted in onomastics, foul-mouthedness, metatheatrics, or some combination thereof. However, unlike the bilingual compounds and derivatives discussed above, which have parallels in terms of formation and use in modern spoken languages, the bilingual blends of Latin literature seem a unique phenomenon, one for which I have found no exact parallel in modern languages, but this is not to say categorically that such forms do not exist. Although bilingual blends are attested in the literature on bilingualism in modern languages, they are of a different kind than the few we find in Latin. In modern languages, bilingual blends are typically the results of speech errors by bilingual speakers, often children, who conflate a word in one language and its synonym in another. Thus, for example, a French-English bilingual is recorded as producing *pinichon*, a blend of *pickle* and *cornichon* (Grosjean 1982. 184); a Dutch-English bilingual is recorded as producing *elchother*, a blend of Dutch *elkaar* and English *each other* (Poullisse 2000. 143); and a Swedish-English bilingual is recorded as producing *clothers*, a blend of *clothes* and *kläder* (Ringbom 1987. 153).

Thus, with bilingual blends Latin authors move away from echoing sociolinguistic reality to what seems to be a purely literary phenomenon. They are linguistic opportunism at its best, and what makes such bilingual blends as we find in

Latin literature possible, in part at least, is the uniquely profound influence of the Greek language on Latin literary culture. Thus, they are emblematic of Latin literature's inheritance, adoption, adaptation, etc. of Greek literature and of Latin authors' willingness to resort to whatever linguistic tool.

The bilingual blends discussed here (just as the other bilingual forms discussed above) are all forms which blend together Latin and Greek words, but it is possible that blends of Latin and other languages (e.g. of the Oscan–Sabellic group) exist(ed). In Greek, however, I have noted no such bilingual forms; nor have I expected to find any: Greek literature, for the most part belying the polyglot world which the Greeks inhabited, manifests a general indifference to languages other than Greek.

5.2.1 MANTISCINARI

Plaut. *Capt.* 891–7

Heg. *di immortales, iterum gnatus videor, si vera autumas.*

Erg. *ain tu? dubium habebis etiam, sancte quom ego iurem tibi?*

postremo, Hegio, si parva iuri iurandost fides,

vise ad portum.

Heg. *facere certumst. tu intus cura quod opus est.*

sume, posce, prome quid vis. te facio cellarium.

Erg. *nam hercle, nisi **mantiscinatus** probe ero, fusti pectito.*

Heg. *aeternum tibi dapinabo victum, si vera autumas.*

mantiscinatus] *manticinatus* Merula : *manticulatus* Angelius :
panticinatus Guyet

{Heg.} Immortal gods, I seem born reborn, if you're speaking the truth. {Erg.}.
Do you say so? You'll still doubt it when I'd solemnly swear to you? Well then,
Hegio, if you have little faith in my oath, go and look in the harbor. {Heg.} I'll
certainly do so. You take care of what's necessary inside. Take, demand, have
whatever you want. I'm making you my butler. {Erg.} By god, unless I'm a
proper **saucerer**, beat me with a club. {Heg.} I'll serve you food forever, if
you're telling the truth.

Don. Ter. *Eu.* 258

*(quibus et re salva et perdita profueram et prosum saepe) quibus et re salva: cum
de meo impenderem; et perdita: cum de alieno mantiscinor atque impendo*

mantiscinor B (*cor. in ras. m. 2*) : *mantissinor* T

(men who had been served by me in good times and in bad and often still are)
quibus et re salva: when I relied on my own affairs; *et perdita*: when I
mantiscinor and depend on another's affairs

5.2.1.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

In his *editio princeps* of 1472, Merula printed *manticinatus* for the paradosis *mantiscinatus* presumably on the ground that *mantiscinatus* is seemingly not a well-formed compound or derivative (see “Formation” below).³⁸⁵ But the manuscripts of Plautus are unanimous, and the existence of the word seems confirmed by its use in Donatus, who has presumably picked the word up from Plautus.

In Donatus, the paradosis of T (on which the correction of a second hand in B is presumably based) probably ought to be regarded as a simple error.³⁸⁶ This seems easier than if one manuscript of Donatus alone has preserved the correct reading and that the other, as well as all the manuscripts of Plautus, have handed down a corrupt form.

Angelius 1514’s *manticulatus* (from *manticolor* “act cunningly”) and Guyet 1658’s *panticinatus* (from *pantex* “innards”) are farther from the paradosis, while doing little to improve the sense of the line, and should thus not be taken seriously.

5.2.1.2 FORMATION

mantiscinari, of which Plautus’ *mantiscinatus* is a participle, blends together Greek μάντις “prophet, seer” and Latin *vaticinari* “prophesy, foretell; sing as poet; rave”. The word is not a derivative nor is it likely as a compound. Verbs in *-cinari* are typically

³⁸⁵ Cf. Ussing 1878 *ad loc.*: “even if the formation of the verb is credible, which it is not, it is nevertheless averse to the sense of the passage (trans.)”.

³⁸⁶ For confusion between *-isc-* and *-iss-*, e.g. Tib. 1.5.1 *discidium*] *dissidium* A.

denominatives formed from nouns in *-cinium*;³⁸⁷ however, we would expect the putative compound of μάντις and *-cinium* to have been **manticinium*, since—as discussed in Chapter 2—Greek and Latin compounding is *stem* compounding, and the stem of μάντις is *manti-*. Compare the Greek compounds μαντιπολέω “prophecy” and μαντιπόλος “inspired”, as well as Latin *gallicinium* “cock’s crow” (< *gallus* “rooster”) and *vaticinium* “prophecy” (< *vates* “prophet”).

There are, however, a handful of nouns in Latin ending in *-cinium* which appear to have been formed by compounding the nominative form of the first constituent rather its stem:

- 1) *ratiōcinium* “a reckoning” < *ratiō* “reckoning”
- 2) **sermōcinium* “a talking” < *sermō* “conversation”
- 3) *lātrōcinium* “robbery” < *lātrō* “bandit”
- 4) *lenōcinium* “brothel keeping” < *lēnō* “pimp”
- 5) *tirōcinium* “military inexperience” < *tirō* “new recruit”

According to Fay 1904. 461–3, these nouns—or, more properly, the verbs derived therefrom—provide a direct model for *mantiscinari*, a form in which allegedly the nominative μάντις has been compounded with *-cinari*.

This is, however, unlikely. Despite the superficial appearance these five nouns, they have not in fact been formed from nominatives. The nouns behind these

³⁸⁷ Cf. *patrocinari* “be a patron” < *patrocinium* “patronage”; *ratiocinari* “reckon” < *ratiōcinium* “reckoning”; *sermocinari* “converse” < **sermocinium* “conversation”; *latrocinari* “plunder” < *latrocinium* “robbery”; and *lenocinari* “flatter” < *lenocinium* “brothel keeping”. The etymology of *alucinari* “wander in thought” is uncertain; perhaps from Greek ἀλύω “wander”.

compounds—namely *ratio*, *sermō*, *latrō*, *lenō*, and *tirō*—are all *n*-stem nouns, which in Latin were of several types:³⁸⁸

- a) cognomina in *-ō* derived from thematic adjectives, such as *Catō*, *Catōnis* < *catus* “sharp”
- b) names for disreputable characters in *-ō* derived from nouns, such as *latrō*, *latrōnis*, “mercenary, bandit” < *λάτρον* “payment”
- c) feminine abstract nouns in *-iō* and *-tiō*, such as *dupliō* “doubling” < *duplus* “double” and *ratio* “reckoning” < the root of *reor* “reckon”
- d) masculine abstract nouns in *-mō*, *-mōnis* such as *sermō*, *sermōnis*, “conversation” < *serō* “link together”
- e) and the word *homō*, *hominis* “man(kind)”

In many cases, Latin has leveled the declension of such nouns, generalizing the *-ō* of the nominative throughout the paradigm, although there is sometimes evidence in diminutives of the original *-ōn-*, which would have weakened in open medial syllables to *-in-*³⁸⁹ but to *-un-* in closed medial syllables: for example, *lenunculus* “young go-between” (e.g. Plaut. *Poen.* 1286) < **lenōnculus* < *lenō*; *curculiunculus* “little weevil” (Plaut. *Rud.* 1325) < **curculiōnculus* < *curculiō* “weevil”.

From these five *n*-stem nouns, we would at any rate have expected such forms as **ratioincinium*, **sermōincinium*, **latrōincinium*, **lenōincinium*, and **tirōincinium*. However, often in compounds, the first constituent, when it was a noun of the third

³⁸⁸ For a comprehensive overview of *n*-stem nouns in Latin see Leumann 1977. 358–64; Sihler 1995. 295–6; Weiss 2010. 309–14.

³⁸⁹ As in e.g. *homō*, *hominis*.

declension (particularly an *n*- or *s*-stem noun) was shortened: for example, *foedifragus* “oath-breaking” < *foedus* (gen. *foederis*) rather than **foederifragus*; and *homicida* “man-slayer” < *homō* (gen. *hominis*) rather than **homicida*.³⁹⁰ Thus, these forms are best regarded as compounds whose first constituent has been shortened in this way, but which have nevertheless retained the long *-ō-* generalized throughout their paradigms rather than as anomalous compounds formed from a nominative. Such forms are, therefore, not models for *mantiscinari*. *mantiscinari* is thus better regarded as a blend of μάντις and *vaticinari*, which provides a convenient point of phonetic overlap between *manti-* and *vati-*.

5.2.1.3 INTERPRETATION

Lewis–Short aver without explanation that *mantiscinari* is a “a false read(ing)” for *manticinari*, which they follow countless others in taking to be from μάντις and *canere* “sing” (s. v. *mantiscinor*) and to be “comically formed, in imitation of *vaticinor*” (s. v. *manticinor*). Implied in their comment is the notion that the word is a conventionally formed compound. Others, however, are less certain about the word’s formation. For example, Ritschl 1887, although he prints *mantiscinatus*, expresses some doubt, saying, “I was unwilling to obscure *mantiscinatus* since it might be antiquated or foreign rather than corrupt (trans.)” (131).³⁹¹ And Ernout–Meillet s. v. *mantiscinor* say

³⁹⁰ On the anomalous form of this compound, see n. 28 above.

³⁹¹ He also adds tentatively, “or derived from *tesco-* on the model of verbs in *-ino-r*, so that *manu tesca sibi facere* (‘to make waste with his own hand’) might mean ‘to wreak havoc’ (trans.)”, but this is a rather fanciful suggestion.

only that the word is a “hybride plaisamment tiré de gr. μάντις, par Plaute, Cap. 896, sur le modèle de vāticinor” and compare the passage of Donatus quoted above, while the *TLL s. v. mantiscinor* says that the word is “comically formed from μάντις on the model of *vaticinor* by Plautus, who alludes to *mantissa* (trans.)”.

Plasberg 1899 (tentatively followed by de Melo 2011. 599 n. 41), taking the the -s- of the *mantiscinari* seriously, was the first to suggest that it derives rather from *mantissa*,³⁹² which he argues means “sauce”, and that it thus means *für die Saucen sorgen* (“take care of the sauces”). To clarify what “take care of the sauces” might mean, he compares the French proverb *donner ordre aux sauces* (“give order to the sauces”), which evidently means *aller dans la cuisine prendre soin que tout soit bien apprêté* (“go into the kitchen to take care that everything is well prepared”). The idea is that after Hegio makes Ergasilus his *cellarius*, Ergasilus invites a beating unless he should tend the larder as well as possible. But this, it seems to me, renders Hegio’s next line somewhat nonsensical: why should Hegio reward Ergasilus for telling the truth about tending the larder well, when he is in fact rewarding him for telling the truth about the return of his son by giving him free access to his larder?

Plasberg argued in addition that his understanding of the word is supported by the fact that Ergasilus cares about food before all else, that there is no discussion of prophecy otherwise in the passage, and that Donatus did not seem to understand

³⁹² Attested only at Fest. p. 132.11 M. *mantisa additamentum dicitur lingua Tusca, quod ponderi adicitur, sed deterius et quod sine ullo usu est. Lucilius (1208): mantisa obsonia vincit* (“mantisa is what an addition is called in Etruscan, but it is something worse and without any use. Lucilius (1208): mantisa overcomes the delicacies”); and Petron. 65.10 *cum vicensimariis magnam mantissam habet* (“he has a great *mantissam* with the tax collectors).

the word as having anything to do with prophecy. However, while it is true that Donatus seems to use the word in the sense “get food” or the like, there is no reason to assume that he, writing in the mid-4th century CE, some 400 to 500 years after the death of Plautus, had correctly understood this Plautine *hapax*. And while there may be little to do properly with prophesying in the passage, Hegio’s response to Ergasilus (*si vera autumas*) does suggest a connection with prophecy in the loose sense of “telling the truth”, as Fay 1904. 461 argued. Moreover, elsewhere in Plautus, the verb *autumare* is used of speaking *vera* (*Capt.* 891; *Epid.* 644) or *falsum* (*Capt.* 955), and of prophetic activity at *Pac. trag.* 308 *flexa non falsa autumare dictio Delfis solet* (“the oracular response at Delphi usually speaks obliquely, not falsely”); and verbs meaning “prophecy” and the like in Latin are often used loosely or facetiously in the sense “speak nonsense”.³⁹³ This is, however, not to deny outright that *mantiscinari* does not at least allude to *mantissa*, as the *TLL* suggests, since *mantiscinari* works even better as a blend if it evokes both *μάντις* and *mantissa*, but to say that Plasberg goes too far in denying that the word has anything to do with *μάντις*.

That verbs meaning “prophecy” should be used colloquially in this sense is understandable given the frequent depiction of seers as venal charlatans looking to trade “cosmic secrets” for meals or money.³⁹⁴ This stereotype about seers as prophesying whatever nonsense by whatever dubious means will bring them profit partially informs the creation and use of the blend *mantiscinari* here, as will be discussed more below. The immediate takeaway, however, is that there would be

³⁹³ Cf. *OLD* s. vv. *auguror*; *hariolor*; *vaticinor*.

³⁹⁴ E.g. Plaut. *Cur.* 481–4; *Mil.* 692–4; Cic. *Div.* 1.132 = Enn. fr. 117b.

nothing especially odd in Latin about saying, for example, “Unless I’ve correctly prophesied” outside of the context of actual prophesying. At any rate, while there may be little in the way of actual prophesying in the passage of Plautus quoted above or in the scene whence it comes, there is however a good deal of religious language in the scene into which *mantiscinari* fits.

According to Cicero (*Div.* 1.95), what the Romans called a *sacerdos*, the Greeks called a μάντις, both of which typically mean “priest” or the like in their respective languages. Likewise, according to Cicero (*Leg.* 2.32.1; *ND* 1.55), what the Romans called *divinatio*, the Greeks called μαντική, both of which typically mean “divination” or the like in their respective languages. In the Roman world, a *sacerdos* was often responsible for, or connected in some way with, divination,³⁹⁵ and occasionally the noun *vaticinium* or the verb *vaticinari* was used in connection with sacerdotal divination.³⁹⁶ Despite the chronological spread of these examples, it is possible to take from them the suggestion that in the mind of an ancient Greek–Latin bilingual speaker the Greek word μάντις and its derivatives and the Latin word *vates* and its derivatives might have occupied the same semantic field and therefore have been liable to the kinds of speech errors made by bilingual speakers conflating a word in one language and its synonym in another discussed above.

Thus, on the one hand, it is perhaps possible to regard the blend *mantiscinari* as such an error, Ergasilus wanting to say, “prophesied”, but starting with Greek and

³⁹⁵ Cf. Cic. *Part. 6 divinum* [*sc. testamentum*], *ut oracula, ut auspicia, ut vaticinationes, ut responsa sacerdotum, haruspicum, coniectorum* (“divine [*sc.* evidence] like oracles, auspices, prophecies, and the responses of priests, haruspices, and conjecters”).

³⁹⁶ Eg. Tib. 1.6.43–4; Plin. Nat. 28.147; Gel. 15.8 pr. 2; Serv. *G.* 4.399

slipping partway through into Latin. There is precedent for this kind of slippage on his part in his series of oaths at 881–4: μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω ... / ... ναὶ τὰν Κόραν ... / ... ναὶ τὰν Πραινέστην ... ναὶ τὰν Σιγνέαν ... / ... ναὶ τὰν Φρουσινῶνα ... ναὶ τὸν Ἀλάτριον (“Yes, by Apollo ... Yes, by Cora ... Yes, by Praenesta ... Yes, by Signea ... Yes, by Frusino ... Yes, by Alatrium”), where he bilingually equivocates on the meaning of *Cora*—both the goddess Proserpina and a town in Italy—and goes from swearing by gods to swearing by cities. But this, of course, is all a deliberate joke to which Plautus calls attention (884–5): {Heg.} *quid tu per barbaricas urbis iuras?* {Erg.} *quia enim item asperae / sunt ut tuom uictum autumabas esse* ({Heg.} “Why are you swearing by foreign cities? {Erg.} Because they’re as rough as you said your food is”). Ergasilus’ *mantisincari* is presumably also a deliberate joke, but what precisely is the joke?

The action of Plautus’ *Captivi* centers on a youth named Philocrates and his slave Tyndarus, both natives of Elis who have been captured in a war with Aetolia. Both are bought as slaves by Hegio, a wealthy Aetolian hoping to trade them for Philopolemus, his own son who had been captured at Elis. Philocrates (pretending to be Tyndarus) is sent to make the trade, while Tyndarus (pretending to be Philocrates) remains. Meanwhile, however, an old friend of Philocrates is also captured and ends up exposing Tyndarus’ efforts to conceal his identity from Hegio. When Hegio learns that he has been tricked, he sends Tyndarus to the quarries. Philocrates eventually returns with Philopolemus and Stalagmus, a former slave of Hegio who had previously stolen another son of Hegio. Stalagmus confesses, explaining that he had sold Hegio’s son to Philocrates’ family. Eventually everybody discovers that Tyndarus is that stolen son, which causes Hegio to regret treating him so poorly when he was

his captive. Hegio and his two sons, Philopolemus and Tyndarus, are reunited, and the plays ends happily.

Largely irrelevant to the action of the comedy is the parasite Ergasilus, who exists solely to provide comic relief. Moore 1998. 192 notes that “the antics of the parasite Ergasilus provide a welcome relief from the disconcerting actions of the main plot. He embodies the spirit of escapist comedy”. As parasites are wont to do, he spends his time trying to find free meals, even offering to sell himself to Hegio in exchange for dinner (179–81); and when he learns that Hegio's son Philopolemus has returned to Aetolia, he trades this knowledge for a meal from Hegio. Ergasilus, who had departed to the harbor (497) in search of opportunities for dinner, returns (768), with his tune changed. Whereas in previous scenes, he had spent much of his time on stage lamenting his pitiful lot in life, he marks his return with an exuberant and highly rhetorical speech, which he begins thus (768–72):

*Iuppiter supreme, servas me measque auges opes,
maxumas opimitates opiparasque offers mihi,
laudem lucrum, ludum iocum, festivitatem ferias,
pompam penum, potationes saturitatem, gaudium*³⁹⁷

He even has a brief metatheatrical moment when he declares that he will throw his cloak (*pallium*) about his neck “in the same way that slaves in comedies do” (*eodem pacto ut comici servi solent*; 788–9). Here he is doing, as Moore 1998. 192 notes, the

³⁹⁷ “O highest Jupiter, you save me, augment my resources, offer me maximum, outstanding opulence praise, profit, play, pleasantries, festivities, festivals a parade, provisions, potables a plenty, joy”

“running slave” bit. In addition to calling attention to what he does on stage on that moment, Ergasilius’ comment here, Moore argues, “has a special significance, for it continues in a humorous vein the confusion over what makes a comic slave. It is as if Ergasilius is saying, ‘No one is doing the slave parts right, so I will have to’” (192). Ergasilius concludes his entrance monologue by saying that he is throwing on a *pallium* so that Hegio will hear the news of his sons return from him first and hoping that he will get food forever for the news (*ob hunc nuntium aeternum ... cibum*; 780), at which point Hegio comes on stage (781) and wonders what Ergasilius is up to wearing a *pallium* (789).

The metatheatrics carry on as Hegio overhears Ergasilius announcing—in playful lines full of alliteration and the like—that he will beat up anyone who stands in the way of his delivering the news first. Ergasilius’ hypothetical victims are bakers (807–10), fishmongers (813–7), and butchers (818–22): such is his obsession with food that he can think of no professionals other than those in the food-service industry. As he threatens them, Hegio comments that Ergasilius “has royal and imperious proclamations. The man is full; yes, he has confidence in his stomach” (*basilicas edictiones atque imperiosas habet. / satur homo est; habet profecto in uentre confidentiam*; 811–2) and “has an aedile’s edicts, and it would be a surprise indeed if the Aetolians haven’t made him their market inspector” (*edictiones aedilicias ... habet, / mirumque adeo est ni hunc fecere sibi Aetoli agoranomum*; 823–4). As Ergasilius finally arrives at Hegio’s house, whither he has evidently been heading since his return to the stage, he declares, “I am no longer a parasite but a rather royal king of kings, if the great supply of food in the harbor is for my stomach” (*non ego nunc*

parasitus sum sed regum rex regalior, / tantus uentri commeatus meo adest in portu cibus; 825–6). Hegio’s comments and Ergasilus’ final boasts raise the question: is a well-fed parasite still a parasite?

The playfulness and exuberance of Ergasilus’ language continues as he strings Hegio along with the promise of good news until he finally manages to secure the promise of a free meal. Ergasilus, before he delivers the news of Hegio’s son’s return, preemptively tells him to have a fire readied (840), cookware washed (846), a pig, lamb, chickens, seafood, and cheese brought (849–51), but Hegio shoots this down: this is all too much for a messenger and his news. Thus, switching tacks, Ergasilus tells Hegio to “order your clean vessels to be prepared quickly for sacrifice and a suitable fat lamb to be brought here” (*iube / vasa tibi pura apparari ad rem divinam cito / atque agnum afferi proprium pinguem*; 860–2) so that Hegio can sacrifice to none other than Ergasilus, who declares, “I’m highest Jupiter, Salvation, Luck, Light, Happiness, Joy” (*sum summus Iuppiter, / idem ego sum Salus, Fortuna, Lux, Laetitia, Gaudium*; 863–4), before eventually swearing that he has seen his son in the harbor. At this, Hegio promises in the passage quoted above (891–7) to give Ergasilus the food forever that he had set out to get (780). *matiscinari* is therefore a part of the exuberant literary language of a low-status character obsessed with food finally about to cash in on his good fortune, the unusual formation capping off more than a hundred lines of buffoonery in which the parasite Ergasilus metatheatrically plays the role of a *servus currens*, delivering news for which he hoped to be rewarded, and, when that

gambit fails, the role of a seer for whom prophecy is merely a commodity and sacrifice merely a barbeque.³⁹⁸

One last thing question to be considered is why Plautus resorts to a bilingual blend, since the metatheatrics and the stereotypes about prophets as parasites and sacrifice as lunch could all have come across just as well, it seems, in Latin. That is, since μάντις seemingly fulfills no denotational need here, what comic need does it fulfill? The word μάντις—already in Homer and thereafter attested abundantly in all genres—typically means “seer” or the like, and it seems generally a positive—or at least neutral—term. Yet that a μάντις, just like his Roman equivalents, could be a professional who traded “prophecies” for payment is hinted at here and there,³⁹⁹ as

³⁹⁸ Cf. Pers. 6.74 *illi tremat omento popa venter* (“his priest belly jiggles with fat”); Plaut. *Rud.* 341–7, where the slave Trachalio asks the captive girl Ampelisca, who is of course not preparing a meal, when lunch will be ready:

{Tr.} *non venit?* {Amp.} *vera praedicas.* {Tr.} *non est meum, Ampelisca.*
sed quam mox coctum est prandium? {Amp.} *quod prandium, obsecro te?*
{Tr.} *nempe rem divinam facitis hic.* {Amp.} *quid somnias, amabo?*
{Tr.} *certe huc Labrax ad prandium vocavit Plesidippum*
erum meum erus vester. {Amp.} *Pol haud miranda facta dicis:* 345
si deos decepit et homines, lenonum more fecit.
{Tr.} *non rem divinam facitis hic vos neque erus?* {Amp.} *hariolare.*

{Tr.} Hasn't he come? {Amp.} You foretell the truth. {Tr.} That's not my habit, Ampelisca, but how long till lunch's cooked? {Amp.} What lunch? {Tr.} Presumably you're sacrificing here. {Amp.} What're you dreaming about? {Tr.} Certainly your master Labrax called my master Plesidippus here to lunch. {Amp.} By god, you aren't saying anything strange: He's acting in the manner of a pimp, if he deceived gods and men. {Tr.} Are neither you nor my master sacrificing here? {Amp.} No duh.

Noteworthy here is that, as far as Trachalio is concerned, *res divina* (“sacrifice”) and *prandium* (“lunch”) are one and the same. This comparandum sheds additional light on Ergasilus' motives, when he tells Hegio to order vessels to be prepared *ad rem divinam* (*Capt.* 861).

³⁹⁹ Cf. D.T. fr. 51 Linke (πέλανος) καὶ ὁ τῷ μάντει διδόμενος μισθὸς ὀβολός (“(*pelanos*) it is also the obol given as payment to a *mantis*”); Luc. *JTr.* 30 φῆς γὰρ καὶ μάντις εἶναι καὶ μισθοῦς

is the idea that a μάντις could be downright deceitful.⁴⁰⁰ At any rate, at *Il.* 1.62–3 (the first attestation of the word) Achilles, after calling the Greeks together on the ninth day of the plague, suggests that the Greeks ask *τινα μάντιν ... ἢ ἱερῆα / ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον* (“some seer or priest or even an interpreter of dreams”) how they should appease Apollo and thereby end the plague. Although this suggests that a μάντις, a ἱερεύς, and an ὄνειροπόλος were in fact three different religious functionaries, they were at least from Achilles’ perspective here functionally synonymous: they all had by means of their unique skillsets access to the same otherwise unknown information. μάντις and ἱερεύς are also used side-by-side elsewhere in Greek as apparently rough equivalents.⁴⁰¹

The upshot of this is that in Greece and Rome priests prophesied from the entrails of sacrificial victims, which were thereafter readied for a feast. That a feast habitually followed priestly activity in Greece lent the verb ἱερεύω, ordinarily “sacrifice”, the meaning “slaughter for a feast”.⁴⁰² Accordingly, if μάντις and ἱερεύς are roughly synonymous, then so too should μαντεύω “perform the actions of a *mantis*” and ἱερεύω “perform the actions of a *hiereus*” be roughly synonymous. This means therefore that a μάντις not only delivered the news from the gods, but also prepared a feast for human consumption, and this is exactly what Ergasilus does in the passage

οὐκ ὀλίγους ἐπὶ τῷ τοιούτῳ ἐξέλεξας (“you say that you’re a *mantis* and have collected large fees for such work”).

⁴⁰⁰ *Erich. fr.* 9.1–3 ὥσπεραὶ πονηραὶ μάντιες, / αἳ θ’ ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς ἄμ πεντόγκιον / ἀργύριον (“Just like wicked *manteis*, who cheat stupid women for five coins at a time”).

⁴⁰¹ Cf. *Pl. Plt.* 290d; *Leg.* 828b; 885d; *Hsch.* τ 1105; υ 788; *EM* p. 468.15. Recall also Cicero’s translation of μάντις mentioned above.

⁴⁰² Cf. *LSJ s. v.* 2

from Plautus with which we began: he delivers to Hegio news otherwise unknown and in so doing prepares for himself a monumental feast. Thus, Ergasilus turns himself into a kind of ἐγγαστρίμαντις “one who prophesies from the stomach”.⁴⁰³

Another possible motivation for the use of μάντις in the blend is that the word may have been a synonym for “actor”, although the evidence for this depends entirely on Hsch. υ 669 ὑποκριτής· μάντις· καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ ἀποκρινόμενος (“*hypokritês: mantis*. And one who responds on stage”). However, if in Plautus’ time μάντις was an acceptable synonym for ὑποκριτής, then there may be in Ergasilus’ line the suggestion that unless he will have delivered his lines properly, he will be beaten. There are other passages in Plautus that suggest that the actors, many of whom were of servile status, were beaten for poor performances.⁴⁰⁴ At any rate, the joke behind the blend *mantiscinari* is ultimately an elaborately metatheatrical one. The parasite Ergasilus, who had spent his first scene on stage trying unsuccessfully to get a meal as a parasite and part of his second scene on stage trying unsuccessfully to get a meal as a *servus currens*, ultimately succeeds in getting a meal by becoming a gastromancer. The

⁴⁰³ The word is attested only in lexicographic sources: e.g. Ael. Dion. ε 2 ἐγγαστρίμυθος· ὁ ἐν γαστρὶ μαντεύμενος· τοῦτον καὶ ἐγγαστρίμαντιν <καλοῦσιν>, ὃν νῦν τινες Πύθωνά φασιν· ὁ Σοφοκλῆς (fr. 59) δὲ στερνόμαντιν. Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος (*Soph.* 252c) Εὐρυκλέα ἀπὸ Εὐρυκλέους τοιοῦτου μάντεως. Ἀριστοφάνης Σφηξί (1019)· μιμησάμενος τὴν Εὐρυκλέους μαντείαν καὶ διάνοιαν. Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν γ’ Περὶ μαντικῆς (*FGrH* 328 F 78) καὶ γυναικῶν ἐγγαστρίμυθους ἔφη (“*engastrimythos*: one who prophesies in their stomach. They also call this an *engastrimantis*, which some authorities now call *Pythô*. Sophocles (fr. 59) calls it a *sternomantis*. Plato the philosopher (*Soph.* 252c) calls it Eurycles because Eurycles was such a *mantis*. Aristophanes in *Wasps* (1019): after imitating the oracle and advice of Eurycles. Philochorus in his *Concerning Divination* (*FGrH* 328 F 78) said that women were also *engastrimythoi*”); Poll. 2.168; Hsch. ε 123; π 4314.

⁴⁰⁴ Moore 1998. 10-2; Christenson 2000. 141.

blend, which additionally conjures up stereotypes about seers as money-grubbing charlatans and priests as pitmasters, draws attention to this fact.

5.2.2 MERDALEUS

Priap. 68.1–8, 21–2

rusticus indocte si quid dixisse videbor,

da veniam: libros non lego, poma lego.

sed rudis hic dominum totiens audire legentem

cogor Homereas edidicique notas.

ille vocat, quod nos psolem, ψολόεντα κεραυνόν,

5

et quod nos culum, κουλεόν ille vocat.

σμερδαλέον certe si res non munda vocatur,

*et pediconum mentula **merdalea** est.*

...

hic legitur radix, de qua flos aureus exit,

21

quam cum μῶλυ vocat, mentula μῶλυ fuit.

7 σμερδαλέον scripsi : μερδαλέον edd. : σμερδάλεον B : *mendaleon* A :

merdaleon cett. 8 *merdalea*] *mendalea* AHV : *medalea* Y

If I, being from the countryside, seem to have said anything in ignorance, pardon me: I collect apples, not books. But, although uncultured, I've often had

to hear my master reading here and I've learned by heart the Homeric notes. What we call a penis, he calls "sooty lightning", and what we call an ass, he calls a "sheath". Certainly, if an unclean thing's called "frightful", then the dick of a pederast's **shiteful**. ... Here is picked the root from which a golden flower sprouts, which though he calls it *môly*, *môly* means "dick"

5.2.2.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

In 7, I print *σμερδαλέον* with initial *sigma* and accent on the penult, as the adjective is always written in Homer and elsewhere.⁴⁰⁵ Since manuscripts have no authority in the case of accents, this is thus a correction rather than an emendation of the paradosis of B, which on the whole seems the most reliable witness for the Greek and Greek names throughout the poem.⁴⁰⁶ The Greek and Greek names confounded copyists, and the transliterated, *sigma*-less forms of the adjective in other manuscripts most likely represent attempts by copyists who had limited or no familiarity with Greek to "correct" an unknown word in light of *merdalea* in 8. Why modern editors partly follow them by printing *μερδαλέον* in Greek but without the *sigma* that the adjective always has elsewhere is unclear.

⁴⁰⁵ In the apparatus, for example, of West's edition of the *Iliad* or Fränkel's edition of the *Argonautica*, there is nary a *sigma*-less variant to be noted.

⁴⁰⁶ B also preserves the Greek in 5 and 22 (but with *κεράυνον* and *μώλυ* wrongly accented thus), which other manuscripts transliterate and otherwise mutilate, and typically transmits the Greek personal names elsewhere in the poem accurately, as other manuscripts often do not. For a fuller report of manuscript readings, see the editions of Pascal 1918 and Cazzaniga 1959 (who both however print *μερδαλέον* in 7). The edition of Büchler 1904 is inadequate.

In 8, the paradoseis of AHV and Y are best regarded as either crude errors or attempts to “correct” the word under the assumption that it was somehow a derivative of *menda* “blemish”.

5.2.2.2 FORMATION

merdaleus blends Greek σμερδαλέος “terrible, frightful”, a word all but confined to epic poetry,⁴⁰⁷ and Latin *merda* “shit”. The word is not a compound nor is it likely as a derivative, since Latin has neither a base **merdal-* to which the suffix *-eus* could be added nor a suffix **-aleus* which could be added to *merda*; the only other words attested in Latin ending in *-aleus* are either Greek names⁴⁰⁸ or derivatives in *-eo-* from Greek words in *-αλο-*.⁴⁰⁹ On the other hand, the suffix *-αλέος* is modestly productive in Greek⁴¹⁰ and adjectives formed therewith, as Chantraine 1939. 254 notes, “se

⁴⁰⁷ A rare exception is Ar. Av. 553 ὡς σμερδαλέον τὸ πόλισμα (“how terrible the buildings of the town!”).

⁴⁰⁸ E.g. *Aegialeus* = Αἰγιαλεύς (e.g. Pac. trag. 243)

⁴⁰⁹ E.g. *tantaleus* “pertaining to Tantalus (e.g. Prop. 2.17.5; 4.11.24).

⁴¹⁰ Cf. Buck–Petersen 1945. 35: “of the origin of this peculiarly Greek conglutinate it can only be said that it must have arisen in prehistoric times by the addition of *-eo-* to *-αλο-*, but everything else is obscure. Its want of tangible meaning does not show any semantic connection with *-εο-* [*ed.* which typically forms adjectives of material: e.g. χρύσεος “golden” < χρυσός “gold”], and there is in existence no possible early pattern in the case of which *-αλέος* is found beside *-αλος*.”

The suffix was fully developed in Homer, but it spread out more and more in later poets, the total number of words formed by it being about 112. It was totally absent from the Attic vernacular, but to a slight extent made its way into the κοινή through the influence of the Ionic dialect, where it originated. Most examples are found in the dactylic poets, who, of course, were under Homeric influence. In this connection it is important that all words in *-αλέος* have a choriambic rhythm, which shows that on the whole they were created

répartissent un certain nombre de groups sémantiques”, including those with the sense “audacious, terrible, frightening” (e.g. δευμαλέος “frightening”; φορικαλέος “dreadful”) and those denoting possession of a physical need or defect (e.g. δυψαλέος “thirsty”; κυφαλέος “blind”; λιμαλέος “hungry”; πειναλέος “hungry”). It is into the former group that Homeric σμερδαλέος falls, whereas Priapus’ unique coinage seemingly fits into both. Although the rare use of Greek suffixes on Latin bases was mentioned above, it seems certainly wrong in this case to assume that *merdaleus* is thus formed, since the context of the word here, where the Greek source word is in fact quoted, would seem to certify that the author has in mind the Homeric adjective and since as a blend the form and meaning of the word are clear. The phonetic overlap between the two words (*smërda-* and *merda*) is exploited to meld the two source-words into a blended word with a combined meaning that serves as the punch line of a joke: that the penis of one who engages in anal sex manifests a certain frightful defect.

5.2.2.3 INTERPRETATION

Lewis–Short *s. v.* simply state that *merdaleus* is equivalent in meaning to *merdaceus*, “defiled with excrement”, evidently giving no thought to its formation, while Ernout–Meillet *s. v. merda* cite the word as a by-form of a *merdaceus* that is perhaps formed after the model of σμερδαλέος. However, *merdaceus* is only attested once in a

intentionally to meet the exigencies of the dactylic metre.” Although, as Aristophanes’ use of it shows, such forms were also suitable in iambic trimeter.

medieval poem (*Anth.* 902.6) referencing Charles the Bald (9th century CE), for which reason *merdaceus* is irrelevant in a discussion of *merdaleus*. The *TLL s. v.* asserts that *merdaleus* is simply “(σ)μερδαλέος, “falsely connected with *merda* (trans.)”. The *OLD*, however, evidently the only one to realize that the word is in fact a joke, notes that it is formed after σμερδαλέος and is “punningly associated with” *merda*; this is surely the right interpretation.

The *Carmina Priapea* is a collection of eighty Latin epigrams, dated to the early imperial period, that focus on the ithyphallic god Priapus. Priapus himself speaks many of the poems. One such poem is *Priapea* 68. It is, as Conte 2013. 89 remarks, “no more or less than a light-hearted parody of Homer: the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are reinterpreted in a carnivalesque spirit, as a continuous series of events all of which are alike conditioned by low sexual motivation. From the rape of Helen to the wrath of Achilles, from the slyness of Ulysses to the faithfulness of Penelope, it is always Priapus who celebrates his obscene triumph”. After the proem of the poem quoted above, the statue of Priapus goes on to explain how, in his understanding, all the events of the *Iliad* were motivated by the uncontrollable sexual urges of Helen, Agamemnon, and Achilles, while the events of the *Odyssey* were likewise motivated by the fact that no one else in all the world was as good in bed as either Odysseus or Penelope. Priapus thus resolves many of the interpretive cruxes of the Homeric epics. The poem—a pastiche of elevated and coarse language, wherein the Greek patronymic *Atlantiades* “child of Atlantis” (23) exists alongside *fututor* “fucker” (30)—features puns aplenty: for example, after Agamemnon takes Briseis from Achilles, *ille Pelethroniam cecinit miserabile carmen / ad citharam, cithara tensor ipse*

sua (“he sings a sad, Pelethronian song on his lyre, himself being tenser than his lyre”; 15–6), punning on two senses of *tensus*: “taut” and “turgid”. And Penelope tells the excited suitors (*arrectos ... procos*; 32) that *nemo meo melius nervum tendebat Ulix*e (“no one used to handle the bowstring better than my Ulysses”; 33), punning on two senses of *nervum*: “bowstring” and “penis”.

While this Priapic poem cleverly parodies the Homeric epics, it also parodies the philological activities of ancient grammarians and lexicographers, who set for themselves in part the task of cataloguing, glossing, etymologizing, and otherwise explaining Homeric vocabulary, and therefore belongs to the wider category of epigrams against grammarians. Accordingly, each of the four Greek words and phrases explained here by Priapus is also glossed, etymologized, and otherwise explained in ancient grammatical, lexicographic, and/or scholarly sources. The first three Greek words and phrases explained in Priapus’ short philological excursus, however, also happen to bear a chance resemblance to obscene words in Latin, for which reason their selection here for ridicule is also part and parcel of Priapus’ sex-obsessed interpretation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

In addition, the poem can perhaps be read as a microcosm of the Romans’ historic engagement with Greek language, literature, and culture: the first Homeric phrase is glossed with what is in fact a crude Greek word; the second with a crude Latin word; the third with a crude Greco-Latin hybrid. This progression encapsulates how the Romans were in the first instance inheritors of Greek; in the second instance, rivals of Greek; and in the third instance, adapters and synthesizers of Greek. Thus, the blend *merdaleus*—reserved for the end of his excursus to shock and amuse—

stands in for the happy synthesis of the Greek and the Roman: a literal intermixture of the two languages and a figurative intermixture of the two cultures, the grandeur of Greek epic and the coarseness of Roman satire. The poem is, however, also an expression of the Roman ambivalence about Greek language, literature, and culture—all simultaneously something both risible and enviable.

That Priapea 68 and its Homeric parody belong to the category of satiric epigrams against grammarians can be seen in the first place in its discussion of μῶλυ, the fabulous herb that Hermes gives to Odysseus along with the following advice on how to deal with the sorceress Circe (*Od.* 10.293–301):

ὄπποτε κεν Κίρκη σ' ἐλάση περιμήκει ῥάβδῳ,
δὴ τότε σὺ ξίφος ὄξυ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ
Κίρκη ἐπαῖξαι, ὥς τε κτάμεναι μενεαίνων. 295
ἢ δέ σ' ὑποδείσασα κελήσεται εὐνηθῆναι·
ἔνθα σὺ μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ἀπανήνασθαι θεοῦ εὐνήν,
ᾧφρα κέ τοι λύση θ' ἐτάρους αὐτόν τε κομίση·
ἀλλὰ κέλευσθαί μιν μακάρων μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμόσσαι,
μή τί τοι αὐτῷ πῆμα κακὸν βουλευσέμεν ἄλλο, 300
μή σ' ἀπογυμνωθέντα κακὸν καὶ ἀνήνορα θήῃ⁴¹¹

before describing the herb itself (303–6):

⁴¹¹ “Whenever Circe strikes you with her long wand, then indeed, drawing your sharp sword from beside your thigh, rush at Circe, as if you wanted to kill her. She will be afraid and invite you to go to bed: do not refuse the goddess’ bed then so that she will free your comrades and entertain you. But tell her to swear a great oath by the blessed gods, that she will not plot anything else bad against you, so that she will not make you weak and unmanly after she has stripped you”

ρίζη μὲν μέλαν ἔσκε, γάλακτι δὲ εἴκελον ἄνθος·
μῶλυ δέ μιν καλέουσι θεοί· χαλεπὸν δέ τ' ὀρύσσειν
ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι, θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα δύνανται⁴¹²

Authors both ancient and modern have attempted to identify the herb.⁴¹³ Particularly noteworthy among such attempts, however, are two Stoic philosophers' allegorical identification of μῶλυ as "reason" at Apollon. p. 114.23–6 μῶλυ φυτὸν ἀλεξιφάρμακον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ γλωσσογράφοι τὸ ἄκεσμα καὶ οἶον τὸ ἔλकुσμα τῶν φαρμάκων· Κλεάνθης (fr. 526) δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος ἀλληγορικῶς φησὶ δηλοῦσθαι τὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ μωλύονται αἱ ὀρμαὶ καὶ τὰ πάθη ("moly is a pharmaceutical plant. However, some glossographers say that it is a remedy and drawn from drugs, whereas the philosopher Cleanthes (fr. 526) says that it allegorically denotes *logos* ('speech; reason'), which alleviates appetitions and sufferings"); and at Heraclit. *All.* 73.10 τὴν δὲ φρόνησιν οὐκ ἀπιθάνως μῶλυ, μόνους <εἰς> ἀνθρώπους ἢ μόλις εἰς ὀλίγους ἐρχομένην ("Homer plausibly calls wisdom *moly* because it comes to humans alone or because it comes to few with difficulty"), which additionally offers a fanciful etymology of the word. That is, according to Cleanthes and Heraclitus, μῶλυ is shorthand for the well-reasoned forethought that Odysseus, often exalted elsewhere as a kind of Stoic *sapiens*,⁴¹⁴ takes before his encounter with Circe.

Priapus, however, takes μῶλυ to be Odysseus' penis, seizing generally on Odysseus' sexual conduct throughout the *Odyssey* and on the sexual content of

⁴¹² "At the root it was black, but its flower was like milk. *Moly* the gods call it, and it is hard for mortal men to dig; but the gods are capable of everything"

⁴¹³ See Stannard 1962 for a summary of identifications.

⁴¹⁴ Montiglio 2011. 66–94

Hermes' advice to Odysseus regarding Circe—in short, threaten her with your *sword* and sleep with her—and specifically on the description of the magical, salvific plant as black at the base and with a white efflorescence. Such a description readily lends itself to innuendo. Moreover, μέλαν (“black”) is used elsewhere of pubic hair (e.g. Ar. V. 1374), while ἄνθος (“flower”) is used elsewhere in an extended sense of frothy, white discharges, both bodily and otherwise,⁴¹⁵ even if it is not however used elsewhere of semen. μῶλυ is therefore neither a magical herb nor hard-won Stoic reason that alleviates sufferings but a penis, and it is not to hard-won Stoic reason that men turn in their suffering but to sex.

As to Priapus' philological excursus proper, the adjective ψολόεις—attested in Archaic epic and lyric only of Zeus' thunderbolt and picked up later as a term needing explanation by Aristotle,⁴¹⁶ but in Hellenistic epic used of Mount Aetna, smoke, and twice, in an extended sense, of snakes⁴¹⁷—is said to have three senses at Σ Nic. *Th.* 288c ἔστι γὰρ ψολόεν τὸ μέλαν, τὸ σποδοειδές, τὸ λαμπρόν (“It is either *melan* ('black'), *spodoeides* ('ash-colored'), or *lampron* ('bright')”). Since the scholia on Nicander often cite by name the grammarians Theon, Antigonus, and Demetrius Chlorus (all 1st century BCE),⁴¹⁸ it is at least possible that this note also goes back to some 1st-century BCE commentator. At any rate, what this scholion suggests is that there was uncertainty about what precisely the adjective meant. Hence, Apollonius

⁴¹⁵ Cf. LSJ s. v. A.2, where note also Alc. *PMG* 26.3 ἐπὶ κύματος ἄνθος (“upon the flower of the waves”), evidently the first attestation of the word in this sense.

⁴¹⁶ *Mete.* 371^a17–21; *Mu.* 395^a25–8

⁴¹⁷ Respectively, *Euph. fr.* 51.11; 139; *Nic. Th.* 129, 288.

⁴¹⁸ Gow–Scholfield 1953. 16 n. 2

resorted to explaining the word by fancifully etymologizing it at p. 169.21–4
 ψολόεντα κεραυνόν· ἦτοι τὸν τεφρώδη, ψόλος γὰρ ἢ αἰθάλη, ἢ ὡς ἔνιοι, συνθέτως
 πεσολόεντα, τὸν διὰ τοῦ πεσεῖν ὀλοὸν γινόμενον, τουτέστιν ὀλοθρευτικόν, τούτοις
 οἷς ἂν ἐμπέση. ἢ τὸν κατὰ ψαῦσιν ὀλλύντα. ἢ τὸν μελαίνοντα (*psoloenta keraunon*:
 either one that is ash-like, since *psolos* is soot, or according to some authorities as a
 compound *pesoloenta*, something that through falling (*pesein*) becomes deadly
 (*oloon*), which is to say destructive, to those on whom it falls, or something that
 destroys via contact (*psausin ollunta*), or something that blackens”).⁴¹⁹

Although Homeric ψολόεις in fact derives from ψόλος (“soot”),⁴²⁰ Priapus
 imagines that it derives rather from ψωλή (“erection”), whence the Latinized
psolem,⁴²¹ seizing on Zeus’ amorous conduct throughout the Homeric epics rather

⁴¹⁹ Repeated at e.g. Suda κ 1379; ψ 123; *EM* p. 819.6–7; Zonar. ψ p. 1875.2–3.

⁴²⁰ As Apollonius Dyscolus (*Grammatici Graeci* I.1 p. 189.11–2) had already clarified.

⁴²¹ The word is attested elsewhere in Latin at *CIL* 4.1363; 4142, both 1st-century CE graffiti from Pompeii (neither noted by the *TLL*), and cf. Lucil. 304 ψωλοκοπέω “affect with Priapism”. In Greek, it is attested in antiquity in literature (Ar. *Av.* 560; *Lys.* 143, 979; *SH* 975.3) and inscriptions (e.g. *SEG* 3.596, a 5th century BCE graffito from Panticapaeum; *SEG* 49.1385a, an early 3rd-century CE graffito from a Roman latrine); in Byzantine literature (Spanos 165, 207, 230, 499; a 14th-century parodist); and survives as a colloquial word in Modern Greek.

There are also several compounds and derivatives thereof in Greek: Hsch. κ 313 ψωλήκυσθος· οὐδενὸς ἄξιος (*psôlēkysthos*: worth nothing”); π 3097 πόσθων· πόσθην τὸ ἀνδρεῖον αἰσχρὸν λέγουσι. πόσθωνας δὲ παρὰ τοῦτο τοὺς παῖδας, τινὲς δὲ τοὺς ψώλωνας, ἄλλοι μωροὺς ἢ παιδαριώδεις (*posthôn*: authorities say that *posthên* denotes the male pudenda, but that *posthōnes* also denotes children. Some authorities say that the word denotes *psôlōnes*, others that it denotes those who are stupid or childish”); Suda ψ 131 ψωλός· ὁ λειπόδερμος, ὄξυτόνως. καὶ ἀκρόψωλος, ὁ ἐπὶ βραχὺ τοιοῦτος. ἢ ὁ ἀσχήμεων, κατὰ παρέκτασιν τοῦ μορίου (*psôlos*: the penis without the foreskin. It is oxytone. And *akropsôlos*, such a one that is tiny. Or one that is unsightly because of the exposure of part of it”; = Phot. p. 657.13–4); Orion ψ p. 167.12–4 ψωλῖς. παρὰ τὸ ἐμφυσαῖσθαι κατὰ τὴν ὄρεξιν τῶν ἀφροδισίων, καὶ φύσει φυσῶδες ἐστί. οὕτω Σωρανός (*psôlis*: from inflating (*emphysasthai*) the desire for intercourse, and by nature it is windy (*physôdes*). Thus Soranus”); Ael.Prom.

than on his role as the arbiter of justice in the world. Noteworthy here is that Zeus' thunderbolt, even if not modified by the adjective ψολόεις, was also in Stoic thought the beneficent instrument with which Zeus directed *logos* in the world: Cleanthes fr. 537 10–2 ἀμφήκη πυρόεντ' αἰειζώνοντα κεραυνόν· / ... / ᾧ σὺ κατευθύνεις κοινὸν λόγον (“the pointed-at-both-ends, flaming, ever-living lightning ... with which you direct common reason”).⁴²² Zeus' ψολόεις κεραυνός is, according to Priapus' understanding, neither the thunderbolt with which he struck down Odysseus' ship after his companions had eaten the cattle of the Sun (*Od.* 23.329–30) nor that one which he threw down to prompt Athena to inspire reason in Odysseus that he no longer fight with the Ithacans (*Od.* 24.538–44), but his penis.

Nor is Priapus alone in having noticed and exploited the phonetic similarity between ψολόεις and ψωλή to turn Homer into something lewd. At *AP* 11.328,

26.1 ὁ τὴν σπορὰν φέρων· τοῦτο καλεῖται ἢ ψωλοτύχη (“the one carrying the seed: this is called the *psolotukhē*”); *FMP* 6.129 Ψωλιχόν, the name of a fictional river. ψωλῖς, ψωλοτύχη, and Ψωλιχόν are all omitted from LSJ and Montanari.

ψωλήκυσθος (omitted by Montanari) and ψώλων probably should be considered comic adespota, as the obscene sense of the former compound, as well as the fact that its constituents ψωλή and κυσθός “cunt” (*Eup.* fr. 247.4; *Ar. Ach.* 782, 789; *Lys.* 1158; *Ra.* 430; *FMP* 7.15; cf. adesp. com. fr. 377 κυσθοκορώνη “clitoris” (lit. “cunt’s prow”)) are mostly confined to 5th-century Attic comedy, suggest. Henderson 1991. 110 n. 15 remarks that these two words, as well as perhaps ἀκρόψωλος (also omitted by Montanari), indicate “men of great profligacy”, but this is not quite right. ψωλήκυσθος is said by Hesychius to denote a man worth nothing, the idea perhaps being that someone who is at once both the male and female genitalia cannot successfully perform the sexual functions of either. ψώλων is, as Hesychius’ note suggests, rather a hypocoristic diminutive for a male child, as also πόσθων “little dick” (*Ar. Pax* 1300; *Men.* fr. 371), σάθων (*Telecl.* fr. 71), and σμόρδων (*Hsch.* σ 1274). And ἀκρόψωλος seems rather to be a term for a circumcised penis.

⁴²² On which see Bremer 2006/7; Asmis 2007.

Nicharchus (1st century CE) relates how he and two acquaintances slept with the same woman at the same time, writing (3–10):

ἦς ἔλαχον μὲν ἐγὼ “πολιὴν ἄλα ναιέμεν” αὐτός⁴²³

εἷς γὰρ ἓν, οὐ πάντες πάντα, διειλόμεθα.

Ἐρμογένης δ’ ἔλαχε στυγερόν “δόμον εὐρώεντα,”⁴²⁴

ὑστατον, εἰς ἀφανῆ χῶρον ὑπερχόμενος,

ἔνθ’ ἀκταὶ νεκύων, καὶ “ἔρινεοὶ ἠνεμόεντες”⁴²⁵

διεῦνται πνοιῇ δυσκελάδων ἀνέμων.

Ζῆνα δὲ θῆς Κλεόβουλον, ὃς οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβαίνειν,

τὸ ψολόεν κατέχων ἐν χερὶ πῦρ, ἔλαχεν⁴²⁶

The phrase τὸ ψολόεν πῦρ (lit. “his sooty flame”), nowhere else attested, while perhaps understandable on its own as mere innuendo, seemingly gains some comic weight as the shocking conclusion to the epigram, if the adjective puns on ψολός and ψωλός and suggests rather that Cleobulus ascends to heaven with τὸ ψωλόεν πῦρ

⁴²³ Cf. *Il.* 15.190 ἦτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἄλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ (“I myself got to inhabit the grey sea forever”). ἄλς is however also used in the sense “cunt” at *Ar. Ach.* 835.

⁴²⁴ The phrase is attested at *Od.* 10.512; 23.322; *Hes. Op.* 153.

⁴²⁵ Cf. *Il.* 22.145 ἐρινεὸν ἠνεμόεντα (“windswept fig (acc.)”), past which Hector and Achilles run away from the walls of Troy. Although words for “fig” are often used of genitalia (cf. Henderson 1991. 20), ἐρινεὸν itself is not. At any rate, since the location of the figs here is not the girl’s genitals, the point is presumably that the remote, windswept figs stand in for an anatomical hinterland.

⁴²⁶ “I myself got her ‘hoary sea to inhabit’. For we divided it one-to-one, nobody getting everything. Hermogenes got a hateful ‘dank lodging’ last, and sneaked into an obscure spot, where the shores of the dead lie and ‘windswept figs’ swirl around in the blast of shrieking winds. Now imagine Cleobulus to be Zeus, who got to ascend to heaven, holding his glowing fire in his hand.”

(“his penile flame”)⁴²⁷ in hand. This pun would have been all the easier to make at a time when there was no longer a contrastive distinction between *omicron* and *omega*.

Nicarchus’ epigram, which broadly parodies Poseidon’s account of how he and his two brothers, Zeus and Hades, divvied up the world among themselves (*Il.* 15.189-93) and which repurposes words and phrases from elsewhere in the Homeric epics to produce “something of a throwback to Old Comedy”,⁴²⁸ does not, it has recently been argued,⁴²⁹ merely parody “the tripartite division of the cosmos recounted at *Iliad* 15.189–93” but “also exploits ancient lexicographical research ... as well as scholarly discussions on Homeric interpretation” to produce a pointed critique of grammarians, especially Stoic grammarians prone to allegorical readings of Homer (Vergados 2010. 406).⁴³⁰

⁴²⁷ The adjective ψωλόεις (given an entry by Montanari) is attested at Σ^o Ar. *Ra.* 490 καὶ ψῶ τὸ καίω, ἔξ οὔ καὶ ψωλὸς δαλὸς ὁ κεκαυμένος καὶ ψωλόεις εἶδος κεραυνοῦ (“and *psô* means ‘kindle’, whence also *psôlos*, a kindled torch [*ed.* otherwise unattested], and *psôloeis*, a kind of lightning”). However, it is likely that ψωλόεις has simply arisen by folk etymology with ψῶ and that this was facilitated by the loss of a contrastive distinction between *omicron* and *omega* after the 2nd century BCE (cf. Browning 1969. 33; Horrocks 2014. 167). Thus, ψωλόεις should probably be stricken from Montanari.

⁴²⁸ Nisbet 2003. 88

⁴²⁹ Magnelli 2005; Vergados 2010

⁴³⁰ As another epigram obscenely parodying epic shows, however, such obscene parody of epic did not necessarily entail parody of grammarians: at *AP* 11.21, Strato (perhaps early 2nd century CE) conscripts the adjectives ῥοδοδάκτυλος “rosy-fingered” and ῥοδόπηγος “rosy-armed” into a dick joke: πρώην τὴν σαύραν Ἀγάθων ῥοδοδάκτυλον εἶχεν / νῦν δ’ αὐτὴν ἤδη καὶ ῥοδόπηγον ἔχει (“Agathon had a rosy-fingered lizard the other day. Now he already has a rosy-armed one”). Although δάκτυλος itself is used elsewhere generally of penises and πήγος of erections (cf. Henderson 1991. 114–6), the noun σαύρα carries the innuendo here, with the adjectives used, in the first place, for comparisons of size and, in the second place, perhaps for their suggestive pigmentation (ῥόδος “rose” is used elsewhere of the female genitalia but not evidently of male genitalia; cf. Henderson 1991. 135). Although these two compound adjectives were confined to elevated poetry, the sense of each was relatively transparent and their constituents were well attested as autonomous words. Accordingly, neither invited

Of the four Homeric words explained by Priapus, the noun *κουλεόν*—according to Hesychius (κ 3827), the Ionic form of *κολεόν*, attested only in epic and Hippocrates⁴³¹—evidently attracted the least scholarly attention in antiquity, presumably because it endured beyond Homer, where it typically meant precisely what it also meant in Homer: “sheath”. However, although the word does not seem to have been the subject of much scholarly discussion, Pollux, for example, nevertheless glosses the word amid a long and richly informed note on weaponry (10.144), while Hesychius twice elsewhere glosses not just the word itself but verbatim phrases from Homer (ε 1446; 6251). It is also fancifully etymologized at Σ^A *Il.* 1.220 *κουλεόν* παρά <τὸ> κοῦλον εἶναι (“*kouleon* is from *koilon einiai* (‘be hollow’)”); Orion κ p. 83.11 *κολεόν*· παρά τὸ κεκοιλάνθαι, ἥτοι κοιλανθῆναι (“*koleon*: from the verb *kekoilanthai* (‘have been emptied’) or *koilanthênai* (‘be emptied’)”); and Epim. *Il.* 1.194a *κουλεοῖο*· εἴρηται *κουλεός* παρά τὸ κῆλα, τουτέστι τὰ βέλη (“*kouleio* (gen.): *kouleos* is derived from *kêla* (‘arrows’), i.e. projectile weapons”). In addition, the word also made the rounds in lines of Homer adduced in discussions of reasonable behavior: Heraclitus

much scholarly interest in antiquity, with Apollonius (p. 139.8–9), for example, explaining the former succinctly: ῥοδοδάκτυλος· ἡ ῥοδόχρους, ἀπὸ μέρους καλή. εἴρηται δὲ διὰ τὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνατολὴν φαινομένης ἀκτῖνας ἡλίου (“*rhododaktylos*: she who has rosy skin, is beautiful in part. It is said from the rays of the sun appearing at sunrise”). However, note the defense against overly literal interpretations of poetic phraseology at Ath. 13.604b, where Sophocles taunts the Eritrean guest, who had criticized Phrynichus’ λάμπει δ’ ἐπὶ πορφυρέαις παρῆσι φῶς ἔρωτος (“the light of love glows on his rosy cheeks (*porphyreais parêisi*”); *TrGF* 3 F 13) on the ground that *porphyreais parêisi* ought to mean literally “cheeks painted purple”, with the following: οὐδὲ ὁ φὰς “ῥοδοδάκτυλον”· εἰ γὰρ τις εἰς ῥόδεον χρῶμα βάψειε τοὺς δακτύλους, πορφυροβάφου χεῖρας καὶ οὐ γυναικὸς καλῆς ποιήσειεν <ἄν> (“Nor would the poet saying ‘*rhododaktylos*’ please you, since if someone dipped the goddess’ fingers into dye, he would make the hands of a dyer rather than of a pretty woman”).

⁴³¹ At *Il.* 1.220; 3.272; 11.20; 19.253; *Od.* 11.98; Q.S. 1.146; 5.116; Hp. *Cord.* 3 = 9.82.9 Littré.

(*All.* 17.1) quotes *Il.* 1.194–7 (ἔλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος ... , “[Achilles] drew his great sword from its sheath ...”), which he argues is an allegory for the bipartite division of the soul into the rational part, which resides in the head, and the irrational part—itsself consisting of two parts: the spirit (ὁ θυμὸς) and the urges of desires (αἱ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ὀρέξεις)—that resides lower in the body. Likewise, Plutarch (*Mor.* 26d) approves of Achilles’ conduct at *Il.* 1.220–1 (ἄψ δ' ἐς κουλεὸν ὥσε μέγα ξίφος, οὐδ' ἀπίθησε / μύθῳ Ἀθηναίης, “He thrust his great sword into his sheath, nor did he disobey the command of Athena”), saying that he behaves rightly and honorably, because even though he is still angry, he nevertheless subordinates his spirit to reason (τὸν θυμὸν ... κατέσχευεν εὐπειθῆ τῷ λογισμῷ γεγόμενον) and thus refrains from doing anything ill-advised like attacking Agamemnon.

While the word is attested in an obscene sense in the 5th/6th-century CE epistolographer Aristaenetus (2.6), and it survives in Modern Greek as a neutral term for “vagina”, although Greek comic authors had seemingly already recognized the comic potential of the metaphor readily suggested by swords and sheaths and used it as the base of several (possibly) obscene nonce formations,⁴³² it is unclear whether Priapus knew the obscene sense of κουλεόν and was therefore rather learnedly glossing the word with its suitably obscene Latin synonym or whether he was simply taking advantage of the obvious resemblance between Greek κουλεόν and Latin *culus*. At any rate, it is therefore not, according to Priapus’ understanding, a sheath from which Achilles draws his sword in anger, when Agamemnon announces that he will

⁴³² adesp. com. fr. 370 κολεάζοντες, κολεάζειν, κολεασμός, Κολέαρχος (“sheathing, to sheath, a sheathing, Sheath-Lord”).

take away Briseis for himself, or a sheath into which Achilles thrusts his sword, when Athena persuades him not to attack Agamemnon, thereby demonstrating his reason and control of his emotions, but rather an orifice into which he thrusts his “sword” as a sign of reasoned restraint.

And finally, the adjective *σμερδαλέος*—mostly confined to epic but picked up by the Stoic philosopher Cornutus⁴³³ and by Lucian⁴³⁴—is typically glossed as *φοβερός* and/or *καταπληκτικός* (“frightening; striking”).⁴³⁵ It is fancifully etymologized at Epim. σ 15: *σμερδαλέος· γίνεται παρὰ τὸ σμερδνόν· τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ μερίζω μεριδνός καὶ συγκοπῆ καὶ πλεονασμῶ τοῦ σ σμερδνός καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ σμερδναλέος καὶ ἀποβολῆ τοῦ ν <σμερδαλέος>· μερίζεται γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ τῶν ὀρώντων τῷ φόβῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἔῃ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μένειν* (“*smerdaleos*: it comes from *smerdnos* (‘terrible’). *smerdnos* comes from *merizō* (‘allot’) and *meridnos* with both syncope and a pleonastic *sigma*; from this comes *smerdnaleos* and with the loss of *nu* <*smerdaleos*>, because the soul of those who see it are allotted (*merizetai*) with fear, and it does not let them stay in the same spot”). While this word itself does not likewise seem to have been the subject of much scholarly discussion, it was widely circulated in lines of Homer adduced for various points. For example, it is attested at *Il.* 20.64–5 οἰκία δὲ θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι φανεῖη / σμερδαλέ’ εὐρώεντα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοὶ περ (“the halls appear frightening and dank to both mortals and immortals, and even the gods hate them”), which is quoted by Plato (*Res.* 386d) as an immoral and

⁴³³ *ND* 37

⁴³⁴ *Icar.* 33; *Tim.* 1

⁴³⁵ E.g. Σ^{ΤΙ} *Il.* 2.309a; Hsch. σ 1231; *Suda* σ 730

inappropriate depiction of the Underworld; by Pseudo-Longinus as part of an immoral and inappropriate depiction of warring between the gods, which although sublime, εἰ μὴ κατ' ἀλληγορίαν λαμβάνοιτο, παντάπασιν ἄθεα καὶ οὐ σώζοντα τὸ πρέπον (“unless one interprets them allegorically, are utterly irreligious and do not preserve propriety”; 9.6); by Plutarch (*Mor.* 940e) as what men from the moon would think earth to be like; and by Sextus Empiricus in his speech against grammarians (291) as part of an odd argument that grammar is useless because it cannot determine truth from myth. And it is attested at *Od.* 6.137, quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Comp.* 6) in a discussion of Homeric poetics: ὅταν δ' οἰκτρὰν ἢ φοβερὰν ἢ ἀγέρωχον ὄψιν εἰσάγη, τῶν τε φωνηέντων οὐ τὰ κράτιστα θήσει ἀλλὰ <τὰ δυσηχέστατα, καὶ> τῶν ψοφοειδῶν ἢ ἀφώνων τὰ δυσεκφορώτατα λήψεται καὶ καταπυκνώσει τούτοις τὰς συλλαβὰς, οἷά ἐστι ταυτί (*Il.* 6.137; 11.36–7). — (“But whenever he introduces a scene that is pitiable, frightening, or august, he will not use the mightiest of the vowels, but will take <the most unpleasant-sounding and> those of the fricatives and the voiceless consonants that are the most difficult to pronounce and crowd his syllables with these, as in these lines (*Il.* 6.136; 11.36–7): —”). At any rate, the word is nowhere attested in Greek in an obscene sense, although it is used to describe how Odysseus first appears to Nausicaä and her handmaidens (*Od.* 6.137), when he emerges from the brush on the beach, covering himself with a branch (*Od.* 127–9). Priapus seizes on this context to turn an eminently epic word into a dirty joke, and even remarks later in the poem that, although Odysseus conceals himself, “the daughter of Alcinous marveled that his member was barely able to be covered by a leafy branch” (25–6). In addition, Priapus takes advantage of the obvious

resemblance between Greek σμερδαλέος and Latin *merda* to further the joke, because Priapus is not just sex-obsessed, he is also fixated on anal sex.

While Priapus' own Homeric notes fit with the general tenor of his poem and his perversion of the Homeric epics, they may seem somewhat abstracted from the rest of his exegesis, since there is little to do otherwise in the poem, for example, with *pedicones*. Yet, with his philological excursus he endeavors to show off his own learning in this sphere and to mock the work of other scholars by glossing obscure terms and dwelling on trivial issues, and in the service of both these endeavors are his bilingual puns and especially his bilingual blend *merdaleus*, a playful coincidence and lexical opportunism at its best.

Unlike, for example, Plautus and Varro who above had used Greek to avoid primary obscenities and unlike even Nicarchus who, although he had turned Homer into something pornographic, nevertheless also avoided primary obscenities, Priapus plunges headlong into the obscene with his blend: of the three words regularly used in Latin for "shit", *fimur* and *stercus* are the polite terms used by respectable authors (e.g. Vergil uses *fimur*; Plautus and Cicero use *stercus*) and even official and religious inscriptions (e.g. *stercus* in *CIL* I².401), often in the context of discussions of agriculture. *merda*, however, is the lowest. While it does appear neutrally as a technical term amid discussions of agriculture, its uses in Horace (*S.* 1.8.37) and Martial (3.17.6) point to its obscene status. Thus, Priapus concludes his proem with a shockingly obscene neologism that sets the tone for his rendition of the epics that follow.

Moreover, at the heart of Priapus' quip is the acknowledgement that regardless of the gender of one's sexual partner, intercourse of any kind can be a messy affair. There is evidence elsewhere that this was something of a going concern, sometimes discussed in frank terms: for example, Mart. 13.26 *sorba sumus, molles nimium tendentia ventres: / aptius haec puero quam tibi poma dabis* ("We are sorb apples, tending to your excessively loose bowels: you will better give us to your slave-boy than to yourself"). The same concern underlying this little epigram is voiced elsewhere in Latin literature and graffiti, although sometimes in franker terms: for example, *CIL 10.4483 caca, ut possimus bene dormire et pedicare natis candidas ꝯceiasinos tuos ...* ("Take a shit, so that we can sleep well and penetrate your white buttocks ..."); Mart. 9.69 *cum futuis, Polycharme, soles in fine cacare. / cum pedicaris, quid, Polycharme, facis?* ("When you fuck, Polycharmus, you usually take a shit afterwards. When you are fucked, Polycharmus, what do you do?"). What Polycharmus might have done, however, is suggested by Mart. 11.88 *multis iam, Lupe, posse se diebus / pedicare negat Carisianus. / causam cum modo quaererent sodales, / ventrem dixit habere se solutum* ("For several days now, Lupus, Carisianus says that he hasn't been able to have sex. But when his acquaintances asked why, he said that he had an upset stomach"). The same concern is voiced at Juv. 9.43-4 *an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem / legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae? / servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum / quam dominum.* ("Or is it easy and straightforward to put a worthy penis and encounter there yesterday's dinner? The slave who ploughs a field will be less miserable than one who ploughs his master"). These quotations all together point to a "significant characteristic of Latin

literature from the earliest times on: a readiness to indulge in an unabashed description of the physical realities of sexual practices, including those between males” (Williams 1999. 29).

Despite Priapus’ initial apology that he is a *rusticus* who may therefore speak *indocte*, in the end he is revealed to be an urbane scholar whose own poem takes part not only generally in the long-standing tradition of Homeric exegesis in epigrams⁴³⁶ and in the long-standing reception of literary epigrams at Rome,⁴³⁷ but specifically in the “humorous use of early epic” that “becomes especially prominent in epigrams of the Imperial period” (Sens 2011. 179), as well as in the humorous use of Homeric exegesis perhaps in vogue at the time. However, the central conceit of the poem—namely, that Priapus addresses us as though we are listening to him lecture—yields not a static poem inheriting older poetic practices, wherein there may however be some novelty, but rather a dynamic, metapoetic performance in which the Roman Priapus *qua* poet is actively and in real time adopting and adapting and parodying Greek literature and culture. As we listen to Priapus lecture on matters of Homeric interpretation, we hear him bringing down a peg the cultural, literary, and linguistic pinnacle of Greece with his frankly obscene bilingual glosses in way that only a Roman well-steeped in Greek literature could, turning it into something especially Roman, and in so doing perhaps demonstrating something of the Roman standoffishness toward Greek culture, literature, and language discussed above. All of this is encapsulated in the blend *merdaleus*.

⁴³⁶ Cf. Sistikou 2007.

⁴³⁷ Cf. Morelli 2007; Nisbet 2007.

5.2.3 IMBUBINARE AND IMBULBITARE

Lucil. 1186 ap. Paul. ex Fest. p. 32 M.

*bubinare est menstruo mulierum sanguine inquinare. Lucilius: haec **imbubin**at, at contra te **imbulbit**at <ille>. imbulbitare est puerile stercore inquinare, dictum ex fimo, quod Graeci appellant βόλβιτον*

*imbubin*at] *in-* L. Müller *imbulbit*at] *in-* L. Müller *ille* add. Dousa

bubinare is to defile with women’s menstrual blood. Lucilius: she **drenches** you **with menstrual blood**, but on the other hand <he> **bemerdes** you. *imbulbitare* is to defile with boy’s shit (*stercore*), called thus from manure (*fimus*), which the Greeks called βόλβιτον (“manure”)

5.2.3.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

Although L. Müller 1872 (followed by e.g. Marx 1904, Lindsay 1913, Krenkel 1970) printed the words under consideration with *in-*, the forms with *im-* are evidently the readings of at least some manuscripts⁴³⁸ and accordingly have been printed before

⁴³⁸ As L. Müller *ad loc.* notes in his apparatus: “imbubin^at — imbulbit^at *scripti praeter L 116*”. Frustratingly, other editions of Festus and Lucilius print either the forms with *in-* or *im-* without comment. The only manuscript that I have been able to see myself (Walters 343, from

and since both in other editions of Festus and Lucilius and in lexica (e.g. Perotti 1506. 610;⁴³⁹ Dousa 1597. 7; Vossius 1662 s. v.; K. Müller 1839; Lachmann 1876; Lewis–Short; the *OLD*). I thus write the forms with *im-* here, which moreover make the blends with *imbuere* more salient (see Formation below), and tentatively take the forms with *in-* to be hyperarchaisms introduced by L. Müller.

5.2.3.2 FORMATION

bubinare,⁴⁴⁰ *imbubinare*, and *imbulbitare* are all hapax legomena. If, as Festus claims, the simplex *bubinare* already means *inquinare* (“befoul”), what is the force of the added preverb? Arguably none, unless to effect a blend of *bubinare* and *imbuere* (“drench”) that means “drench with menstrual blood.” I take it as such, because it creates a vivid and humorous image where otherwise none exists. And if *imbubinare* is a blend, so too is *imbulbitare*, that is a blend of *imbuere* and βόλιτον “manure”⁴⁴¹

ca. 1450) reads: “inbubinat ... imbulbinat. Impulbitare ...”, which tilts toward the forms in *im-* despite its errors.

⁴³⁹ This is an edition of a work first printed in 1489 but completed in 1478, only a few years after the *editio princeps* of Paul’s epitome of Festus appeared. I have not seen the 1489 edition.

⁴⁴⁰ The etymology of the word, which is otherwise attested in a handful of glosses (collected at Loewe 1886. 313–4) either drawn direct from Festus or his source, is uncertain. However, it is plausibly a Sabellic loanword derived ultimately from **gʷou-* “cow” and thus related to e.g. PSl. говѣнѹ “cow-shit” (cf. Walde–Hofmann s. v.); Placidus, another of the glossographers, also cites and glosses the related *bubinarium* as “blood that comes from women each month” (*sanguis qui mulieribus menstruus venit*). At any rate, how *bubinare* should come to mean “befoul with menstrual blood” is unclear, which at least raises the possibility that Festus (writing 200 or so years after Lucilius) or his source has gotten the word wrong.

⁴⁴¹ According to Phot. β 200 = *Et.Gen.* AB β 176 = Phryn. *Ecl.* 334 and Moeris β 14, the general Greek form of the word, as opposed to specifically Attic βόλιτον (e.g. Cratin. fr. 43; Ar. *Eq.* 658;

that means “drench with manure”. The context suggests that while both *imbubinare* and *imbulbitare* could be formally analyzed as compounds, pragmatically they function here as blends that together serve as jingly witticism: that whether you (*te*) chose her (*haec*) or him (*ille*), you will be drenched with something unpleasant.

5.2.3.3 INTERPRETATION

Lewis–Short *s. v. imbuino* merely quote the text of Festus, while the *OLD s. v. imbuino* claims that the word is a compound of *bubino*. And Lewis–Short *s. v. imbulbito* again merely quote the text of Festus, while Ernout–Meillet and the *OLD* (both *s. v. imbulbito*) each quote the text of Festus and suggest that the word is a bilingual derivative. On the other hand, Walde–Hofmann *s. v. imbulbito* claim that the word is “von **bulbitum*, L(ehn)w(wort) aus gr. βόλβιτον “Kuhmist” (*bolbiton* Plin.)”, that is that the word is a derivative of a loanword, although the passage of Pliny (writing 150 or so years after Lucilius) that they cite suggests rather that the word had not been loaned into Latin.⁴⁴²

The text of Lucilius is fragmentary, and *imbubinare* and *imbulbitare* are cited with only a line of context in an epitome of an epitome of a lexicon. For this reason, it is difficult to guess at the precise joke behind these neologisms, although the

Arist. *HA* 552^a16). βόλβιτον is first attested in Hipponax (fr. 95.9; 138), whence perhaps Lucilius picked it up.

⁴⁴² Plin. *Nat.* 28.232 *fimi taurini maxime, sed et bubuli ... quod bolbiton vocant* (“especially bull’s dung, but also that of an ox ... which they call *bolbiton*”; a discussion of remedies for dropsy).

formations do call attention to themselves as facetious in a way like English *bemerded* “bemired with *merde*”.⁴⁴³ Yet, why does Lucilius resort to coining these fanciful formations, and why especially does he resort to coining a fanciful bilingual formation instead of relying on words already extant in Latin or coining a new word entirely in Latin? Latin certainly has no lack of words for “shit” and the like: for example, *caca*, from which there is later a derivative *concacare* “defile with shit”;⁴⁴⁴ *merda*; *fimus*; and *stercus*, from which there is already a derivative *stercorare* “fertilize”.⁴⁴⁵ Nor does Greek lack verbs meaning “befoul with shit” or the like that he could have borrowed: for example, κοπρώω; μινθόω; προστιλάω. None of these, however, lend themselves to paranomasia and antithesis as do *imbubinare* and *imbulbitare*. Thus, Lucilius does not resort to coining these blends because Latin or Greek lacked words of suitable meaning for the quip, but because they lacked words of suitable meaning *and* sound similarity.

However much Lucilius may have been party to unabashed conversations about the physical realities of sexual intercourse in his satires, this fragment is not quite one of those instances when Latin so indulges, for *imbulbitat* at any rate is not an unabashed word but rather innuendo.⁴⁴⁶ Lucilius avoids straying into the vulgar

⁴⁴³ E.g. “... having soundly and legitimately *bemerded* that face in imagination ...” (Anthony Burgess, *Enderby Outside*). *Bemerded*, however, might just be an Anglo-Gallic hybrid derivative, but this is a bit beside the point.

⁴⁴⁴ E.g. Sen. *Apoc.* 4.33; Petr. 66.7.

⁴⁴⁵ First attested at Cato *Agr.* 36.1.

⁴⁴⁶ *pace* Chahoud 2011. 380, who argues that while Roman satirists refrain from using coarse slang, “the surviving fragments [of Lucilius] exhibit only a handful of examples. We find three instances of possibly vulgar terms for the male and female sexual organ respectively (307 and 1067M *mutto*; 940M *eugium*) and an obscene description of intercourse polluted by

or obscene by relying on a curious nonce formation at the heart of which is a relatively neutral term for “manure”. That Lucilius sidesteps obscenity here is typical: “in Lucilius, as in the later tradition, obscene subject matter is handled by suggestive innuendo, metaphorical or metonymic association” (Chahoud 2011. 380).

5.2.4 CRUCISALUS

Plaut. *Bac.* 358–67

sed quid futurumst, cum hoc senex resciverit,

cum se excucurrisse illuc frustra sciverit

nosque aurum abusos? quid mihi fiet postea? 360

credo hercle adveniens nomen mutabit mihi

*facietque extemplo **Crucisalum** me ex Chrysalo.*

aufugero hercle, si magis usus venerit.

si ero reprehensus, macto ego illum infortunio:

si illi sunt virgae ruri, at mihi tergum domist. 365

nunc ibo, erili filio hanc fabricam dabo

super auro amicaque eius inventa Bacchide.

362 *Crucisalum me]* *cruci salumme C* *Chrysalo]* *Crisalo* PBCD,

Questa

bodily fluids (1186M).” However, without other attestations of either *imbubinare* or *imbulbitare*, it seems impossible to aver that either word is “course slang”.

But how's it going to be, when the old man figures this out, when he learns that he's hustled here for nothing and that we've used up the gold. What'll happen to me then? By god, I think that when he comes he'll change my name and immediately turn me from Chrysalus to **Crossalus**. By god, I'll run away, if it'll be more useful. If I'm caught, I'll make some trouble for him. If he's got a switch in the country, well, I've got a back at home. Now I'll go; I'll present this lil' story to the master's son about the gold and about his girlfriend Bacchides having been found.

5.2.4.1 TEXTUAL NOTES

C's cruci salumme is nonsense, but perhaps represents an attempt by a copyist to turn a difficult nonce word into something recognizable, thus pulling *cruci* ("cross"; dat.) out of *Crucisalum me* and leaving *salumme* ("safe me?") at the expense of the joke.

Chrysalo (printed by virtually all modern editors except Questa 2008 since the *editio princeps*, Merula 1472) is certainly a late restoration of Greek spelling to an ostensibly Greek personal name.⁴⁴⁷ Before *ca.* 145 BCE, Latin transcribed the Greek aspirated stops <φ θ χ> as <p t c> (cf. Kent. 1945. 40), and Latin regularly transcribed Greek υ with <u> or, especially in unaccented syllables, with <i> (cf. Kent 1945. 46–

⁴⁴⁷ The name is otherwise attested only at *CIL* 4.10604 (a 1st-century (B)CE graffito from Herculaneum), where it has been Latinized (*CRVSALI*); however, the feminine Χρυσάλλις (e.g. *IG* II² 5649.1) and Χρύσιλλα (e.g. *IG* II² 1524.213) are both attested already in the 4th century BCE. A by-form Χρύσιλλος is attested at *IG* XII⁹ 916.24 (25 BCE; from Euboea).

8). Thus, either PBCD's *crisalo* or perhaps *crusalo* is probably to be preferred. Although the manuscripts agree in spelling the name *crisalo* here, elsewhere they are all over the place: for example, at 182 (the first instance of the name) B² reads *chrisale*; C *chrysale*; D¹ *crisale*; D² *chrisale*.

Ritschl 1848. cccxxv thought likewise that the name would be better written with a <c> and a <u> than with <ch> and <y>, that is as *Crusalo*, but for a different reason, arguing that “it is permissible to seek by far the most illuminating evidence that for *y* Plautus wrote *u* from *Bacch.* 362, where unless you think that it was pronounced *Crucisalum me ex Crusalo*, the charm and wit perish (trans.)” However, this runs afoul of an issue discussed above, namely the overly-exacting demand of phonetic similarity placed on puns in Greek and Latin (cf. n. 21). However, whether the text reads *Crucisalum me ex Chrysallo* (thus Ritschl himself, followed for example by Lindsay 1904, who notes in the apparatus that it “ought to be pronounced *Crusalo* (trans.)” and de Melo 2011) or *Crucisalum me ex Crisalo* (thus Questa 2008), the punny wordplay is lost on no one.

5.2.4.2 FORMATION

The *communis opinio* among lexical authorities since at least Scheller 1783 *s. v.* is that *Crucisalus* is a conventionally formed compound of *crux* “cross” and *salere* “leap”, although Scheller only implies as much when he glosses the word “leaping onto the cross, a fictitious name (trans.)”. Scheller is followed, for example, by Freund 1882 *s. v.* “[cross – leap] a humorous name formed like *Chrysalus*, as though it were Cross-

dancer (trans.)” and the *OLD s. v.* “[crux + salio + us] A facetious name for a slave, ‘Cross-dancer’”.

Doubts about the word’s status as a compound, however, had been raised by Coulter 1916. 58, who, although she classified *Crucisalus* as a compound whose nominal first constituent stands in an ablative relationship to its second verbal constituent, noted that the word is “a pun on the name Chrysalus, in which the relation of the two elements probably should not be too carefully analyzed”. That is, she found *Crucisalus* formally unobjectionable but semantically suspect. Barsby 1991 *ad loc.* noted that Plautus “has replaced the Greek root *chrys-* (‘gold’) by the Latin root *cruc-* (‘cross’), neatly implying that Chrysalus will be crucified for his misdeeds”, not outright calling the word a blend but seemingly understanding it as one. And Fontaine 2010. 5, although he calls the word a “portmanteau”,⁴⁴⁸ has nothing much otherwise to say about it. Gallutius 1621. 571 thought that the line was an example of *allitteratio vero lepidissima* (“really the most charming alliteration”).

In *Bacchides*, the slave Chrysalus (“Goldie”) is tasked by his young master Mnesilochus with getting enough gold from his father Nicobulus so that he can buy the freedom of a courtesan whom he loves. Chrysalus succeeds in doing so (and it is after a long scene in which he swindles Nicobulus out of the money that the passage

⁴⁴⁸ However, his understanding of “the sort of verbal monstrosities that literary critics sometimes call ‘portmanteau’ coinages” (5) is shaky. For example, he includes in his brief discussion *lumbifragium* “dick-wreck” (Plaut. *Am.* 454), a blend, he claims of *lumbus* “groin” and either *naufragium* “ship-wreck” or an unattested **lumbifragium* “skiff-wreck”. But *lumbifragium* is explainable as a conventionally formed compound. In the end, it seems that by “portmanteau” he means, on the one hand, humorous and, especially, punny compounds and, on the other hand, just puns (e.g. he also cites Plaut. *Cur.* 30 *intestabilis*, normally “intestate” but here in the sense “without testes”).

containing the blend quoted above occurs), but when Mnesilochus later overhears that his best friend has allegedly slept with the courtesan, he confesses the ploy to his father, gives the gold back and begs that he not punish Chrysalus. When he then learns that what he overheard was incorrect, he asks Chrysalus to extort the same sum of money again from his father. He does so, but Nicobulus eventually finds out.

Since Chrysalus' primary task in the comedy is extorting and transporting gold, he is thus appropriately named, and naturally enough his name is punned on with the Greek word *chrysos* "gold" and the Latin word *aurum*. For example, when Nicobulus first comes on stage, Chrysalus gives himself a little pep talk (239–40): *extexam ego illum pulchre iam, si di volunt. / hau dormitandum est: opus est chryso Chrysalo* ("I'll fleece him nicely now, if the gods are willing. No being sleepy: Chrysalus needs *chrysos*"). Later in the play when Mnesilochus asks Chrysalus to swindle his father out of some money again, Chrysalus effectively glosses his name, saying (703–5): *ceterum quantum lubet me poscitote aurum: ego dabo. / quid mihi refert Chrysalo esse nomen, nisi factis probo? / sed nunc quantillum usust auri tibi, Mnesiloche? dic mihi* ("But however much gold from me as you want, I'll give it to you. What's the point of me being called Chrysalus, unless I prove it through my actions? But how much gold do you need now, Mnesilochus? Tell me").

Thus both the theme of the drama and the specific textual context of this coinage makes it clear that while *Crucisalus* can be formally analyzed as a Latin compound, pragmatically it functions as a bilingual blend.

5.2.4.4 INTERPRETATION

Paronomasia and references to crucifixion come together with the name Chrysalus three times in *Bacchides*. The first time is in the passage containing the bilingual blend discussed above. The second is at 687, just after Mnesilochus has told Chrysalus that he confessed their plot to his father and gave back the gold: *istoc dicto dedisti hodie in cruciatum Chrysalum* (“with those words you’ve handed Chrysalus over to crucifixion today”).⁴⁴⁹ Near the end of the comedy, Nicobulus, when learns that he has been swindled of gold for a *second* time, calls out (1182–4):

satis, satis iam vostris convivi: me nil paenitet ut sim acceptus:

quadringentis Philippis filius me et Chrysalus circumduxerunt.

*quem quidem ego ut non excruciem, alterum tantum auri non meream.*⁴⁵⁰

Repeatedly, then, the name “Chrysalus” will be thematically linked to crucifixion in this play, and that theme is explicitly announced with the bilingual blend that first creates the linkage.

5.3 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have given a brief account of the Romans’ use of Greek to situate bilingual blends within the linguistic practices of Roman literature. Greek in some

⁴⁴⁹ Here Fontaine 2010. 41 n. 7 assumes Chrysalus “temporarily adopts a ‘Pseudo-Umbrian’ accent for the sake of the pun”, pronouncing *cruciatum* as *cruchiatum*, but there is simply no need for such heavy-handedness (cf. n. 116 above).

⁴⁵⁰ “I’ve already had enough of your dinner party: I don’t care how I’ve been received. My son and Chrysalus have duped me out of four hundred bucks. I certainly wouldn’t hesitate to crucify him, not for the same amount of gold again.”

form or another is present in virtually every variety and level of Latin literature, despite Romans' occasional resistance to that influence. Bilingual formations—whether derivatives like *hamiota*, compounds like *ferritribax*, or blends—are all but confined “low” genres” like technical literature and comedic texts, where such formations are an aspect of the stylistically marked—that is, humorous—use of Greek and the kind of bilingual games which Romans—especially Plautus, perhaps the most inventive coiner of words ever to have written in Latin, whose creation and use of bilingual formations is unparalleled in its variety and creativity—were evidently keen to play with Greek and Latin. And although in comedic texts, as we have seen, low-status characters speak the most bilingual formations, and so in that respect their use thereof is appropriate and contributes to their characterization, bilingual forms of all kinds, blends included, are chiefly instantiations of humor rooted in onomastics, foul-mouthedness, and metatheatrics.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This dissertation set out to demonstrate that lexical blending, while not explicitly recognized as such in antiquity nor even for the most part in modern classical scholarship, is a kind of word formation that is well attested in ancient Greek and Latin. From one point of view, given what appears to be the linguistic universality of lexical blending, it would be perplexing if lexical blends could *not* be found in the surviving corpus of classical literature. Yet the phenomenon of lexical blending is not generally acknowledged as a kind of word formation in any of the standard historical grammars and lexica of ancient Greek or Latin. I hope to have demonstrated that the foregoing discussion of two-dozen lexical blends in Greek and Latin comedic literature proves that it should be.

First, the identification and analysis of these hitherto troublesome words as lexical blends has supplemented the traditional analysis of word formation in Greek and Latin that focus on two processes—derivation and compounding, both of which were regular, systematic, and widely productive in both languages, operating on morphemic constituents such as lexical roots, stems, prefixes, and affixes—by adding a third process: blending, which was irregular and unsystematic, operating on non-morphemic constituents and typically combining them at points of phonetic overlap rather than at morphological boundaries on an as-needs basis.

Second, the identification and analysis of these hitherto troublesome words, whose formations and semantics were not well explained through derivation or compounding because they contain non-morphemic constituents, as lexical blends

has provided clear and economical explanations of their formations and semantics, thereby forestalling the need for such *ad-hoc* solutions as positing Etruscan suffixes, as in the case of *madulsa*, or fabricating lost dramatic festivals, as in the case of τρυγωδία, or for emending away perceived textual issues, as in the case of *mantiscinari*. In some cases, on the other hand, the identification and analysis of these lexical blends as such has vindicated the intuition and conjectures of earlier scholars, as in the case of Camerarius with *perenticida*, Pareus with *tragicomoedia*, Dobree with μεσοπέρδην, and both ancient and modern scholars with βομβηλοῖ. These scholars clearly understood the joke behind each word but lacked the formal or terminological wherewithal necessary for a full explanation.

In addition, the identification and analysis of lexical blends in Greek and Latin contribute more broadly to our understanding of the history and use of lexical blends generally. On the one hand, the foregoing work vindicates the assertion of Cannon 1986 that “[b]lends are a very old kind of word formation, occurring in many of the world’s languages as early as Vedic Sanskrit, Attic Greek, Latin, and Old High German” (956) by furnishing bona fide examples of lexical blends in at least two of these old languages.⁴⁵¹ Although putative examples of blends in Greek and Latin were adduced as such as early as the early 20th century,⁴⁵² these examples are often better regarded

⁴⁵¹ Whether there are bona fide lexical blends in Sanskrit or Old High German remains to be seen, although the vast corpus of Sanskrit texts, some of them comedic, does strike me as a possible source of lexical blends.

⁴⁵² Wood 1911. 117 had cited as examples of “haplologic blends” in Greek and Latin the following: ἀμφορεύς (< ἀμφιφορεύς) “amphora”; κατάδε (< κατὰ τάδε) “after this”; ὀλέκρανον (< *ὀλενοκρανον) “point of the elbow”; *medialis* (< **medidialis*) “middle”; *lapicida* (< *lapidicida*) “stone-cutter”.

as conventionally formed compounds and derivatives that have undergone haplology, and even Cannon himself provided only one unsatisfactory example from Latin.⁴⁵³ The Greek and Latin lexical blends discussed above in this dissertation are thus some of the earliest attested examples of lexical blends generally and are—perhaps more significantly and interestingly—some of the earliest attested examples of lexical blends as self-consciously facetious nonce formations both in literary and evidently demotic contexts. The identification and analysis of these lexical blends in Greek and Latin, in addition to suggesting that blends were a feature of everyday language, hint at the longevity and vitality, if not the productivity, of blends as a form of wit.

Moreover, the foregoing discussion of lexical blends in Greek and Latin further vindicates in part Cannon's claim that "the process of blending seems to occur in all languages, to be very common in them, and to occur in every stage of the individual language's development" (725). While it would be a stretch to say that blends are very common in either Greek or Latin, it is certainly the case that they occur in Greek and Latin and perhaps also that they occur at different stages of each language's development. Although most of the Greek blends in my corpus come from 5th- and/or 4th-century Attic comedy, and those mostly from Aristophanes, which fact I had expected, one does nonetheless come from the 3rd-century BCE philosopher Bion. On the other hand, although the majority of Latin blends in my corpus come from Plautus in the 2nd century BCE, which fact again I had expected, a handful of others are nonetheless either coined or recorded elsewhere later: by Seneca, Suetonius, and

⁴⁵³ See Chapter 1 above.

Quintilian in the 1st century CE and by “Priapus” in the 2nd century CE. Thus, lexical blends in Latin are attested across the roughly 300-year span of Latin literature to which I initially restricted my search.

Third, the identification and analysis of lexical blends as such has provided solutions to several troubling textual issues. Only some of the two dozen lexical blends discussed above have been transmitted to us without textual issues (Κλωπιδαί; λακιδαίμονος; *Biberius*; *inbulbitare*; *mantiscinari*), whereas others have been transmitted sometimes with considerable textual issues and, in the case of Latin *tragicomoedia*, for example, precipitated hundreds of years of scholarly debate and emendation. In addressing the textual issues affecting many of these blends, I have noted the evident difficulty with which these blends have reached us and suggested that it is a reasonable if unprovable hypothesis that other blends in Greek and Latin may have been emended out of existence already in antiquity. This is not to encourage looking for lexical blends where there is no contextual evidence of one or to say that any time a lexical blend may be possible in a given Greek or Latin text it should be restored, but to point out that blending needs to be kept in mind as a possibility in the work of textual criticism. One of the difficulties, in addition to the usual sorts of scribal errors affecting Greek and Latin texts, is, as I have hinted at throughout and as I discuss more fully in Appendix I, that the ancient and even relatively modern grammatical, lexicographic, and otherwise scholarly traditions that have dealt with these lexical blends have not always recognized them as such. Thus, at best, such superficially anomalous forms have been noted as curious and, at worst, have been “corrected”.

Fourth, the identification and analysis of lexical blends as such has illuminated what is going on in several passages, especially those of Aristophanes and Plautus, in whom the attested blends often come with considerable context. I noted above in Chapter 1 that the functional side of word formation was in general understudied and that other studies of particular kinds of word formation in Greek and Latin have devoted little space to the polyvalency of blends. I have in my analysis dwelt at length on the pragmatic functions of each blend both in the immediate passage in which it occurs and in the work from which the passage is taken. Thus, for example, I have explained how Plautus with his *virgindemia* riffs on agricultural language in delivering a tightly constructed threat of violence or how Priapus' *merdaleus* is not an opportunistic, throwaway joke about pederasty, but in fact one of several learnedly crass Homeric glosses in a poem that functions as a clever sendup of both Homer himself and Homeric scholarship and reflects the Romans' ambivalence toward Hellenic culture; and how Aristophanes with, for example, his Ἀττικωνικοί has Hermes meld together the names of the Athenians and the Spartans as he assigns blame to both of them for ongoing war and prompts the protagonist of the comedy to stop blaming the gods and look for a solution himself. Even in the case of lexical blends such as the comic adespota Βδεῦ and λακιδαίμονος and *tuburcinari* in the fragments of Titinius and Turpilius, which were all transmitted by ancient lexicographic or scholarly sources without context, and in the case of λακιδαίμονος, which was transmitted with an almost certainly incorrect gloss, I have tried to consider the pragmatic function of each and ground my interpretation of each in considerations of dramatic context, however speculative.

In general, I have noted throughout that lexical blends in Greek and Latin—whether they are onomastic, bilingual, both, or neither—are functionally instantiations of humor rooted in onomastics, foul-mouthedness, metatheatrics, or some combination thereof and that these lexical blends are often witticisms tethered to particular dramatic contexts in meaningful ways: for example, Aristophanes’ σκαταιβάτης, with its scatological distortion of an epithet of Zeus’, reflects a world that is shitty and distorted by war and Zeus’ negligence; and Plautus’ *Crucisalus* reflects the referent Chrysalus’ function throughout the comedy as a getter of gold and as slave about to be tortured for his misdeeds. Some lexical blends such as Bion’s οίκιτιεύς and *Biberius*, a soubriquet of Tiberius reported by Suetonius, are not tethered to particular dramatic contexts, nor are they random slurs; rather, they mock named persons and salient defects of their characters, in these cases respectively the slavishness of being a philosopher’s pupil and an Emperor who is a drunkard. Lexical blends in Greek and Latin are often carefully crafted to make a particular point, and the novelty of blends often helps to underscore that point.

And finally, I have made a number of smaller contributions throughout the foregoing work including brief lexicographic notes, notices of words omitted from modern lexical authorities, suggestions for deletions therefrom, suggestions of words that might be considered comic adespota, and pushback against heavy-handed interpretations of Greek and Latin puns by modern scholars.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams 1990: J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*³ (London)
- Adams 2004: J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Oxford and New York)
- Alexandrow 1888: Aleksandr Alexandrow, *Litauische Studien I* (diss.: Dorpat)
- Algeo 1977: John Algeo, "Blends, a Structural and Systemic View", *American Speech* 52: 47–66
- Alinei 1980: Mario Alinei, "Evidence from Plautus for Oscan-Umbrian Substrate in Central and Southern Italian Dialects", in Kruijssen 1980, pp. 274–80
- Allen 1968: Sidney Allen, *Vox Graeca* (Cambridge)
- Angelius 1514: Nicola Angelius (ed.), *Plauti Comoediae Viginti* (Florence)
- Arcodia–Montermini 2013: Giorgio Francesco Arcodia and Fabio Montermini, "Are reduced compounds compounds? Morphological and prosodic properties of reduced compounds in Russian and Mandarin Chinese", in Renner et al. 2013, pp. 93–114
- Arnott 1968: W. Geoffrey Arnott, Review of Rychlewska 1962, *Gnomon* 40: 31–5
- Asmis 2007: Elizabeth Asmis, "Myth and Philosophy in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*", *GRBS* 47: 413–29
- Austin 1922: James Curtiss Austin, *The Significant Name in Terence* (Urbana)
- Bader 1962: Françoise Bader, *La formation des composés nominaux du latin* (Paris)
- Bagordo 2017: Andreas Bagordo (ed.), *Aristophanes frr. 675–820. Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Fragmenta Comica Band 10.10: Heidelberg)

- Baier 1999: Thomas Baier (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus' Amphitruo* (*Scriptoralia* 116: Tübingen)
- Bakker 2010: Egbert J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chichester–Malden)
- Bakola 2010: Emmanuela Bakola, *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford)
- Baldwin 1992: Barry Baldwin, “Greek in Cicero’s Letters”, *Acta Classica* 35: 1–17
- Balles 2008: Irene Balles, *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen. Die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen. Band 1: Latein, Altgriechisch* (Hamburg)
- Barsby 1991: John Barsby (ed.), *Plautus Bacchides*³ (Warminster)
- Barsby 2007: John Barsby, “Native Roman Rhetoric: Plautus and Terence”, in Dominik–Hall 2007, pp. 38–53
- Barton 1990: Anne Barton, *The Names of Comedy* (Oxford)
- Bat-El 1996: Outi Bat-El, “Selecting the Best of the Worst: The Grammar of Hebrew Blends”, *Phonology* 13: 283–328
- Bauer 2013: Laurie Bauer, “Blends: Core and Periphery”, in Renner et al. 2013, pp. 11–22
- Bauer 2017: Laurie Bauer, *Compounds and Compounding* (Cambridge)
- Beck 1782: Daniel Beck (ed.), *Aristophanis Aves Graece* (Leipzig)
- Bekker 1829: Immanuel Bekkerus (ed.), *Aristophanis Aves* (London)
- Benedetti 1988: Marina Benedetti, *I composti radicali latini. Esame storico e comparativo* (Pisa)

- Bentley 1816: Richard Bentley, "Emendationes ineditae in Aristophanem", *Classical Journal* 14: 130–47
- Bergler 1760: Stephanus Berglerus (ed), *Aristophanis comoediae undecim* (2 vols.: Brittenburg)
- Berrey 1939: L. V. Berrey, "Newly-wedded Words", *American Speech* 14: 3–10
- Bertinetto 2004: Pier Marco Bertinetto, "Blends and syllabic structure: A four-fold comparison",
- Bhatia–Ritchie 2004: Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie, *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (Malden and Oxford)
- Bickel 1953: Ernst Bickel, "Salaputium: Mentula Salax", *RhM* 96: 94–5
- Biles–Olson 2015: Zachary Biles and S. Douglas Olson (eds.), *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford)
- Bing–Bruss 2007: Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden and Boston)
- Blänsdorf 1979: Jürgen Blänsdorf (ed.), *Plautus' Amphitruo* (Stuttgart)
- Blass 1882: Friedrich W. Blass, *Über die Aussprache des Griechischen* (Berlin)
- Blumenthal–Kahane 1979: Henry Blumenthal and Renée Kahane, "Decline and Survival of Western Prestige Languages", *Language* 55: 183–98
- Boissonade 1848: Jean François Boissonade, *Hierokles kai Philagrios. G. Pachymeris declamationes XIII quarum XII ineditae, Hieroclis et Philagrii grammaticorum φιλόγελως longe maximam partem ineditus* (Paris)
- Boldrer 2003: Francesca Boldrer, "Il bilinguismo di Cicerone: *scripta Graeca Latina* (fam. 15.4)", in Oniga 2003, pp. 131–50

- Bond 1999: R. P. Bond, "Plautus' *Amphitryo* as Tragi-Comedy", *Greece & Rome* 46: 203–20
- Boogaart *et al.* 2014: Ronny Boogaart, Timothy Colleman and Gijsbert Rutten (eds.), *Extending the Scope of Construction-Based Grammar* (Berlin)
- Booij *et al.* 2000: Gert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*, Vol. 1 (Berlin and New York)
- Booij–Hüning 2014: Geert Booij and Matthias Hüning, "Affixoids and Constructional Idioms", in Boogaart *et al.* 2014, pp. 77–106
- Bopp 1827: Franz Bopp, *Ausführliches Lehrgebäude der Sanskritsprache* (Berlin)
- Bothe 1828: Fridericus Henricus Bothe (ed.), *Aristophanis Pax* (Leipzig)
- Boyce 1997: Bret Boyce, *The language of the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis* (Leiden and Boston)
- Braun 1991: Ludwig Braun, "Keine griechischen Originale für *Amphitruo* und *Menaechmi*?", *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 17: 193–215
- Brdar-Szabo–Brdar 2008: Rita Brdar-Szabo and Mario Brdar, "On the marginality of lexical blending", *Jezikoslovlje* 9: 171–94
- Bremmer 2006/7: Jan Maarten Bremer, "Zeus' Lightning in Early Greek Myth and in Kleantes' Hymn", *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 54–5: 21–36
- Brinkhoff 1935: J. M. G. M Brinkhoff, *Woordspeling bij Plautus* (Nijmegen)
- Brotherton 1921: Blanche Brotherton, *The Vocabulary of Intrigue in Roman Comedy* (diss.: Chicago)

- Browning 1969: Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (London)
- Brucale 2012: Luisa Brucale, "Latin Compounds", *Probus* 24: 93–117
- Büchler 1904: Franciscus Büchler (ed.), *Petronii Saturae et Liber Priaporum* (Berlin)
- Buck 1966: Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago and London)
- Buck–Petersen 1945: Carl Darling Buck and Walter Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago)
- Bullock–Toribio 2009: Barbara Bullock and Almeida Toribio (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching* (Cambridge)
- Burrow 1973: Thomas Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language* (London)
- Butler–Owen 1917: H. E. Butler and A. S. Owen (eds.), *Apulei Apologia* (Oxford)
- Camerarius 1552: Joachim Camerarius, *Plauti Comoediae XX* (Leipzig)
- Cannon 1986: Garland Cannon, "Blends in English Word Formation", *Linguistics* 24: 725–53
- Cannon 2000: Garland Cannon, "Blending" in Booij et al. 2000, pp. 952–6
- Carnie 2006: Andrew Carnie, *Syntax²* (Malden and Oxford)
- Carroll 1871: Lewis Carroll, *The Annotated Alice* (ed. Martin Gardner: New York, 1999)
- Carroll 1876: Lewis Carrol, *The Annotated Hunting of the Snark* (ed. Martin Gardner: New York, 2006)
- Cazzaniga 1959: Ignazio Cazzaniga (ed.), *Carmina Ludicra Romanorum* (Torino)
- Cèbe 1966: J.-P Cèbe, *La caricature et la parodie, dans le monde romain antique des origines a Juvenal* (Paris)

- Ceccagno–Basciano 2007: Antonella Ceccagno and Bianca Basciano, “Compound headedness in Chinese: an analysis of neologisms”, *Morphology* 17: 207–31
- Chadwick 1976: John Chadwick, *The Mycenaean World* (Cambridge)
- Chahoud 2011: Anna Chahoud, “The Language of Latin Verse Satire”, in Clackson 2011, pp. 367–383
- Chantraine 1933: Pierre Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris)
- Chase 1900: George D. Chase, “The Form of Nominal Compounds in Latin”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 11: 61–72
- Chiarini 1980: Gioachino Chiarini, “Compresenza e conflittualità dei generi nel teatro latino arcaico (per una rilettura dell’*Amphitruo*)”, *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici* 5: 87–124
- Christenson 2000: David Christenson (ed.), *Plautus: Amphitruo* (Cambridge)
- Clackson 2011: James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Cambridge)
- Clackson 2015: James Clackson, *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge)
- Coleman 1989: Robert Coleman, “The Formation of Specialized Vocabularies in Philosophy, Grammar, and Rhetoric: Winners and Losers”, in Lavency–Longrée 1989, pp. 77–89
- Coleman 1991: Robert Coleman (ed.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics* (Amsterdam)
- Conlon 2016: Joseph Matthew Conlon (ed.), *Persa: Introduction and Commentary* (diss.: Princeton)
- Conte 1994: Gian Biaggio Conte, *Latin Literature. A History* (Baltimore and London)

- Conte 2013: Gian Biaggio Conte, *Ope ingenii. Experiences of Textual Criticism* (Berlin and Boston)
- Cook 1925: Arthur Bernard Cook, *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion* (2 Vols.: Cambridge)
- Cooper 1895: Frederic Taber Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York)
- Costa Ramalho 1952: Américo da Costa Ramalho, *Dipla Onomata no estilo de Aristófanes* (Coimbra)
- Coulter 1916: Cornelia Coulter, "Compound Adjectives in Early Latin Poetry", *TAPA* 47: 153–172
- Courtney 2001: Edward Courtney, *A Companion to Petronius* (Oxford and New York)
- Crespo 1993: E. Crespo (ed.), *Dialectologia Graeca: Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega*. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
- Cucchiarelli 2001: Andrea Cucchiarelli, *La satira e il poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones* (Pisa)
- Damon 1997: Cynthia Damon, *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage* (Ann Arbor)
- Daviault 1979: André Daviault, "Togata et Palliata", *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*: 422–30
- Davies 1971: J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford)
- de Melo 2011–3: Wolfgang de Melo (ed.), *Plautus* (5 vols: Cambridge, MA.)
- de Meo 1983: Cesidio de Meo, *Lingue tecnica del latino* (Bologna)
- Debrunner 1917: Albert Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg)

- Dederding 1983: Hans-Martin Dederding, "Wortbildung und Text: Zur Textfunktion (TF) von Nominalkomposita (NK)", *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 11: 49–64
- Dobree 1874: Peter Paul Dobree, *Adversaria Vol. III Miscellaneae Observationes ad Varios Scriptores Graecos* (Berlin)
- Dobrov 2011: Gregory Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy* (Leiden and Boston)
- Doleschal–Thornton 2000: Ursula Doleschal and Anna Thornton (eds.), *Extragrammatical and Marginal Morphology* (Munich)
- Dominik–Hall 2007: William Dominik and Jon Hall, *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Malden)
- Dorsa 1876: Vincenzo Dorsa, *La Tradizione Greco-latina nei Dialetti della Calabria Citeriore* (Cosenza)
- Dousa 1597: Franciscus Dousa (ed.), *C. Lucilii Saturarum Quae Supersunt Reliquiae* (Brittenburg)
- Dover 1968: Kenneth Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes Clouds* (Oxford and New York)
- Dover 1993: Kenneth Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford and New York)
- Downing 1977: Pamela Downing, "On the Creation and Use of English Compound Nouns", *Language* 53: 810–42
- Dubois 2005: Laurent Dubois, "Alphabet, onomastique et dialecte des îles Lipari", *Revue des Études Grecques* 118: 214–28
- Duckworth 1940: George Duckworth (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus* (Princeton)
- Duckworth 1952: George Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy*² (Princeton)

- Dudley 1937: Donald R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.* (Cambridge)
- Dunbar 1995: Nan Dunbar (ed.), *Aristophanes Birds* (Oxford)
- Dunkel 2000: G. E. Dunkel, "Remarks on code-switching in Cicero's letters to Atticus", *Museum Helveticum* 57:122–9
- Eberhard 1869: Alfred Eberhard (ed.), *Philogelos: Hieroclis et Philagrii facetiae* (Berlin)
- Edwards 1991: Anthony T. Edwards, "'Aristophanes' Comic Poetics: Τρύξ, Scatology, σκῶμμα", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 121: 157–79
- Edwards 2004: John V. Edwards, "Foundations of Bilingualism," in Bhatia–Ritchie 2004, pp. 7–31
- Erskine 2011: Andrew Erskine, "The Life of Persaios of Kition", in Erskine–Llewellyn-Jones 2011, pp. 177–94
- Erskine–Llewellyn-Jones 2011: Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *Creating a Hellenistic World* (Swansea)
- Farmer 2017: Matthew Farmer, *Tragedy on the Comic Stage* (Oxford and New York)
- Fay 1904: Edwin Fay, "Studies of Latin Words in -cinio-, -cinia-", *Classical Review* 18: 461–3
- Ferris-Hill 2015: Jennifer Ferris-Hill, *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition* (Cambridge)
- Fleckeisen 1850: Alfred Fleckeisen, *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Flores 1998: Enrico Flores, "Il comico (*Pseudolus*) e il tragicomico (*Amphitruo*) in Plauto", *Lexis* 16: 139–47

- Fontaine 2010: Michael Fontaine, *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy* (Oxford and New York)
- Forza–Scalise 2016: Francesca Forza and Sergio Scalise, “Compounding”, in Ledgeman–Maiden 2016, pp. 524–37
- Foster 2004: Verna Foster, *The Name and Nature of Tragicomedy* (Oxon and New York)
- Fradin 2000: Bernard Fradin, “Combining forms, blends and related phenomena”, in Doleschal–Thornton 2000, pp. 11–60
- Fradin et al. 2009a: Bernard Fradin, Fabio Montermini, and Marc Plenat, “Morphologie grammaticale et morphologie extragrammaticale”, in Fradin et al. 2009b, pp. 21–45
- Fradin et al. 2009b: Bernard Fradin, Marc Plénat, and Françoise Kerleroux (eds.), *Aperçus de morphologie du français* (Paris)
- Friedrich 2008: Cornelia Friedrich, *Kontamination: zur Form und Funktion eines Wortbildungstyps im Deutschen* (diss.: Erlangen–Nürnberg)
- Frohwein 1868: Eugenius Frohwein, *De Adverbiis Graecis* (Leipzig)
- Fruyt 2003: Michèle Fruyt, “Constraints and Productivity in Latin Nominal Compounding”, in *Transactions of the Philological Society* 100: 259–87
- Ferguson 1961: John Ferguson, “Apuleius”, *Greece and Rome* 8: 61–74
- Gäbel–Weise 1893: Gäbel and Oskar Weise, “Die Latinisierung der griechischen Wörter”, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie* 8: 339–68
- Gallutius 1621: Tarquinius Gallutius, *Vergilianae Vindicationes et Commentarii tres de tragoedia, comoedia, elegia* (Rome)

- Georgescu 2017: Theodor Georgescu, “Le grec en latin: des mots grecs attestés seulement en Latin”, in Logozzo–Pocetti 2017, pp. 825–33
- Goetz 1876: Georg Goetz, Review of Ussing 1875, *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* 113: 351–62
- Gow–Scholfield 1953: A. S. F. Gow and A. F. Scholfield (eds.), *Nicander. The Poems and Poetical Fragments* (Cambridge)
- Gratwick 1993: Adrian S. Gratwick (ed.), *Plautus. Menaechmi* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics: Cambridge)
- Gray 1893: J. H. Gray (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus* (Cambridge)
- Green 1873: W. C. Green (ed.), *The Peace of Aristophanes* (London)
- Grenier 1912: Albert Grenier, *Étude sur la formation et l'emploi des composés nominaux dans le latin archaïque* (Nancy)
- Grésillon 1984a: Almuth Grésillon, *La règle et le monstre: le mot-valise. Interrogations sur la langue, à partir d'un corpus de Heinrich Heine* (Linguistische Arbeiten 152: Tübingen)
- Grésillon 1984b: Almuth Grésillon, “Le mot-valise et ses contraintes d'écriture chez Heine”, *Cahier Heine* 3: 29–64
- Gribble 1999: David Gribble, *Alcibiades and Athens* (Oxford)
- Grosjean 1982: François Grosjean, *Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism* (Cambridge, M.A. and London)
- Guardì 1981: T. Guardì, “Note sulla lingua di Titinio”, *Pan* 7: 145–65
- Guevara–Scalise 2009: Emiliano Guevara and Sergio Scalise, “Searching for Universals in Compounding”, in Scalise–Bisetto–Magni 2009, pp. 101–28

- Haas 1959: O. Haas, "Die griechischen Absolutiva auf -δα, -δην, -δον", in Kronasser 1956, pp. 130–45
- Hall 2006: Edith Hall, *The Theatrical Cast of Athens* (Oxford and New York)
- Hansen 1963: K. Hansen, "Wortverschmelzung", *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 11: 117–42
- Hapselmath *et al.* 2001: Martin Hapselmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals* (Berlin and New York)
- Hardin 2018: Richard Hardin, *Plautus and the English Renaissance of Comedy* (Lanham)
- Harlow 2007: Ray Harlow, *Maori. A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge)
- Hatcher 1951: Anna Granville Hatcher, *Modern English Word-Formation and Neo-Latin. A Study of the Origins of English (French, Italian, German) Copulative Compounds* (Baltimore)
- Helfer 2017: Ariel Helfer, *Socrates and Alcibiades: Plato's Drama of Political Ambition and Philosophy* (Philadelphia)
- Henderson 1991: Jeffrey Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (Oxford and New York)
- Henderson 1998–2008: Jeffrey Henderson (ed.), *Aristophanes* (5 vols.: Cambridge, MA)
- Henry-Richards 1983: Frank Henry and Barry Richards (eds.), *Linguistic Categories: Auxiliaries and Related Puzzles* (Dordrecht)
- Hettrich 2002: Heinrich Hettrich (ed.), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven* (Wiesbaden)

- Hinge 2001: George Hinge, "Die Aussprache des griechischen Zeta". *Die Sprache Alkmans: Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte* (diss: Aarhus)
- Hough 1934: John N. Hough, "The Use of Greek Words by Plautus". *AJP* 55: 346–64
- Hough 1940: John N. Hough, "Miscellanea Plautina: Vulgarity, Extra-Dramatic Speeches, Roman Allusions", *TAPA* 71: 186–98
- Hough 1947: John N. Hough, "Terence's Use of Greek Words", *The Classical Weekly* 41: 18–21
- Isager–Skydsgaard 2001: Signe Isager and Jens Erik Skydsgaard, *Ancient Greek Agriculture* (London and New York)
- Jaech–Koncel-Kedziorski–Ostendorf 2016: Aaron Jaech, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski and Mari Ostendorf, "Phonological Pun-derstanding", *Proceedings of NAACL HLT*: 654–63
- Janko 1984: Richard Janko, *Aristotle On Comedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles)
- Jocelyn 1999: H. D. Jocelyn, "Code-switching in the comoedia palliata", in Vogt-Spira–Rommel 1999, pp. 169–95
- Kagan 2004: Donald Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War* (New York)
- Kahane 1986: Henry Kahane, "A Typology of the Prestige Language", *Language* 62: 495–508
- Kaimio 1979: Jorma Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 64: Helsinki)
- Kanavou 2011: Nikoletta Kanavou, *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names* (Berlin and New York)

- Karakasis 2005: Evangelos Karakasis, *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy* (Cambridge)
- Kastovsky 1978: Dieter Kastovsky, "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Wortbildungslehre des Englischen", *Linguistik und Didaktik* 36: 351–66
- Kastovsky 2009: Dieter Kastovsky, "Diachronic Perspectives", in Lieber–Stekauer 2009b, pp. 323–40
- Kemmer 2000: Suzanne Kemmer, "Schemas and lexical blends", LAUD Series B 299: 1–28
- Kemmer–Barlow 2000: Suzanne Kemmer and Michael Barlow (eds.), *Usage-based Models of Language* (Chicago)
- Kent 1932: Roland Kent, "The Sounds of Latin. A Descriptive and Historical Phonology", *Language* 8: 11–216
- Kindstrand 1976: Jan Fredrik Kindstrand (ed.), *Bion of Borysthenes: a collection of the fragments with Introduction and Commentary* (Uppsala)
- Kölligan 2002: Daniel Kölligan, "Zur Funktion schwundstufiger -éje/o- Präsens im Indogermanischen". In Hettrich 2002, pp. 137–52
- Krenkel 1970: Werner Krenkel (ed.), *Lucilius Satiren* (2 vols.: Leiden)
- Kronasser 1956: H. Kronasser (ed.), *Μνημῆς Χάριν. Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer, 2. Mai 1866 – 9 März 1956* Vol. I (Vienna)
- Kruijssen 1980: Joep Kruijssen, *Liber Amicorum Weijnen* (Assen)
- Lachmann 1876: Karl Lachmann (ed.), *C. Lucilii Saturarum* (Berlin)

- Lavency–Longrée 1989: Marius Lavency and Dominique Longrée (eds), *Actes du Ve colloque de linguistique latine, Louvain-la-Neuve/Borzée 31 mars-4 avril 1989* (Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain: Leuven)
- Ledgeway–Martin 2016: Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages* (Oxford)
- Lefèvre 1982: Eckard Lefèvre, *Maccus vortit barbare: Vom tragischen Amphitryon zum tragikomischen Amphitruo* (Wiesbaden)
- Lefèvre 1999: Eckard Lefèvre, “Plautus’ *Amphitruo* zwischen Tragödie und Stegreifspiel”, in Baier 199, pp. 11–50
- Leo 1887/8: Friedrich Leo, *Vindiciae Plautinae* (Rostock)
- Leo 1895: Friedrich Leo (ed.), *Plauti Comoediae* (Berlin)
- Leo 1912: Friedrich Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*² (Darmstadt)
- Leumann 1977: Manu Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*⁵ (2 vols.: Munich)
- Lewis 1997: David M. Lewis, *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (Cambridge)
- Liberman 2008: Anatoly Liberman, *An Analytic Dictionary of English Etymology* (Minneapolis)
- Lieber–Štekauer 2009a: Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, “Introduction: status and definition of compounding” in Lieber–Štekauer 2009b, pp. 3–19
- Lieber–Štekauer 2009b: Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding* (Oxford and New York)
- Lindemann 1834: Fridericus Lindemannus (ed.), *M. A. Plauti Fabulae* (Leipzig)

- Lindner 1996: Thomas Lindner, *Lateinische Komposita. Ein Glossar vornehmlich zum Wortschatz der Dichtersprache* (Innsbruck)
- Lindner 2002: Thomas Lindner, *Lateinische Komposita. Morphologische, historische und lexikalische Studien* (Innsbruck)
- Lindsay 1901: Wallace M. Lindsay (ed.), *Nonius Marcellus* (Oxford and London)
- Lindsay 1903: Wallace M. Lindsay (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (2 vols.: Oxford)
- Lindsay 1913: Wallace M. Lindsay (ed.), *Sexti Pompei Festi de Verborum Significatu Quae Supersunt cum Pauli Epitome* (Leipzig)
- Lipka 2000: Leonhard Lipka, *An Outline of English Lexicology*² (Cambridge)
- Livingston 2004: Ivy Livingston, *A Linguistic Commentary on Livius Andronicus* (New York and London)
- Lobeck 1829: Christian Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (Königsberg)
- Loewe 1886: Gustavus Loewe, *Prodromus Corporis Glossariorum Latinorum* (Leipzig)
- Logozzo–Pocetti 2017: Felicia Logozzo and Paolo Pocetti (ed.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics: New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives* (Berlin and Boston)
- López Rúa 2004: Paula López Rúa, “The Categorical Continuum of English Blends”, *English Studies* 85: 163–71
- Lorenzetti 2014: Luca Lorenzetti, “Greek/Latin bilingualism”, in *EAGLL*
- Lowe 2015: John J. Lowe, “The syntax of Sanskrit compounds”, *Language* 91: 71–115
- Lucas 1968: D. W. Lucas (ed.) *Aristotle Poetics* (Oxford)
- Lundquist–Yates 2018: Jesse Lundquist and Anthony D. Yates, “The Morphology of Proto-Indo-European”
(<https://pies.ucla.edu/resources/ady/papers/IEmorph-F.pdf>)

- MacSwan 2009: Jeff MacSwan, "Generative approaches to code-switching", in Bullock–Toribio 2009, pp. 309-335
- Magnelli 2005: Enrico Magnelli, "Nicarco, AP 11.328: allusioni oscene e allusioni erudite (con osservazioni sulla trasmissione degli epigrammi scoptici)", *SemRom* 8 no. 2: 153-66
- Maling 1983: Joan Maling, "Transitive Adjectives: A Case of Categorical Reanalysis", in Heny–Richards 1983, pp. 253-289
- Manuwald 1999: Gesine Manuwald, "Tragödienelemente in Plautus' *Amphitruo* — Zeichen von Tragödienparodie oder Tragikomödie?", in Baier 1999, pp. 177–202
- Manuwald 2011: Gesine Manuwald, *Roman Republican Theatre* (Cambridge)
- Martinius 1655: Matthias Martinius, *Lexicon Philologicum* (Frankfurt)
- Marx 1904: Fridericus Marx (ed.), *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* (Leipzig)
- Marzano 1928: Giovan Battista Marzano, *Dizionario Ettimologico del Dialetto Calabrese* (Laurena di Borrello)
- Marzullo 1953: Bernard Marzullo, "Strepsiade", *Maia* 6: 99–124
- Mastronarde 1999/2000: Donald J. Mastronarde, "Euripidean Tragedy and Genre: The Terminology and its Problems", *Illinois Classical Studies* 24/25: 23–39
- McArthur 1998a: Tom McArthur, "Code-mixing and Code-switching," in McArthur 1998b s. v.
- McArthur 1998b: Tom McArthur (ed.), *The Concise Oxford Companion to the English Language* (Oxford and New York)

- Medda *et al.* 2006: Enrico Medda, Marina Serena Mirto, and Marina Pia Pattoni (eds.), *Kômôidotragôidia: intersezioni del tragico e del comico nel teatro del V secolo a.C.* (Pisa)
- Meillet–Vendryes 1960: Antoine Meillet and Joseph Vendryès, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*³ (Paris)
- Meineke 1860: August Meineke (ed.), *Aristophanis Comoediae* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Meissner–Tribulato 2002: Thorsten Meissner and Olga Tribulato, “Nominal Composition and Mycenaean Greek”, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 100: 289–300
- Melloni–Bisetto 2010: Chiara Melloni and Antonietta Bisetto, “Parasynthetic Compounds”, in Scalise–Vogel 2010, pp. 199–218
- Mendelsohn 1907: Charles Jastrow Mendelsohn, *Studies in the Word-Play of Plautus* (Philadelphia)
- Méndez Dosuna 1993: Julián Méndez Dosuna, “On <Z> for <Δ> in Greek Dialectal Inscriptions”, *Die Sprache* 35: 82–114
- Merry 1887: William W. Merry (ed.), *Aristophanes. The Acharnians* (Oxford)
- Merula 1472: Georgius Alexandrinus Merula (ed.), *Plautinae viginti comoediae* (Venice)
- Meuli 1955: Karl Meuli, “Altrömischer Maskenbrauch”, *Museum Helveticum* 12: 205–16
- Mikalson 1975: Jon D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton)

- Minarini 1997: Alessandra Minarini, "Il linguaggio della togata fra innovazione e tradizione: considerazioni sullo stile", *Bolletino di Studi Latini* 27: 34–55
- Monier Williams 1846: Monier Williams, *An Elementary Grammar of the Sanskrit Language* (London)
- Montiglio 2011: Silvia Montiglio, *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought* (Ann Arbor)
- Moore 1995: Timothy Moore, "Tragicomedy as a Running Joke: Plautus' *Amphitruo* in Performance", *How is it Played? Genre, Performance and Meaning* (*Didaskalia* Supplement 1: <http://www.didaskalia.net/issues/supplement1/moore.html>)
- Moore 1998: Timothy Moore, *The Theater of Plautus* (Austin)
- Moorton 1988: Richard F. Moorton Jr., "Aristophanes on Alcibiades", *GRBS* 29: 345–59
- Morelli 2007: Alfredo M. Morelli, "Hellenistic Epigram in the Roman World: From the Beginnings to the End of the Republican Age", in Bing–Bruss 2007, pp. 521–42
- Mukai 2008: Makiko Mukai, "Recursive Compounds", *Word Structure* 1: 178–98
- Müller 1839: Karl Müller (ed.), *Sexti Pompei Festi de Verborum Significatu Quae Supersunt cum Pauli Epitome* (Leipzig)
- Müller 1866: Max Müller, *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners* (London)
- Müller 1872: Lucian Müller (ed.), *C. Lucilii Saturarum Reliquiae* (Leipzig)
- Muysken 2004: Pieter Muysken, *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing* (Cambridge)
- Navia 1996: Luis Navia, *Classical Cynicism. A Critical Study* (Contributions to Philosophy 58: Westport and London)

- Nilsson 1908: Martin P. Nilsson, “Zu Zeùs Καταιβάτης”, *RhM* 63: 313–6
- Nisbet 2003: Gideon Nisbet, *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial’s Forgotten Rivals* (Oxford)
- Nisbet 2007: Gideon Nisbet, “Roman Imperial Receptions of Hellenistic Epigram”, in Bing–Bruss 2007, pp. 543–64
- Noonan 1992: Michael Noonan, *A Grammar of Lango* (Berlin and New York)
- Olsen 2000: Susan Olsen, “Composition”, in Booij *et al.* 2000, pp. 897–916
- Olson 1992: S. Douglas Olson, “Names and naming in Aristophanic comedy”, *CQ* NS 42: 304–19
- Olson 1998: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Aristophanes Peace* (Oxford)
- Olson 2002: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Aristophanes Acharnians* (Oxford)
- Olson 2007–12: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Athenaeus. The Learned Banqueters* (8 vols.: Cambridge, MA.)
- Olson 2014: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Eupolis frr. 326–497. Translation and Commentary* (Fragmenta Comica Band 8.3: Heidelberg)
- Olson 2016: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Eupolis: Heilotes – Chrysoun genos (frr. 147–325). Translation and Commentary* (Fragmenta Comica Band 8.2: Heidelberg)
- Olson–Seaberg 2018: S. Douglas Olson and Ryan Seaberg (eds.), *Cratinus frr. 299–504 and Dubia. Translation and Commentary* (Fragmenta Comica Band 3.6: Heidelberg)
- Olson–Sens 1999: S. Douglas Olson and Alexander Sens (eds), *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE* (Athens, GA)

- Oniga 1985: Renato Oniga, “Il canticum di Sosia: Forme stilistiche e modelli culturali”,
Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 14: 113–208
- Oniga 2003: Renato Oniga (ed.), *Il plurilinguismo nella tradizione letteraria latina*
(Rome)
- Paley 1873: F. A. Paley (ed.), *The “Peace” of Aristophanes* (Cambridge)
- Panagiotarakou 2009: Eleni Panagiotarakou, *Aristophanes' Acharnians: pursuing
peace with an iambic Peitho* (diss.: Concordia)
- Papademetrakopoulos 1889: Theodoros Papademetrakopoulos, Βάσανος τῶν περὶ
τῆς ἑλληνικῆς προφορᾶς ἑρασμικῶν ἀποδείξεω (Athens)
- Pareus 1610: Johann Philipp Pareus, *M. Acci Plauti Sarsinatis Umbri Comoediae XX
Superstites* (Frankfurt)
- Pareus 1614: Johann Philipp Pareus, *Lexicon Plautinum* (Frankfurt)
- Pascal 1918: Carolus Pascal (ed.), *Carmina Ludicra Romanorum* (Torino)
- Pasetti 2007: Lucia Pasette, *Plauto in Apuleio* (Testi e Manuali per l'Insegnamento
Universitario del Latin 94: Bologna)
- Perotti 1506: Niccolò Perotti, *Cornucopiae* (Mediolanum)
- Perpillou 1973: Jean-Louis Perpillou, *Les substantifs grecs en -ευς* (Paris)
- Perpillou 1982: Jean-Louis Perpillou, “Verbes de sonorité à vocalisme expressif en
grec ancien”, *REG* 95: 233–74
- Petersmann 1996–7: Hubertus Petersmann, “Die Nachahmung des ‘sermo rusticus’
auf der Bühne des Plautus und Terenz“, *AAnthung* 37: 199–211
- Pickard–Cambridge 1966: Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and
Comedy*² (Oxford)

- Piñeros 2000: Carlos-Eduardo Piñeros, "Word-blending as a case of non-concatenative morphology in Spanish," Rutgers Optimality Archive 343: <http://roa.rutgers.edu/files/343-0999/343-PINEROS-0-0.PDF>
- Piñeros 2004: Carlos-Eduardo Piñeros, "The creation of portmanteaus in the extragrammatical morphology of Spanish", *Probus* 16: 203–40
- Plasberg 1899: O. Plasberg, "Mantiscinor und mantisa", *RhM* 54: 638–40
- Poliakoff 1981: Michael Baron Poliakoff, *Studies in the Terminology of Greek Combat Sports* (diss.: Michigan)
- Poulisse 2000: Nanda Poulisse, "Slips of the Tongue in First and Second Language Production", *Studia Linguistica* 54: 136–49
- Pound 1914: Louise Pound, *Blends, their Relation to English Word Formation* (*Anglistische Forschungen* 42: Heidelberg)
- Pulgram 1947: Ernst Pulgram, "Indo-European Personal Names", *Language* 23: 189–206
- Ralli 2009: Angela Ralli, "Modern Greek", in Lieber–Štekauer 2009b, pp. 453–63
- Ralli–Xydopoulos 2013: Angela Ralli and George Xydopoulos, "Blend Formation in Modern Greek", in Renner et al. 2013, pp. 35–50
- Rau 2006: Jeremy Rau, "The Greek Adverbs in -δην, -δον, -δα", *Glotta* 82: 211–20
- Reisch 1902: Emil Reisch, "Zur Vorgeschichte der attischen Tragödie", *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz*, pp. 451–78
- Renner et al. 2013: Vincent Renner, François Maniez, and Pierre Arnaud, *Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending* (*TiLSM* 252: Berlin)

- Richter 1898: Oswald Richter, "Die unechten Nominalkomposita des Altindischen und Altiranischen", *Indogermanische Forschung* 9: 1–61
- Riese 1884: Alexander Riese (ed.), *Die Gedichte des Catullus* (Leipzig)
- Ringbom 1987: Håkan Ringbom, *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning* (Multilingual Matters 34: Clevedon and Philadelphia)
- Risch 1974: Ernst Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*² (Berlin and New York)
- Ritschl 1848: Friedrich Ritschl (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti*, Vol. 1 (Bonn and London)
- Ritschl 1871–1894: Friedrich Ritschl (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (4 vols.: Leipzig)
- Rix 1992: Helmut Rix, *Historische Grammatik des griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*² (Darmstadt)
- Rochette 1997: Bruno Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec* (Brussels)
- Rochette 2010: Bruno Rochette, "Greek and Latin bilingualism", in Bakker 2010, pp. 281–93
- Rodríguez González 1989: Félix Rodríguez González, "Los cruces léxicos en el ámbito político-periodístico", *Verba* 16: 352–86
- Rohlf s 1962: Gerhard Rolfs, "Die Aussprache des z (ζ) im Altgriechischen", *Das Altertum* 8: 3–8
- Rohlf s 1964: Gerhard Rolfs, *Lexicon Graecanicum Italiae Inferioris. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der unteritalienischen Gräzität* (Tübingen)
- Ronneberger-Sibold 2013: Elke Ronneberger-Sibold, "Blending between Grammar and Universal Cognitive Principles: Evidence from German, Farsi, and Chinese", in Renner et al. 2013, pp. 115–44

- Rose 1962: K. F. C. Rose, "Time and Place in the *Satyricon*", *TAPA* 93: 402–9
- Rosen 1988: Ralph Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition* (American Classical Studies 19: Atlanta)
- Rosén 1991: Haiim Rosén, "Probable Substratum Features in the Expansion of Republican Latin: The Phonological Aspect", in Coleman 1991, pp. 23–33
- Rychlewska 1962: Ludovica Rychlewska (ed.), *Turpili Comici Fragmenta* (Wrocław)
- Rychlewska 1971: Ludovica Rychlewska (ed.), *Turpili Comici Fragmenta* (Leipzig)
- Sacks 2005: David Sacks, *Encyclopedia of the Ancient Greek World²* (New York)
- Santiago Álvarez 1987: R. A. Santiago Álvarez, *Nombres en -ευς y nombres en -υς en micénico. Contribución al estudio del sufijo -ευς* (Barcelona)
- Scalise–Bisetto 2009: Sergio Scalise and Antonia Bisetto, "The Classification of Compounds", in Lieber–Štekauer 2009b, pp. 34–53
- Scalise–Bisetto–Magni 2009: Sergio Scalise, Antonia Bisetto, and Elisabetta Magni (eds.), *Universals of Language Today* (Amsterdam)
- Scalise–Vogel 2010: Sergio Scalise and Irene Vogel (eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 311) (Amsterdam and Philadelphia)
- Schmidt 1860: Mauricius Schmidt, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, Vol. 3.1 (Jena)
- Schmidt 2003: Ernst Schmidt, "Die Tragikomödie *Amphitruo* des Plautus als Komödie und Tragödie", *Museum Helveticum* 60 : 80–104 .
- Schulze 1904: Wilhelm Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin)
- Schwering 1916/7: Walter Schwering, "Die Entstehung des Wortes *tragicomoedia*", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 37: 139–41

- Schwyzler 1953: Eduard Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* (3 vols.: Munich)
- Sedgwick 1927: W. B. Sedgwick, "Parody in Plautus", *CQ* 21: 88–9
- Sedley 1999: David Sedley, "Lucretius's Use and Avoidance of Greek", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 93: 227–46
- Segebade–Lommatzsch 1898: Joannes Segebade and Ernestus Lommatzsch, *Lexicon Petronianum* (Leipzig)
- Sens 2011: Alexander Sens, "Notes on Homeric Humor in Lucilius", *Homère revisité. Parodie et humour dans les réécritures homériques. Actes du colloque international, Aix-en-Provence 30-31 octobre 2008*, pp. 179–91
- Sheets 1983: George Sheets, "Plautus and Early Roman Tragedy," *Illinois Classical Studies* 8: 195–209
- Sheets 2007: George Sheets, "Elements of Style in Catullus", in Skinner 2007, pp. 190–211
- Sihler 1995: Andrew Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford and New York)
- Sistakou 2007: Evina Sistakou, "Glossing Homer: Homeric Exegesis in Early Third Century Epigram", in Bing–Bruss 2007, pp. 391–408
- Skeat 1906: Walter Skeat, *The Place-Names of Bedfordshire* (Cambridge)
- Skinner 2007: Marilyn B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus* (Malden and Oxford)
- Slater 1990: Niall Slater, "Amphitruo, Bacchae, and Metatheatre", *Lexis* 5–6: 101–25
- Slater 1992: Niall Slater, "Plautine Negotiations: The *Poenulus* Prologue Unpacked", *Yale Classical Studies* 29: 131–46

- Smyth 1956: Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. Gordon M. Messing: Cambridge, MA.)
- Sobkowiak 1991: Włodzimierz Sobkowiak, *Metaphonology of English Paronomasic Puns* (Bamberg Studies in English Linguistics: 26)
- Sommer 1948: Ferdinand Sommer, *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Nominalkomposita* (Munich)
- Sommerstein 2007: Alan Sommerstein, Review of Medda *et al.* 2006, *BMCR* 2007.03.29
- Steele 1900: R. B. Steele, "The Greek in Cicero's Epistles", *AJP* 21: 387–410
- Štekauer 1991: Pavol Štekauer, "On Some Issues of Blending in English Word Formation", *Linguistica Pragensia* 1: 26–35.
- Stewart 1958: Zeph Stewart, "The *Amphitruo* of Plautus and Euripides' *Bacchae*", *TAPA* 89: 348–73
- Studemund 1882: Willhelm Studemund, *Abhandlungen. I. Duo commentarii de comoedia. II. Pseudo-Plutarchus de metro heroico* (Göttingen)
- Sun 2006: Chaofen Sun, *Chinese. A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge)
- Sweet 1902: Henry Sweet, *A New English Grammar* (Oxford)
- Taplin 1983: Oliver Taplin, "Tragedy and Tragedy", *Classical Quarterly* 23: 331–3
- Teodorsson 1993: Sven-Tage Teodorsson, "The pronunciation of zeta in different Greek dialects", in Crespo 1993, pp. 305–321
- Thierfelder 1939: Andreas Thierfelder, "Plautus und römische Tragödie", *Hermes* 74: 155–66
- Threatte 1980–96: Leslie Threatte, *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (2 vols.: Berlin)

- Tichy 1983: Eva Tichy, *Onomatopoetische Verbalbildungen des Griechischen* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 409 Band 14: Vienna)
- Tribulato 2015: Olga Tribulato, *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds* (Berlin and Boston)
- Tuchhaendler 1876: Nathan Ionas Tuchhaendler, *De Vocabulis Graecis in Linguam Latinam Translatis* (diss: Berlin)
- Tylawsky 1999: Elizabeth Tylawsky, Review of Damon 1997, *BMCR* 1999.0.22
- Ussing 1875–1887: Johannes Ludovicus Ussing (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (2 vols.: Hannover)
- Ussing 1878: Joannes Ludovicus Ussing (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (2 Vols.: Copenhagen)
- Vaahtera 1998: Jaana Vaahtera, *Derivation: Greek and Roman Views on Word Formation* (Turku)
- van Leeuwen 1896: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Ranae* (Brittenburg)
- van Leeuwen 1900: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Equites* (Brittenburg)
- van Leeuwen 1902: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Aves* (Brittenburg)
- Vergados 2010: Athanassios Vergados, “Nicarchus *AP* 11.328 and Homeric Interpretation”, *Mnemosyne* 63: 406–23
- Vogt-Spira 1999: Gregor Vogt-Spira and Bettina Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart)
- Vossius 1662: Gerardus Vossius, *Etymologicon Linguae Latinae* (Amsterdam)

- Waanders 2008: Frits Waanders, *An Analytic Study of Mycenaean Compounds* (Pisa and Rome)
- Wackernagel 1905: Jakob Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, Vol. II.1 (Göttingen)
- Wackernagel 1916: Jakob Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zur Homer* (Göttingen)
- Wackernagel 1920–4: Jakob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*² (2 vols.: Basel)
- Walín 2012: Daniel Walín, *Slaves, Sex, and Transgression in Greek Old Comedy* (diss.: Berkeley)
- Weise 1882: Oskar Weise, *Die griechische Wörter im Latein* (Leipzig)
- Weiss 2010: Michael Weiss, *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin* (Ann Arbor and New York)
- Welcker 1841: Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien*, Vol. 3 (Bonn)
- Wenskus 1995: Otta Wenskus, “Triggering und Einschaltung griechischer Formen in lateinischer Prosa”, *Indogermanische Forschung* 100: 172–92
- Wenskus 1996: Otta Wenskus, “Markieren der Basissprache in lateinischen Texten mit griechischen Einschaltungen und Entlehnungen”, *Indogermanische Forschung* 101: 233–57
- Wenskus 1998: Otta Wenskus, *Emblematischer Codewechsel und Verwandtes in der lateinischen Prosa. Zwischen Nähesprache und Distanzsprache* (Innsbruck)
- Wentworth 1933: Harold Wentworth, “Twenty-nine Synonyms for Portmanteau-words”, *American Speech* 8: 78–9
- West 1992: Martin West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford)

- Whitney 1896: William D. Whitney, *A Sanskrit Grammar* (Boston)
- Willi 2003: Andreas Willi, *The Languages of Aristophanes* (Oxford and New York)
- Willi 2010: Andreas Willi, "The language of old comedy", in Dobrov 2010, pp. 471–510
- Willi 2018: Andreas Willi, *Origins of the Greek Verb* (Cambridge)
- Williams 1999: Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford and New York)
- Wilson 2008: Nigel Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae* (2 vols.: Oxford)
- Withington 1931: Robert Withington, "More 'Portmanteau' Coinages", *American Speech* 7: 200–3
- Withington 1933: Robert Withington, "Dickensian and Other Blends", *American Speech* 8: 73–5
- Wladowa 1975: E. W. Wladowa, "Okkasionelle Wortbildungen mit dem Gleichen Stamm als Satz- und Textverflechtungsmittel", *Textlinguistik* 4: 71–87
- Wood 1911: Francis A. Wood, "Iteratives, Blends, and 'Streckformen'", *Modern Philology* 9: 157–94
- Wood 1919: Francis A. Wood, "Greek and Latin Etymologies", *Classical Philology* 14: 245–72
- Wouters et al. 2014: Alfons Wouters, Pierre Swiggers, Toon van Hal, and Lambert Isebaert, "Word Formation (Derivation, Compounding)", in *EAGLL*

APPENDIX I. ANCIENT RHETORICAL THEORY AND BLEND FORMATION

In Chapter 3 s. v. Βδεῦ we saw that this word was cited in the Anon. *de Com.* as follows:

Anon. *de Com.* 8 p. 16 Koster

πέμπτον (sic Janko : ἔκτον codd.) κατὰ παρωδίαν (sic Janko : ἑξαλλαγὴν codd.)

ὡς τὸ ὦ βδεῦ δέσποτα (adesp. com. fr. 83) ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ Ζεῦ

Βδεῦ] ζεὺς Θ : ζεῦ (sscr. m² βεῦ) U : δεῦ V⁵⁷ : βδῆ Chis

fifth (thus Janko : sixth codd.) is from parody (thus Janko : alteration codd.) as in **O Lord Bdeus** (adesp. com. fr. 83) instead of O Zeus

Since this is one of the few blends transmitted by and singled-out as worthy of comment in an ancient scholarly source, it affords the chance to see how the ancient tradition analyzed blends. This Appendix attempts to answer that question.

In the Anon. *de Com.* Βδεῦ is cited under the heading κατὰ ἑξαλλαγὴν (“from *exallagē*”) amid a discussion of the manifold ways in which laughter arises from speech. Janko 1984. 32–3 (comparing Tzetzes 79, 81) moves the fragment under the heading κατὰ παρωδίαν (“from parody”), arguing that the ordinals were misplaced after the categories κατὰ παρωδιαν and κατὰ μετάφοραν (preserved without examples in Tzetzes) were lost from the text and diminutives and alteration, formerly subtypes of paronymy, were promoted. This is most likely correct, since the wordplay here better fits the definition of παρωδία than it does of ἑξαλλαγή.

LSJ s. v. ἐξαλλαγή 2 offers “ἐξαλλαγαὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων *variations in the forms of nouns*, Arist. *Po.* 1458^b2”, adding in the Supplement that ἐξαλλαγή 2 is also a “*departure from common idiom*, D.H. *Dem.* 13”,⁴⁵⁴ by which they seemingly mean “*unusualness of diction*” or the like.⁴⁵⁵ LSJ seems to understand the two passages—with Aristotle allegedly talking about changing the forms of nouns (in the context of what characterizes the elevated language of tragedy) and Dionysius talking about exchanging one word for another (as a form of rhetorical embellishment)—as two different senses of the term. Eventually ἐξαλλαγή could also refer more broadly still to the use of more dignified diction to elevate the entire tenor of a passage, as in the following passage from Pseudo-Herodian (*Fig.* 12):

... ὁπόταν ὁ Αἰσχίνης λέγη ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου (69)· οὐδὲν γοῦν θαυμαστόν· ἀναβήσεται γὰρ ἀνὴρ καλός τε κάγαθός, καὶ μισοπόνηρος καὶ πιστεύων τῷ ἑαυτοῦ βίῳ, καὶ τὸν Λεωδάμαντα ὅστις ἐστὶν ἀγνοῶν. ταῦτα γὰρ τῇ ἐξαλλαγῇ ἔχει τινὰ δεινώσιν, καὶ ἔστι δυνατώτερος ὁ λόγος τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν· ἀγοραῖος γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἀπρεπῆς ἐγίνετο ἢ λοιδορία, εἰ οὕτως ἔλεγεν· οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστόν· ἀναβήσεται γάρ, ὡς οἶμαι, ἄνθρωπος ἀσελγῆς τὸν βίον καὶ οὗτος αὐτὸς πόρνος καὶ παρὰ Λεωδάμαντι ἠταιρηκῶς καταφανῶς.⁴⁵⁶

⁴⁵⁴ ἐξαλλαγῆς δὲ ἢ σεμνολογίας ἢ δεινότητος ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τινός, ἃ τῇ Δημοσθένους δυνάμει παρακολουθεῖν πέφυκεν, ὀλίγην ἐπίδειξιν ἔχει (“There is little demonstration of *exallagê* or dignified language or rhetorical brilliance or of any of the other qualities associated with the art of Demosthenes”; said of Demosthenes’ political speeches).

⁴⁵⁵ The addition in the Supplement has evidently been overlooked by Montanari s. v.

⁴⁵⁶ “... whenever Aeschines says in his speech Against Timarchus (69): ‘No wonder at all, since a nobleman will come forth, a hater of wickedness and confident in his life, ignorant as to who Leodamas is.’ For this has gravitas because of the *exallagê*, and the speech is more powerful than it would be, were it said naturally. The invective would be fit for the marketplace and unseemly, if it were to say this: ‘thus, no wonder, since a man will come forth, as I think, lewd

None of these senses appears to have any relevance to the word βδεῦ.

The term παραγραμματισμός (“putting one letter for another”) gets us closer to what is going on with the word βδεῦ. It is defined at *Suda* π 317 as follows:

παραγραμματισμός· ὅταν γράμμα ἀντὶ γράμματος τεθῆ· οἷον ἀντὶ τοῦ μυρσίνη βυρσίνη, β ἀντὶ τοῦ μ· ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ἀντὶ τοῦ μ τῷ β ἐχρήσατο. δέον γὰρ εἰπεῖν μυρσίνη, βυρσίνη εἴρηκε· ταῖς γὰρ μυρσίναις ἀποσοβοῦσι τὰς μυίας. ὁ δὲ ἔπαιξε διὰ τὸν βυρσοδέψην. καὶ μυρσίνη ἐστεφανοῦντο οἱ στρατηγοί. ἢ ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ (*Eq.* 79) ἐγὼ Κλωπιδῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ Κρωπιδῶν, λ ἀντὶ τοῦ ρ⁴⁵⁷

Another Aristophanic passage featuring the same sort of verbal humor is also cited as an example of παραγραμματισμός at Σ^{Tz} *Ar. Ra.* 428a:

καὶ Καλλίαν γέ φασι τοῦτον τὸν Ἴπποβίνου· τὸ σχῆμα παραγραμματισμός. ὁ Καλλίας γὰρ Ἴππονίκου υἱὸς ἦν· οὗτος δὲ Ἴπποβίνου τοῦτον

in life and a prostitute and obviously keeping company with Leodamas.” Neither version here matches the text of Aeschines, at least as it has come down to us. Either Pseudo-Herodian is quoting the passage from memory and has simply misremembered it, or he is intentionally offering two different revisions of the same passage, one elevated by its unusualness of diction, the other dragged down by its banal, colloquial language.

⁴⁵⁷ “*paragrammatismos*: whenever a letter is substituted for another letter, e.g. *byrsinê* instead of *myrsinê* with *beta* instead of *mu*, as when Aristophanes used *beta* instead of *mu*. Although he ought to have said *myrsinê*, he says *byrsinê*: for they scare away flies with myrtle branches. Generals used to be crowned with myrtle branches. Or just as when he says (*Eq.* 79) among the *Klôpidae* instead of among the *Krôpidae* with *lambda* instead of *rho*.” The same two examples (βυρσίνη for μυρσίνη and Κλωπίδαι for Κρωπίδαι) are each described at Σ^{VEGΘ} *Ar. Eq.* 59a (ἀλλὰ βυρσίνην ἔχων) and Σ^{VEΓΘMVatLh} *Ar. Eq.* 79a (ὁ νοῦς δ’ ἐν Κλωπιδῶν) respectively as an ἐναλλαγή στοιχείου (substitution of a letter). On Κλωπίδαι, see Chapter 3 s. v.

παραγραμματίζων φησὶν ἵπποβίνου ἦτοι μεγάλως πορνεύοντος· ἵππος γὰρ ἐπὶ μεγάλου λαμβάνεται. τὸ δὲ βινεῖν συνουσιάζειν⁴⁵⁸

Although not every example of παραγραμματισμός is necessarily meant to be funny,⁴⁵⁹ it is nonetheless considered as a subtype of παρωδία at Anon. *Rhetores Graeci* III p. 661.17–8: ὁ μὲν παραγραμματισμός καλεῖται παρωδία, ὡς ὅταν ἀντὶ κόρακος κόλακος εἴπῃς παίζων (“*paragrammatismos* is called parody, just as whenever you jokingly say *kolakos* (‘flatterer’) instead of *korakos* (‘crow’)”). The latter example is a reference to the parody of Alcibiades’ speech impediment at Ar. *V.* 42–5.⁴⁶⁰ Moreover, the more general term παρωδία could evidently be used in place of the more specific term παραγραμματισμός, with Ar. *V.* 45 offered instead as an example of the former at [Hermog.] *Meth.* p. 34.6–10 τὸ μὲν κατὰ παρωδιαν οὕτως ἔχει (Ar. *V.* 45)· ὀλᾶς; Θεώλος τὴν κεφαλὴν κόλακος ἔχει. θέλων γὰρ εἶπεῖν ‘τὴν κεφαλὴν κόρακος ἔχει’ διὰ τὸ τραυλὸς εἶναι δῆθεν ἀμαρτῶν τῇ φωνῇ διεκωμώδησε τὸν τρόπον (“An example of parody is this (Ar. *V.* 45): Do you shee? Theolus has the head of a *kolakos* (‘flatterer’). Although wanting to say, ‘he has the head of a *korakos* (‘crow’), because he has a lisp, he misspoke and satirized in this way”). Another example of what could properly be considered παραγραμματισμός cited under the

⁴⁵⁸ “And they say ‘this Callias, son of Hippobinus’: the scheme is *paragrammatismos*, for Callias is the son of Hipponicus (‘Horse-victorious’), but Aristophanes, changing it to the son of Hippobinus (‘Horse-fucker’), says that he is the son of a horse-fucker or someone who greatly prostitutes himself, since *hippos* (‘horse’) is used of a large amount, and the verb *binein* (‘fuck’) means *synousiazein* (‘have sex’).”

⁴⁵⁹ E.g. Hdn. *Grammatici Graeci* III.1 p. 383.10–1 ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Θόανα καὶ κατὰ παραγραμματισμὸν Τύανα, ὡς Ἀρριανός (“And Tyana is also called Thoana with a change of letter, according to Arrian”)

⁴⁶⁰ Cf. Tzetzes *Chil.* 8.169; 10.319

more general term παρωδία is given at Eust. p. 894.45–6 = III.361.1–4 Στρατόνικος ὁ κιθαρῳδὸς πρὸς Ἄριον τὸν ψάλτην, ὀχλοῦντά τι αὐτῷ, ἔφη τὸ ψάλλ' ἐς κόρακας, ὅπερ ἐστὶ παρωδία τοῦ βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας (“The citharode Stratonicus said the following to Areius, the harp-player, who was annoying him somewhat: *psall' es korakas* (‘play harp to the crows’), which is a parody of *ball' es korakas* (‘throw yourself to the crows’, i.e. go to hell)).⁴⁶¹

However, not every instance of παρωδία is necessarily an example of παραγραμματισμός.⁴⁶² For example, Ar. *Pax* 528 ἀπέπτυσ' ἐχθροῦ φωτὸς ἔχθιστον πλέκος (“I spurn an odious man’s most odious bag”), identified by Σ^v as a play on E. fr. 727 ἀπέπτυσ' ἐχθροῦ φωτὸς ἔχθιστον τέκος (“I spurn an odious man’s most odious child”), is an example of paragrammatic parody, since the substitution is of letters, while Cratin. fr. 299.4 τῷ Κορινθίῳ πέει (“to the Corinthian penis”), which is said to play on E. fr. 664 τῷ Κορινθίῳ ξένῳ (“to the Corinthian stranger”) is not, since the substitution is of entire words.

⁴⁶¹ Although ἐς κόρακας (“to the crows”) is first and occasionally attested with a verb other than βάλλω (e.g. Archil. fr. S 478a.31; Pherecr. fr. 76.5; Ar. *Nu.* 123; Amips. fr. 23) or without a verb at all (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 864; Hipparch.Com. fr. 1.5), Stratonicus’ witticism plays on, as Eustathius says, the variant βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας, which is however attested only in Aristophanes (*Nu.* 133; *V.* 835; *Th.* 1079 (twice); *Pl.* 782; fr. 477.2) but taken as proverbial at e.g. Σ^{EN} Ar. *Nu.* 133 and Diogenian. 2.4 βάλλ' ἐς ὕδωρ· ἐπὶ τῶν ὀλέθρου ἀξίων· οἷον καταπόντισον· τοιοῦτον καὶ τό· βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας, βάλλ' ἐς φθόρον· τὸ δὲ βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν ἐπὶ καλῷ (“throw yourself into water: used of those who deserve ruin, i.e. *katapontison* (‘throw yourself into the sea’). Of a similar sort is *ball' es korakas* (‘throw yourself to the crows’) and *ball' es phthonon* (‘throw yourself to perdition’), but *ball' es makarian* (‘throw yourself to blessedness’) is said of something good”).

⁴⁶² For additional subtypes of parody, see Tsitsiridis 2010. 259–382.

From this review it emerges that lexical blends, as such, were not recognized as a category of word-formation in the Greek grammatical tradition. Since Roman rhetorical theory is largely derived from the Greek tradition, it is unsurprising that here too blends were not perceived as such. We have already seen, for example, that Quintilian (*Inst.* 6.3.53) refers to two onomastic blends as the products of *nominum fictio adiectis detractis mutatis litteris* (“creation of names by means of adding, removing, or changing letters”). For the ancients, evidently, a blended word might count as an instance of parody. Formally, however, it was explained as a modification of one word in order to parody another, rather than a mix of two words to form a third.

APPENDIX II. ADDITIONAL BLENDS

The following are blends that, although mentioned above, are not discussed above because the first is reconstructed based on a comment in Seneca the Elder, whereas the second two are offered as examples of “frigid” word formation in Quintilian without context or attribution; in fact, it is at least possible that he has coined them himself as examples.

II.1 PASCHIENUS OR PATHIENUS

Sen. *Con.* 10 pr. 11

[Pacatus] ipse ab eloquentia multum aberat; natus ad contumelias omnium ingeniis inurendas, nulli non impressit aliquid quod effugere non posset. Ille Passieno prima eius syllaba in Graecum mutata obscenum nomen inposuit.

[Pacatus] himself was far from eloquent; born to brand insults on the talents of all, he saddled everyone with something that could not be escaped. It was he who gave Passienus an obscene name by changing the first syllable of his name into Greek.

Although Seneca (perhaps for decency’s sake) declines to say what punning nickname the rhetorician Pacatus gave to Passienus, it was perhaps “Paschienus” from πάσχω,

typically “suffer” but often used of pathetic homosexuality,⁴⁶³ or “Pathienus” from παθ-, the aorist stem of πάσχω. If so, then this would be a bilingual, onomastic blend. This would also perhaps be a blend arising in a non-literary context: although Seneca only says that Pacatus saddled everyone with insulting nicknames, he does not say whether Pacatus did so in writing or in conversation. However, he gives an example just before the passage quoted above of Pacatus reportedly being witty in conversation.

II.2 PACISCULUS AND TOLLIUS

Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.53

haec tam frigida quam est nominum fictio adiectis detractis mutatis litteris, ut Acisculum, quia esset pactus, Pacisculum, et Placidum nomine, quod is acerbus natura esset, Acidum, et Tullium cum fur esset, Tollium dictos invenio. Sed haec eadem genera commodius in rebus quam in nominibus respondent.

Equally feeble is inventing names by adding, removing or changing letters: for example, Pacisculus for Acisculus because he made a pact, Acidus for Placidus because of his acidic nature, and Tollius for Tullius because he was a thief. This kind of joke works better with things than with names.

⁴⁶³ Cf. Henderson 1991 § 242.

Pacisculus is a blend of the stem of *pacisci* “make a pact” and the cognomen *Acisculus*,⁴⁶⁴ while *Tollius* is a blend of the nomen *Tullius* and the stem of the verb *tollere*. Neither word is a compound, and there is respectively neither a suffix *-sculus* that could be added to *paci-* nor a base *pacis-* to which the suffix *-culus* could be added, while the suffix *-ius* typically forms denominative adjectives.⁴⁶⁵ At any rate, the context suggests that pragmatically they function as blends.

Although Quintilian broadly explains the jokes behind these blended names, he leaves unsaid who coined them and about whom.⁴⁶⁶ What is perhaps most interesting about them, however, is the fact that the three nicknames (*Pacisculus*, *Acidus*, *Tollius*), whether coined by Quintilian himself or culled from elsewhere, further suggest that the blends, while certainly self-consciously facetious formations, were not self-consciously blends. That is, that the same process of παραγραμματισμός here could give rise to *Pacisculus* (add a *p* to *Acisculus*), *Tollius* (swap an *o* for the *u* of *Tullius*), and *Acidus* (delete the *pl* of *Placidus*) but with different formal results, as also in the case of *Biberius* (discussed above).

⁴⁶⁴ From an earlier **asciculus* “little axe”.

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. Leumann 1977. 288–90; Weiss 2010. 274–5.

⁴⁶⁶ The only *Acisculi* of record are seemingly Lucius Verius *Acisculus*, a *triumvir monetalis* in 45 BCE and, according to Porph. *Hor. S.* 1.2.95, Verius *Acisculus*, a plebeian tribune with whom the otherwise unknown matron *Catia* had a liaison in the temple of *Venus* in Pompey’s theater.