Katrin Iakimova-Zheleva

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*: The Glorious Ability to Create (and Translate) Humor

The paper regards Plautus' Miles Gloriosus in terms of comedy type and methods used for achieving comic effect. For this purpose, we consider two episodes from the plot, both containing a repetitive motif – an idea that is continuously reiterated by the characters throughout the respective act. These occurrences are subjected to analysis to determine the essence of humor contained within them – apart from their repetitiveness. After exploring some specific examples in the original, we then compare them to their counterparts in the Bulgarian translation from 1978 made by the Bulgarian translator Alexander Nichev. The aim of the study is to outline the techniques for creating humor within those repetitive parts in the original mainly with regard to the language style and the way humor is transferred in Bulgarian language – what strategies and/or procedures are applied and has the comic effect been achieved.

Keywords: translation studies, ancient literature, ancient comedy, Plautus, humor, Bulgarian translation

Laughter is a universal phenomenon and one of its agents is humor. When it comes to humor, we react to it naturally. That is if we understand it. Only when we do not understand a joke, we start to question why it was funny and what was missing for us to appreciate it. And if we persist on analysing, we eventually discover that there are various techniques for creating humor and achieving comic effect. One of those techniques is repetitiveness.

In the Plautine drama *Miles Gloriosus* there are two repetitive motifs, which encompass a great portion of the play. In this text we will review them as a background to some techniques for creating verbal humor (alongside the repetitive motifs) and their translation in Bulgarian.

Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* is one of the four Plautine comedies translated in Bulgarian. It has only one translation to this day, which was published in an authoritative edition of collection of ancient drama texts in 1978. This year is part of a certain period (from 1956 to 1995) in the Bulgarian literary tradition of translating ancient texts, which is characterized by renewed interest toward classical works after approximately a decade without any such texts.[1]

We can regard verse 138 of the drama as the logical beginning of the episode containing the repetitive motif which we will call 'to not see what he sees' as it is in verse 149 where we encounter it initially. The first scene of the second act, to which these verses belong, serves as a delayed prologue. There the cunning slave Palaestrio discloses to the audience that his previous master (Pleusicles) was cheated off his love when the soldier Pyrgopolynices kidnapped and took away his woman Philocomasium. During his attempt to notify his master of what happened, Palaestrio is captured and given to Pyrgopolynices as a gift but still manages to inform Pleusicles of the situation. When Pleusicles arrives at Ephesus, where they all are located, he finds residence at the soldier's neighbour's house – Periplectomenus. Palaestrio momentarily conjures a plan how to reunite the lovers *and* at the same time trick Sceledrus, the slave left to guard Philocomasium, so he will not see what he sees. Sceledrus is introduced as a person of no great value (*nam meus conservos est homo haud magni preti*[2]) so the schemes are bound to be successful. This all happens with the approval of the neighbor.

> ei nos facetis fabricis et doctis dolis
> glaucumam ob oculos obiciemus eumque ita
> faciemus ut quod viderit ne viderit.
> (Pl. *M. Gl.* 147–149)

---

[1] Atanasov (2002).
[2] Because my fellow slave is a man without great value (All English translations belong to the author of this paper and are mainly literal).

> We with witty tricks and skilful deceptions
> will throw dust in his eyes and thus
> we will make him to not see what he sees.

The central trick is a hole in Philocomasium's room by which she can cross unnoticed to the neighbour's house to see her lover, and the deception is Philocomasium pretending to be her twin sister who allegedly is staying at the neighbour's house with *her* lover.

> ita sublinetur os custodi mulieris.
> (Pl. *M. Gl.* 153)

> Thus, the woman's guard will be mocked.

At the start of the next scene the events begin to unfold a few steps back as someone (still unknown for the characters, even for Palaestrio) has climbed on the roof of Periplectomenus' house and have seen Philocomasium kissing her lover. Ahead lies the unveiling of this mystery person as well as the witty plan of how to deceive him and cheat him off of his knowledge.

For the purpose of this analysis, we will review the moments where our repetitive moment is present only briefly. In short it looks like this:

> Whoever has seen her, convince them not to have seen her.
> Whatever has been seen, make it to not have been seen.
> I am certain I have seen …
> So, he has seen?
> I have seen for sure …
> For sure? You have not seen
> I know for sure that I have seen
> You still claim you have seen?
> What else can I tell you except what I have seen?
> You say you have seen her there?

What if I make you see her here?
Go on, I want to know if I have seen what I have seen.

Then comes Philocomasium

Are you saying you have seen me there?
You see more than you see
I will not be convinced I have not seen what I have seen

Then comes the story for the twin sister

What I believe I have seen, now I think I have not seen
I have not seen even if I have seen

Then comes "the twin" herself and a chain of lines Is it her/ it is not her/ it is her/ Am I who/ You are her/ I am not her and so on. Then:

You have seen but you have misjudged what you have seen
Even now I do not know what I have seen

Sceledrus checks both houses for each of the twin sisters.

So, have you seen?
I have seen (why deny what I have seen) but I thought I have seen the other.
From now on you will not see even what you have seen
We have deceived him to not have seen what he has seen

As *we* can see this repetitive motif plays with audience's expectations and thus creates humorous effect by itself – firstly by the audience recognizing its repetitiveness (in some variations), then by anticipating its appearance again and again and finally by awaiting its end, which probably does not

come as quickly as expected, because it continues to drag on and on until it reaches levels of absurdity. Every stage of this process brings comic relief for different reasons, but our study will not be concerned with them. This chain of repetitions inspires other comical moments during its continuance, more or less connected with the 'seeing' theme. Furthermore, because this chain spreads along around 400 verses, there are plenty opportunities for even more instances eliciting laughter. And Plautus is nothing if not opportunistic for creating humor whenever possible. Those instances vary among alliterations, metaphors, wordplay, specific military language, accumulation of words from one grammatical category, irony, farce, etc.

We will review three such examples, interconnected by wordplay on Sceledrus' name to which this repetitive motif serves as a background, and one similar example of wordplay, again at Sceledrus' expense, from the second repetitive moment.

This motif is introduced in the next – the III act – and pervades the storyline until around the middle of the IV act. Thus, it is longer than the previous motif but is present mostly with different parts of its whole – that is, the whole plan for tricking the soldier and ensuring the happy ending for the two young lovers. Palaestrio's plan, *lepidam sycophantiam*[3] by his own words, is presented in its entirety from line 782 and on and consists of Periplectomenus procuring two women – one as beautiful and young as possible (*quam lepidissimam potis quamque adulescentem maxume* [Pl. *M. Gl.* 788]), in which the heart and soul are full of banter and guile (*cui facetiarum cor pectusque sit plenum et doli* [Pl. *M. Gl.* 783]), which has self-interest, sustains body with body and has sound mind (*quae sit quaestuosa, quae alat corpus corpore / cuique sapiat pectus* [Pl. *M. Gl.* 785–786]). She has to be brought to Periplectomenus' house glamorized as a matron and must present herself as Periplectomenus' wife. This will be Acroteleutium's role. The second woman should also be cunning and must play the role of the matron's maid. For that the actual maid of Acroteleutium – Milphidippa – is chosen. After the procurement of the women Periplectomenus has to instruct Acroteleutium

---

[3] Beautiful scheme.

to behave as his wife but also as if she is enamored of the soldier and wants to send him a ring through her maid as a token of her love. Then the maid should pass the ring onto Palaestrio so he can present it to the soldier as if he is the mediator of the entire deal Pl. *M. Gl*. 798). One line later the key part of the plan is repeated (although with some additional explanation) by Palaestrio, thus setting the beginning of the repetition:

> ei dabo, aps tua mi uxore dicam delatum et datum,
> ut sese ad eum conciliarem …
> (Pl. *M. Gl*. 800–801)

> I will give it to him, I will say it was brought and given to me by your
> wife in order to recommend her to him …

Thenceforth about eight instances take place where this plan is mentioned. After laying it out in front of Periplectomenus, it is then needed for the old man to explain everything to the two women. This, however, is not shown to us as audience in detail, but we understand it has taken place by Periplectomenus' words. This is also the first teasing with the repetitive motif itself.

> **Per.** Rem omnem tibi, Acroteleutium, tibique una, Milphidippa,
> domi demonstravi in ordine. hanc fabricam fallaciasque
> minus si tenetis, denuo volo percipiatis plane;
> satis si intellegitis, aliud est quod potius fabulemur.
> (Pl. *M. Gl*. 874–877)

> **Per.** I explained the whole deal to you, Acroteleutium, along with you,
> Milphidippa,
> at home in turn. This trickery and cleverness
> if you don't grasp enough, I want for you to understand clearly;
> if you understand enough, there is something else we should rather discuss.

After Periplectomenus has secured that the plan has been understood, it is Palaestrio's turn to do the same. Although this time, as diligent plan-maker, he goes over every step one by one and waits at each for Acroteleutium's confirmation (Pl. *M. Gl.* 902–914). During this conversation there are two more distinguishable instances which play with the absurdity of the motif of repetition and the characters' thorough comprehensiveness. After confirming two of Palaestrio's steps of the plan with phrases such as 'It will happen' (*Fiet*) and 'It will be so' (*Sic futurum est*), the third response of Acroteleutium – 'You could have been a great soothsayer, because you say the things that will be' (*Bonus vates poteras esse, nam quae sunt futura dicis* [Pl. *M. Gl.* 911]) sounds comical, and even if we presume it was not uttered mockingly but seriously it would amplify its comic effect even more (because, after all, he has devised the plan). This adds another layer of humor on top of the initial one, created by the constant repetition of the plan (much like in the previous repetitive motif which, in a way, has set the tone for this one and magnifies its comicality even more).

The second instance, which brings to an end this particular variation of the plan's continuous revision, is when Periplectomenus asks what probably most of the audience wants to know – 'Why are such reminders needed of things that they remember?' (*Quid istis nunc memoratis opust quae commeminere?* [Pl. *M. Gl.* 914]). Plautus uses the repetition technique to create humor and then makes his own characters mock it.

There are six more instances repeating the plan or parts of the plan, most of which are from its actual enactment in front of the soldier, as well as another instance of mocking the repetitiveness: when Milphidippa asks Palaestrio how to trick Pyrgopolynices, he starts to utter the already well-known (part of) the plan – 'By pretending she is in love with him—' (*Quasi hunc depereat—* [Pl. *M. Gl.* 1026]), but she cuts him off with the words 'I know this' (*Teneo istuc* [ibid.]).

The first instance, which we will consider, is when Sceledrus encloses to Palaestrio that he has seen Philocomasium with another man.

Quod ego, Sceledre, scelus ex te audio?

(Pl. *M. Gl.* 289)

What evildoing,[4] Sceledrus, am I hearing from you?

Скот си ти, Скеледре!

(Nichev 1978: 363)

You are a brute, Sceledrus!

Sceledrus' name is a wordplay on the Latin word *scelus*, which means evil-doing, crime, villainy, wickedness and by extension – criminal, villain, felon. The two words are directly juxtaposed, as if to inform anyone who has not figured out the connection yet. The resemblance is blunted by the ending of the vocative case (*Sceledre*). In the nominative clause the euphony connects the two more effectively – Sceledrus-scelus. Nevertheless, the wordplay is clear and by positioning them consecutively, the connotations of *scelus* are in a way attributed to Sceledrus as additional definition of his character – next to 'a person of no great value'.

In the context of the Latin original *scelus* is meant as something done wrong or with evil intentions. In the Bulgarian translation, however, the translator has preferred the figurative meaning of *scelus* (criminal, villain, felon) and have used it as a predicate noun ('*Скот си ти, Скеледре*'/You are a brute, **Sc**eledrus; notice the similar sounding of the two initial letters '*Ск*' ([sk])-'Sc'). The word '*скот*', used here, means a domesticated animal, live-stock, but it *also* has a figurative meaning – scurvy, villainous person. In this regard it approximates some of the connotations of *scelus*. We may also notice that in Bulgarian both '*скот*' and '*Скеледре*' start with [sk] which corresponds to the similarity between the starting sounds of *scelus* and *Sceledre* in Latin. However, if we are not searching for such similarities, we might miss this and miss overall the intended connection between '*скот*' and '*Скеледре*' as the original words are much more alike than those in the Bulgarian trans-lation. Two similar letters are not sufficient for immediate connection of the

---

[4] Because we are looking for a meaning denoting action.

two words on phonetic level and then eventually, by extension, on connotative level. Part of the satisfaction which humor elicits comes from recognizing that there is some kind of joke and that a person has managed to perceive it. Though there is an explanatory note, which points out the alliteration, it does not mention the connection on semantic level and what it alludes about the character. This is also valid for the next two examples.

> nescio quae te, Sceledre, scelera suscitant.
> (Pl. *M. Gl.* 330)
> I don't know what villainies, Sceledre, incite you.

> Скеледре, едра глупост те мори!
> (Nichev 1978: 365)
> Sceledre, large stupidity plagues you!

Here, in the Latin original, we can observe the same juxtaposition, although this time the form of *scelus* is in its Nom. Pl. form (**sceler**a). Because of that it has even more similarities on phonetic level with the word **Sceledre**. The alliteration here is extended by the word *suscitant* – also starting with 's' and containing the [stʃ] sound of the previous two words. The meaning of *scelera* is the same as in the previous example – referring to some evildoings.

The Bulgarian translation differs significantly from the previous example, even though in the Latin original the usage is more or less the same. Seemingly the alliteration is absent, although when we examine the sentence carefully, we notice that in the peculiar collocation '**едра глупост**' (large stupidity) there is a sequence of letters which corresponds to the same one in *Скеледре*, namely '*едр*' [edr]. This can explain the odd choice of the adjective '*едра*' (large) instead of a more appropriate one. We could go even further as to suggest that the choice of '*глупост*' (stupidity) for *scelera* instead of something closer to the meaning 'evildoing, villainy' is justified not only by the need of (semi-)suitable noun for the adjective '*едра*' (large) but also by the presence of the phonemes '*л*' [l] and '*ст*' [st] in '*глупост*'. In this way,

although not ultimate, the translator has managed to resemble the sounds in 'Sceledre' but in reverse.[5] So, it looks something like this:

Ск – л – едр   –   едр – (г)л – ст

Even though the translator has moved away from the exact connotations of *scelera*, his choice is a meaningful addition to the list of words defining Sceledrus' character and is plausible for the situation (i.e., he is so stupid, that he has started seeing things that are not there). The phonetic pattern of word choice is discernible. Nevertheless, the comic effect here is weaker than in the original because there are too many connections to be made and the recognition of the wordplay is not immediate but rather arduous.

tun, Sceledre, hic, scelerum caput
(Pl. *M. Gl.* 494)
Did you, Sceledrus, here, head of evildoings

Ти ли, хей, Скеледре, скверна твар
(Nichev 1978: 375)
Did you, hey, Sceledrus, vile creature

The third and last play on Sceledrus' name with *scelus* occurs when Periplectomenus addresses him. He calls him *scelerum caput* which literally means 'head of evildoings'. This time *Sceledre* and *scelerum* are separated by *hic*, but this is not an obstacle before the wordplay's recognition. On the contrary, this plays with the previously established pattern. It also is able to achieve similarity in sound dynamic – *tun, Sceledre / hic, scelerum*.

In the Bulgarian translation the separating word *hic* is relocated in front of *Sceledre*, so that the two can again be next to each other, probably because in the Bulgarian version the wordplay did not establish a pattern with

---

[5] Regarding the resemblance between [sk] and [st] – [k] and [t] are both voiceless plosives, differing only in the place of articulation, so they truly have grounds for similarity.

the previous two instances and must rely on the proximity of the words for recognition. Otherwise, the translator has chosen another synonym for someone unworthy and animal-like and in this regard stays consistent. Furthermore, the chosen adjective '*сквернa*' (vile) starts appropriately with [sk] sounds and together with the noun '*твар*' (creature) and '*Скеледре*' they repeat another sound effect: (*e*)*др* – *в*(*e*)*р* – *в*(*a*)*р* [(e)dr – v(e)r – v(a)r]. The comic effect in the original, however, is accumulating with every new occurrence of this particular wordplay, so by the third appearance it can even play with itself by (slightly) cheating the expectations. As we said, recognition of a joke's existence is important for achieving humorous effect and satisfaction in the audience. The repetitive pattern in the original helps the wordplay in this regard, which cannot be said for the Bulgarian translation where every instance, seemingly, is a standalone one.

Although the three examples are not as interconnected in the Bulgarian version as in the original, their translation seems to be driven by one principle – to achieve a similar level of comic effect to that of the Latin text and at the same time, to preserve as much of the utterance's other characteristics – form, sound effect, meaning – as possible.

Amid the humorous background of the second repetitive motif, there are many other comical occurrences. We will put under consideration one of them. It is yet another ridicule of the second most preferred character for mockery after Pyrgopolynices – Sceledrus. Because by this point he is well-known, the comic effect of this ridicule is much more effective than if it was made at someone else's, less known character's, expense. True to himself, Plautus seizes the opportunity to utilize Sceledrus' character for comic effect one last time. Sceledrus himself is not present in this scene. Palaestrio is looking for him but stumbles upon his mate – they were put in charge of the cellar and it seems they have abused their post by drinking from the wine. As a result, Sceledrus has fallen asleep and becomes yet again the perfect target for mockery and a fruitful source of comedy. When Palaestrio inquires about his status, Lucrio – Sceledrus' mate, answers with a sort of wordplay.

Lvcrio Non operaest Sceledro. **Pal**. Quid iam? **Lvc**. Sorbet dormiens.

Pal. Quid, sorbet? **Lvc**. Illud, stertit, volui dicere.

sed quia consimile est, quom stertas, quasi sorbeas—

Pal. Eho an dormit Sceledrus intus? **Lvc**. Non naso quidem,

nam eo magnum clamat. …

(Pl. *M. Gl*. 818–822)

Lucrio There is no work for Sceledrus. **Pal**. Why? **Luc**. He slurps while

sleeping.

Pal. What, he slurps? **Luc**. This, snores, I wished to say.

But because it's all the same, when one snores as if he slurps—

Pal. Hey, is Sceledrus sleeping in there? **Luc**. Not with his nose, he isn't,

because he makes a lot of noise. …

Лукрион: Не може.

Палестрион: Как така?

Лукрион: Заспал е, смърка си...

Палестрион: Как, смърка ли?

Лукрион: Не, „хърка" бе в главата ми.

Но хъркането – то е като смъркане...

Палестрион: Какво, Скеледър спи ли там?

Лукрион: Не спи... с носа.

Шуми със него. ...

(Nichev 1978: 389–390)

Lucrio: He can't.

Palaestrio: Why is that?

Lucrio: He's fallen asleep, snuffing…

Palaestrio: What, he is snuffing?

Lucrio: No, 'snoring' was in my mind.

But the snoring – it's like snuffing…

Palaestrio: What, is Sceledrus sleeping there?

Lucrio: He doesn't sleep… with his nose.
He is making noise with it. …

The first part of the wordplay is on the similar sounding of the words *sorbet*[6] and *stertit*. Although there are differences between the two, they both start with an [s], have an [r] in the middle, followed by a consonant, and end with a [t], preceded by a soft vowel. The second part of the wordplay is again sound based, but this time it concerns the sounds someone makes when he actualizes those words – that is when he slurps and snores. Here they are regarded as similar (even more, having in mind the second meaning of *sorbeo*) and thus a parallel is drawn between the act of sleeping and the act of drinking, that has taken place beforehand and about which we learn a few lines later. In result we are urged to imagine a very loud, non-typical snoring and according to the humor theory of incongruity every such occurrence (not the one that is expected or usual) can be amusing and therefore can create comic effect. The last part of the wordplay about Sceledrus' snoring is when Palaestrio interrupts Lucrio's comparison of Sceledrus' snoring to slurping with the question 'is Sceledrus sleeping' (having been able to connect the elicited sounds to their respective actions). Lucrio answers the question semantically correctly but is ignoring the pragmatics. He says, 'Not with his nose' and thus cheats the expectations about the reply to this type of question ('Yes, he is sleeping' or 'No, he is not sleeping' for example). With this Lucrio draws the attention back to the unusual and loud snoring sound and with this yet another layer is added to the accumulated comic effect.

In the Bulgarian translation the existence of a sound effect is preserved. It relies on the identical endings of the two words – '*смърка*' (for *sorbet*) and '*хърка*' (for *stertit*) (in contrast to a suitable alliteration, for example),

---

[6] '*Sorbeo* means not only "to drink up," but to make that gulping noise in snoring which is produced by inhaling the breath with the mouth open, and the head thrown back. Palaestrio purposely misunderstands him, for the purpose of getting a confession out of him' (RILEY 1912: n.2). In his English translation Riley has translated the word *sorbet* as gulping. We have chosen 'slurps' in an effort to better illustrate the phonetic similarities.

which makes the two words similar in sounding in a different way but still very successful, if not even more than in the original. On semantical level there is also an obvious effort for transferring the second, hidden meaning of the word *sorbet* as 'something that elicits a distinctive sound', although not through open mouth but with the nose. This is the meaning of the word '*смърка*' – 'doing something with or taking something through the nose'. Probably because of the potential opportunity to convey the idea of a certain sound, which can be attributed to both drinking *and* snoring, the word '*смърка*' is chosen, although it does not have a direct connotation to the act of drinking. However, it has the same ending with yet another word – '*кърка*', which has the meaning of 'drinking a lot' and is mentioned in the explanatory note,[7] accompanying this wordplay. All this results in a not so exact and direct transfer of the similarities on semantical level between *sorbet* and *stertit* in the corresponding couple of '*смърка*' and '*хърка*'. Still, because the sounding of the words in the Bulgarian translation is much more similar (they rhyme) compared to the one in the original, and because sound effect is instantaneously perceived by the audience, whereas the understanding of the wordplay on semantical level takes a little time, this similarity helps with the indication that there is something funny in those words and it is possible that it does not stop at the sound level (so by the existence of one fast transferred effect, the audience might be urged to look even deeper – towards the meanings of the words, in order to find more hidden connections).

Translation of humor, especially verbal humor, is one of the most difficult aspects of translation and it is not surprising it is one of the less studied ones.[8] There are many classifications and translation models but not many of them are concerned with humor and the difficulties it presents. One of the most detailed and prescriptive models of translation, considered the classical example amongst this kind of classifications, belongs to Jean-Paul Vinay

---

[7] Lucrio is drunk and can't control his tongue, which confuses '*смъркане*' (the act of '*смъркам*') with '*къркане*' (the act of '*къркам*'). From the following dialogue it is understood that by '*смъркане*' he means drinking. Nichev (1978: 396, n. 36).

[8] Chiaro (2001: 570).

and Jean Darbelnet.[9] They distinguish between a general orientation of the translation, named a strategy – orientation towards literal or free translation, towards the target text or source text, etc.), and the translation of a particular instance, occurrence or phenomenon using specific procedures (e.g., borrowing of a word from the source language, the addition of an explanation or a footnote in the TT, etc).[10] When concerned with humor translation, the functional aspect and the equivalent effect are essential in order for the comic text to remain comic. For this purpose, two procedures from Vinay and Darbelnet's method can be used – namely adaptation[11] and equivalence[12], and, of course, a main strategy towards the preservation of the comic effect can also be applied to achieve the desired result (if preference is given to the target text and its audience perception for example). The terminology of W. Koller and his five types of equivalence is also applicable. In our case may be said that the Bulgarian translator Al. Nichev has utilised more than one type of those five equivalences for whichever one instance, because in the reviewed examples the humor is achieved not only through 'sound play' and sound effects (similarity in the sounding of the words and/or other such tricks) – for which the formal equivalence[13] may be accounted, but also through ambiguity of the words' sense – for which we can point to connotative[14] and/or pragmatic[15] equivalence. Another theory useful for humor translation is the *skopos* theory – a collaboration between Hans J. Vermeer and Katharina Reiss. It is a functional theory in which the purpose of the text takes precedence – in our case that is to achieve comicality and to elicit

---

[9] Munday (2016: 87–88).

[10] Munday (2016: 88).

[11] 'This involves changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture' Munday (2016: 91).

[12] Also called idiomatic translation. Vinay and Darbelnet use this term 'to refer to cases where languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means. … The use of equivalence in this restricted sense should not be confused with the more common theoretical use' in the methods of Nida and Koller for example (ibid).

[13] 'Related to the form and aesthetics of the text, includes wordplays and the individual stylistic features of the ST' (source text) Munday (2016: 75).

[14] 'Related to lexical choices, especially between near-synonyms' (ibid).

[15] 'Oriented towards the receiver of the text or message' (ibid).

laughter. All the mentioned methods can be listed as evident in the Bulgarian translation of the reviewed examples. There is an overall aspiration for compliance with the text function for preserving the comism first and foremost (or in other words – achieving pragmatic equivalence) but also, if possible, for preserving at least some of the formal and/or connotative aspects of the words, phrases, or even whole lines, although the main impression is that one should be sacrificed for the sake of the other.

Primary sources

Capps 1916   E. Capps (ed.): *Plautus I: in four volumes*. The Loeb classical library. London – New York 1916.

Nichev 1978   Al. Nichev (prev.): *Antichni komedii. Voynikat samohvalets*. Sofiya 1978.

Secondary sources

Atanasov 2002   V. Atanasov: *Prevodite ot Antichni ezitsi ot 1944 do 1995 godina*. In: A. Nikolova (ed.): Prevodna retseptsiya na evropeyskite literaturi v Balgariya. Tom 3. Klasicheska literatura. Sofiya 2002, 55–67.

Chiaro 2008   D. Chiaro: *Verbally expressed humor and translation*. In: V. Raskin – W. Ruch (eds.): The Primer of Humor Research. Berlin 2008, 569–608.

Munday 2016   J. Munday: *Introducing Translation Studies*. London – New York 2016.

Riley 1912   Th. H. Riley: *The Comedies of Plautus*. London 1912.