Accio, Firenze 1980. * F. DELLA CORTE, La filologia latina dalle origini a
Varrone, Torino 1937, Firenze 2nd ed. 1981. * W. FAUTH, Der Traum des
Tarquinius, Spuren einer etruskisch-mediterranen Widder-Sonnensymbolik
bei Accius (*frg.* 212 D), Latomus 35, 1976, 469–503. * E. GABBA, Il *Brutus*
di Accio, Dioniso 43, 1969, 377–383. * B. GLADIGOW, Trimmballast bei
antiken Schiffen, WS 82, 1969, 37–48. * H. D. JOCELYN, Ancient Scholar-
ship and Virgil's Use of Republican Latin Poetry 2, CQ n.s. 15, 1965,
126–144. * H. D. JOCELYN, The Quotations of Republican Drama in
Priscian's Treatise *De Metris Fabularum Terentii*, esp. App. III: Accius' *Medea
sive Argonautae*, Antichthon 1, 1967, 68–69. * I. LANA, L'*Atreo* di Accio e la
leggenda di Atreo e Tieste nel teatro tragico romano, AAT 93, 1958–1959
(1959), 293–385. * A. LA PENNA, Atreo e Tieste sulle scene romane, in:
Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella, Catania, Fac. di Lett. e Filos. 1972,
1, 357–371. * LEO, LG 384–405. * I. MARIOTTI, Tragédie romaine et tragédie
grecque: Accius et Euripide, MH 22, 1965, 206–216. * S. MARIOTTI, Accio
in Malsacano, RFIC 94, 1966, 181–184. * F. MARX, Accius, RE 1, 1893,
142–147. * A. POCIÑA PÉREZ, El tragediógrafo latino Lucio Acio, Granada
1984. * A. RESTA BARRILE, ed., Il *Meleager* di Accio, Latomus 50, 1991,
227–231. * N. W. SLATER, Two Republican Poets on Drama: Terence and
Accius, in: B. ZIMMERMANN, Antike Dramentheorien und ihre Rezeption,
Stuttgart 1992, 85–103. *A. TRAINA, *Vortit barbare*. Le traduzioni poetiche
da Livio Andronico a Cicerone, Roma 1970, 181–203.

PLAUTUS

Life, Dates

Titus Plautus was born in Sarsina in Umbria. It is not quite certain
whether he bore the gentile name Maccius, also attested at Pompeii.
He calls himself Maccus (*Asin.* 11), something like 'Jack Pudding',
after a character from the popular Atellane farce. This may be a
joke, or it may be that both here and in the *Mercator* (*prol.* 9–10) he
was still conscious of his past as an Atellane actor.[1] Since all three
names echo the farce, we may be dealing with pseudonyms.[2] He
died in 184 B.C. (Cic. *Brut.* 60) at Rome (Jerome *chron.* 1817). Since
he attained old age (Cic. *Cato* 50) he may have been born before
250. He is said to have earned money as a worker in the theater, to

---

[1] K. H. E. SCHUTTER, Quibus annis comoediae Plautinae primum actae sint quae-
ritur, diss. Groningen 1952, pp. i–v.

[2] A. S. GRATWICK, Titus Maccius Plautus, CQ 67 n.s. 23, 1973, 78–84.

have lost it in business dealings and then to have taken service with a miller. Allegedly three of his plays were composed in the mill (Varro *apud* Gell. 3. 3. 14). Whatever the truth of this, there is no doubt about his varied experience of life and his theatrical talent, nor about his Greek education. He must have acquired this for himself, perhaps under the influence of Livius Andronicus or Naevius.

About 130 plays were ascribed to Plautus. Of these the grammarian Lucius Aelius Stilo regarded 25 as undoubtedly genuine, while his pupil Varro accepted 21 (*apud* Gell. 3. 3. 3). These are the plays transmitted to us. On the basis of ancient notices preserved in the Codex Ambrosianus (A), about the dates[1] of first production (*didascaliae*), the *Stichus* may be dated to 200 B.C. and the *Pseudolus* to 191.[2] Cicero (*Cato* 50) attests that not only the *Pseudolus*, but also the *Truculentus*, was composed by the poet in his old age. The *Miles* falls, as v. 211 shows, into the later period of the life of Naevius who was a generation older,[3] and therefore may be dated 206–201 B.C. Perhaps it was a 'draw' at the *Ludi plebei* of 205[4] which had to be staged seven times. The *Cistellaria* was written before the end of the Second Punic War (Prologue 201–202), the *Trinummus* (v. 990) at the earliest in 194.[5] The *Epidicus* is mentioned in the *Bacchides* (v. 214), and therefore must be older. Parodies reminiscent of the original production of Pacuvius' *Antiopa* prove the late date of the *Persa*, *Pseudolus*, and *Casina*. That poet's career was beginning in Plautus' last years.[6]

The dating of the *Mostellaria* teaches an interesting lesson about method. The play speaks (v. 941) of 'newly elected magistrates'. In those days they entered office on March 15. The only possible occasion therefore for Plautus' play is at the *Ludi Megalenses* in April, a festival which included dramatic presentations only since 194 (Livy 34. 54. 3). Accordingly this year is the earliest date for the *Mostellaria*[7]—

---

[1] SCHUTTER'S dissertation is basic: s. the note before the last.

[2] Doubts are raised by H. B. MATTINGLY, The Plautine Didascaliae, Athenaeum n.s. 35, 1957, 78–88.

[3] L. SCHAAF, Die Todesjahre des Naevius und des Plautus, RhM 122, 1979, 24–33.

[4] C. BUCK, A Chronology of the Plays of Plautus, Baltimore 1940, 84.

[5] F. RITSCHL, De actae *Trinummi* tempore, Ind. lect. Bonn 1843, repr. in: Parerga 1, Leipzig 1845, 339–354, esp. 348; for 187 B.C.: T. FRANK, Some Political Allusions in Plautus' *Trinummus*, AJPh 53, 1932, 152–156.

[6] A. THIERFELDER, Plautus und die römische Tragödie, Hermes 74, 1939, 155–166.

[7] K. H. E. SCHUTTER, De *Mostellariae* Plautinae actae tempore, in: *Ut pictura poesis*, FS P. J. ENK, Leiden 1955, 174–183.

provided that v. 941 is genuine and may be referred to Roman conditions.

Other evidence is less secure. Parallel passages in particular often allow different interpretations.[1] Stylistic criteria have an even smaller degree of certainty, since such differences may be influenced by outward circumstances, by change of models and by the whims of the author. With this proviso the following criteria may be mentioned: the increase in lyrical parts;[2] the spread of intrusive subordinate clauses;[3] the decline in the use of recitative (long verses);[4] the more sophisticated conduct of the plot;[5] the more prominent role assigned to the cunning slave; the cumulative development of thematic references into a coherent imagery; the increase in Roman elements. Even if the chronological reliability of such studies may be doubted, they do have the merit of directing our attention to Plautus' artistic achievement.[6]

Survey of Works

The *Amphitruo*, as the poet himself explains in his prologue, is a *tragicomoedia*, dealing with kings and gods. The subject is mythical. Jupiter courts Alcmene, while her husband Amphitruo is kept far from Thebes by his military duties. Since Jupiter appears in the form of Amphitruo, and Mercury as a double of the slave Sosia, after Amphitruo's return a whole series of confusions develops. Plautus exploits all the possibilities of presentation, ranging from amusing comedy to the most poignant tragedy, especially in the lyric roles of Sosia and Alcmene. It is this crossing of generic boundaries which creates the special charm of this favorite play.

The *Asinaria* is a prank, dominated by situation comedy and ready wit. The young lover Argyrippus cannot find the money which the *lena* Cleareta

---

[1] F. W. HALL, Repetitions and Obsessions in Plautus, CQ 20, 1926, 20–26.

[2] W. B. SEDGWICK, The Cantica of Plautus, CR 39–40, 1925–1926, 55–58.

[3] J. SCHNEIDER, De enuntiatis secundariis interpositis quaestiones Plautinae, diss. Leipzig 1937; W. B. SEDGWICK, The Dating of Plautus' Plays, CQ 24, 1930, 102–106; id., Plautine Chronology, AJPh 70, 1949, 376–383; A. DE LORENZI, Cronologia ed evoluzione Plautina, Napoli 1952.

[4] V. PÜTTNER, Zur Chronologie der Plautinischen Komödien, Progr. Ried 1905/06.

[5] J. N. HOUGH, The Development of Plautus' Art, CPh 30, 1935, 43–57.

[6] P. A. JOHNSTON follows a cultural-historical approach (*Poenulus* 1. 2 and Roman Women, TAPhA 110, 1980, 143–159); she dates the *Poenulus* to 191 B.C. or later; see however now G. MAURACH's Commentary on the *Poenulus* 1988, p. 33 (between 195 and 189). On the *Curculio* and *Trinummus* N. W. SLATER, The Dates of Plautus' *Curculio* and *Trinummus* Reconsidered, AJPh 108, 1987, 264–269.

is demanding for her daughter Philaenium. Slaves finally hand him the money which in fact is owed to his father for an ass he has sold (thus *Asinaria*). Even so, a rival steals a march on the young lover; and there is a second rival who turns out to be the young man's own father.

The *Aulularia*, in spite of its basic tone of cheerful burlesque, at times verging almost on the grotesque, is nevertheless a comedy of character. Old Euclio has inherited not only a treasure from his grandfather and father, but also the obsessive fear of losing it. This makes him more of a 'mistrust-ful' character than a regular miser. It is from this pot of gold that the comedy takes its name. His rich neighbor Megadorus meanwhile is seeking his daughter Phaedria in marriage. Euclio scents danger: does his intended son-in-law know anything about the pot of gold, and does he therefore want to filch the treasure? Eventually he gives permission, but makes extremely parsimonious wedding preparations. To protect his treasure during the celebrations he takes it to the temple of Fides, watched by the slave Strobilus. But he will not even trust Trust personified. He seeks a better hiding place, and once again Strobilus is secretly on his track. Meanwhile, Megadorus' nephew Lyconides has confessed to his uncle that he has already won Phaedria's love. Now Euclio comes on stage, full of despair. His treasure has been stolen! Lyconides thinks that Euclio is talking about his daughter and accuses himself, but of course Euclio is talking about his pot of gold. There is a classic scene of misunderstanding. Finally the thievish slave is unmasked, and the gold is given to the happy couple.

The *Bacchides* has a double plot of intrigue, telling of two young fellows with their servants, two fathers and two hetaerae (the Bacchides). During the course of the play, fathers and sons become rivals. The brilliant director of the action is the slave Chrysalus with his unmatched cleverness, one of Plautus' most subtly drawn slave characters.

Already the prologue of the *Captivi* proclaims (57–58) that the typical figures of comedy are not to appear, and there are no women's roles at all. Old Hegio keeps buying prisoners of war in the hope of securing the freedom of his son, who is held captive by the enemy. When rich Philocrates falls into his hands he decides to send off Philocrates' slave to redeem his (Hegio's) son and send him home with a ransom. However master and slave have exchanged clothes. Philocrates is free. But on that very day he returns with Hegio's son Philopolemus. The slave who has stayed behind in Philocrates' place is revealed as Hegio's long-vanished second son, and this scene of recognition marks the culmination. The parasite Ergasilus is an hilarious ingredient in the play. In some respects its composition appears slack, lacking in thoroughness, and exaggerated. Even so, the portrait of human weaknesses and good qualities is prominent, while the farcical element is replaced by subtle irony.

The *Casina* is a comedy of intrigue, full of complications and grotesque

situations. Father and son are in love with the same girl, the slave Casina. The struggle between the two rivals is fought on two 'battlefields': father and son each send a slave who pretends he wishes to marry Casina. It goes without saying that the one chosen will yield to his master the right of the first night. Old Lysidamus' slave Olympio manages to prevail, but the jealous wife succeeds in frustrating the scheme and allows Chalinus, her son's slave, to take Casina's place. Thus what was supposed to be a bridal night actually became a scene of battery. Now Lysidamus comes repentantly back to his wife, and the way is left open for the young people. The scenes and characters of the comedy are, in certain respects, pushed to the point of caricature, and overdrawn.

In spite of its fragmentary transmission, we are still in a position to reconstruct the *Cistellaria*, the 'box comedy'. It is focused on an unhappy couple: Alcesimarchus is supposed to marry a girl whom he does not love; his beloved Selenium is a hetaera, who will not be given up by the *lena*, her mother Nelaenis. At the last moment, Selenium prevents Alcesimarchus from committing suicide. At this point, the married couple Demipho and Phanostrata identify the girl as their child who was once exposed. A box of toys serves as the token of recognition. With this, Selenium takes her place in society and may marry Alcesimarchus. The characters in this comedy are treated as types without becoming stereotypical. In spite of all, the effect they create is realistic. In this play, too, character portrayal is more important than the plot.

In the *Curculio*, the basic situation is the same as in the *Cistellaria*. An ill-starred pair of lovers at first find their way to happiness barred. The heroine Planesium is of free birth, but has been purchased and confined by a *leno*. Finally, her legitimate status is proved by a token of recognition, and the marriage can take place. The parasite Curculio ('corn weevil') matches slyness with greed. He saves, though not without selfish motives, Planesium from being sold to a soldier. The latter turns out to be, as Planesium suddenly discovers, her long-lost brother, and so from rival he becomes the witness to her free birth. The *Curculio* is a charming blend of elements, combining satirical realism with the romantic idyll (for example, the scene at night with its serenade and rendezvous, vv. 147–216). The Janus-faced character of Curculio lends a special piquancy to a comic dialectic which lives on in harlequin and in Shakespeare's fools.

The *Epidicus*, in spite of its brevity, is a play of complex intrigue. Its hero, the wily slave Epidicus, enjoys free scope as director of the action. He buys off the lyre player Acropolistis for the young Stratippocles, while telling the father Periphanes that she is his long vanished daughter Telestis. However, the young fellow then brings another girl back from campaign. It is she whom Epidicus must now purchase, while disposing of Acropolistis. But this other girl is Telestis. The intrigue is successful, until Telestis' mother appears

and recognizes her. The action is brilliantly calculated to produce the greatest possible complexity. The individual characters are drawn with perfect sympathy; there is no caricature. In spite of the intrigue that takes center stage, this is a play of humane ideas in which the comic principle is represented by Epidicus who gave the play its name.

The *Menaechmi*, like the *Amphitruo*, rests on the theme of doubles. Twin brothers, both called Menaechmus, have been separated since childhood, and suddenly find themselves unawares in the same town. This produces endless complications and misunderstandings. Finally the cunning slave Messenio brings the two together. This comedy of mistaken identity is distinguished by rapid action and abstention from grotesque features and exaggerations.

In its action, the *Mercator* is reminiscent of the *Casina*. Charinus and his father Demipho are both in love with Pasicompsa. Frightened of his wife, Demipho hands the girl over to his neighbor Lysimachus, whose wife Dorippa has left for the countryside. She however returns earlier than expected, and lets fly a broadside of abuse against her husband. Eutychus, their son, has been sent out by Charinus to look for his missing beloved. He now arrives on the scene and explains everything. Demipho surrenders Pasicompsa on condition that Charinus says nothing to his mother. More than other Plautine comedies, this play is focused on subtle character portrayal and on the conflict between father and son.

The *Miles gloriosus* owes its life to its central character, the vainglorious braggart, although the other figures are also well-drawn. Pyrgopolynices, the soldier, has abducted Philocomasium. Her beloved Pleusicles discovers her whereabouts, thanks to his cunning slave Palaestrio, and moves into the near-by house of a friend. He then knocks a hole in the dividing wall so that the happy couple may meet undisturbed. However, they are discovered by the watchman Sceledrus. Palaestrio attempts to unravel the difficulties by claiming that Philocomasium is her own twin sister, only to create new problems. Palaestrio convinces his master's friend and host (Periplectomenus) to invite two hetaerae to pass themselves off as his wife and her maid in order to allure Pyrgopolynices, who swallows the bait and lets Philocomasium go. But at his rendezvous with his neighbor's 'wife' the entire household assails him with clubs.

The *Mostellaria* is a comedy of ghosts, full of intrigues and complications whose threads are again controlled by the cunning slave, Tranio. When Theopropides arrives home after a long absence, he almost stumbles into a wild party thrown by his son Philolaches for his girlfriend, his friends and various hetaerae. On the spur of the moment, Tranio invents a ghost which will prevent Theopropides from entering the house. At first the trick wins Theopropides' credence, but then everything collapses. Philolaches' friend, Callidamates, persuades Theopropides to relent. The *Mostellaria* is one of

Plautus' most amusing plays, with a particularly colorful central character.

The *Persa* is a somewhat crude play of intrigue. It is notable for centering around a love affair among slaves and depicting the courageous, independent demeanor of a *virgo*.

Intrigue also occupies center stage in the *Poenulus*. A young lady and her sister are in the grasp of a *leno*, and must be rescued from their intended destiny as hetaerae. This comes about by a trick. Then it is revealed that both sisters are free-born girls from Carthage. The Carthaginian traveller Hanno is discovered to be a friend of the now-dead adoptive father of the young lover, and at the same time the real father of the two girls. Occasional passages in 'Punic' are intriguing for linguists, while the friend of literature takes delight in the characters drawn with a subtlety and a humanity worthy of Menander.

The *Pseudolus* is a fresh and lively play of intrigue. Pseudolus, a slave of genius but also something of a braggart, is unique even among Plautus' slaves for his tongue and his impudence. Once again the beloved of the young master (Calidorus) must be filched from a *leno* and rescued from her fate with a soldier. In spite of its rapid action, this mature play of Plautus is rich in ornament provided by cantica and monologues. The characters act their roles in full awareness. The *leno* knows that he must be very wicked (360–369), Calidorus that he has to be in love (238–240), the slave Pseudolus that he must be very cunning (905–907). Plautus is said to have been particularly fond of this comedy (Cic. *Cato* 50).

In the *Rudens*, the *leno* Labrax and two girls, Palaestra and Ampelisca, are shipwrecked by a storm on the coast of Africa near Cyrene. The shrine of Venus there coincidentally happens to be the agreed rendezvous of Palaestra and her lover, Plesidippus. The girls take refuge from the *leno* at the shrine, and use the slave Trachalio to establish contact with Plesidippus. With the aid of a distinguished citizen, Daemones, they are rescued from the *leno*. Meanwhile, Gripus, the fisherman, has discovered a chest in the shipwreck holding toys from Palaestra's childhood, which leads Daemones to recognize her as his daughter. The lack of action is compensated for by the liveliness of the slaves' repartee and of the chorus of fishermen.

The *Stichus*, short on intrigue, owes its comedy chiefly to the part of Gelasimus, the parasite. Two brothers, after a long absence brought about by bankruptcy, return to their wives, whose father had long been planning to marry them off again. But he now changes his mind because of the newly-won riches of his sons-in-law. A banquet follows, but the parasite may not take part because in his time, thanks to his greed, he has been partly to blame for the bankruptcy. Accompanying this, there is a celebration by the servants to which the slave Stichus extends invitations. The comedy is cheerful and ironic. Its atmosphere and characters are sympathetically drawn in accordance with the original by Menander.

Trinummus is a family drama with a moralizing background. Lesbonicus lives a life of debauchery until his father returns. The truth that house and property have been squandered must be suppressed. However the innocent deception which he spins along with his friend collapses. He is forgiven on condition that he marries immediately (1185). In this wholly masculine play, subtle irony dominates, and there is less comedy. Character portrayal is close to life; the development of the action particularly clear and self-contained.

The *Truculentus* is a wild and coarse play of intrigue centering around an avaricious hetaera, Phronesium. Through her low machinations she tries to fleece three lovers simultaneously. The play takes its name from the slave Truculentus, a crude fellow in every sense of the term. He becomes involved in a refreshingly unrefined affair with Astaphium, Phronesium's maid.

The *Vidularia*, which has come down to us in mutilated form must have been similar to the *Rudens*. Young Nicodemus is shipwrecked and rescued by an old fisherman. He works for his neighbor Dinia as a day laborer. Another fisherman rescues Nicodemus' chest from the sea, and so the hero is restored to prosperity. By the contents of the chest, Dinia recognizes him as his long-lost son.

Only fragments survive from the following plays: *Acharistio, Addictus, Agroecus, Artemo, Astraba, Bacaria, Boeotia, Caecus vel Praedones, Calceolus, Carbonaria, +Cesistio+, Colax, Commorientes, Condalium, Cornicula, Dyscolus, Faeneratrix, Fretum, Frivolaria, Fugitivi, Hortulus, Lenones gemini, Lipargus, Nervolaria, Phago, Parasitus medicus, Parasitus piger, Plocinus, Saturio, Schematicus, Sitellitergus, Trigemini.*

Sources, Models, and Genres

As already indicated, Plautus was likely to choose his models not from the Old Comedy, but from the less mordant New. Other sources, if we discount the Italian theatrical tradition, are less noteworthy.[1] Within the genre, the range is quite broad. It stretches from Menandrean comedy with its subtle character drawing (*Aulularia* perhaps taken from Menander's *Apistos*; Stichus from the *Adelphoi*; Cistellaria from the *Synaristosai; Bacchides* from the *Dis exapaton*) to a more typical comedy of mistaken identities (*Menaechmi*); from the simple prank (*Asinaria*, based on the *Onagos* [rather than *Onagros*] of Demophilos) all

---

[1] Other possible models are suggested by H. Lucas, Die Scherbenkomödien des Epicharm und Plautus, WS 56, 1938, 111–117; B. Veneroni, Allacciamenti tematici tra la commedia greco-latina e il mimo di Eroda, RIL 107, 1973, 760–772; W. F. Hansen, An Oral Source for the *Menaechmi*, CW 70, 1977, 385–390.

the way to the serious drama of moral dilemma (*Captivi*). The tragi-comic *Amphitruo* is unique; its source has been sought in the *hilarotra-goedia* of Rhinthon of Tarentum.[1] Already among these predecessors there were substantial differences, even if we look no further than the work of a single poet. In Menander, ethos and subtle art of char-acterization coexist with more agitated scenes. The original of the *Stichus*, now that the recovery of the *Dyskolos* seems to confirm the genuineness of its lively conclusion, may be set in the Greek poet's early period. Diphilos wrote such varied works as the romantic *Rudens*, reminiscent of Euripides, and the somewhat coarser *Casina*. From Philemon comes a tranquil family play, rich in maxims, such as the *Trinummus*, and on the other hand the *Mercator*, in which one highly charged scene follows quickly on the heels of another. The running slave who, completely out of breath, has difficulty in delivering his important news; exaggerated fears of eavesdroppers raising eager ex-pectation; excuses improvised on the spur of the moment; moralizing maxims; excess of pride on the part of the young hero; reconciliation mediated by a friend: these are some common features of Philemon's otherwise so different plays, which were already favorites with his Attic audience. Such are the often crowd-pleasing methods which Plautus takes up, fashions for himself and bequeaths to European comedy. From Menander he takes the immortal scene of mutual mis-understanding, e.g. in the *Aulularia* the young hero is talking of his beloved, while the old miser is speaking of his pot of gold. In the *Mostellaria*, whose original is unknown,[2] even three characters in turn give different meanings to their words. The plays Plautus takes from Diphilus on the one hand provide inspiration for romantic plays of a later period (Shakespeare), while on the other they exhibit 'archaic' features such as agon, chorus, the natural scenery of the satyr play. This means that the *Rudens* may simultaneously be regarded as one of the most 'old-fashioned' and yet most 'modern' plays. Comedies showing many of the merits of Menander's art without his inimitable gift for characterization, are ascribed to his successors: this is the case with the effective, but somewhat overdrawn, *Miles*[3] and the sharp

---

[1] F. DUPONT, Signification théâtrale du double dans l'*Amphitryon* de Plaute, REL 54, 1976, 129–141.

[2] For Philemon: M. KNORR, Das griechische Vorbild der *Mostellaria* des Plautus, diss. München, Coburg 1934.

[3] See however K. GAISER, Zum *Miles gloriosus* des Plautus: Eine neuerschlossene

caricatures, satiric detachment and loose structure of the *Truculentus*.[1]

In different plays, the influence of the Middle Comedy has been assumed.[2] The *Persa* is an example, although such influence there is not universally accepted.[3] Features of Middle Comedy, of which we know hardly anything, have been sought in the already mentioned plays adapted from Diphilus and in the *Poenulus*, although the latter as we now know goes back not to Menander but to his uncle Alexis.[4] The *Curculio* cannot be definitely traced to an original. It is assigned to the early period of New Comedy and even to Menander himself.[5] The quite extraordinary 'parabasis'[6] in it produces an archaic effect. The *Amphitruo* is also associated by some scholars with the Middle Comedy. In fact, because of its mythological plot, it is an exception to the genre of New Comedy, although precisely because of its burlesque of the gods it is also regarded as the work of an ironic latecomer. Since on the one hand we possess only Euripides, and on the other a few plays of Menander, too much leeway is left for the critic wishing to construct the history of Greek drama from Euripides to Plautus. It is not always possible, in the case of plays of coarser texture, to decide whether they are 'still' primitive[7] or 'already' trite. Conversely, in a period where Euripides is an early author, irony cannot be a criterion for late dating.

The first difficulty for the interpretation of Plautus therefore is our defective knowledge of his models. The only sure ground is furnished by comparison with Menander. The task of separating what is 'Plautine' from what is 'Attic'[8] is easiest in the *Bacchides* to which we possess,

---

Menander-Komödie und ihre literaturgeschichtliche Stellung (1967), repr. in: Die römische Komödie: Plautus und Terenz, ed. by E. LEFÈVRE, Darmstadt 1973, 205–248.

[1] For a Menandrean origin P. J. ENK, Plautus' *Truculentus*, in: FS B. L. ULLMAN, Rome 1964, vol. 1, 49–65; more correctly (in the school of Menander): the same author in his edition of the *Truculentus*, Leiden 1953.

[2] U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, De tribus carminibus Latinis commentatio (1893); repr. in: Kleine Schriften 2, 1941, 260–274.

[3] G. L. MÜLLER, Das Original des plautinischen *Persa*, diss. Frankfurt 1957 (bibl.).

[4] W. G. ARNOTT, The Author of the Greek Original of the *Poenulus*, RhM 102, 1959, 252–262; see earlier H. LUCAS, Der *Karchedonios* des Alexis als Vorbild des plautinischen *Poenulus*, RhM 88, 1939, 189–190. On Diphilos' place in the tradition: W. T. MACCARY, The Comic Tradition and Comic Structure in Diphilos' *Kleroumenoi*, Hermes 101, 1973, 194–208.

[5] T. B. L. WEBSTER, Studies in Later Greek Comedy, Manchester 1953, 189–202.

[6] H. JORDAN, Die Parabase im *Curculio* bei Plautus, Hermes 15, 1880, 116–136.

[7] F. DELLA CORTE, La commedia dell'asinaio, RFIC 79, 1951, 289–306 (influence of Doric comedy).

[8] G. JACHMANN, Plautinisches und Attisches, Berlin 1931.

thanks to a papyrus, a lengthy parallel text in Greek.[1] This new evidence proves that those scholars were right who had attributed to the Roman a good deal of independence in his reworking. Plautus removed two scenes which served more to sketch character than to forward the plot. He allowed the hero to be ironic at his own expense in his monologue, when in the middle of his sentence his decisiveness ebbs away and his thought swings round to its opposite: 'I punish her in every way so that a beggar's staff is all that is left—for my father' (*Bacchides* 507a–508). We will come back to the particularly striking expression given to the reproach uttered to the friend. The circumstance that a section full of 'Athenian *humanitas*' is now shown to be an addition by Plautus, and that two scenes have been omitted which no one had previously missed, gives pause for thought.

With this in mind, some of the chief criteria determining the analysis of Plautus may be mentioned. Besides the comparison with original texts there is another criterion: the critic should ask himself, whether certain crucial concepts may be translated back into Greek. The methods of the Latin scholar for establishing what is 'Plautine in Plautus' are of more consequence. Starting with obvious points, such as the mention of Roman topics and affairs, this method of interpretation leads on to the establishment of Plautus' mental processes, for example, that of the conundrum as an interplay of transformation and identification ('my father is a fly: we can't keep anything away from him', *Merc.* 361). Here may be categorized the use of comparisons to introduce speeches (e.g. *Cas.* 759–779), personification of inanimate objects, extension of monologues, introduction of features which do not forward the action, elaboration of the role of the slave especially by the use of military terminology, and in particular of course the independent fashioning of the recitative and the sung parts (cantica), meaning that the comedy of dialogue in fact approximates a musical comedy. E. Fraenkel's observations[2] on language and style,

---

[1] Plaut. *Bacch.* 494–562; Men. *Dis exap.* 11–112 (ed. SANDBACH). On this E. HANDLEY, Menander and Plautus. A Study in Comparison, University College London, Inaugural Lecture, 1968; C. QUESTA, Alcune strutture sceniche di Plauto e Menandro, Entretiens (Fondation Hardt) 16, 1970, 183–228; K. GAISER, Die plautinischen *Bacchides* und Menanders *Dis exapaton*, Philologus 114, 1970, 51–87; V. PÖSCHL, Die neuen Menanderpapyri und die Originalität des Plautus, SHAW 1973.

[2] E. FRAENKEL, Plautinisches im Plautus, Berlin 1922; Elementi plautini in Plauto, Firenze 1960 (enlarged); an instructive example: E. FANTHAM, The *Curculio* of Plautus. An Illustration of Plautine Methods of Adaptation, CQ 59, 1965, 84–100.

especially his studies concerning the role of the slave, point the way to a descriptive structural analysis of imagery, which reveals our poet's creativity, both aural and visual.

More dated is the research into the question of so-called *contaminatio*.[1] It starts from the presupposition that Plautus in many plays inter-wove two or even three Greek comedies. However, a 'large-scale' *contaminatio* of this type has not so far been proved conclusively. An example is the *Miles*. Because it contains two consecutive intrigues, it was traced back to two Greek originals. But it may be objected that the theme, which half resembles a fairy-tale, is found elsewhere in world literature connecting two elements considered heterogeneous; that even elsewhere New Comedy displays two intrigues (cf. titles such as Δὶς ἐξαπατῶν); and that finally, if we read the text closely, the second intrigue is implied in the first and is merely an 'expanded stage' of it.[2]

Even so, studies on *contaminatio* are justified. Their point of depar-ture is the existence of undeniable inconsistencies and contradictions found in Plautus.[3] The cogency of their premise, that in the Greek original all must have proceeded logically, without contradiction or hiatus, was overestimated for a long time. Once however it is con-ceded that many inconsistencies may be traced back to the original,[4] the prospects for successful analysis become gloomy. Nevertheless even in this area Plautine scholarship has attained secure results, although only where 'small-scale' *contaminatio* is concerned, such as the insertion by the poet of individual scenes, mostly from one other Greek play.

With every new discovery of Menander papyri, we are forced to rethink. In one respect, our admiration for Plautus' originality rises; in another, it becomes clear that Menander could employ final scenes of uproar, as in the *Dyskolos*; introduce a slave planning an intrigue, as in the *Aspis*; and that he even did not shrink back from exchanges

---

[1] On the word: J. B. HOFMANN, *Contaminare*, IF 53, 1935, 187–195; W. BEARE, CR 73, 1959, 7–11; on the question of *contaminatio* M. BARCHIESI, Problematica e poesia in Plauto, Maia 9, 1957, 163–203, esp. 185–186 with bibl.; a broad treat-ment in Schaaf (see the following note); G. GUASTELLA, La contaminazione e il parassita. Due studi su teatro e cultura romana, Pisa 1988.

[2] L. SCHAAF, Der *Miles gloriosus* des Plautus und sein griechisches Original. Ein Beitrag zur Kontaminationsfrage, München 1977, 300.

[3] For example, in the *Captivi* the unexpected appearance of the old slave and the swift return of Philocrates, in the *Amphitruo* the birth immediately after the 'long night'.

[4] W. H. FRIEDRICH, Euripides und Diphilos, München 1953.

of abuse between domestic wits, again in the *Aspis*. Furthermore, our knowledge of Plautus has greatly profited from research into fragments of comedy by authors other than Menander.[1]

A further working hypothesis is also found to be of limited application: the notion that Plautus destroyed the symmetry of his models. In the previously mentioned *Bacchides*, it is true that the removal of two of Menander's scenes produced a small scale change in proportion. But on a large scale, the play's symmetry was actually made more perfect.[2] In the *Mostellaria*,[3] the musical arrangement of the scenes before the exposition of the plot (1. 4) and before the dénouement (4. 1 and 2), produces clear points of reference, between which the central part of the play is artistically constructed.

The role of music in the general structure of the plays is reflected in the regular alternation of spoken parts (senarii), recitative (long verses), and sung, lyrical scenes.

Our regret that there are still relatively few interpretations of Plautus is tempered by the knowledge that the interpreter here is confronted with unusual difficulties. The question of what is Plautine and what is Attic is already complex. But it is made more so by the problem of double versions and interpolations. In the text as transmitted, often double and even triple versions have been left. In the ancient edition lying behind our tradition, these were indicated by critical signs, which disappeared in the course of time. In our oldest manuscript A, portions of text are missing which are preserved in the medieval tradition P. Sometimes P has maintained the 'scholarly' character of its model better than A. Apart from double versions, interpolations[4] are also intrusive. Many prologues read now as they were delivered when the plays were produced again in the middle of the 2nd century.

In these conditions the interpreter must steer a course between the Scylla of hypercritical fault-finding and the Charybdis of uncritical failure to see any problem. The rewarding course is to accept the challenge.

---

[1] H. W. PRESCOTT, Criteria of Originality in Plautus, TAPhA 63, 1932, 103–125.

[2] J. R. CLARK, Structure and Symmetry in the *Bacchides* of Plautus, TAPhA 106, 1976, 85–96; see also W. STEIDLE, Probleme des Bühnenspiels in der Neuen Komödie, GB 3, 1975, 341–386.

[3] I. WEIDE, Der Aufbau der *Mostellaria* des Plautus, Hermes 89, 1961, 191–207.

[4] A. THIERFELDER, De rationibus interpolationum Plautinarum, Leipzig 1929; H. D. JOCELYN, Chrysalus and the Fall of Troy, HSPh 73, 1969, 134–152 (Interpolations in the *Bacchides*).

As well as elements of comedy, traces of tragic poetry are also found in Plautus. These were probably transmitted in part by Greek comedy or *hilarotragoedia*. However, there are certainly also imitations of Latin tragedies.[1]

Among other representatives of the Latin tradition, we see that Naevius was Plautus' most important predecessor, especially in regard to powerful, vivid language. In trying to pinpoint the origin of the cantica we are left in the dark. Their polymetry may be compared with Euripidean choral songs and Hellenistic lyric such as *The Maiden's Lament*, though, unlike Euripides, Plautus is hardly writing choral lyric. Plautus' closeness to Roman tragedy is certainly significant; although there choral lyric played a greater role, and meters were less complex. It is a probable assumption that Plautus took up native musical traditions, which must, however, be thought of as sharing a living link with Hellenistic music.

In calling himself Maccus, Plautus identified himself with a character from the Atellane. It is plausible that his original *vis comica* is rooted in this native type of drama, which was played by free citizens. Quite apart from this, scholars searched for other popular sources, such as fables.[2] At any rate, it is a mistake to regard Plautus merely as a 'translator' of plays of New Comedy. He is rather the

---

[1] See below: Language and Style (also on the cantica).

[2] P. BRIND'AMOUR, Des ânes et des bœufs dans l'*Aululaire*. Commentaire des vers 226–235, Maia 28, 1976, 25–27; on the relationship of Plautus to his sources and models: A. BLANCHARD, Essai sur la composition des comédies de Ménandre, Paris 1983, ch. V: Les adaptations de Plaute; on individual plays: W. STEIDLE, Plautus' *Amphitruo* und sein griechisches Original, RhM 122, 1979, 34–48; P. HARVEY, Historical Allusions and the Date of the *Amphitruo*, Athenaeum 59, 1981, 480–489 (line 193: 201 B.C.); H. TRÄNKLE, *Amphitruo* und kein Ende, MH 40, 1983, 217–238 (mingling of comic and tragic elements); E. STAERK, Die Geschichte des *Amphitruo*stoffes vor Plautus, RhM 125, 1982, 275–303 (model allegedly a tragedy); R. L. HUNTER, The *Aulularia* and its Greek Original, PCPhS 27, 1981, 37–49; L. FINETTE, Le *Dis exapaton* et les *Bacchides*. Deux ou trois fourberies, CEA 15, 1983, 47–60; E. LEFÈVRE, Neue und alte Erkenntnisse zur Originalität der römischen Komödie, Plautus und Menander, Freiburger Universitätsblätter 18, fasc. 65, 1979, 13–22 (on the *Bacchides*); M. WALTENBERGER, Plautus' *Casina* und die Methode der Analyse, Hermes 109, 1981, 440–447 (influence of the *Kleroumenoi* of Diphilos); E. LEFÈVRE, Plautus-Studien 4. Die Umformung des 'Αλαζών zu der Doppelkomödie des *Miles gloriosus*, Hermes 112, 1984, 30–53 (a philosophical piece is turned into a farce by elimination of the theological features); on this K. DÉR, *Duplex argumentum*, Homonoia 5, 1983, 129–160; E. LEFÈVRE, Diphilos und Plautus. Der *Rudens* und sein Original, AAWM 1984, 10; W. S. ANDERSON, Plautus' *Trinummus*. The Absurdity of Officious Morality, Traditio 35, 1979, 333–345; R. HUNTER, Philemon, Plautus and the *Trinummus*, MH 37, 1980, 216–230.

creator of specifically Roman comedies with the musical structure of
Roman tragedy and stylized humorous additions from rustic farce.[1]

Literary Technique

In the last analysis, according to Aristotle (*poet.* 1450a 15–23) plot
takes precedence over character portrayal. In what follows, minor
modifications must be made, and in general, before passing a judge-
ment on Plautus' art we should not forget that Aristotle's view of
drama is only one of several approaches.

The papyri of Menander's comedies exhibit a division into five
acts; the plays are four times interrupted by the remark XOPOY. While
the Greek plays mark four definite places for musical and choreo-
graphic interludes, in Plautus regular and explicit indications of this
kind are missing. It is therefore assumed that the plays were acted at
one go,[2] perhaps not only in order to prevent the audience from
leaving the theater in favor of other attractions (cf. Ter. *Hec. prol.*
33–36; Hor. *epist.* 2. 1. 185–186). Traces of the Greek conclusion of
an act are seen in the reference to the entry of a drunken crowd of
nightly revellers (*komos*).[3] The division into acts found in our plays
goes back to the Renaissance,[4] and therefore has no authority for us.
A more illuminating principle in the structure of Plautine comedy is
a division into 'exposition', 'tying' of the knot ('complication') of in-
trigue and 'release' (unraveling, 'dénouement'). Such terms spring from
the very nature of the plot. The avoidance of musical entr'actes has
more than an external explanation. It is connected with the pro-
found transformation of comedy into a musical performance. Music
was no longer an adventitious extra irrelevant to the text. In sung
scenes, it became a fixed element of the action on the stage. A struc-
tural analysis of the *Mostellaria* has shown that Plautus used such scenes
to mark the introduction of the main action and the point before the
dénouement. This means that the previously mentioned division of

---

[1] G. A. SHEETS, Plautus and Early Roman Comedy, ICS 8, 1983, 195–209.

[2] A different theory in G. MAURACH, Preface to his edition of the *Poenulus*; see
now J. A. BARSBY, Actors and Act Divisions. Some Questions of Adaptation in Roman
Comedy, Antichthon 16, 1982, 77–87.

[3] *Bacch.* 107. At *Pseud.* 573 it is announced that the *tibicen* will fill the interlude
with his playing.

[4] C. QUESTA, Plauto diviso in atti prima di G. B. PIO (Codd. Vatt. Latt. 3304 e
2711), RCCM 4, 1962, 209–230.

the play into three parts was clearly accentuated by musical means. The recitatives and dialogues grouped between sung scenes reveal a significant order. This proves that Plautus did not abandon the five acts of his model without replacement, but that he substituted a musical and poetic structure arising from the very fabric of the plot.

Along with the formative principle indicated here, there are others for which the analysis is more difficult. For example, the *Stichus* may be divided into three stages: expectation, arrival and celebration of reunion. The plot comes to an early end in the second of these divisions, and the third makes a boisterous finale. The *Truculentus* is a loose sequence of scenes of a satiric rather than dramatic nature, and for this reason cannot be entirely derived from dramatic rules.

The parts of the Plautine comedy may now be noted in detail. The exposition is not necessarily moulded into scenes of dialogue such as are known from Terence. Plautus prefers to make use of the traditional form of the prologue, also familiar from Euripides and Menander. Its speaker may be a character from the play, but the characters' necessarily limited knowledge of events is often insufficient to give a satisfactory outline of the coming action to the spectator. This difficulty may be overcome in various ways. The simplest, if not the most elegant, solution is to give the character more knowledge in the prologue than it has in the actual play (*Mil.* 147–153). In order to avoid this contradiction, in addition to the human speaker, a second, divine character may be introduced (*Cist.*). He fills in the gaps of knowledge left by the previous speaker. It is also possible, following an old tragic and comic tradition, to have the entire prologue spoken by a god (*Aul.*) or an allegorical figure (*Trin.*), closely related to the action. As a last and artistically least attractive option there remains finally the anonymous, omniscient prologue speaker. Plautus most often employs prologues, and where they are missing they may have been subsequently lost. We may not however exclude the possibility that in individual cases the poet did without a prologue and tried a technique of 'suspense-filled' presentation, a method which would become more frequent in Terence.

The surviving prologues were partly revised and expanded in the course of later productions about the middle of the 2nd century. As a rule, the prologue informs us on the scene of the action, and on the Greek and Latin title; moreover, it often contains the name of the Greek playwright and of Plautus. The announcement of the title is a detail not known from Menander. We may surmise, therefore,

that the Roman audience did often not know previously what exactly was the title of the piece. The prologue furthermore presents the principal character and narrates the previous part of the story so far as it is relevant to understanding the plot. Occasionally it even goes further, as in the *Mercator*, where the description of the father's rise to wealth is somewhat long-winded (61–72). For the continuation and conclusion of the action, the prologue is usually satisfied with hints, allowing the spectator to recognize or guess the play's happy end. Allusions to future details of the plot or confusion of identity are generally only given when the action is complex. This is the case in the mistaken identities of the *Amphitruo* (140–147) and in the *Miles gloriosus* (147–153). To help his audience, Plautus distinguished his Jupiter from his human double even by an external mark of recognition. After this additional effort to avoid any possible confusion, the poet can later afford the joke of having Jupiter maintain that he is Amphitruo, of course with the important addition that we are dealing with an Amphitruo who can turn himself into Jupiter. In this instance the audience has in some sense too much information, and this permits a new sort of play with the artistic instrument of 'prologue' or 'intermediate prologue'. In general, the prologue has the task of taking the spectator up to a vantage point and giving him a bird's eye view of the play. One element of the pleasure taken by the spectator in the comedy lies in the awareness that he can see through the mistakes of the characters. This requires above all a knowledge of the real identities of the characters concerned. We can now see why gods are particularly appropriate in delivering prologues. Their vantage point from the very outset is that of superior knowledge. It cannot however be maintained that this prologue technique destroys all dramatic suspense. The poet is merely telling the spectator what might assure him the requisite superiority. After the 'what' is more or less established, the spectator can take undisturbed satisfaction in noting the 'how'. But when it comes to the details, there is still quite a lot concealed from him. He can still go wrong, and then, when he discovers his mistake, laugh in relief.

Excessive information was already mentioned. But there is also the reverse. In the *Stichus*, we learn facts essential to our understanding only after the lapse of several hundred verses. This makes the assumption especially probable that there must have been a prologue. In other plays, the expectations of the public are sometimes sent off in a wrong direction. In ancient comedy too, there is not merely the

error of the characters, but also that of the audience; and the poets play with it. In comedies of mistaken identity, we observe a particular regularity in the sequence of scenes, for example, in the change-off between Amphitruo I and Amphitruo II or Menaechmus I and II. This rational structure makes a fascinating contrast with the irrational confusions, and moreover, by its inner logic, helps the spectator understand the plot.[1]

The prologue may stand first, but it may also follow an introductory scene which explains in dialogue the nature of the principal characters. This form of introduction is found, for example, in the *Miles gloriosus* and in the *Cistellaria*. It is livelier and more exciting than the traditional introductory prologue, since it immediately leads *in medias res*. But even this was already known before Plautus (in Menander's *Aspis*, for instance).

One or more expository scenes may be found near the prologue. Occasionally, the prologue positively refuses to give an exposition: 'Don't expect me to say anything to you about the content of the play. The old people who are just about to come on stage will let you know what is happening' (*Trin.* 16–17). The description of the principal characters is also part of the exposition, whether direct or indirect. A typically Plautine touch in the prologue is the jesting and familiar quasi-dialogue with the audience, including witty address to unnamed individuals (*Men.* 51–55).[2]

An introductory scene in dialogue requires a second speaker who sometimes in the later course of the play has either a small or no role. Such figures are called πρόσωπα προτατικά. This technique is occasionally used by Plautus; it will be favored and expressly emphasized (cf. *Trin.* 16–17) by Terence. Five plays have no prologue, and nine a prologue which explains nothing of the plot. The prologue of the *Bacchides* is lost, as may also be the case elsewhere.[3] In comedies of deception like the *Curculio* and the *Epidicus*, the prologue may have been intentionally omitted in order to increase dramatic suspense, and this would be an anticipation of Terence's method.

---

[1] A. GOLDBACHER, Über die symmetrische Verteilung des Stoffes in den *Menaechmen*, FS J. VAHLEN, Berlin 1900, 203–218.

[2] R. CRAHAY and M. DELCOURT, Les ruptures d'illusion dans les comédies antiques, AIPhO 12 (= Mélanges H. GRÉGOIRE 4), 1952, 83–92.

[3] F. LEO, 2nd ed. 1912, 188–247, thinks that originally all of Plautus' plays had prologues, some of which were lost; but it is possible that Plautus employed different techniques on different occasions (G. B. DUCKWORTH 1952, 211–218).

Characterization may go no further than types. Such types, formed
at the latest in the course of the Middle Comedy, are the young
lover, the stern father,[1] the bickering matron,[2] the boastful soldier,[3]
the greedy hetaera, the unscrupulous *leno*, the *lena*,[4] the cunning slave,[5]
the parasite, the moneylender, the cook,[6] the doctor.

A more sophisticated method is the presentation of two opposite
characters: the cunning and the stupid slave, the authoritarian, and
the liberal old gentleman. A significant sidelight is thrown on cul-
tural history by the absence of the adulteress among comic charac-
ters. This was an offence which could not be taken lightly. In the
Amphitruo, as still in Kleist, Alcmene accordingly appears as anything
but a comic character.

Subtle deviation from traditional types is particularly frequent in
Menander's masterly character portrayal. In contrast to the cliché-
ridden stereotype, he presents the high-minded hetaera and the morally
superior foreign slave who gives his Greek master a lesson in hu-
manity. This is Menander's gentle protest against conventions and
established opinions. Even more delicate are the shades which distin-
guish, for example, pairs of sisters from each other, as in the *Cistellaria*[7]
and the *Stichus*.[8] In the latter comedy, one sister is ready for compro-

---

[1] H.-W. Rissom, Vater- und Sohnmotive in der römischen Komödie, diss. Kiel
1971; J. M. Cody, The *senex amator* in Plautus *Casina*, Hermes 104, 1976, 453–476.

[2] Different nuances are emphasized by E. Schuhmann, Der Typ der *uxor dotata* in
den Komödien des Plautus, Philologus 121, 1977, 45–65.

[3] Probably rarer than previously assumed: G. Wartenberg, Der *miles gloriosus* in
der griechisch-hellenistischen Komödie, in: Die gesellschaftliche Bedeutung des antiken
Dramas für seine und für unsere Zeit. Protokoll der Karl-Marx-Städter Fachtagung
(1969), ed. by W. Hofmann and H. Kuch, Berlin 1973, 197–205; W. Hofmann and
G. Wartenberg, Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie, Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss.
der DDR 1973, 2, Berlin 1973.

[4] G. Horstmeyer, Die Kupplerin. Studien zur Typologie im dramatischen Schrift-
tum Europas, Diss. Köln 1972.

[5] E. Fraenkel, Elementi plautini in Plauto (German original 1922), Firenze 1960,
223–241; G. Freyburger, La morale et la *fides* chez l'esclave de la comédie, REL
55, 1977, 113–127.

[6] H. Dohm, Mageiros. Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie,
München 1964.

[7] W. Ludwig, Die plautinische *Cistellaria* und das Verhältnis von Gott und Hand-
lung bei Menander, in: Ménandre, Entretiens Fondation Hardt 16, 1970, 43–110.

[8] W. G. Arnott, Targets, Techniques, and Tradition in Plautus' *Stichus*, BICS
19, 1972, 54–79; W. G. Arnott, Quibus rationibus usus imitetur Plautus Menandrum
in fabula Sticho nominata, in: Acta omnium gentium ac nationum conventus Latinis
litteris linguaeque fovendis (Malta 1973), Malta 1976, 306–311.

mise, while the other is firm. In this, the sequence of speakers, by contrast with the tradition of tragedy (Antigone—Ismene), is interestingly reversed. Surprisingly, the character introduced in second place later shows herself to be dominant, although she is the younger. The crossing of genres and their typical characters is visible in the tragicomedy of the *Amphitruo*. Mercury now acts as a 'slave', now as a 'parasite'. The poet's joke consists in allowing two kinds of convention to blend.[1]

The character of Euclio in the *Aulularia*[2] shows a different kind of complexity. Superficially, he is a miser, although not, like Molière's Harpagon, a greedy usurer, but rather a curmudgeon unwilling to part with his money (μικρολόγος). On closer inspection, however, we find that this reluctance to spend is not ordinary miserliness, but a complicated phenomenon connected with Euclio's life and circumstances. He may have inherited this disposition, but that is not surprising in view of his family's poverty. By his sudden find of a treasure in his house, poor honest Euclio is completely bereft of his wits. He is afraid of his neighbors' envy, a fear easily understandable in a small town (*polis*). To keep his discovery secret and avoid gossip he overdoes even further his previous parsimony. His behavior then externally looks like that of a miser, but in reality is a disguise for a mistrust which is socially conditioned and unhealthily exaggerated. It is extremely probable that the model for the *Aulularia* bore the title "Άπιστος (*The Mistrustful Man*). This finely drawn character, rich in nuances, conveys not merely the picture of an individual but that of his interaction with society. In Plautus this is still clearly recognizable, in spite of crude exaggeration, as in the scene with the slave at 2. 4. Indeed, by removing scenes in which the principal hero was missing, Plautus has emphasized the quality of the *Aulularia* as a comedy of character, and allowed its Menandrean element to be revealed even more clearly. Molière's Harpagon, by contrast, is an embodiment of avarice raised to the level of the grotesque. The decisive point comes at the dénouement. Harpagon must be blackmailed by the young couple, while in Plautus the suitor generously gives the

    [1] D. GUILBERT, Mercure-Sosie dans *l'Amphitryon* de Plaute. Un rôle de parasite de comédie, LEC 31, 1963, 52–63.
    [2] G. LAFAYE, Le dénouement de *l'Aululaire*, RCC 4, 1896, 552–559 (basic); P. J. ENK, De Euclionis Plautini moribus, Mnemosyne ser. 3, 2, 1935, 281–290; W. HOFMANN, Zur Charaktergestaltung in der *Aulularia* des Plautus, Klio 59, 1977, 349–358.

treasure back to Euclio who then, for his part, voluntarily relinquishes it to his daughter as her dowry; he is even delighted to do so, since now, finally, he will be able to sleep peacefully.

Character is also an important element in the plot. It is precisely Euclio's basic mistrust which forms the premise for the theft of his treasure and ultimately for the resolution of the conflict. Because of this mistrust, he carries his treasure abroad, thus making the theft possible. Character and plot are therefore interwoven more closely than appears at first glance.

Other examples of the comedy of character are found in Menander's *Dyskolos* and *Aspis*, the latter with a genuine miser. It treats the following problem: an individual is isolated from the community by a particular trait of his character, which may be reinforced by outside influences; finally, this leads him into a situation causing him to recognize that in the long term he cannot do without other men, although this may not bring about any radical change of heart.

The comedy of character may contain elements of the comedy of intrigue. Characters who contrive a plot are already found in classical tragedy and Old Comedy. In Plautus the cunning slave, whose model was recently discovered in Menander's *Aspis*, is surprisingly prominent. Plays that contain two intrigues, such as the *Miles gloriosus* need not necessarily, however, be mixed together ('contaminated') from two Greek comedies of intrigue. The title of the original of the *Bacchides*, 'The Man Who Deceived Twice' (Δὶς ἐξαπατῶν), shows that Menander himself wrote plays of this type.

On the negative side, the conclusion of the intrigue is usually the outwitting of some hostile figure such as the father, the soldier, the *leno*. On the positive side, it unites the happy couple. The role of helper is often given to the cunning slave. The reversal (*peripeteia*) may be linked, as in tragedy, with a recognition (*anagnorismos*). Most often a young girl regarded as a hetaera, or threatened by that fate, is revealed as the daughter of an Athenian citizen so that her lover can marry her. The dramatic technique therefore is related to a type also known from tragedy, especially in its late Euripidean form. In their turn the poets make play with the devices typical of their genre:[1] in the *Pseudolus*, the deception is expressly announced to the man who is to be deceived.

---

[1] A. THIERFELDER, Die Motive der griechischen Komödie im Bewußtsein ihrer Dichter, Hermes 71, 1936, 320–337; W. GÖRLER, Über die Illusion in der antiken Komödie, A&A 18, 1973, 4–57.

A distinctive literary procedure in Plautine comedy is the employment of polymetric cantica. In the last analysis, although not exclusively, they have their roots in the 'modern' musical style introduced to drama by Euripides and his followers. The meter and the music are subordinated to the words, which retain their dominance in spite of the musicality pervading the play. In addition, Plautus is taking up here a native theatrical tradition already well developed.

The set[1] in Plautus' plays is generally uniform. On the spectator's left is the exit towards the harbor and the country; on the right to the town and the forum. The doors in the background may serve as entrances to private residences.

The entries and exits of the actors are normally announced in the text. Where this is not the case, scholars suppose that Plautus deviated from his originals. The number of actors is usually five. It is assumed that in case of need the same part could be played alternately by different actors. There was a certain order of precedence here. Star roles, such as that of the cunning slave, were expanded by Plautus to please the leader of the company, who in the Roman theater liked to take a prominent part. In the *palliata*, by contrast with the New Comedy and the Atellane, it seems that at first masks were not worn.

The first Roman comic actors were not respectable citizens, but slaves or freedmen. The first stage artists (dancers) were from Etruria. These professional players initially performed without masks, whereas, by contrast, masks were worn by the presenters of the Atellane, who came from good families. The difference therefore was social rather than merely technical. The wearing of masks was a privilege reserved for the successors of the singers of Fescennine verses. Their purpose was to assure the anonymity of the citizen who *ex officio* here often had to indulge in crude jesting. Conversely, a professional actor had no civic rights. The public was entitled to see his face.[2]

The actor Roscius is said to have introduced masks in order to conceal his squint (Suet. *de poet.* 11. 2–5 Reiff.; cf. Cic. *de orat.* 3. 221). In comedy, the acting must have been especially lively. According to their degree of animation, a distinction was made between *fabulae*

---

[1] V. J. ROSIVACH, Plautine Stage Settings (*Asin., Aul., Men., Trin.*), TAPhA 101, 1970, 445–461; M. JOHNSTON, Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy, Geneva, N.Y. 1933.

[2] P. GHIRON-BISTAGNE, Les demi-masques, RA 1970, 253–282.

statariae (e.g. Terence's *Hecyra*), *motoriae* (e.g. *Phormio*) and a mixed form
(Evanth. 4. 4). Gestures were often stereotyped; for example, that of
reflection (*Mil.* 201–207). Plautus' text gives us relatively detailed infor-
mation on the movements and gestures of the actors, although stage
directions are more or less unknown.[1] The comparison with Menander
(in the *Bacchides*) shows that the words of Plautus often tend to con-
vey what the actor would think, not what the character would say.
The playful nature of the play thus receives greater emphasis. Menan-
der prefers to give necessary information to the spectator indirectly,
by incidental and apparently 'natural' remarks. Plautus instructs him
more directly, often breaking the stage illusion. He takes account of
the distance separating the Roman audience from the Greek play,
and elevates it to an extra means of artistic presentation. To a cer-
tain extent, this produces a stronger impression of stylization, par-
ticularly reinforced by the musical form and the more ornate style of
the sections in long verses and of the lyrical cantica.

   In one instance we may compare Plautus' manner of conducting
an action with that of Menander. A young fellow suspects his friend
of treachery. In Menander he confronts him with this charge right
at the beginning of the scene. Plautus, however, at first creates the
impression that the traitor is a third party who is intimate with his
friend. Only after the latter has distanced himself from the traitor
does he learn that thereby he has condemned himself. It must be
admitted that there is more suspense in Plautus' scene and that it
has also gained a new dimension of irony. Whereas in Menander
the irony consisted of the suspicion unjustly cast by one friend on
the other, in Plautus there is double irony. The baseless suspicion is
presented in such a way that the suspected party is quite unaware
that he is the false friend. All this both increases theatrical effect and
adds intellectual interest (*Bacch.* 3. 6). In other cases, Plautus uses
stage effects, such as entries and exits, to produce parallels and con-
trasts between neigboring or distant scenes, thus emphasizing the
structure and symmetries of the whole.[2]

   The unity of Plautine comedy lies, in fact, in its verbal and mu-
sical structure, the organized succession of senarii, long verses and
cantica. It is also found in the employment of imagery as a struc-
tural element. In this area, which has not yet been explored sufficiently,

---

[1] Occasionally directions are found such as 'soft'.
[2] W. STEIDLE 1975.

mere hints must serve. Complicated images, sustained and extended
metaphors approximating allegory, are often found in the cantica,
which were shaped by Plautus himself. A striking example is the
parallel drawn between the intrigues of the slave and the capture of
Troy (*Bacch.* 925–978), an allegory which is worked out in pedantic
fashion even to the point of absurdity. It is not an isolated phenom-
enon in the play, but is organically connected with Plautus' poetic
discourse which in general lifts the action of the cunning slave to the
level of military strategy, or, as in the *Pseudolus*, makes him a 'stage
director' in a world of art.[1] Quite apart from the parody of elevated
poetry, the Roman element here, with its reference to military lan-
guage and triumphal inscriptions, is unmistakeable. The predomi-
nance of the slave's role therefore is not an extraneous addition, but
contributes to the unity of the play and even influences its linguistic
structure. The parallel drawn between human life and a house in
the lyric verses of the *Mostellaria* is closely linked to the play's theme.
The confrontation between the worlds of father and son is reflected
in the scandal affecting the family house, said to be haunted by a
ghost, and the feigned purchase of the house next door, which is
built in the most up-to-date Greek style.[2] The concern here is less
with particular psychological interpretation than with the inner unity
of the system of images. Even more telling is the part played by
Pseudolus who, in the course of that play, grows into a director and
writer, and with that into the poet's own representative within the
drama. Imaginative means thus turn the comedy into a mirror of
poetic thought.

Key words, recurring in significant places, are thematically impor-
tant. Sometimes they have a specifically Roman character, for example,
mores in the *Trinummus, fides* in the *Aulularia, exemplum* in the *Mostellaria*.

The technique of tragedy makes itself felt in Plautus in more than
one way. It may be used in parody[3] with allusion to Latin tragedies
recently produced; it may have a Roman earnestness in effecting
rhetorical and lyrical elevation of style. Examples are *Rud.* 204–219;
the entire role of Alcmene in the *Amphitruo*; long passages in the *Captivi*

---

[1] J. WRIGHT, The Transformation of Pseudolus, TAPhA, 105, 1975, 403–416.

[2] E. W. LEACH, *De exemplo meo ipse aedificato*: an Organizing Idea in the *Mostellaria*, Hermes 97, 1969, 318–332.

[3] W. B. SEDGWICK, Parody in Plautus, CQ 21, 1927, 88–89; A. THIERFELDER, Plautus und römische Tragödie, Hermes 74, 1939, 155–166.

and the *Trinummus*; and in general the cantica. As a rule, Roman comedy is related to the 'play of bourgeois life' towards which late Euripides leans. Many features link New Comedy with the latest development of tragedy:[1] exposure of children, recognition, rivalry between father and son. Thus the basic situation and the pretended journey in the *Mercator* form a comic parallel to the rivalry depicted by Euripides between Amyntor and Phoenix (cf. *Iliad* 9. 432–480). In Plautus' day, Ennius adapted Euripides' *Phoenix*[2] (cf. also Menander's *Samia*). Even the *Captivi*, which is insufficiently described as a 'drama of sentiment', is related to Menander and to tragedy.[3]

Plautus makes more emphatic use of action occurring behind the scenes and therefore left to the spectator's imagination. In the *Bacchides*, the return of the money to the father takes place off stage, and in the same way at the end of the *Casina* he cuts out the scene of recognition and the wedding. This play in any case is conceived as a model of off-stage action. Casina does not appear nor does her bridegroom. It is a play without the traditional happy couple. Even the slave who triggers the recognition and who elsewhere often arrives unceremoniously, as in the *Captivi*, is absent. Here Plautus successfully carried off a particularly elegant play which, through a minimum of means attained a maximum of effectiveness. The so-called composer of slap-dash comedies revealed himself in this instance as a master of indirect presentation.

Language and Style

The widespread identification of Plautine language with colloquial speech raises many questions. Colloquial speech is not a uniform phenomenon. It is differentiated both chronologically and socially. Again, modern scholarship has established that Plautus' language itself displays considerable variation of style. The dialogue written in senarii is relatively close to the everyday language of the educated, although even here we are presented with an artistically shaped diction. The portions written in long verses show to a larger extent elements of

---

[1] A. SALVATORE, La struttura ritmico-musicale del *Rudens* e l'*Ione* di Euripide. Contributo allo studio dei cantica plautini, RAAN 26, 1951, 56–97; F. MARX, in his edition of the *Rudens*, pp. 274–278.

[2] B. WARNEKE, Zum *Mercator* des Plautus, WS 56, 1938, 117–119.

[3] W. KRAUS, Die *Captivi* im neuen Lichte Menanders, in: FS R. HANSLIK, Wien 1977 (= WS suppl. 8), 159–170.

style and forms of language springing from the solemn oral style of old Italian tradition.[1] The most exalted language is found in the lyrical portions.

It is in Plautus' language and style that the characteristic marks of his creativity are revealed. Features like the following reflect the fascinating process of *vortere*, that is, the transformation of 'modern' Greek ideas into a still archaic linguistic medium. Word repetitions help to organize complex chains of reasoning; in the same way larger textual units consisting of several sentences are interspersed with lively phrases from colloquial language which serve as structural markers: e.g. *dicam tibi; eloquar; scies; quid ais?* The principal point of view is anticipated, and the narrative returns to its point of departure.[2] Plautus rounds off and isolates individual utterances. The progress of thought is clearly indicated. Elliptical allusions to words of the interlocutor are less common than in Terence. The poet prefers to allow the answer to start again at the beginning, and presents it as an integral thought matching its predecessor.

A typical example of Plautine wit is found in the echoed curse (*Capt.* 868): 'Jupiter and the gods—may they destroy you.' The ready answer begins with the word *te* ('you'), an offence, softened by the surprising innocuousness of what follows. A second form is the already mentioned jocular use of the riddle (e.g. *Cist.* 727–735 and similarly 16–19). The word *disciplina* at first sounds puzzling and produces the question: *quid ita, amabo?* Then follows the explanation of what was meant by *disciplina: raro nimium dabat.*

The imitation of the Fescennine repartee in scenes of contention is also typical (e.g. *Persa* 223, *par pari respondere* 'tit for tat'). Intervening questions by the second speaker, and phrases such as *quid vis?* or *ego dicam tibi*, serve as structural markers.[3] A basic feature of Plautus' comedy is the literal interpretation of metaphors (*Amph.* 325–326). Sound and word play are of course also found in Greek literature,[4] but in Plautus, corresponding to his Italian temperament, they are

---

[1] H. HAFFTER, Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache, Berlin 1934, esp. 132–143; H. HAPP, Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus, Glotta 45, 1967, 60–104.

[2] J. BLÄNSDORF, Archaische Gedankengänge in den Komödien des Plautus, Wiesbaden 1967.

[3] G. THAMM, Beobachtungen zur Form des plautinischen Dialogs, Hermes 100, 1972, 558–567.

[4] A. KATSOURIS, Word-Play in Greek Drama, Hellenika (Thessalonike) 28, 1975, 409–414.

particularly common. The poet often imitates official language, but also lofty poetry,[1] and particularly the tragedies known to his audience: examples are Ennius' *Achilles*[2] or Pacuvius' *Teucer*. Tragic parodies in early Plautine plays furnish us with a notion of elevated poetic language in the days before Ennius.

Naevius' handling of language offered an important model to Plautus. Both developed further features of the Italian delight in witty repartee (cf. Hor. *sat.* 1. 5. 51–69). There is a preference for strongly expressive verbs. Linguistic archaisms are somewhat rare in Plautus: for example, the vowel weakening in *dispessis manibus* (*Mil.* 360) and the syncope *surpta* (*Rud.* 1105). *Mavellem*[3] (*Mil.* 171) is perhaps a vulgarism, *ausculata* (*Mil.* 390) for *osculata* is certainly an hyper-urbanism. It is an open question how far the removal of hiatus by the introduction of archaic final consonants, such as -*d* in the ablative and imperative, should proceed. The solemn air of archaisms may produce a comic effect, as with the weighty dissyllabic genitives in *magnai rei publicai gratia* (*Mil.* 103). In a paratragic context we find *duellum* (*Amph.* 189). On the other hand, the employment of a preposition to replace the dative case, as in later Romance, may be taken from popular usage (e.g. *Mil.* 117: *ad erum nuntiem*). Yet expressions such as *nullos habeo scriptos* (*Mil.* 48) are not direct predecessors of the Romance perfect.

Greek words were by no means a mere affectation of high society. They were not rare in everyday life and often their effect is more humorous than academic.[4] Foreign tags need not necessarily spring from the original. They may derive from Plautus' knowledge of the colloquial usage of slaves, whether exemplified in phrases (*Stich.* 707) or jests (*Pseud.* 653–654).

The *verba Punica* in the *Poenulus*[5] are carefully prepared and rendered intelligible by the situation. The introduction of exotic languages or dialects is reminiscent of the Old Comedy, although a

---

[1] H. HAFFTER, *Sublimis* bei Plautus und Terenz. Altlateinischer Komödien- und Tragödienstil in Verwandtschaft und Abhängigkeit (1935), repr. in: Römische Komödie, Darmstadt 1973, 110–121.

[2] H. D. JOCELYN, *Imperator histricus*, YClS 21, 1969, 95–123.

[3] P. B. CORBETT, '*Vis comica*' in Plautus and Terence. An Inquiry into the Figurative Use by them of Certain Verbs, Eranos 62, 1964, 52–69.

[4] G. P. SHIPP, Greek in Plautus, WS 66, 1953, 105–112.

[5] P. A. JOHNSTON, *Poenulus* 1, 2 and Roman Women, TAPhA 110, 1980, 143–159 (dates the play to 191 B.C. or later); A. VAN DEN BRANDEN, Le texte punique dans le *Poenulus* de Plaute, B&O 26, 1984, 159–180.

Doric-speaking doctor does make an appearance in Menander's *Aspis*. With a teacher's skill, Plautus imparts to his audience the feeling that it understands Punic. We deduce easily from emphasis and gestures what in fact we already know from the prologue.[1] Plautus is always aware of the need to communicate and attains his aim even when using an unintelligible language.

Compound abstracts again need not necessarily be based on Greek models. Nouns in this style, e.g. *multiloquium, parumloquium, pauciloquium* (*Merc.* 31–36), were coined by Plautus himself.[2]

Plautus introduced telling Greek names on his own. In the *Bacchides*, he replaced the neutral Menandrean name 'Syrus' with *Chrysalus* ('Gold-hunter'), and obviously was sure that his audience would understand its meaning. Many of his spectators after all had served as soldiers for a number of years in the Greek East. A list of peculiarities of word formation and usage would be too long, and in particular would create the false impression that Plautus' language is a collection of exceptions. Nothing would be more misleading. His language is lively, but kept in check by a natural grace.

As far as meter[3] and music are concerned, the comedies consist, according to the manuscripts, of dialogue (*diverbia*, DV, written in iambic senarii), and sung portions (*cantica*, C). The latter are subdivided into recitatives written in long verses, such as iambic and trochaic septenarii, and fully lyrical scenes resembling arias. Their purposes are different. If a letter is being read on stage, the meter switches from recitative in long verses into merely spoken senarii (*Bacch.* 997; *Pseud.* 998). If the accompanying music falls silent, the actor is speaking. Thus in the *Stichus* (762), while the 'flute' player takes a drink, the meter changes to spoken verse (senarius). Occasionally long verses too are indicated by DV (e.g. *Cas.* 798) at the point where the 'flute' player is being asked to begin.[4]

The sung parts hark back to a native tradition of 'musical play', while the spoken parts are, a specifically 'Greek' element. The importance of native traditions is perhaps confirmed by the fact that the bacchii and cretics, which are a favorite in Plautus, and which are

---

[1] A. S. GRATWICK, Hanno's Punic Speech in the *Poenulus* of Plautus, Hermes 99, 1971, 25–45.

[2] Greek comedy is differently oriented: Stobaeus 36. 18 = Philemon *frg.* 97 K.; A. TRAINA, Note plautine, Athenaeum 40, 1962, 345–349.

[3] H. DREXLER, 'Lizenzen' am Versanfang bei Plautus, München 1965.

[4] A. KLOTZ, Zur Verskunst des altrömischen Dramas, WJA 2, 1947, 301–357.

especially well-adapted to Latin, are not widespread in Greek, so far as our fragmentary knowledge of Hellenistic lyric permits conclusions to be drawn.

Music undoubtedly played a greater part in Plautus than in Menander. Even so, it is now known that 'flute' music was also found in Menander at the tumultuous finale, and that Plautus could appeal to Menander's authority for his expansion of the parts written in long verses; for example, Menander's *Samia* contains many trochaic tetrameters. The meter changes at important points in the plot: instances are found in recognition scenes, such as *Cist.* 747; *Curc.* 635; cf. *Men.* 1063. Large-scale compositions in polymetric cantica and correspondences between distant lyrical passages within a play are characteristic of Plautus. Music therefore does not appear as some sort of 'entr'acte' but is an essential component of the drama. It forms the lyrical beginning and end. The canticum marks the start of the real action or of the dénouement.[1] Terence did not imitate this type of overarching composition.[2] The cantica, written in anapaests, bacchii, cretics, perhaps also in dochmiacs or in a variety of meters, are monodies or small-scale ensembles. An exception is formed by the chorus of fishermen at *Rudens* 290–305. Occasionally the song is accompanied by dancing.

An organizing principle of the Plautine cantica is the agreement of meter and meaning, verse and sentence.[3] In the structure of his cantica, the poet shows great artistic ingenuity and originality. There is no strict responsion[4] (although even here the Latin poet's deep-rooted delight in symmetry is evident).[5] The structure follows the musical reforms of Timotheus, also accepted by Euripides. The meter yields to the text and its emotion,[6] as it does in the so-called *Carmen*

---

[1] F. Leo, Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik, Berlin 1897.

[2] L. Braun, Polymetrie bei Terenz und Plautus, WS 83, 1970, 66–83.

[3] F. Leo 1897 (s. note above).

[4] Mistaken: F. Crusius, Die Responsion in den plautinischen Cantica, Philologus suppl. 21, 1, Leipzig 1929.

[5] W. Ludwig, Ein plautinisches Canticum: *Curc.* 96–157, Philologus 111, 1967, 186–197; C. Questa, Due cantica delle *Bacchides* e altre analisi metriche, Roma 1967; L. Braun, Die Cantica des Plautus, Göttingen 1970 (with bibl.); L. Braun, Polymetrie bei Terenz und Plautus, WS 83, 1970, 66–83.

[6] H. Roppenecker, Vom Bau der plautinischen Cantica, Philologus 84, 1929, 301–319; 430–463; 85, 1930, 65–84; A. S. Gratwick and S. J. Lightley, Light and Heavy Syllables as Dramatic Colouring in Plautus and Others, CQ 76, n.s. 32, 1982, 124–133.

Grenfellianum, an instance of Hellenistic lyricism.[1] Historical links how-
ever are missing, although the complex meter of a fragment of Diphilos
in Stobaeus is important.[2] In other respects, too, Diphilus often bridges
the gap between tragedy and comedy.

Within the cantica, Plautus himself sets clear metrical boundaries.[3]
Just like Ennius in the hexameter and Horace in his lyric verse, Plautus
reveals here the typical Roman desire to fix the caesura and to con-
trol and regulate metrical license in arsis, thesis, and prosody.[4]

In the treatment of the different meters, the so-called licenses are
greater or smaller according to the type of verse used. Bacchii and
cretics, which are especially well adapted to the Latin language, are
constructed with the greatest strictness. Anapaests are relatively free,
but in sung verses the music may have provided more smoothness
than the bare text now permits us to recognize. The treatment of
the quantities is based on natural linguistic phenomena, partly con-
nected with Latin word accent. In the case of synaloephe, iambic
shortening, and caesuras, it must also be borne in mind that in fluent
speech groups of words were treated as units.

Final *-s* was attenuated even in Cicero's time (Cic. *orat.* 161), but
already in Plautus it may make position. In the stage poets, length-
ening of a syllable by the combination of mute and liquid is impos-
sible. Iambic shortening also affects syllables which stand before or
after the accented syllable. The shortened syllable must occur after a
short syllable, since otherwise there is no iambus. It is difficult to
draw strict lines in the use of synizesis and hiatus. The latter is found
particularly at major pauses required by sense, such as change of
speaker; after interjections; and in phrases such as *quae ego, di ament.*

In spite of these differences from classical meter, many principles
of the treatment of language in Roman poetry evidently remain
constant, along with the indivisible unity of style and meter.

In the long run, the polymetric cantica remained without succes-
sor. This subtle verbal music, with its lively effects, was a culmina-
tion; unique in its fashion, it formed a high point in the history of
the musical drama.

---

[1] M. GIGANTE, Il papiro di Grenfell e i cantica plautini, PP 2, 1947, 300–308.
[2] W. M. LINDSAY, Plautus *Stichus* 1 sqq., CR 32, 1918, 106–110, esp. 109 (with
a reference to F. MARX).
[3] G. MAURACH, Untersuchungen zum Aufbau plautinischer Lieder, Göttingen 1964.
[4] H. ROPPENECKER (cited above).

Ideas I
Reflections on Literature

Apart from examples like the remarks on tragicomedy at *Amphitruo*
50–63, Plautus made few theoretical pronouncements on literary
problems. Occasionally he uses comedy and the theater as meta-
phors. The most impressive instance is provided by the figure of
Pseudolus who, as the director of a complex play of intrigue, be-
comes a twin of the poet. The most important verb linking the poet
and his creativity is *velle*. In his prologues, Plautus is categorical about
his choices of scene and title or in favor of or against the presence
of particular characters: *Plautus voluit, Plautus noluit*. Here he speaks of
himself almost as if he were some natural power or deity: 'The young
fellow will not come back to the city today in this comedy; Plautus
did not want it. He has broken the bridge that lay in his path' (*Cas.*
65–66). How could a poet who on his own admission, behaved so
high-handedly with his characters (and models) ever have been re-
garded as a literal translator? His Majesty the Poet at the very most
will take advice only from another sovereign majesty, the Public: 'He
wants the play to be called (literally, 'to be') *Asinaria*, with your per-
mission' (*Asin.* 12).

Another basic verb of Plautus' poetic is *vertere (vortere)*.[1] It describes
the metamorphosis of a Greek to a Latin play. But we must not
think of literal translation. *Vortere* is linked with the adverb *barbare*.
The task therefore is adaptation to a non-Greek environment. *Barbarus*
is also the proud and humble adjective conferred by Plautus on his
fellow poet Naevius. It presupposes an awareness of distance, both
from Greek and from one's own world. The poet composes as one
apart. He is not a *vates* but a *poeta* or, as Plautus likes to call his
meddling and manipulative slaves, *architectus*. The poet is therefore
distinguished, not only by his own sovereign will, but also by a con-
structive intellect. Inspiration is secondary, perhaps because in Plautus
it is taken for granted. Plautus considers himself an author working
rationally.

---

[1] E. LEFÈVRE, *Maccus vortit barbare*. Vom tragischen *Amphitryon* zum tragikomischen
Amphitruo, AAWM 5, 1982; D. BAIN, *Plautus vortit barbare*. Plautus, *Bacch.* 526–561
and Menander, *Dis exapaton* 102–112, in: Creative Imitation and Latin Literature,
ed. by D. WEST and T. WOODMAN, Cambridge 1979, 17–34; elements of literary
criticism in the *Amphitruo*: G. RAMBELLI, Studi plautini, L'*Amphitruo*, RIL 100, 1966,
101–134.

Conversely, he makes fun of himself as *Maccus*. This character from popular farce is a modest image for the artist as society's jester not without the melancholy distinguishing great humorists, some of which makes itself felt in figures like the parasite of the *Stichus*.

Ideas II

A complex relationship unites reality and interpretation. Out of regard for a Roman audience, Greek material is shot through with elements originally foreign to it. In its new social context, even literal translation may in given circumstances sound different. In the *Captivi*, the panhellenic idea is transformed into citizenship of the world. Menander's comedy is relatively self-contained and consistent in tone. Both linguistically and artistically it strives for uniformity, a feature often enhancing the illusion of truthfulness to life. By contrast, in Plautus the very Greekness of the scene and of the dress produces a persistent awareness of distance.

The creation of a 'topsy-turvy world', as for example in the often misunderstood *Asinaria*, harks back to the very roots of comedy. The father obeys his son; the master commands his slave to deceive him; the slave enjoys divine dignity (*Salus*, 713); the son abases himself before him; the mother forces her daughter to behave immorally; the matron lords it over her husband. It is precisely an audience which thinks in 'realistic' terms which can do full justice to the absurdity found in this comedy.

Illusion, so far from being maintained, is actually broken. The conventional character of the play is emphasized. The world is not uniform or self-contained. Rather it is pluralist, open on all sides, filled with surprises. Music enhances even more the degree of stylization and the contrast with the stage of illusion. In union with the word, a magic effect on the spectator is produced, completely unintended by Menander. This irrational element, belonging to the particular gifts of his genius, unites Plautus with those great poets of the comic stage in whom lyrical and magical features are also encountered in different ways: Aristophanes and Shakespeare.

Plautus' model is the less outspoken New Comedy in Menander's style, and we must not therefore expect from him direct intervention in contemporary events in the manner of Aristophanes. In any case, he had before his eyes among other things the living example of

Naevius, who was forced to atone for his attacks on the mighty while
reduced to living on bread and water. Thanks to the Greek dress
from which the palliata takes its name and their Greek locales, Plautus'
plays, viewed superficially, are even further removed from reality than
those of Menander, which do after all take place in the spectators'
homeland. Slaves smarter than their masters could be found only in
degenerate Greece, and at first it was only natural that immorality
found in a foreign country should rouse the heartiest laughter. How-
ever, under the pallium, the toga may sometimes be glimpsed, as
when Alcmene asks Amphitruo whether an *auspicium* prevents him
from rejoining his army (*Amph.* 690), or when, in particular circum-
stances, such as the abolition of the *lex Oppia* about 195, there is
repeated criticism of the luxurious fashions of ladies in high society.[1]
In the distorting mirror of a foreign world arousing permissible laugh-
ter, features of the Roman society could also be quite properly distin-
guished. Comic laughter thus became the harbinger of self-knowledge
and self-criticism. It has long been assumed that in the *Epidicus* Plau-
tus suppressed a marriage between half-brother and sister found in
the original out of consideration for his Roman audience.[2] However
that may be, Plautus, by contrast with Terence, quite frequently takes
note of Roman circumstances. Such violations of the dramatic illu-
sion must not be understood as a lapse, but as a deliberate choice.
They comprise more than allusions to Roman topography (*Curc.* 467–
485), legal regulations[3] and social customs in general. Plautus had
the courage to confront thorny issues of the day, sometimes in sym-
pathy with the authorities. Thus, probably shortly before the legal
measures against the *Bacchanalia*[4] or against usurers,[5] he assailed mis-
behavior of this kind. But he also opposed authority. In the *Miles*, an

---

[1] For example, F. DE RUYT, Le thème fondamental de l'*Aululaire* de Plaute, LEC
29, 1961, 375–382.

[2] C. W. KEYES, Half-Sister Marriage in New Comedy and the *Epidicus*, TAPhA
71, 1940, 217–229.

[3] E. SCHUHMANN, Ehescheidungen in den Komödien des Plautus, ZRG 93, 1976,
19–32; E. COSTA, Il diritto privato romano nelle commedie di Plauto, Torino 1890;
R. DÜLL, Zur Frage des Gottesurteils im vorgeschichtlichen römischen Zivilstreit,
ZRG 58, 1938, 17–35; O. FREDERSHAUSEN, De iure Plautino et Terentiano, Göttingen
1906; id., Weitere Studien über das Recht bei Plautus und Terenz, Hermes 47,
1912, 199–249.

[4] E. SCHUHMANN, Hinweise auf Kulthandlungen im Zusammenhang mit plautini-
schen Frauengestalten, Klio 59, 1977, 137–147.

[5] *Most.* 625–626; 657–658; cf. Livy 35. 41. 9 (192 B.C.).

allusion to a great writer held in prison (see above) was anything but
a compliment to the guardians of social order. In the *Trinummus*, the
importance of legality is emphasized to the detriment of a hypocriti-
cal appeal to a so-called *mos maiorum*. This may be seen as support
for Cato's criticism of the diversion of spoils to private use and for
his struggle against the party of the Scipios.[1] Bribery (*Trin.* 1033) and
the excessive granting of triumphs are assailed (*Bacch.* 1072–1075).
At the production of the *Captivi*, set in Aetolia, the audience was
bound to recall the 43 noble Aetolians then imprisoned at Rome.[2]
More important than such details, which in the nature of things are
often open to dispute, is the general principle. We can scarcely measure
how many burning issues of the day were treated in these plays. In
them, the dignity of *patres familias*, whose power was almost unlimited
at Rome, was dragged through the mud; friend and enemy, master
and slave turned out to be brothers; the hated and treacherous Cartha-
ginian appeared on the stage as a man of honor; and the boasting
of generals became, on the lips of slaves, empty talk. The magis-
trates who organized these games for the people may have seen in
comedy a method of influencing the masses. But it was a two-edged
weapon which could also turn against those who employed it.

In general, we should not imagine that Plautus' audience was all
crude and uneducated. These were the same people who also at-
tended tragic performances. They could understand tragic parody,
and Plautus could presuppose in them a certain degree of wit and
sophistication.[3]

Plautus employed the religious ideas of his models while combin-
ing them with those of Rome. The typical Roman notion of the *pax
deorum* makes its appearance.[4] *Exemplum* plays a leading role,[5] and
Roman and Greek ways of living encounter each other in fruitful ex-
change. In the *Stichus*, Plautus depicted the Roman ideal of the *univira*.

As a rule, in the New Comedy gods appear only to speak the

---

[1] T. Frank, Some Political Allusions in Plautus' *Trinummus*, AJPh 53, 1932, 152–
156; on the history of the period, see also G. K. Galinsky, Scipionic Themes in
Plautus' *Amphitruo*, TAPhA 97, 1966, 203–235.

[2] Livy 37. 3. 8; dating after the conclusion of peace in 189: K. Wellesley, The
Production Date of Plautus' *Captivi*, AJPh 76, 1955, 298–305; P. Grimal, Le modèle
et la date des *Captivi* de Plaute, in: Hommages à M. Renard, Bruxelles 1969, vol. 1,
394–414.

[3] J.-P. Cèbe, Le niveau culturel du public plautinien, REL 38, 1960, 101–106.

[4] G. Pasquali, Leggendo 5, SIFC n.s. 7, 1929, 314–316.

[5] E. W. Leach, *De exemplo meo ipse aedificato*, Hermes 97, 1969, 318–332.

prologue. An exception is the *Amphitruo* in which Jupiter and Mercury actually take part. Plautus calls the play, though not only for this reason, a tragicomedy. Jupiter's role in the dénouement recalls tragic endings in which a god resolves the dilemma and prophesies the future. The gods acting as prologue speakers play this part in the first instance because of their superior knowledge. Being aware of family connections still concealed from the actors, they can prepare the spectators for the recognition which is to come at the finale.

But the gods may also influence the course of the action. In the *Aulularia*,[1] the *Lar familiaris* allows the old father to find a treasure so as to assist his pious daughter with her dowry. He also causes Megaronides to seek the girl's hand, thus indirectly leading the man who is her real choice to take a similar step. Moreover, the deities whose altar rests on the stage are often related to the action. So with Fides, to whom Euclio only grudgingly entrusts his treasure. This mistrustful character does not even trust Trust personified. The name of the goddess is entwined with the chief character. In other cases, it is related to the setting. The *Rudens* begins with a storm at sea. The star Arcturus, whose early rise in the middle of September marks the beginning of the stormy season, is therefore more than a weather god. He also guides the fate of men, for it is he who has brought about the storm which in the end reunites the divided members of the family and rescues the shipwrecked girls from the power of the *leno*. A philosophical thought is involved. Perjurers and villains cannot placate the gods by sacrifice (*Rud.* 22–25). In the same play, the awe-inspiring priestess embodies *pietas* and divine justice, a basic concept of the play.

In general, the prologue deities are closer to allegory than to myth and religion. It may be Arcturus in the prologue who has conjured up the storm, but in the play itself only Neptune is named (84; 358; 372–373). Similarly, in Philemon (*frg.* 91 K.), Aër presents himself as an all-seeing Zeus. The speaker of the prologue in Menander's *Aspis* is indeed Tyche herself, changeable Fortune in contrast to stable *Fatum*.

Menander assigns to Tyche, as to the gods who appear in his other prologues, an inobtrusive leading role.[2]

---

[1] Basic treatment by W. LUDWIG, *Aulularia*-Probleme, Philologus 105, 1961, 44–71; 247–262.

[2] W. LUDWIG, Die plautinische *Cistellaria* und das Verhältnis von Gott und Handlung bei Menander, in: Ménandre, Entretiens Fondation Hardt 16, 1970, 43–110. Tyche, who is an Oceanid in Hesiod, even in Herodotus does not denote blind chance but

Behind the employment of allegorical figures in the prologue, philosophical sources may occasionally be detected, as at the beginning of the *Rudens*.[1] According to Plato's *Epinomis* (981e–985b), the stars are visible and seeing gods. They know our thoughts, they love the good and hate the bad. They tell everything to each others and to the higher gods, since they occupy a middle place between them and us. In fact, in the play, the storm aroused by the star leads to the punishment of the bad and the reward for the good. In his prologue, Plautus did not remove this philosophical passage, but carefully developed it. Along with the Pythagorean elements in Ennius, he gave us one of the earliest philosophical texts in the Latin language. This is all the more significant because it was only several decades after Plautus' death that professional philosophy came to Rome. In its introduction there, the acquisition of the Macedonian court library[2] by Aemilius Paullus after the Battle of Pydna in 168 B.C., and the embassy of philosophers in 155, marked decisive moments.

In this context, a play of ideas like the *Captivi* is of particular significance. Its original springs from a time when the Greeks were taking belated account of their national unity. It proves in the course of the action that differences between friend and foe, master and slave,[3] are arbitrary and incidental. Tyndarus is taken away from his father by a slave, and sold into enemy hands as a slave. Later, with his new master, he is made prisoner by his own countrymen. There, he changes clothes with his master, and so aids in his escape home. When the new owner hears of the treachery, he punishes Tyndarus most severely. But, as the end of the play reveals, Tyndarus is his long-lost son. A single character here experiences, on behalf of all, the full gamut of roles conditioned by inner and external events. The play, influenced by the thinking of the Greek Enlightenment,[4]

---

the reversal of fortune in connection with divine envy. This gives her a religious dimension. Sophocles also knows the Wheel of Tyche. Her role in drama is expressed by Euripides (*Ion* 1512–1515).

[1] E. FRAENKEL, The Stars in the Prologue of the *Rudens*, CQ 36, 1942, 10–14.

[2] F. DELLA CORTE, Stoiker und Epikureer in Plautus' Komödien, in: FS A. THIERFELDER, Hildesheim 1974, 80–94.

[3] P. SPRANGER, Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz, Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1984; E. COLEIRO, Lo schiavo in Plauto, Vichiana 12, 1983, 113–120 (argues implausibly that sympathy for slaves and their positive depiction is Plautine rather than Greek); J. DINGEL, Herren und Sklaven bei Plautus, Gymnasium 88, 1981, 489–504.

[4] The equality of all people: Antiphon VS 87 B 44 B; Alcidamas *Schol. Arist. rhet.*

had originally as its principal aim the reconciliation of Greek with Greek. In its transfer to Rome and detachment fom its original national milieu, it gains even more in general human significance. It was not for nothing that a champion of tolerance such as Lessing declared the *Captivi* the 'most wonderful play ever staged'.[1] While the *Captivi* inclines towards Stoic thought, for the *Persa* traces of Cynic influence,[2] and even a portrait drawn from life of Diogenes himself,[3] have been claimed. Before philosophy found its way to Rome, it was drama that became the vehicle of enlightenment and of moral progess.

Transmission

Plautus experienced his first renaissance after Terence's death.[4] Many of his plays were re-staged (cf. *Casina*, prologue 5–14). This led to the intrusion of interpolations and double recensions into the text. Soon the *grammatici* assumed care of the text, as early, for example, as Aelius Stilo. Cicero and the eminent scholar Varro valued Plautus highly. Our tradition, in fact, consists of the plays which Varro accepted as undoubtedly genuine. After a temporary decline in reputation (Hor. *epist.* 2. 1. 170–176; *ars* 270–274), brought about by the unrelenting demand for literary perfection on the part of the Augustan poets, he again attracted scholarly interest from Probus and the Archaists. A scholarly edition may have been produced, to become the source of our tradition. A palimpsest dating from late antiquity (A) was discovered in the Ambrosian Library by A. MAI in 1815, and deciphered at the cost of his own eyesight by W. STUDEMUND. It gives a selection of the double recensions occasioned by repeated productions. The medieval tradition (P—Palatine recension) has preserved the variants with greater completeness, though without the critical textual marks.[5] It may depend on a

---

1373 B 18; Hippias *apud* Plat. *Prot.* 337 CD; cf. Philemon, *frg.* 95 K.; R. MÜLLER, in: Der Mensch als Maß der Dinge, Berlin 1976, 254–257.

[1] *Beiträge zur Hist. und Aufnahme des Theaters* (Works, vol. 3, ed. K. S. GUTHKE, München 1972, 389).

[2] F. LEO, Diogenes bei Plautus (1906), in: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften 1, 1960, 185–190; but this interpretation is connected with the now doubtful early dating of the Greek original.

[3] U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, Göttinger Index lectionum 1893/4, 16 (= Kleine Schriften 2, 1941), disputed by G. L. MÜLLER, Das Original des plautinischen *Persa*, diss. Frankfurt 1957.

[4] H. B. MATTINGLY, The First Period of Plautine Revival, Latomus 19, 1960, 230–252; important remarks on transmission: B. BADER 1970; on interpolations: H. D. JOCELYN, *Imperator histricus*, YClS 21, 1969, 95–123.

[5] A discussion of the critical marks in: W. BRACHMANN, De *Bacchidum* Plautinae retractatione scaenica capita quinque, diss. Leipzig 1880, 59–188.

manuscript of the 4th century. The manuscripts present the plays, with minor variations, in alphabetical order. The three plays the titles of which begin with A circulated in antiquity as a separate volume. Nonius cites them with especial frequency. Nothing is preserved of them in Codex A.

Of the *Vidularia*, which stood in last place, only parts now remain. Regrettable major lacunae are found in the *Aulularia* (end), *Bacchides* (beginning), *Cistellaria*. Several prologues are missing. From lost plays, about 200 lines or parts of lines are cited. Some of the transmitted *argumenta* are acrostics and date from before Donatus. Following Alexandrian precept, in the palimpsest A the verses are written colometrically and distinguished from one another by indentation corresponding to their length. Since no intact original text survives, even lines lacking in A may be genuine.

Influence

Comedy makes its influence felt on other genres: on the *togata*, for example, which confers on Roman subject-matter a form owed to Menander and Terence, and even on elegy[1] and the art of love.[2] In the history of such influence,[3] Plautus is only partly overshadowed by Terence,[4] whose language was more easily understood by later generations. But Plautus was esteemed even by Cicero as a source of clear and elegant Latin.[5]

During the Middle Ages Plautus was not very popular, although Aimeric (11th century) recommended him for class use. Hrotsvit (Roswitha) of Gandersheim (10th century) was influenced by his language in her own plays.

Plautus was a particular favorite of the Renaissance. Petrarch knew at least four of his plays. Apart from Virgil, Plautus was the only secular author taken by Luther in 1508 to his Augustinian Priory at Erfurt. New productions, translations, and adaptations, both in Latin

---

[1] J. C. YARDLEY, Comic Influences in Propertius, Phoenix 26, 1972, 134–139; F. LEO, 2nd ed. 1912, 143–145.

[2] F. LEO, 2nd ed. 1912, 146–157.

[3] K. VON REINHARDSTOETTNER, Plautus. Spätere Bearbeitungen plautinischer Lustspiele. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte, Leipzig 1886; the influence of Plautus on the late antique *Querolus* is disputed: W. SÜSS, Über das Drama *Querolus sive Aulularia*, RhM 91, 1942, 59–122 (bibl.); W. SALZMANN, Molière und die lateinische Komödie. Ein Stil- und Strukturvergleich, Heidelberg 1969. R. S. MIOLA, Shakespeare and Classical Comedy, Oxford 1994.

[4] S. PRETE, Plautus und Terenz in den Schriften des F. PETRARCA, Gymnasium 57, 1950, 219–224.

[5] *De orat.* 3. 45; *off.* 1. 104; see already Aelius Stilo *apud* Quint. *inst.* 10. 1. 99.

and the vernacular, began as early as the second half of the 15th century. Albrecht von Eyb (d. 1475) began the long series of German adaptations with his *Menaechmi* and *Bacchides*, printed for the first time in 1511. In 1486 there began at the court of Ferrara the soon innumerable Italian versions. In 1515, a Spanish *Amphitryon* by Francisco de Villalobos appeared, to be followed in 1562/63 by an English counterpart composed by W. Courtney.

Menander was lost, and it was Latin comedy that became the model for Europe.[1] Plautus,[2] Terence and Seneca taught the way to the artistic construction of plays and the careful conduct of the plot.[3] A classic example, although relatively late, is *Der Schatz* by Lessing (d. 1781). It is an admirable condensation of the *Trinummus* from five acts into one. Early in Germany, in addition to the professional stage, the school play was important. From a later period, Goethe's contemporary J. M. R. Lenz (d. 1792) may be mentioned.

To world literature, Plautus left a rich legacy of scenes and motifs. As early as the 12th century, the *Amphitruo* found a successor in elegy,[4] and in general perhaps this play has had the widest influence. Molière (d. 1673) sharpened the theme of adultery, although not by sacrificing courtly levity. The great Portuguese author Luis de Camões (d. 1580) gave less prominence to Hercules' birth, and emphasized the misunderstandings caused by the two Amphitryons. Kleist (d. 1811) treated the love of the creator for his creature with philosophical seriousness. Giraudoux (d. 1944) developed a remarkable philosophy of human resistance to divine caprice.

In the course of history the action of the *Aulularia* was transferred from a Greek polis to other places and social structures: the Dutchman

---

[1] More details in the section on Terence below; E. Lefèvre, Römische und europäische Komödie, in: Die römische Komödie. Plautus und Terenz, ed. by E. Lefèvre, Darmstadt 1973, 1–17.

[2] Erasmus and Melanchthon recommended Plautus for class use, without lasting success. Pomponius Laetus staged Plautine comedies at Rome; an Italian performance took place in Ferrara as early as 1486; such events encouraged both Neolatin (e.g. E. S. Piccolomini, Conrad Celtis) and vernacular playwrights (Machiavelli, Ariosto, Calderón, Corneille, and others).

[3] This applied e.g. to the works of Goldoni (d. 1793) and to opera libretti like those of Da Ponte (d. 1838).

[4] In the *Geta* of Vitalis of Blois, who also composed an *Aulularia*; H. Jacobi, Amphitryon in Frankreich und Deutschland, diss. Zürich 1952; for the influence of the *Amphitruo* on contemporary German literature: G. Petersmann, *Deus sum: commutavero.* Von Plautus' *Amphitruo* zu P. Hacks' *Amphitryon*, AU 36, 2, 1994, 25–33; cf. also Georg Kaiser's *Zweimal Amphitryon*.

Hooft (d. 1647) set the scene of his *Warenar* in Amsterdam. Molière's *Avare* exaggerates the complex character drawn by Plautus into a grotesque and almost demonic portrait of greed incarnate. Shakespeare (d. 1616) in his *Comedy of Errors* followed the opposite path. The straight comedy of mistaken identity (*Menaechmi*) is heightened by individual character drawing and so removed from traditional patterns.[1] The novelistic framework and the motif of metamorphosis (partly influenced by the *Amphitruo*) produce a fantastic fairy-tale atmosphere somewhat reminiscent of the *Rudens*. Shakespeare was to give back to comedy, in his own way, the lyrical element lent to it by Plautus through his association of it with music.

Plautus has not yet been sufficiently discovered by the cinema. Richard Lester's film *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum* (1965) is a promising beginning.[2]

Plautus had much to say to his time, and to later generations. Horace assigns him the simple intention of filling his theater's cashbox, although that is in itself not a blameworthy attitude for a man of the theater. His plays, however, have much deeper significance. They were, precisely because they enjoyed so wide an audience, an inestimable means of enlightenment and progress, affirmation and criticism of traditional values. They were concerned with communicating rules for behavior both between individual men and entire peoples, and with farreaching challenges to thought that prepared the way even for philosophy. They offered criticism of purblind overemphasis on the military and on the power of money. They helped to put into words private themes such as love or work. All this must have had a liberating and fascinating effect on the Roman audience. These aspects are emphasized here not because they are to be thought of as the most important, but because in so elemental a comic genius as Plautus they are easily overlooked.

Above all, Plautus created immortal theater. His language was both original and yet artistically formed, combining the charm of life with the magic of music. Without ever falling into obscurity, Plautus is continually aware of his spectator, sometimes carefully explaining and preparing, sometimes purposely leading him astray so that the surprise will be all the greater.

---

[1] L. SALINGAR, Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy, Cambridge 1974, 59–67; 76–88; 129–157.

[2] To give another example, Louis de Funès adapted the theme of Plautus' *Aulularia*.

His extraordinary control of language finally prevents his drama from dissolving into a simple concern with action. It stands and falls by word and gesture. Later, Roman literature would make much further progress in brevity, subtlety, and strictness of form. The freshness, richness, and clarity of Plautus in their way found no successor.

The farcical playwright and 'old stager' in Plautus, allegedly destroying the symmetry of his models by violent interventions, is well known. Less well known is the Plautus who is restrained and refined, who truncates what is melodramatic and sentimental or confines it to off-stage, and Plautus, the creator of new, personal, dramatic and musical symmetries and structures. Least well-known of all are Plautus the intellectual and Plautus the great lyric poet of early Latin literature.

Editions: G. MERULA, Venetiis 1472. * F. LEO, 2 vols., Berlin 1895–1896, repr. Berlin 1958. * W. M. LINDSAY, 2 vols., Oxford 1904, with add. 1910. * P. NIXON (TTrN), 5 vols., London 1917–1938, repr. 1965–1988. * A. ERNOUT (TTrN), 7 vols., Paris 1932–1940. * W. BINDER, rev. by W. LUDWIG (Tr), 2 vols., Darmstadt 1969, repr. 1982. * A. THIERFELDER (TTrN), (separate eds.: *Mil., Curc., Capt.*), Stuttgart 1962–1965. * *Amph.*: W. B. SEDGWICK (TN), Manchester 1960, 2nd ed. 1967. * *Asin.*: F. BERTINI (TC), 2 vols., Genova 1968. * *Aul.*: C. QUESTA (C), Torino 1978. * G. AUGELLO (TC), Torino 1979. **Bacch.*: L. CANALI (Tr), C. QUESTA (T, introd.), Firenze 1965; 2nd ed. with add. 1975 (with Menander's *Dis exapat.*). * J. BARSBY (TTrC), Warminster 1986. * *Capt.*: W. M. LINDSAY (TN), Oxford 2nd ed. 1921, repr. 1950. * J. BRIX, M. NIEMEYER, O. KÖHLER (TC), Leipzig 7th ed. 1930. * *Cas.*: W. T. MACCARY, M. M. WILLCOCK (TC), Cambridge 1976. * *Cist.*: L. E. BENOIST, Lyon 1863. * *Curc.*: J. COLLART (TC), Paris 1962. * G. MONACO (TTr), Palermo 1969. * *Epid.*: G. E. DUCKWORTH (TC), Princeton 1940. * *Men.*: P. T. JONES (TC), Oxford 1918, repr. 1968. * J. BRIX, M. NIEMEYER, F. CONRAD (TC), Leipzig 6th ed. 1929. * N. MOSELEY, M. HAMMOND (TC), London 9th ed. 1975. * *Merc.*: P. J. ENK (TC), 2 vols., Leiden 1932, 2nd ed. 1966. * *Mil.*: J. BRIX, M. NIEMEYER, O. KÖHLER, Leipzig 4th ed. 1916, repr. 1964. * M. HAMMOND, A. M. MACK, W. MOSKALEW (TN), Cambridge, Mass. 2nd ed. 1970. * P. RAU (TTr), Stuttgart 1984. * *Most.*: N. TERZAGHI (TC), Torino 1929. * J. COLLART (TC), Paris 1970. * *Persa*: E. WOYTEK (TC), Wien 1982. * *Poen.*: G. MAURACH (TC), Heidelberg 2nd ed. 1988. * *Pseud.*: A. O. F. LORENZ, Berlin 1876, repr. 1981. * *Rud.*: F. MARX (TC), Leipzig 1928, repr. 1959. * A. THIERFELDER, Heidelberg 2nd ed. 1962. * *Stich.*: H. PETERSMANN (TC), Heidelberg 1973. * *Trin.*: J. BRIX, M. NIEMEYER (TC), Leipzig 5th ed. 1907. * J. TAMBORNINI (TC), 2 vols., Paderborn 1954–1955. * *Truc.*: P. J. ENK (TC), 2 vols., Leiden 1953, repr. 1979. * K. H. KRUSE (TC), diss. Heidelberg

1974. * *Vidularia*: R. CALDERAN (TC), Palermo 1982. * *Frg.*: F. WINTER, diss. Bonn 1885; s. above Leo, Lindsay, Ernout. ** *Lexica*: G. LODGE, Lexicon Plautinum, 2 vols., Leipzig 1904–1933. * A. MANIET, Plaute. Lexiques inverses, listes grammaticales, relevés divers, Hildesheim 1969. * A. MANIET, Plaute, *Asinaria*. Index verborum, lexiques inverses, relevés lexicaux et grammaticaux, Hildesheim 1992. ** *Bibl.*: J. A. HANSON, Scholarship on Plautus since 1950. CW 59, 1965–1966, 103–107; 126–129; 141–148; repr. in: The Classical World Bibliography of Drama and Poetry and Ancient Fiction, with a new introd. by W. DONLAN, New York 1978, 1–16. * G. GASPARRO, La questione plautina nella critica anglo-sassone contemporanea, RCCM 15, 1973, 87–133. * J. D. HUGHES, A Bibliography of Scholarship on Plautus, Amsterdam 1975. * W. G. ARNOTT, Menander, Plautus, Terence, Oxford 1975. * D. FOGAZZA, Plauto 1935–1975, Lustrum 19, 1976 (1978), 79–295. * E. SEGAL, Scholarship on Plautus 1965–1976, CW 74, 7, 1981 (Special Survey Issue), 353–483. * S. below LEFÈVRE 1973 and GAISER 1972.

K. ABEL, Die Plautusprologe, diss. Frankfurt 1955. * W. S. ANDERSON, Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy, Toronto 1993. * A. ARCELLASCHI, Plaute dans Plaute, VL 77, 1980, 22–27. * B. BADER, Szenentitel und Szeneneinteilung bei Plautus, diss. Tübingen 1970 (important for the textual transmission; in addition: C. QUESTA, Maia n.s. 26, 1974, 301–319). * D. BAIN, *Plautus vortit barbare*: Plautus *Bacchides* 526–61 and Menander *Dis Exapaton* 102–12, in: D. WEST, A. J. WOODMAN, eds., Creative Imitation in Latin Literature, Cambridge 1979, 17–34. * M. BARCHIESI, Plauto e il 'metateatro' antico, in: I moderni alla ricerca di Enea, Roma 1980. * W. BEARE, The Roman Stage. A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic, London 3rd ed. 1964. * M. BETTINI, Verso un'antropologia dell'intreccio: Le strutture semplici della trama nelle commedie di Plauto, in: Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 7, 1981, 39–101. * M. BIEBER, The History of the Greek and Roman Theater, Princeton 2nd ed. 1961 (archaeol.). * J. BLÄNSDORF, Archaische Gedankengänge in den Komödien des Plautus, Wiesbaden 1967. * H.-D. BLUME, Einführung in das antike Theaterwesen, Darmstadt 1978. * L. BRAUN, Die Cantica des Plautus, Göttingen 1970. * W. R. CHALMERS, Plautus and his Audience, in: Roman Drama, ed. by T. A. DOREY and D. R. DUDLEY, London 1965, 21–50. * K. H. CHELIUS, Die Codices Minores des Plautus. Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kritik, Baden-Baden 1989. * L. DE FINIS, ed., Teatro e pubblico nell'antichità. Atti del convegno nazionale, Trento 25/27 Aprile 1986, Trento 1987. * F. DELLA CORTE, Da Sarsina a Roma, Firenze 1967. * H. DREXLER, 'Lizenzen' am Versanfang bei Plautus, München 1965. * G. E. DUCKWORTH, The Nature of Roman Comedy. A Study in Popular Entertainment, Princeton 1952. * E. FANTHAM, Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery, Toronto 1972. * P. FLURY, Liebe und Liebessprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz, Heidelberg 1968. * E. FRAENKEL, Plautinisches im Plautus, Berlin

1922; with add.: Elementi plautini in Plauto, Firenze 1960. * O. FREDERS-HAUSEN, De iure Plautino et Terentiano, diss. Göttingen 1906. * W. H. FRIEDRICH, Euripides und Diphilos. Zur Dramaturgie der Spätformen, München 1953. * M. FUHRMANN, Lizenzen und Tabus des Lachens, in: Das Komische, ed. by W. PREISENDANZ and R. WARNING, Poetik und Hermeneutik 7, München 1976, 65–101. * K. GAISER, Zur Eigenart der römischen Komödie. Plautus und Terenz gegenüber ihren griechischen Vorbildern, ANRW 1, 2, 1972, 1027–1113. * K. GAISER, Die plautinischen *Bacchides* und Menanders *Dis exapaton*, Philologus 114, 1979, 51–87. * B. GENTILI, Lo spettacolo nel mondo antico. Teatro ellenistico e teatro romano arcaico, Roma 1977. * P. GRIMAL, ed., Le théâtre à Rome. Travaux de la Commission de latin, in: Association G. BUDÉ, Actes du IXᵉ Congrès (Rome 1973), Paris 1975, 247–499. * H. HAPP, Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus, Glotta 45, 1967, 60–104. * H. HAFFTER, Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache, Berlin 1934. * E. W. HANDLEY, Menander and Plautus. A Study in Comparison, London 1968. * P. B. HARVEY, Historical Topicality in Plautus, CW 79, 1986, 297–304. * W. HOFMANN, G. WARTENBERG, Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie, bes. bei Plautus und Terenz, Akad. Wiss. DDR 1973, 2. * R. L. HUNTER, The New Comedy of Greece and Rome, Cambridge 1985. * G. JACHMANN, Plautinisches und Attisches, Berlin 1931. * H. D. JOCELYN, Imperator histricus, YClS 21, 1969, 95–123 (on interpolations). * D. KONSTAN, Roman Comedy, Ithaca 1983. * E. LEFÈVRE, ed., Die römische Komödie. Plautus und Terenz, Darmstadt 1973. * E. LEFÈVRE, Die römische Komödie, in: M. FUHRMANN, ed., Römische Literatur, Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 3, Frankfurt 1974, 33–62. * E. LEFÈVRE, ed., Das römische Drama, Darmstadt 1978. * E. LEFÈVRE, L'originalité dell' ultimo Plauto, Sic Gymn 33, 1980, 893–907. * E. LEFÈVRE, E. STÄRK, G. VOGT, *Plautus barbarus.* Sechs Kapitel zur Originalität des Plautus, Tübingen 1991. * M. LENTANO, *Parce ac duriter.* Catone, Plauto e una formula felice, Maia n.s. 45, 1993, 11–16. * F. LEO, Plautinische Forschungen. Zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie, Berlin (1893), 2nd ed. 1912. * W. M. LINDSAY, The Ancient Editions of Plautus, Oxford 1904. * W. M. LINDSAY, Syntax of Plautus, Oxford 1907. * H. MARTI, Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik bei Plautus und Terenz, diss. Zürich, Winterthur 1959. * F. MIDDELMANN, Griechische Welt und Sprache in Plautus' Komödien, diss. Münster, Bochum 1938. * U. E. PAOLI, Comici latini e diritto attico, Milano 1962. * L. PERELLI, Società Romana e problematica sociale nel teatro plautino, StudRom 26, 1978, 307–327. * G. PETRONE, Teatro antico e inganno. Finzioni plautine, Palermo 1983. * Plauto e il teatro. Atti del V congresso internazionale di studi sul dramma antico = Dioniso 46, 1975. * V. PÖSCHL, Die neuen Menanderpapyri und die Originalität des Plautus. SHAW 1973, 4. * C. QUESTA, Introduzione alla metrica di Plauto, Bologna 1967. * C. QUESTA, Maschere e funzioni

nelle commedie di Plauto, in: Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 8, 1982, 9–64. * C. QUESTA, Numeri innumeri. Ricerche sui *cantica* e la tradizione manoscritta di Plauto, Roma 1984. * R. RAFFAELLI, Ricerche sui versi lunghi di Plauto e di Terenzio, Pisa 1982. * U. REINHARDT, Mythologische Beispiele in der Neuen Komödie (Menander, Plautus, Terenz), diss. Mainz 1972. * F. H. SANDBACH, The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome, London 1977, 118–134. * L. SCHAAF, Der *Miles gloriosus* des Plautus und sein griechisches Original. Ein Beitrag zur Kontaminationsfrage, München 1977. * H. P. SCHÖNBECK, Beiträge zur Interpretation der plautinischen *Bacchides*, Düsseldorf 1981. * K. H. E. SCHUTTER, Quibus annis comoediae Plautinae primum actae sint quaeritur, diss. Groningen, Leiden 1952. * E. SEGAL, Roman Laughter. The Comedy of Plautus, Cambridge, Mass. 1970. * G. A. SHEETS, Plautus and Early Roman Comedy, ICS 8, 1983, 195–209. * N. W. SLATER, The Theatre of the Mind. Metatheatre in Plautus, diss. Princeton 1981. * N. W. SLATER, Plautus in Performance. The Theatre of the Mind, Princeton 1985. * E. STÄRK, Die *Menaechmi* des Plautus und kein griechisches Original, Tübingen 1989. * W. STEIDLE, Probleme des Bühnenspiels in der Neuen Komödie, GB 3, 1975, 341–386. * G. TANNER, The Origins of Plautine Comedy, in: Vindex humanitatis. Essays in Honour of J. H. BISHOP, Armidale (New South Wales) 1980, 58–83. * G. THAMM, Zur *Cistellaria* des Plautus, diss. Freiburg i. Br. 1971. * W. THEILER, Zum Gefüge einiger plautinischer Komödien, Hermes 73, 1938, 269–296. * A. THIERFELDER, De rationibus interpolationum Plautinarum, Leipzig 1929. * A. TRAINA, Forma e suono, Roma 1977. * T. B. L. WEBSTER, Studies in Later Greek Comedy, Manchester 1953 (with a good account of the problems of many Latin plays). * F. WEHRLI, Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie, Zürich 1936. * I. WEIDE, Der Aufbau der *Mostellaria* des Plautus, Hermes 89, 1961, 191–207. * J. WRIGHT, Dancing in Chains. The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata, Rome 1974. * N. ZAGAGI, Tradition and Originality in Plautus. Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy, Göttingen 1980. * O. Zwierlein, Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus, 1: *Poenulus* und *Curculio* (1990), 2: *Miles gloriosus* (1991), 3: *Pseudolus* (1991), 4: *Bacchides* (1992), Stuttgart 1990–1992.

CAECILIUS

Life, Dates

Caecilius Statius, who in the opinion of Volcacius Sedigitus (1. 5 M. = 1. 5 Bü.) was Rome's greatest writer of comedy, came to Rome from Cisalpine Gaul, as would many famous authors. Jerome, who may be drawing on Suetonius (*chron. a. Abr.* 1839 = 179 B.C.), makes him