CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

PLAUTUS

PSEUDOLUS

EDITED BY DAVID CHRISTENSON

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

PLAUTUS
PSEVDOLVS

DAVID CHRISTENSON
University of Arizona

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521766241
DOI: 10.1017/9781139028363

First published 2020

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd, Padstow Cornwall

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
NAMES: Plautus, Titus Maccius, author. | Christenson, David M. (David Michael), editor.
TITLE: Plautus: Pseudolus / David Christenson.
OTHER TITLES: Pseudolus | Cambridge Greek and Latin classics.
DESCRIPTION: New York : Cambridge University Press, 2020. |
SERIES: Cambridge Greek and Latin classics | Includes bibliographical references and index.
IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2019059918 | ISBN 9780521766241 (hardback) | ISBN 9781139028363 (epub)
SUBJECTS: LCSH: Plautus, Titus Maccius. Pseudolus.
CLASSIFICATION: LCC PA6568 .P8 2020 | DDC 872/.01–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019059918

ISBN 978-0-521-76624-1 Hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-14971-6 Paperback

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Years ago I was dissuaded from writing a commentary on *Pseudolus* by the report that H. D. Jocelyn was preparing just such an edition, and instead I eventually published a Cambridge 'Green and Yellow' on another Plautine masterpiece, *Amphitruo* (2000). Unfortunately, Professor Jocelyn's death prevented his lengthy labours on *Pseudolus* from seeing the light of day. Returning to this project in recent years, I was able to benefit enormously from the insightful publications on various aspects of the play and Plautus in general that Professor Jocelyn bequeathed to us – this volume is much richer because of them. Professor Jocelyn is just one of a host of brilliant scholars who to this day have led a rediscovery and re-evaluation of Plautus' not always fully appreciated comic genius. Whereas my decision to focus on Plautus in my PhD comprehensive exams elicited some snickers and sneers in the late 1980s, the Plautine renaissance of recent decades has forged a secure and respected place for the comedies within contemporary Classics curricula. Plautus has emerged anew, intact and fresh, if still a little scarred by his former secondary status among antiquity's comic playwrights: Plautine comedy, like Pseudolus himself, has a strong back (cf. *Ps.* 1325). My dependence on, and deep gratitude for, my fellow Plautinists' stimulating contributions can be readily glimpsed throughout this volume.

Special thanks are owed to the friends and colleagues who over the course of this project patiently endured conversations with me about it or commented on sections of the commentary: Michael Fontaine, Boris Shoshitaishvili, Christopher Trinacty, Gonda Van Steen, Cynthia White, and David Wright. Walter Stockert most generously read the entire commentary with a keen eye for its metrical issues (any errors remaining there are my own). University of Arizona graduate students Elizabeth Harvey, Patrick Meusel, Collin Moat, Meaghan Nielson, Daylin Oakes, Catherine Shenck, and Grace Welch-Zaricor offered helpful suggestions on an early draft. A Loeb Classical Library Foundation Fellowship allowed me time away from teaching to launch this project.

Series editors Philip Hardie and Stephen Oakley provided gracious, perceptive, and thoughtful guidance throughout the process. Michael Sharp at the Press kindly supplied versions of Timothy Moore's scansions of Pseudolus' *cantica* (from *Music in Roman Comedy*) for me to work from. Iveta Adams' superb editing was indispensable in the production process. Incalculable, longer-term debts of gratitude are owed to Ted Kenney, who exerted his incisive and elegant influence on my writing,

and to Robert Renehan, who showed me the infinite value of meticulous reading free of its too frequently concomitant myopia. This commentary aims to elucidate some of *Pseudolus*' deceptively simple complexity, playful provocativeness, piquancy, and enduring relevance, and, above all, to help make Plautus accessible to new audiences.

INTRODUCTION

1 PLAUTUS THE PLAYWRIGHT

The historical Plautus remains elusive.[1] The biographical tradition depends on Varro (116–27 BCE), who lacked reliable sources. Today as in antiquity any detailed account of P.'s life is an obvious scholarly construct. For example, the tantalizingly vague claim that P. earned money 'in the service of stage-personnel' (Gel. 3.3.14 *in operis artificium scaenicorum*) plausibly supports competing notions of P. as a person of the theatre who got his start in Atellan farce or as a touring actor with the Artists of Dionysus.[2] The dates given for P.'s life, 254–184 BCE, may not be exactly correct (they yield a neat seventy years),[3] but match a dramatic career agreed to flourish from the last years of the Second Punic War (218–201 BCE) to the mid 180s BCE. We can accept the testimony of the production notice,[4] preserved in the Ambrosian palimpsest, that ties *Ps.* to an important occasion at the Megalenses of 191 BCE.[5] The broader historical context for P.'s work is Rome's ascendancy to Mediterranean 'superpower' status and the social transformations accompanying this early phase of imperialism: increased migration of persons, customs, and ideas to the city-state (especially from Greece), an influx of wealth and property (including a greatly expanded supply of slaves), and inevitable collisions between Roman traditions and external innovations.[6] Further facts of P.'s professional life are scarce: he seems to have been the first Roman playwright to specialize in one dramatic genre (after Greek practice), and he worked with the famous actor-manager T. Publius Pellio.[7]

[1] Accounts of P.'s life: Leo 1912: 63–86, Gratwick 1982: 808–9, Paratore 2005: 85–7. For the fictionalizing tendencies of ancient biographies see Fairweather 1974.

[2] Promoting scholarly views of P. as a playwright whose primary influence was either Italian or Greek: Fontaine 2014a: 533–4, 2014b: 416–18. For Atellan farce and the Artists of Dionysus see pp. 6, 11–12 below.

[3] 184 BCE, the year of Cato the Elder's censorship, is also suspiciously given as the date of Terence's birth. Cic. *Sen.* 14, which claims P. produced *Ps.* in his twilight years, broadly supports the 184 date; *Cas.* 979–80 refer to the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 BCE.

[4] Didascaliae survive for only *Ps.* and *St.* (200 BCE). If adjustments for the errant Roman calendar are made, the debut of *Ps.* was in December 192, not April 191.

[5] Pp. 9–10, 43–4 below.

[6] For P.'s cultural-historical context see Gruen 1990 and Leigh 2004.

[7] The didascalia of *St.* identifies Pellio as producer. A metatheatrical joke at *Bac.* 213–15 (with Barsby 1986: 115–16) indicates that Pellio acted in P.'s plays and another at *Men.* 404 (with Gratwick 1993a: 178) makes him responsible for the stage's construction.

P.'s ironic and self-abasing name hardly clarifies his historical identity. The improbable *tria nomina* Titus Maccius Plautus, 'Phallus son of Clown the Mime-Actor',[8] appear to be a professional pseudonym,[9] and we can infer nothing certain about his social status (Roman, freedman, Italian citizen?) from them. Ancient sources give P.'s origins in Sarsina, Umbria. If accurate, this would make the Latin of Rome, along with Greek, P.'s second or third language, and place P. among 'the first practitioners of the new translation literature, who normally inhabited the interstices between three linguistic cultures' (Feeney 2016: 66).[10] While P. certainly should be counted among the *semigraeci* (Suet. *Gram.* 1 (p. 100Re)) driving early Latin literature's creation, there is no compelling reason to accept this geographic claim alone among other obviously fictional details provided for P.'s life; it appears to be a scholarly deduction from Tranio's real-estate pun on *umbra* and *Vmbria* at *Mos.* 770 (*quid? Sarsinatis ecqua est, si Vmbram non habes?*).[11] Gellius (1.24.3) cites a charming epitaph (apud Varro), introduced with scepticism that it was written by P.:

> postquam est mortem aptus Plautus, Comoedia luget,
> scaena est deserta, dein Risus, Ludus Iocusque
> et Numeri innumeri simul omnes conlacrimarunt.

Whenever these post-Plautine hexameters were composed,[12] they reflect a received view of P. as a master comedian and musician, who in antiquity was as shadowy a historical figure as he is today.

We may extrapolate some information about P. from his works. First, P.'s command of Greek is deep.[13] The extent of his familiarity with Greek literature beyond New Comedy has not always been acknowledged.[14] *Ps.* engages intertextually with Greek epic, archaic lyric, philosophy,

[8] Gratwick 1973: 83.

[9] Mime actors (pp. 12–13 below) wore phalli, and since they performed barefoot were nicknamed *planipedes* ('flat-foots'); cf. *plaut-/plot-*, 'flat', and the joke about P.'s 'barking name', *Cas.* 34 (dogs with flat, floppy ears were called *plauti*: *OLD plautus*). For the association of *Maccius* with the clown of Atellan farce (and P.'s 'cook's identity') see pp. 12, 50–1 below, 832n.

[10] As Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius. Culturally, Umbria was not subject to Greek influence, as southern Italy had been for centuries before P. For Umbrian dialect see Adams 2007: 55, 85–8, 176.

[11] *Pace* Conte 1994a: 49. For regional humour in P. see e.g. *Capt.* 881–4, *Mil.* 647–8, *Trin.* 545–6, 609, *Truc.* 262, 690–1 (with Adams 2007: 52–4, 119–23).

[12] For the collocation *Ludus Iocusque* see 65n.; for P.'s penchant for personifying abstracts see 292, 669, 736nn.

[13] As the commentary (*passim*) and Fontaine 2010 amply demonstrate.

[14] Parker 1996 debunks the related construct of P. as the comic darling of an uneducated populace versus Terence, playwright of the philhellenic elite.

and Hellenistic poetry.[15] Moreover, it seems improbable that P. did not have access to texts of classical Greek tragedies, since his contemporaries were translating and performing these in Rome.[16] Where and how P. received his literary education is unknown, but he seems to have been the first Latin poet to specialize in a single literary genre.[17] From P.'s self-representations in prologues we glean a sense of his literary persona, as when he portrays himself as a translator of Greek comic texts: *As.* 11 *Demophilus scripsit, Maccus uortit barbare*, *Trin.* 19 *Philemo scripsit, Plautus uortit barbare.* The ironic *barbare*,[18] in humorously co-opting a culturally superior, Greek perspective, promotes the legitimacy of P.'s enterprise.[19] At *Cas.* 32–4 *Diphilus | hanc graece scripsit, postid rursum denuo | latine Plautus cum latranti nomine*, the prologist employs the rhetorically neutral *latine*, and in conceiving of P.'s translation programme as 'writing Diphilus' play anew all over again' suggests bold appropriation.[20] *Poen.* 54 *latine Plautus patruos pultiphagonides* similarly has *latine* instead of *barbare*,[21] with ironic self-deprecation in the portrayal of P. as 'uncle porridge-eater'.[22] The opening of *Truc.* depicts P. as an illusionist seeking spectators' indulgence in transforming his temporary Roman stage into Athens:

[15] Homer: 12, 996nn.; Sappho: 1253, 1258, 1260nn.; the Platonic Socrates: 465, 566nn.; Callimachus: 401, 403, 810nn.

[16] Paratragedy in *Ps.*: 469, 702–6, 702, 703, 707, 834, 835nn. From *ca.* 207 BCE there was a (non-elite?) guild of writers (*scribae*) and actors (*histriones*) in Rome (Boyle 2006: 16–17); the establishment of a *collegium poetarum* at the Temple of Minerva may postdate P. (Gruen 1990: 87–90, Manuwald 2011: 95–7). For the social, institutional, and literary conditions in which Roman tragedy based on Greek models arose see Gildenhard 2010.

[17] Livius, Naevius, and Ennius wrote tragedies, comedies, and epics.

[18] Spoken by the anonymous prologist and *Luxuria*, respectively, not (Greek) characters in the plays.

[19] '[P.] positively embraces the implication that he has debased his model by stating that he has translated it into barbarian. The criticisms of the Greek-speaking snob are not deflected, they are made part of the comic experience' (Leigh 2000: 289). McElduff 2013: 69 compares the Roman acquisition of Greek art: 'Plautus presents his work as translator as potentially equivalent to that of a general who brings glory and art back to Rome, and humorously elevates his achievements, even as this setting gives his use of "barbarian" a powerful sting, since the barbarians have clearly won.' Cf. Petrone 1983: 33–7.

[20] *Cas.* comes at the end of P.'s career and the wording here (i.e. without *uortit* and *barbare*) perhaps reflects confidence in highly creative translations. Connors 2004: 182 sees playful, programmatic irony in the etymology of P.'s name: 'the echo of *latine* in the sound of the word for "barking" (*latranti*) seems to suggest that Latin itself might be a kind of barbarous barking'.

[21] The understood verb of the lacuna following the revelation of the Greek title (53) is *uortit*. Cf. *Mer.* 9–10, where the prologist reports Philemon's title *graece* and P.'s translation of it *latine*.

[22] See further Giusti 2018: 84–7. For the metaphorical value of cuisine in P.'s poetics see pp. 50–1 below.

perparuam partem postulat Plautus loci
de uostris magnis atque amoenis moenibus,
Athenas quo sine architectis conferat. (1–3)

At *Men.* 3–4 *apporto uobis Plautum lingua, non manu,* | *quaeso ut benignis accipiatis auribus*, the prologist makes the playwright (a metonymy for his comedy) the vehicle of a characteristically Plautine joke conflating the literal and figurative.[23] The persona thus constructed in P.'s prologues is that of a playwright who brings pronounced self-awareness of poetic process and dramatic fiction to his work while reflecting on its place in literary tradition – such creative consciousness comes to the forefront in *Ps.*

2 THE ROMAN APPROPRIATION OF GREEK COMEDY

Latin literature is thought to (officially) commence at the *ludi Romani* of 240 BCE with the performance of at least one play based on a Greek model by Livius Andronicus, a native of Tarentum in southern Italy.[24] The timing is significant, as it closely follows the end of the First Punic War (261–241 BCE) and the emergence of Rome as a Mediterranean power. The creation of a national literature in Latin and a literary culture modelling the Greeks' in the wake of imperial expansion is necessarily enmeshed in issues of power and prestige, though scholarly consensus on the motivations and mechanisms behind these beginnings is lacking.[25] Plenty of cultural capital stood to be gained by adopting the Greeks' literary tradition and transferring it to Rome. Roman national identity could be enhanced through selective appropriation of Greek cultural goods of various types, including literature, as also social cohesion, primarily among the educated elite. The development of literary culture as an accoutrement of political hegemony might also assert superiority over both Rome's Italian

[23] Pp. 48–51 below. One leg of the joke here, the call for the audience's reception of the play with 'kindly ears', perhaps puns on P.'s name and dogs' ears (p. 2 above).

[24] Cic. *Brut.* 72, *Cato* fr. 50, Gel. 17.21.42, Liv. 7.2.8–10, Cass. *Chron.* p. 128 Mommsen; cf. Bernstein 1998: 234–51. 'Literature' here refers to the co-opting of Greek literary genres in Latin; the development of a literary establishment to construct aesthetic hierarchies, canons, etc. came later (see further Goldberg 2005).

[25] Overview of the issues in Gildenhard 2010: 158–60, Manuwald 2011: 30–40. Much, often polarizing, debate surrounds the role of shadowy (oral rather than literary) native traditions in the creation of the national literature: see e.g. Habinek 1998: 3–68, Wiseman 1998. For Livy's problematic account (7.2.3–13) of drama extending back to 364 BCE see Oakley 1998: 37–72, Bernstein 1998: 119–29, Feldherr 1998: 178–87.

neighbours[26] and rival Mediterranean city-states. Less abstract, practical considerations figured as well. Roman armies stationed in Sicily and southern Italy during the war developed a taste for Greek-style arts and entertainment, especially drama. Ambitious magistrates envisioned occasions for sociopolitical self-promotion in presenting drama at public venues, and bilingual poets and playwrights found professional opportunities for themselves there as well. What role the state, embodied by the senate, played in the creation of a national literature, versus the efforts of these various individuals, is uncertain.[27] Regardless, the vast appropriation of Greek literary genres following the First Punic War marks an ideological and cultural achievement unparalleled among Rome's neighbours in the ancient Mediterranean. This Roman translation project also marks a significant milestone in the critical analysis of literature.[28] As the European tradition's first vernacular translators (of literature) and literary critics, Latin writers transformed the 'secondariness' of their project into a creative strength, so successfully that the study of Latin literature now focuses on its extraordinarily innovative engagement with Greek intertexts.[29]

2.1 *From Athens to Rome*

Unlike the fantastical and satirical Old Comedy of fifth-century Athens built around contemporary Athenian personages and public institutions, Greek New Comedy (floruit *ca.* 325–250 BCE) was cosmopolitan and accessible to audiences in other city-states.[30] More quietly centred

[26] For the Roman figuring of Italians as *barbari* among the peninsula's dominant, Latin-speaking people see Dench 1995: 68–70, Feeney 2005: 236–40.

[27] Cf. the conclusion of Most 2003: 388, 'The Romans recognized themselves from the beginning as latecomers in the highly competitive market-place of the Hellenistic Mediterranean, and seem to have decided early that a program of intense translation was the best strategy for catching up: given that it was the Greeks who dominated that market-place, it was inevitable that it was to Greek literature that the Romans should from the very beginning have primarily oriented their translating activity. In the absence of a Ministry of Culture, the decisions involved were individual, unsystematic and largely the work of poets.'

[28] 'The first producers of the texts that became "Roman literature" were considered by Suetonius, at least, as *grammatici*, who taught Greek and Latin authors (*Gram.* 1.2). The conditions in the Greek world in which these first authors of Latin literary texts trained were conducive to self-consciousness about what was involved in codifying and organizing an institution of literature in Greek, against which it was possible to conceive of measuring a corresponding institution in Latin' (Feeney 2005: 228–9).

[29] For Latin intertextuality see Conte 1994b, Hinds 1998; Sharrock 2009: 18–21, 201–19 makes the case for reading P. intertextually.

[30] Useful overviews of Greek New Comedy, as it is represented mostly by Menander (*ca.* 342–290 BCE), include Blanchard 2007, Lowe 2007: 63–80, Ire-

on domestic rather than civic life, Greek New Comedy depicts the drama of everyday mistakes, misconceptions, and ignorance within or between families, especially tensions related to finances, patriarchy, citizenship, and marriage. In contrast to the chaotic comedy of Aristophanes (d. 386 BCE), New Comedy observes unities of time and place, usually has an expository prologue delivered by a deity, is carefully organized into five acts, and features naturalistic dialogue and nuanced soliloquies in iambic trimeters. Old Comedy's musical and linguistic exuberance, including its aggressive obscenity, is muted, with the chorus relegated to non-integral performances between acts (marked ΧΟΡΟΥ, '(song) of the chorus', in texts). In the comedy of manners that evolves in the fourth and third centuries in Athens an aesthetic premium is placed on plausible representation of situation and character. While the characters (household slaves, soldiers, pimps, prostitutes, young men in love, professional types such as cooks, etc.), like New Comedy's romantic plots, are stereotyped, they are endowed with psychological nicety and their costumes and masks made them appear similar to real people.[31] Apart from sporadic addresses to spectators, collectively as ἄνδρες ('gentlemen'), dramatic illusion is carefully respected in Greek New Comedy. Plays move towards harmonious resolutions of everyday conflicts ('domestic tragedies'), often secured with a marriage, and so traditional family values, as those of Athenian citizenship and the *polis*, ultimately prevail over personal desire and youthful irresponsibility. Such in broad outline are the dramas of Greek New Comedy that probably reached Italy by the middle of the third century BCE through 'classic' performances by itinerant, professional companies such as the 'Artists of Dionysus'.[32]

Although Athenian New Comedy's interest in familial relationships and familiar persons and situations accounts for its exportability, the genre's earliest adaptors felt no compulsion to scrupulously translate its forms and formats to Roman stages. Roman (literary) comedy or the *fabula palliata* as it came to be known[33] involved a radical restructuring of its Greek models, in large part owing to the influence of native Italian (unscripted) drama. Most strikingly, New Comedy became much more

land 2010; important topical studies: Wiles 1991, Rosivach 1998, Lape 2004, Traill 2008, Petrides 2014a.

[31] These qualities are best exemplified by Menander. Other famous Greek playwrights include Diphilus of Sinope (born *ca.* 350 BCE), Philemon (*ca.* 360–265 BCE), and Apollodorus of Carystus (first play produced in 285 BCE).

[32] For the diffusion of New Comedy post-Menander see Nervegna 2013, Le Guen 2014.

[33] 1275n. Overviews of the *palliata*: Gratwick 1982, Lowe 2007: 81–96, Manuwald 2011: 140–56; images in Bieber 1961: 147–66.

musical in Rome: only about a third of lines in P. are spoken, with the rest either in musically accompanied measures (mainly trochaics) or song (*cantica*).[34] This modal transformation alone undermined Greek New Comedy's emphasis on realistic representation of its characters' words and thoughts by substituting more stylized comedy (cf. modern musicals and operas). Act divisions and the choral *entr'actes* of Greek New Comedy were eliminated, as Roman comedy features continuous action,[35] its overarching structural principle instead consisting of repeated sequences of spoken-sung-accompanied ('recitative') verses.[36] There was no three-actor rule in Rome, which allowed for more dynamic interactions among cast members. Roman playwrights seem to have introduced more physical comedy and stage business, probably under the influence of native Italian forms of drama. Certain roles, as those of the clever slave and the comic prostitute, are amplified in Roman comedy, not only by P., where they are most farcically developed, but perhaps from the start of New Comedy in Rome.[37] The Roman tradition, as it is most vigorously evidenced by P.'s corpus, shows an enlargement of various verbal effects, perhaps unsurprisingly in that linguistic self-consciousness is often a concomitant of translated literature. Finally, while Greek settings (usually Athens) are nominally preserved in the Latin plays, the *palliata*'s world shares many points of contact with contemporary Roman society.[38] To theatregoers conversant with the norms of Greek New Comedy, Roman comedy presented a very different spectacle. It must have created interesting tensions for spectators, as they – individually rather than as the monolithic block modern scholarship too often theorizes them to be – in varying degrees saw themselves and their own social lives, in terms of both sameness and difference, unmasked in Greek alterity.

Whereas Athenian comedy was stably ensconced in annual civic festivals, funded by a combination of contributions from wealthy citizens and public monies and held in the Theatre of Dionysus – where perhaps

[34] Unlike the choral interludes of Greek New Comedy, the musically accompanied *cantica* are fully incorporated into plays. For operatic song as the definitive transformational element of Roman comedy see Fontaine 2014b: 405–7.

[35] For Roman adaptations of Greek act divisions see Barsby 1982.

[36] Pp. 31–2, 52 below.

[37] In his study of the fragments of early Roman comedy Wright 1974 demonstrates that many of the linguistic features and comic conventions associated with P. were present from the beginning. Terence, in adhering more closely to the aesthetic and dramaturgical preferences of a Menander, may be an outlier within the *palliata* tradition, as the conclusions of Karakasis 2005 suggest.

[38] While this is obviously the case for P., even Terence's Atticizing comedy is firmly rooted in the social and cultural milieu of Rome in the 160s BCE: Starks 2013.

as many as 17,000 Athenian inhabitants and some foreigners gathered for competitions associated with the Greater Dionysia – early Roman comedy was a more transient affair. In Rome, annual religious festivals (*ludi sollemnes*) included drama among other entertainments staged in honour of the deity celebrated. Performances were also held on special occasions such as funerals for prominent aristocrats, fulfilment of a victorious general's vow to a god, or the inauguration of temples and cults.[39] There thus was no fixed public venue for early performances, nor did a single god preside over Roman theatre. Festivals were state-funded, and sponsoring magistrates, usually aediles, provided additional support (the same held true for temple dedications, which were important civic occasions). The religious, political, and social character of the festivals was immediately visible in the grand parades (*pompae*) of magistrates, performers, priests, and cult statues with which they began. Very few details related to the production of *ludi scaenici* are known: actor-managers, the *actores* who headed a troupe (*grex*), probably negotiated contracts on behalf of playwrights with the magistrates.[40] A *choragus* was in charge of costumes and props,[41] companies were small,[42] and acting, a respected profession in Greece, was a low-status occupation,[43] perhaps employing mostly slaves and freedmen, although there was some form of competition among individual actors and troupes.[44] Elite spectators perhaps found themselves complexly distanced from, yet drawn to, the actors' social otherness. It is unknown how many plays were performed at a particular event or on a single day; the number might vary owing to the practice of *instauratio*, the 'repetition' of a performance following some disruption of ritual.[45] Nor do we know what happened to scripts after public performances, as the Roman state did not require official copies to be made (as Lycurgus had in fourth-century Athens), nor did it keep theatrical records in P.'s day.

[39] Franko 2014: 411 charts *ludi* featuring dramatic performances. By 200 BCE there probably were at least eleven days of theatrical performances annually (Taylor 1937: 291).

[40] The *actores* apparently maintained ownership of the playwrights' scripts (Brown 2002).

[41] Metatheatrically referred to at *Cur.* 464–86, *Per.* 159–60, *Trin.* 857–60. Cf. 1184n. Charinus serves this function in *Ps.*' play-within-the-play.

[42] P.'s plays require four to six speaking parts plus mute characters and a musician to play the *tibia*. At least nine actors appear onstage in Scenes 2–3 of *Ps.* (133–264n.). For actors' associations see Jory 1970.

[43] Actors were counted among the *infames*: Edwards 1997.

[44] *Am.* 69–74, *Poen.* 37–9.

[45] Bernstein 1998: 282–91.

The contingent and ephemeral nature of early theatre was manifest in performance spaces themselves, which remained temporary in Rome, where they were constructed for specific occasions in the forum, circus, or before temples, until the dedication of Pompey's fabulous stone theatre on the Campus Martius in 55 BCE. The Romans could easily have built permanent theatres on the model of the Greeks',[46] but avoided doing so for reasons still debated.[47] Some scholars accept aristocratic contentions that large stone structures would provide venues for political protest (as they later did) and contribute to the corruption of public morals. Others stress that the senate and magistrates saw the construction of temporary structures as a means of reminding the populace that the institution of theatre depended on their munificence.[48] Religious scruple also fuelled the resistance to building stone theatres, as these might unduly 'secularize' performances – Pompey's theatre featured a temple of Venus Victrix, prominently located among the upper tiers of seating.[49]

These temporary structures bore significant consequences for adaptations of New Comedy produced in Rome.[50] What we glean about Rome's impromptu performance spaces comes from extant texts, as no visual evidence or detailed descriptions survive. A wooden backdrop, the *scaena*, depicted up to three houses (as in Greek New Comedy) with individual doors through which characters access the actors' space, the *proscaenium*. Characters also enter and exit from side wings, which by convention usually lead to either the forum or to the harbour/country. Early Roman theatres had no orchestra, and the spectators' space, the *cauea*, varied according to the space available at individual venues. Beginning in 194 BCE, senators were granted the privilege of segregated seating near the stage.[51] We know from the surviving *didascaliae* that *Ps.* was performed in connection with the dedication of the Magna Mater's

[46] These existed in Italy from the fourth century BCE; for theatrical traditions outside Rome see Rawson 1985.

[47] Overview in Manuwald 2011: 55–63.

[48] E.g. Gruen 1992: 209.

[49] Cf. Goldberg 1998: 12: 'In the case of the original Megalesia [where *Ps.* debuted], the temple was itself an integral part of the production space. In effect, the *scaena* was temporary but the *cauea* was a permanent fixture. A separate, free-standing theatre threatened to disrupt this connection between temple and festival.' For Roman 'theatre-temples' see Hanson 1959b.

[50] Slater 1987 and Wiles 1991: 36–67 discuss differences between Greek and Roman theatrical spaces.

[51] This directive of the censors generated controversy: Gruen 1992: 202–5, Moore 1994, Gilula 1996. The prologue of *Capt.* highlights differences in seating and status among audience members (with Moore 1998: 195–6).

temple in 191 BCE.[52] Goldberg's 1998 analysis of the excavated site on the Palatine shows that a stage must have been erected on the plaza before Cybele's temple (above the Circus Maximus), with spectators sitting on the steps leading up to the raised podium. Even allowing for tight seating arrangements and crowd overflow into areas of the precinct affording a view, Goldberg estimates that less than 2,000 spectators attended the debut of *Ps.*[53] These intimate accommodations, along with early Roman theatre's permeable, sociopetal space between actors and audiences, facilitate Pseudolus' monologues, wherein he communicates directly with spectators, and help foster an illusion of improvisatory performance.[54] Given limited seating and the occasion of the Palatine temple's dedication, the audience that assembled for *Ps.* might have included a higher percentage of the elite than usual, which perhaps influenced P.'s decision to present a play so concerned with esoteric matters of poetics. In 191 BCE Marcus Junius Brutus, the *praetor urbanus et inter peregrinos* tasked with the Megalenses, no doubt hoped to enhance his social capital;[55] still the audience of *Ps.* represented a cross-section of the populace, including slaves.[56]

There was no curtain in early Roman theatre. A herald (*As.* 4 *praeco*) signalled the onset of a performance. Stage properties were used sparingly, but effectively: the most important props in *Ps.* are Calidorus' writing tablet and Harpax's letter.[57] The actors wore masks and costumes according to

[52] The cult of Cybele was brought to Rome in 204 BCE following a prophecy that this was a precondition for Hannibal's removal from Italy. The Magna Mater resided in the Temple of Victory on the Palatine until her temple could be built. *Ludi Megalenses* were established in 194 BCE, an enhanced version of which was held for the new temple's dedication in 191. During the festival, Cybele's eunuch priests no doubt presented visual reminders of the strangeness (to Romans) of her Phrygian cult, although *Ps.* makes no allusion to this (cf. the performance of Terence's *Eunuch* at the Megalenses of 161 BCE, with Christenson 2013).

[53] 1998: 13–14.

[54] Pp. 34–5 below. The orchestra of Greek theatre promoted more definitive separation of actors' and audiences' spaces, as did the theatre's monumental scale itself. For proxemics, the study of space in theatrical communication, see Elam 1980: 56–69.

[55] See further 1231n., Christenson 2020: 88.

[56] The prologue of *Poen.* (esp. 5–35) represents a wide spectrum of society (admission to festivals was free) in attendance, i.e. rich and poor, slave and free, male and female. Accounts of the diversity of Roman audiences: Beare 1964: 173–5, Manuwald 2011: 98–108, Richlin 2017: 1–20.

[57] 3–132, 594–666, 647nn.; overview of the functionality of props in P. in Marshall 2006: 66–72.

their character type,[58] so that, for example, before Pseudolus and Calidorus speak at *Ps.*' opening, seasoned spectators might guess the comedy features a lovesick *adulescens* requiring the assistance of a clever slave. An altar stood on the *proscaenium*, which represented a street before the stage-houses where by convention characters meet. There perhaps was some convenient place onstage for eavesdroppers; later stage representations show enclosed porches, but we should not insist on naturalistic treatment of a conventional device in P., where characters exploit this framework of listening to, and commenting on, other characters' discourse to build relationships with spectators.[59] In sum, the distinct spatial configurations, seating arrangements, sight lines, acoustics, and more fluid actor/audience dynamics of temporary Roman theatre combined to create a very different theatrical experience from watching a play in the Theatre of Dionysus.

2.2 *Plautus and Italian Comic Traditions*

Because P.'s name connects him with traditions of unscripted Italian drama that also figure prominently in his poetics,[60] it is instructive to review the *fabula Atellana* and the elusive genre of mime. Atellan farce was so named for its origins in the town of Atella in Oscan-speaking Campania.[61] It survives only in its first-century BCE literary form through the fragments of Pomponius and Novius. In P.'s heyday, Atellan farce consisted of impromptu skits performed in marketplaces or wherever troupes found an audience. The masked actors worked with set situations, from which

[58] Regrettably little is known about these, and in the absence of an iconographic tradition we cannot know how closely Roman masks conformed to Greek New Comedy's taxonomy. For masks in P. see Gratwick 1982: 83–4, Wiles 1991: 129–49, Marshall 2006: 126–58. Colours and styles of costumes were codified by character type (by gender, age, status) as they had been in Athens: Beare 1964: 184–91, Wiles 1991: 188–208, Duckworth 1994: 88–94, Marshall 2006: 56–66. The illustrated manuscripts of Terence provide visual evidence, albeit several centuries later: Jones and Morey 1931, Radden Keefe 2015. Conventional gestures and movements were associated with different character types: Graf 1991, Marshall 2006: 167–71, Dutsch 2007.

[59] Beacham 1992: 56–85 includes the porches in his reconstruction of a temporary theatre. On eavesdropping in P. see Slater 1985: 11–12, 162–5, Moore 1998: 34–40.

[60] Pp. 2 above, 37–9 below; images of Italian popular comedy in Bieber 1961: 129–46.

[61] Accounts in Beare 1964: 137–48, Rieks 1978: 351–61, Duckworth 1994: 10–13, Panayotakis 2005b; fragments in Frassinetti 1967, Ribbeck 1898. According to Livy (7.2.12), (free) actors in Atellan farce uniquely were not disenfranchised (cf. p. 8 above).

they might expansively improvise. Performances were built around five stereotypical characters: Bucco ('Fool'), Dossenus ('Glutton'), Manducus ('Jaws'),[62] Pappus ('Grandpa'), and the crowd-favourite Maccus, who like Bucco[63] was a clownish figure. Maccus, who supplies P.'s pseudo-*nomen*,[64] seems to have specialized in impersonation, to judge by extant titles, e.g. *Maccus Miles*, *Maccus Virgo*, *Maccus Copo* (= Caupo, 'Innkeeper'), *Macci Gemini*. The stock types, extant titles, and fragments suggest a low-status milieu featuring obscene and everyday language, burlesque (including of myth), rustic customs, slapstick, and verbal banter. Literary Atellan farce uses many of Plautine comedy's metres, and song and dance probably were essential components. Whether or not P. performed in Atellan farce is unknowable; his adoption of the moniker Maccus indicates a desire to metonymically represent his playwriting in terms of Italian farce's improvisatory and pattering style.

Mime covers a wide-range of popular dramatic forms in Italy and in its 'low realism' defies generic characterization.[65] Because its lineage and influences are complex, Panayotakis 2005b: 139 suggests it should be designated 'Graeco-Roman mime'. It is best known to us in its first-century BCE literary form (esp. Decimus Laberius and Publilius Syrus), though non-scripted mime predates P. Mime included skits of everyday life, satirical and sexual matters (adulterous love triangles were popular subjects), politics, literary parody, mockery of the foolish and pretentious, and mythical, religious, and philosophical burlesque. Mime's recurring characters include flatterers, slaves, adulterers, and jealous spouses. Mimes typically were set in the non-elite worlds of cooks, sausage sellers, innkeepers, and fullers. The actors wore no masks and performed barefoot – their nickname, *planipedes*, apparently inspired P.'s pseudo-*cognomen*.[66] Companies were itinerant, as portable performances required only a curtain and public space. Mime's largely improvisatory performances included spoken dialogue, song, and dance. Italian mime was known for its

[62] Manducus was a grotesque figure with a gaping mouth, referred to by the pimp Labrax (as his teeth clatter from a chill) at *Rud.* 535. Like Dossenus Manducus may have been gluttonous.

[63] Cf. *Bac.* 1088 (a list of synonyms) *stulti*, *stolidi*, *fatui*, *fungi*, *bardi*, *blenni*, *buccones*, Apul. *Apol.* 81 *macci prorsus et buccones uidebuntur.*

[64] 832n., p. 2 above.

[65] Latin *mimus* (μῖμος) refers to the genre or a mime-actor. The root sense (< μιμέομαι, 'imitate'; cf. mimesis) suggests mimicry. In *Ps.* Simia's ethos and name suggest mime: 905–55, 940nn., pp. 41–3 below. For the genre see Beare 1964: 149–58, Rieks 1978, Fantham 1989, Duckworth 1994: 13–15, Panayotakis 2005b: 139–46. Fragments in Ribbeck 1898, Bonaria 1965; for Decimus Laberius see Panayotakis 2010.

[66] Pp. 30, 41–2 below.

uninhibitedness and obscenity (the actors wore exaggerated phalli in some skits), and it uniquely employed female actors, who were expected to strip naked onstage during a performance. Elite writers (e.g. Cicero) marginalized mime, though it resurfaces in various genres of Latin literature and enjoyed enduring popularity. P., as his name suggests, found mime exemplary for his self-representation as a comedian.

2.3 Menander's *Dis Exapaton* and Plautus' *Bacchides*

The identification of 113 lines of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* ('The Double Deceiver') in 1968 as P.'s source for *Bac.* 494–562 at last allowed scholars to carry out text-based comparative analysis of P.'s translation practices.[67] Comparison of the parallel sections of *Bac.* and *Dis Exapaton* demonstrates that P. generally follows the plot and action of his source. P. can translate closely or boldly transform his source text. He both curtails and expands sections of *Dis Exapaton* and transposes material, sometimes as a necessary adaptation to the conventions of early Roman theatre, as when dealing with Menander's act breaks.[68] P. also recasts his Greek material to support his dramatic priorities, and his aesthetic, musical, and linguistic tendencies.[69] P.'s transformations of his Menandrean source are so extensive that it is reasonable to speak of creative translation and adaptation,[70]

[67] Handley 1968; for the text of *Dis Exapaton* (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 4407, third century CE) see Handley 1997. Just over half the damaged papyrus' lines are comprehensible.

[68] P. deletes two scenes of dialogue between Sostratos and his father on each side of an act break, after the first of which they exit so that Sostratos can return the money he has stolen to his father. Instead, in *Bac.* Mnesilochus (= Sostratos) in his monologue (500–25) decides to hand over the money and does so offstage. Before Mnesilochus returns (530), P. inserts a brief entrance monologue by Pistoclerus (526–9), thus avoiding Mnesilochus' immediate reappearance, while bridging the act break in accordance with Roman comedy's convention of continuous action. See further Goldberg 1990, Damen 1992.

[69] Insightful analyses include Questa 1970, Bain 1979, Primmer 1984, Anderson 1993: 3–29, Handley 2001, Jacques 2004, Fontaine 2014a: 519–26.

[70] Plautinists often draw too sharp a distinction between 'translation' and 'adaptation', terms with problematic axiological histories. Translation, when it follows its source closely ('word for word'), is typically deemed 'faithful', which unduly privileges the source text as 'original' (for the fraught concept of 'fidelity' in translation terminology see Chamberlin 2012). Adaptation by contrast is employed to signal creative license, in that the translator is no longer seen as 'slavish' vis-à-vis a source text. Translation, even on the micro-level of individual words, usually is a complex, interpretative, and highly creative activity; it is impossible to define objectively a point at which translation passes over into adaptation. Translation and adaptation are different metaphors for describing a writer's reception of a text that is being incorporated into a new cultural and linguistic environment (good discussion of the issues in Paul 2008).

as well as intertextuality.[71] If more plays of Greek New Comedy survived, we might well discover that in each of his comedies P. strategically appropriates scenes and passages from a number of Greek plays, to a much greater degree than is usually assumed in modern notions of *contaminatio*.[72] The discovery of the *Dis Exapaton* papyrus also validated various hypotheses about P. brilliantly advanced by Fraenkel 2007,[73] even showing P. to be a more versatile and innovative translator than Fraenkel imagined. The papyrus affords us an opportunity to identify P.'s methods of translation in a thematically similar play thought to be near-contemporary with *Ps.*[74]

One of P.'s most striking alterations to *Dis Exapaton* involves character names, which he makes more exotically Greek. Sostratos, a young man in love with a *hetaira*,[75] mistakenly believes his friend Moschos has fallen for his beloved (Moschos is infatuated with her twin sister). P. alters the young men's stock comic names to Mnesilochus ('mindful of the platoon') and Pistoclerus ('trusting in the lot'), respectively. Menander's

[71] Cf. pp. 2–3, 5 above, and 47 below.

[72] Terence in his prologues (*An.* 9–21, *Hau.* 16–21; cf. *Eu.* 19–34) represents his critics as employing the verb *contaminare* ('spoil', 'debase') to describe the practice of allegedly defiling the 'purity' of a Greek source by adding material from a second play when translating it into Latin. Because Terence defends himself by appealing to the precedent of P. and other early *palliata* playwrights, a scholarly industry bent on finding traces of *contaminatio* in P. was launched. Unfortunately, the idea – which Terence rejects as pedantic – that P. clumsily grafts sections of plays to each other gained considerable purchase in Plautine scholarship, especially when applied to recovering lost Greek 'originals', of which P.'s versions were judged to be an inferior palimpsest. This analyst movement (and prejudice against P.) was further encouraged by Menandrean drama's conformity with late nineteenth- and twentieth-century taste for theatrical naturalism. Now that we have substantial comparative materials to illustrate how P.'s distinct poetics guided his translations, it is more productive to approach the transformations of his sources in terms of intertextuality rather than this compositionally crude idea of *contaminatio*. 'Contamination', if still a useful critical tool in the study of Roman comedy, alternatively and more broadly might be applied as a metaphor for transformations of language, culture, discourse, etc. that inevitably occur in translation. Cf. p. 13n.70 above.

[73] His *Plautinisches im Plauto* was originally published in 1922. Fraenkel based his study on the relatively scant remains of New Comedy at the time; the discovery of the only (nearly) complete play of Menander, *Dyskolos*, was not made known until 1959. The only extended comparison of Greek source and Latin target text before the *Dis Exapaton* find was Gellius' discussion (2.23) of three passages of Caecilius' *Plocium* and 32 lines of Menander's *Plokion*.

[74] 65, 1244nn.

[75] Unnamed in the papyrus, but if she bore the common *hetaira*'s name Chrysis (659n.), this lends further point to P.'s choice of Chrysalus as the slave's name in *Bac.* (Handley 1997: 41).

generically designated slave Syros[76] becomes Chrysalus ('Goldie') in *Bac.*, like Pseudolus one of P.'s most colourful tricksters. The name provides scope for bilingual play on 'gold': 703–4 *ceterum quantum lubet me poscitote aurum: ego dabo.* | *quid me refert Chrysalo esse nomen, nisi factis probo?*[77] Chrysalus code-switches to turn a similar pun: 240 *opus est* χρυσῷ *Chrysalo.*[78] And reflecting Chrysalus' daring as a Plautine clever slave, P. generates a series of puns on his name and Latin *crux* ('torture'): 362, 687, 1183a. Most striking is Chrysalus' metacomic boast at *Bac.* 649–50, *non mihi isti placent Parmenones Syri,* | *qui duas aut tris minas auferunt eris,* where in disparaging his Menandrean counterpart Chrysalus suggests that P.'s enlargement of the clever slave's role constitutes a comedic advance on his source material.[79] The name of Moschos' stern tutor, Lydos, by contrast is transliterated by P. This, however, allows the smitten Pistoclerus, in the course of dubbing his spoilsport tutor a 'barbarian' (121–3) for rejecting his erotic Latin deities (115–16), to declare, 129 *non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo conuenit*, which plays on dual senses of *ludus*, both 'school' and, incongruously for Lydus, 'fun'.

Comparison of *Dis Exapaton* 11–17 and *Bac.* 494–9 demonstrates how, even when P. is translating almost word for word, he significantly alters Menander in tone and tenor. Moschos'/Pistoclerus' father (Philoxenus in P., not named in Menander) urges Sostratos/Mnesilochus to castigate his son for partying at the *hetaira*'s house. Whereas this section of the papyrus is in conversational iambic trimeters, P. recasts the scene in longer, musically accompanied trochaics with comparatively artificial diction. For example, Moschos' father bluntly orders Sostratos to fetch his son from the brothel (11); Philoxenus elevates this to an ethical/philosophical imperative, 494 *hoc tecum oro ut illius animum atque ingenium regas.*[80] Lydos chimes in (15–17), 'give it to him, Sostratos, attack him for being out of control; he's shaming (αἰσχύνει) all of us who love him', lines which Philoxenus, not the tutor, delivers in *Bac.* (497–8). Personal

[76] 636n.

[77] Cf. Chrysalus' quip, 229 *negotium hoc ad me attinet aurarium*; for the juxtaposition of the proper name with *aurum* in the parallel text cf. 521–3, 530–2.

[78] The transmitted *chryso* is best read as Greek rather than positing a (*hapax legomenon*) Latin loanword.

[79] Parmeno ('Trusty') is another stock slave's name in Greek New Comedy. Not all P.'s audience understood the clever reference to *Dis Exapaton*, but an 'in-group' familiar with Menander's comedies in Greek might relish Chrysalus' boast.

[80] P.'s stylistic register similarly is significantly higher at 528, where Pistoclerus wonders aloud why Mnesilochus has not shown up to meet him: with *nam illud animus meus miratur, si a me tetigit nuntius* cf. Menander's straightforward discourse, i.e. 102 ἀκούσας ('since he's heard (I'm here)') and 103 ποῦ γῆς ἐστι; ('Where in the world is he?').

relationships are made explicit in P. (τοὺς φίλους / *te, me, amicos, alios*); Menander's two imperatives are expanded into an alliterative tricolon with crescendo, *cura, i, concastiga* (the intensifying compound is perhaps coined here); P.'s moral vocabulary is enhanced, *dedecorat . . . flagitiis suis*. Where Menander aims for natural sounding conversation, P. is rhetorically excessive and emotions are heightened, further augmented by musical accompaniment.

P. breaks up his longer lines with Mnesilochus' monologue (500–25), which like its source, *Dis Exapaton* 18–30, is in spoken trimeters. But apart from this shared mode, the two monologues diverge sharply in tone and purpose. Following the departure of his father and tutor, Menander's Sostratos struggles with his emotions now that he (mistakenly) believes his friend Moschos is sexually involved with the *hetaira*. The Menandrean monologue brilliantly captures the speaker's ethos and induces spectators/readers, from their perspective of superior knowledge, to sympathize with the conflicted Sostratos. As his anger and syntax shift, Sostratos variously describes the absent courtesan's actions in the third person (18–21, 24–9); addresses her (19) and himself (23) in the second person; imaginatively mimics her own words (22–3, a brilliant instance of Menandrean 'speech within speech'); and he even injects himself (in the first person) into direct conversation with her (24–5). After all this compellingly represented emotional turmoil, Sostratos bluntly resolves, 'I'll give back all the money to my father' (26–7).

Mnesilochus' corresponding monologue doubles the length of its source and operates in very different linguistic and cognitive registers. In objectifying himself as a Plautine comic lover, Mnesilochus' speech aims more at rhetorically dazzling his audience than winning their sympathies. Mnesilochus opens with four consecutive *para prosdokian* jokes (503–8), the first two of which highlight his powerlessness before Bacchis, as he bathetically deflates his short-lived resolve to punish her. In the latter two, Mnesilochus' hopes of revenge against Bacchis morph into fantasies of bamboozling his father (again!) to finance his affair, counter to the scene's main purpose of returning the money purloined in *Bac.*'s first trick. Here we meet the stereotypically hapless Plautine lover – as *Ps.*' Calidorus[81] – an imbecilic figure who acknowledges the foolishness of his comic type,[82] as he remains bent on self-destruction. The comic self-referentiality of Mnesilochus' speech is capped with his own commentary

[81] 3–132n.
[82] 238n.

on it:[83] 'Am I actually in my right mind, seeing as I'm prattling on *here like this* about what's going to happen?' (509–10).[84] Sostratos' brief thought of the *hetaira* cajoling him once he's penniless (25–6), just before he resolves to return the money, becomes an extravagant series of linguistic fantasies, e.g. 512–14 *de mea pecunia | ramenta fiat plumea propensior | mendicum malim mendicando uincere* ('I'd rather out-beg a beggar than make her heavier by a feather's shaving out of my money'). In the course of this massive expansion of *Bac.*'s source (511–20),[85] Mnesilochus twice states his intention to return the money in ring composition (516, 520) that reins in his thoughts as he prattles about the future. Reflecting P.'s trademark transposition of the clever slave to a central role, Sostratos' monologue ends with five lines (521–6) expressing his fear that Chrysalus will take the rap for him,[86] underscored by repetition: 521 *causa mea*, 523 *mea causa*, 524 *causa mea*. P. introduces a new emphasis on artifice, the manifest constructedness of language, comic type, and situation, entirely in tension with cogent representation of ethos.[87]

At this point in *Bac.* the music resumes in trochaics. Following Pistoclerus' entrance at 526–9, P. collapses *Dis Exapaton* 91–102 into the entrance monologue of Mnesilochus at *Bac.* 530–3. In Menander, Sostratos, in a second monologue after the act break, again subtly uses speech within speech in imagining his meeting the *hetaira* once he's destitute (92 κενός). Sostratos concludes his emotional monologue with the assertion that the woman is to blame and Moschos deserves pity as her victim (99–102). Mnesilochus instead concisely reports that he handed over the money to his father (530), states his wish to meet Bacchis now that he's impoverished (531 *inanis*), and expresses relief that his father pardoned Chrysalus (532–3). He does not view Pistoclerus as a victim of Bacchis' charm, as his anger stays focused on his friend. Whereas Moschos exits the *hetaira*'s house and the pair of friends immediately exchange greetings

[83] Cf. Fontaine 2014a: 523, 'the aside here seems ironic, self-reflexive, and farcical'.

[84] The farcicality is underscored by abundant parallelisms (alliteration, assonance, polyptoton, homoioteleuton), esp. 510 *qui ad hunc modum haec hic quae futura fabulor.*

[85] P. here preserves only a proverb about the futility of lecturing a corpse (*Dis Exapaton* 28–9 = *Bac.* 519).

[86] Cf. the fragmentary *Dis Exapaton* 84–9, where Sostratos perhaps speaks with his father on Syros' behalf.

[87] Cf. Wiles 1991: 225: '[the] sign systems of Menander's theatre are designed to appear coherent and complete, in order to create the ultimate illusion that reason can apprehend reality. In Plautus' theatre, it is made plain that reason has no such ambitions. The coherence of Menander's stage world is demolished.'

(103–5), P.'s Pistoclerus and Mnesilochus prolong their encounter (534–8), which is first triangulated with the audience ('Is this my *sodalis*?', Pistoclerus asks; 'Is this my *hostis*?', Mnesilochus counters in his aside),[88] as they telegraph their thoughts and movements onstage in a theatricalized manner typical of P. In *Dis Exapaton*, Sostratos quickly reveals his displeasure at being betrayed (as he thinks) by his friend (108–10), and as the papyrus breaks off the friends are poised to resolve their misunderstanding. After the *adulescentes* greet each other in *Bac.*, an exchange follows (538–58) that is entirely P.'s invention. It commences with Pistoclerus' proposal that they celebrate Mnesilochus' return with a Roman *cena aduenticia*, for which the latter has no stomach. Before Mnesilochus finally declares that Pistoclerus has wronged him (560 *Pistoclere, perdidisti me sodalem funditus*), the pair engage in riddling, richly ironic repartee about the nature of friendship, in which Mnesilochus (unbeknownst to Pistoclerus) refers to their situation as he has misconstrued it (as spectators know). As Mnesilochus delays revealing his displeasure in moralizing subterfuge, the pair swap ethical commonplaces on the insidiousness of false friends. P. has them both marshal some favourite rhetorical turns, e.g. 541 *falsi falsimoniis*, 542 *lingua factiosis, inertes opera*, 547 *nulli amici sunt, inimicos ipsi in sese omnis habent*, 548 *frustrant, frustrare*. As tension mounts and Pistoclerus declares his eagerness to learn the identity of the person responsible for his friend's anger, Mnesilochus delivers enigmatic pronouncements: 554 *beneuolens uiuit tibi*, 557 *nequam homo est, uerum hercle amicus est tibi*. Even though *Bac.* 540–51 are not transmitted in the Ambrosian palimpsest but survive only in P,[89] Leo 1912: 131 asserted that they had to be genuine because they are so Menandrean, a claim the 1968 publication of the *Dis Exapaton* papyrus proved wrong. But Leo's observation that P. has written dialogue whose moralizing, dramatic tension and use of misunderstanding recall Menander merits further consideration.[90] P. perhaps has translated a passage from somewhere else in Menander,[91] but, regardless, he has outdone Menander at his own game. Such *imitatio* and *aemulatio* would be evident only to a small fraction of P.'s audience at

[88] The difference between a true friend (*sodalis*) and a false one (*hostis*) becomes the central point of the exchange at 538–58. With *hostis* (for *inimicus*) Mnesilochus employs military metaphor; similarly, 535 *contollam gradum* ('I'll engage him head on').

[89] Pp. 63–4 below.

[90] P.'s thorough overlay of his style diminishes the importance of whether or not he is working with a specific source text (i.e. if he was, he has made it 'his own'). Leo, in keeping with scholarly trends of his day, approached P. as a means of retrieving lost Greek comedies.

[91] Thus Fontaine 2014a: 526, who sees this as a possible case of *contaminatio*.

the Megalenses, but P.'s agonistic stance towards his Menandrean source remains undeniable.[92]

2.4 *Menander at the Megalenses*

The opening 8 lines of P.'s Menandrean source for *Ps.* appear to have survived, as Wilamowitz first suggested.[93] In the papyrus fragment (*P.Freib.*12 = Men. *fab. incert.* 4 Arnott = *fr. com. adesp.* K–A 1027), a slave urges his master to communicate the cause of his gloom:

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί σύννους κατὰ μόνας σαυτῷ λαλεῖς,[94]
δοκεῖς τε παρέχειν ἔμφασιν λυπουμένου;
ἐμοὶ προσανάθου: λαβέ με σύμβουλον πόνων:
μὴ καταφρονήσῃς οἰκέτου συμβουλίας.
πολλάκις ὁ δοῦλος τοὺς τρόπους χρηστοὺς ἔχων
τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐγένετο σωφονέστερος.
εἰ δ' ἡ τύχη τὸ σῶμα κατεδουλῶσατο,
ὅ γε νοῦς ὑπάρχει τοῖς τρόποις ἐλεύθερος.

By Zeus, why are chattering to yourself, alone in your gloom? You seem like someone in grief. Confide in me, take me as an adviser in your troubles. Don't despise the advice of a slave. If a slave's got good character, he may prove wiser than his master. Even if chance has enslaved his body, his character still possesses a free person's reasoning.

Over a more circuitous opening of nineteen lines, Pseudolus similarly entreats Calidorus to divulge the reason for his obvious grief: with the commands of *P.Freib.* 12.3–4 cf. *Ps.* 8 *responde mihi*, 12 *eloquere*, 18 *fac me certum.* As the Menandrean slave aspires to become his master's σύμβουλος ('confidant', 3) in providing useful counsel (4 συμβουλίας),[95] so Pseudolus notes that he has often served as 'a partner' (*comitem*) in Calidorus' *consilia* (17), and promises to provide 'good advice' (19 *consilio bono*) or, as P.

[92] Cf. pp. 38–9, 42–7 below.

[93] 1925: 107 n. 1., followed by Fraenkel 1955, who further argued that the papyrus fragment and its Roman version descended from the opening scene of Eur. *IA* (cf. Arnott 1982: 131–4). Fontaine 2014a: 527 regards the papyrus as P.'s source for *Ps.*' opening.

[94] The first line of the papyrus is damaged and the initial iamb uncertain. Arnott plausibly reads ὦ Ζεῦ on the basis of Lucian, *Iupp. trag.* 1. Wilamowitz proposed τρόφιμε ('master'), corresponding to *Ps.* 4 *ere.* The text printed here is Arnott's (2000: 488).

[95] The Greek loanword *symbolus* (with reference to the soldier's seal), as Fontaine 2014a: 529 notes, becomes 'a catchword' in *Ps.*: 55n.

expands, the more concrete assistance (*aut re* | *aut opera*) typical of a *seruus callidus*, who unlike Menander's slave delights in his 'badness'.[96] Such precise verbal correspondences hardly seem accidental, and suggest that P. here translates *P.Freib.* 12, while also creatively transforming his source.

Menander's slave argues (5–8) that a master should heed the advice of a slave with good character, because the latter may only be a slave by chance (ἡ τύχη), not nature (7–8). Pseudolus dispenses with any such pleading here[97] to explain (naturalistically) why a master might prudently heed a slave's advice, as it soon becomes obvious that Pseudolus, as a far more self-controlled character, is his master's intellectual and emotional superior;[98] Calidorus himself suggests such an inverted dynamic when he depicts himself as love's slave (15 *uapulo*). The notion, however, that a person may be a slave only 'in body' is a central theme of *Ps.*, where it receives fresh treatment. Pseudolus' acute awareness of his body's vulnerability shapes his pragmatic and markedly unromantic world-view.[99] The clever slave's detached cynicism inspires creative agency that extends far beyond Menander's simple incongruity between servile status and 'liberal' character.

The opening lines of *Ps.* are dominated by Pseudolus' blustery verbiage,[100] which establishes him as a consummate crafter of words (a clearly Plautine amplification). While the Menandrean slave directly inquires about his master's distraction (1 τί . . . λαλεῖς), Pseudolus constructs a prolix, tautological conditional ('if I knew what was wrong, I wouldn't have to ask you', 3–6). Still more circumlocution follows (7–8) before the pressing question is formulated (*quid est . . . facis?*, 9–11) – all these preliminaries so that Pseudolus may know what he doesn't know (12)! Before Calidorus responds, Pseudolus' invocation of Jupiter (13–14), perhaps inspired by ὦ Ζεῦ in *P.Freib.* 12.1, provokes a domesticating and typically Plautine conceit about how the *adulescens* suffers under Venus' jurisdiction rather than in Jupiter's court (14–15).[101]

The discourse of the two openings reveals the playwrights' contrasting approaches to a similar comic situation. Menander's slave skilfully induces spectators to empathize with his master's emotional crisis: 'You

[96] 581–2n.
[97] Not that P. is averse to such moralizing (cf. Pseudolus' Menandrean '*Fortuna* monologue': 667–93n.), but because his servile character is of a very different stripe from Menander's.
[98] See e.g. 23–77, 23–4, 37, 75, 77nn., Stewart 2012: 166 n. 40.
[99] Pp. 26, 36, 39, 47.
[100] 3–12n.
[101] 'Plautus probably adds a bit of farce in which the young master interprets Pseudolus's oath literally' (Fontaine 2014a: 528).

look like someone one who's grieving' (2). Pseudolus by contrast characterizes his master as a typical Plautine *adulescens amans* (4 *miseriae te tam misere macerent*),[102] a stereotype Calidorus echoes with his initial words: 13 *misere miser sum.* Calidorus' acknowledgement of his stock character, along with the hyperbolic description of him as 'dead' (9 *exanimatus*), distances spectators from the suspense and sympathy Menander creates.[103]

The most striking contrast between these two opening scenes is highly visible from the start: P.'s *adulescens amans* clings to a writing tablet drenched in his tears (10). For spectators, the writing tablet is a pervasive fascination, which eventually introduces another character (Phoenicium) into the opening conversation.[104] As a writing tablet does not figure in Menander, the banter of Pseudolus and Calidorus about it that follows (20–77) constitutes enormous expansion by P., far exceeding the basic plot elements probably related in the (lost) source text. Most significantly in P.'s amplification, Pseudolus frames the *tabellae* and its content in terms of translation: Phoenicium's words demand a 'translator' (26),[105] someone with the skills of a Sybil (25) to decipher their meaning. Her scrawled letters are later characterized as her 'interpreters' (42).[106] P.'s innovative introduction of the *tabellae* thus metapoetically foregrounds translation. Beyond its superficial jests about Phoenicium's handwriting (23–31) and physical presence (35–6), the tablet contains a script describing the imminent sale of Phoenicium (inherited from its Greek source) that, as Pseudolus quips, 'is poorly written' (74 *est misere scriptum*). Pseudolus' charge is to transform this tired plot into a captivating Plautine play.[107] The tablet's erasable surface is a metonym for *Ps.*' translation project.

Unfortunately, *P.Freib.* 12 provides only this limited text for *Ps.* We nonetheless can make some generalizations about P.'s translation, especially along the important axis of domestication/foreignization.[108] At first

[102] 4n.
[103] Cf. 9, 13nn.
[104] 3–132n.
[105] *interpretor* describes close, 'literal' translation, as in official correspondence: McElduff 2013: 24, 108–9, 192–3. Cf. 26, 42nn.
[106] Cf. the casting of Pseudolus as Apollo's oracle: 480, 481nn.
[107] Cf. Slater 1985: 119–21.
[108] This tension is a central preoccupation of translation studies (Munday 2016 provides an excellent introduction). Schleiermacher's formulation (1813: 49) remains seminal: 'Either the translator leaves the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him [foreignization]; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him [domestication].' A highly domesticating translation deceives its target readers into believing that a work was composed in their language (and culture); foreignizing translators (Nabokov 1955 offers an extreme example) privilege a source text's 'otherness' and do not disguise their role as intermediary/interpreter.

glance, the many Greek words and phrases in *Ps.* seem to preserve the 'Greekness' of its source text. But most of these could not have stood in P.'s source, either because they are not Attic (483–7) or because they represent back translations from Latin and not idiomatic Greek (211, 712).[109] Other syntactically and semantically well integrated examples of Greek in *Ps.* (654, 700, 742) could stem from P.'s source, though P. just as likely introduced these himself to 'foreignize' his Latin version at appropriate moments.[110] More recherché in terms of demands placed on spectators are P.'s bilingual puns, such as those on Charinus' name vis-à-vis the quasi-synonyms χάρις and *gratia*.[111] In contrast, some puns work only in Latin, e.g. those on *Salus/ saluto* (709) and *plebi scitum* (748). Greek loanwords unsurprisingly are ubiquitous in *Ps.* (e.g. 86 *drachumam*, 138 *clepe*, 735 *petaso*) and P. generally, as the assimilation of these into Latin extends back to the beginnings of Greek cultural contact (centuries before P.). While loanwords, adapted as they are to the orthography and morphology of Latin, may – or may not – contribute towards the illusion of an Attic setting in Roman drama,[112] their use becomes marked when they occur in high concentrations, such as in Pseudolus' descriptions of the Greek-style symposium in the play's final *canticum* (1246–1335b).[113] There Pseudolus' description of 'French-kissing' (1260 *bilingui*) may metapoetically signal the rich process of (interlingual) translation at play during the banquet and throughout *Ps.*[114]

The transmogrified world of P.'s comedies rarely appears either unilaterally foreign (Greek) or domesticated (Roman), but rather represents a dynamic conflation. The omnipresence of Greek-style costumes and Greek personal names[115] creates a Hellenizing aura. In *Ps.* characters scrupulously refer to their urban environment as Athens (202a, 270, 339, 416, 620, 731), sometimes mentioning its institutions (e.g. the City Dionysia, 86). The soldier repeatedly is identified as Macedonian (51, 346, 616, 1090, 1040–1, 1162–3, 1209–10), and there are references

[109] See notes ad locc.

[110] 443, 654, 700, 742nn. Cf. the intended effect of such demonstrably Plautine coinages as *Mil.* 14 *Bumbomachides-Clytomestoridysarchides*.

[111] 712, 713nn. Throughout this edition I assume an 'all-embracing definition of bilingualism' (Adams 2003: 8) that views this phenomenon as a broad spectrum of linguistic competencies, in both speaking and writing.

[112] These occupy a liminal linguistic niche somewhere between (Greek) difference and (Latin) similarity.

[113] 1253–67, 1268–78ann.

[114] 1260n.

[115] Virtually all P.'s characters have purely Greek names: Fontaine 2010: 63, 253–6 and *passim*.

to figures of Greek history (Jason of Pherae, 193) and myth (Dirce, 199–200, Medea, 861–71). The overlay of Latin and widespread introduction of musical accompaniment and *cantica* notwithstanding, the idiosyncratic speech of P.'s characters, which bounds between conversational, formal, elevated, and highly imaginative registers,[116] never allows his audience to feel entirely at home. Domesticating features simultaneously work against Plautine comedy's Hellenizing effects. Deities in *Ps.* always have their Latin names. Such a culturally specific concept as *pietas* becomes a playful motif in *Ps.* (121–2, 287–94, 356), as do Roman style magisterial edicts (125–9, 143, 172, 855–65). A Roman *lex quinauicenaria* (303–4), the practice of *stipulatio* (114–18, 1070–8), a Roman praetor's formula (1231), and the *comitia centuriata* itself (1232) constitute part of *Ps.*' comic fodder, as also institutional practices of the Roman military (578–91, 761–6). Pseudolus jarringly employs the metaphor of a Roman funeral dirge, a *naenia* (1278a), to signal the end of his – largely Greek-style – celebratory dance, and in victory taunts Simo with Brennus' legendary threat, *uae uictis.*[117] How dissonant (or not) all this is largely depends on a spectator's individual identification with the characters' sameness and/or alterity; in generalizing we should not underestimate the diversity of P.'s audience and their capacity for idiosyncratic reactions to onstage spectacle.

Other elements in *Ps.* are subject to hybrid treatment: currency is consistently neither Greek nor Roman (e.g. *minae passim*, but *libella* at 98, 1146). The Trojan War is viewed through a Greek lens (1064, 1244, 1310a), though Odysseus receives his Latin name, *Vlixes.*[118] P. throughout weaves an elaborate fabric of Greek and Latin roots, down to the level of such hybrid (*hapax legomena*) coinages as 255 *inanilogistae*, 1096 *sit contechnatus.* Similarly striking are juxtapositions of high (Greek) and low (Latin) style, e.g. 707 *ut paratragoedat carnufex* (Charinus exclaims approvingly of Pseudolus) and 989–90 *Polymachaeroplagides | purus putus est ipsus* (Ballio's Latin proverb glosses the revelation of the soldier's fantastical Greek name).[119] P. remains a remarkably visible translator amid these various metalinguistic moves;[120] their cumulative effect is creation of a uniquely Plautine world, most aptly dubbed 'Plautinopolis'.[121]

[116] Pp. 47–51 below.
[117] 1317n.
[118] 1063n.
[119] Cf. 1200 *purus putus hic sycophanta est.*
[120] For an illuminating history of translation and its core issues as these pertain to translator (in)visibility see Venuti 2008.
[121] Gratwick 1982: 113.

3 *PSEVDOLVS:* PLOT, CHARACTERS AND POETICS

Ps. conforms to a typical New Comedy plot structure whereby plays are constructed around the exchange of women.[122] A transaction, followed by a physical transfer, takes place between two houses represented on the stage backdrop involving either marriage (with a dowry) or a non-reproductive union (the purchase of a prostitute).[123] Both parties must agree to the transaction's terms – a play's negotiated settlement is legally binding – even if duplicitous or unlawful acts occurred in the process. In *Ps.* ownership of Ballio's brothel-slave, Phoenicium, passes to her neighbour/lover, Calidorus, through imposture and abduction, a transaction involving complicated finances.[124] Calidorus, the conventionally impoverished *adulescens* dependent on his slave/helper Pseudolus, desires exclusive possession of Phoenicium, despite Ballio's imminent sale of her to a Macedonian soldier. The soldier has made a down-payment of 15 minae and contracted to complete the sale with delivery of 5 minae. Calidorus faces an additional (possible) obstacle in his father Simo, who is concerned about his son's expenditures and reputation (415–20), and mistrustful of Pseudolus (445–8). Pseudolus does not advance a scheme until the soldier's slave, Harpax, arrives. Pseudolus intercepts Harpax before he transacts his business with Ballio, and posing as Ballio's slave Syrus obtains the soldier's letter demanding delivery of Phoenicium (646–8). While Harpax awaits Ballio's return, Pseudolus borrows 5 minae from Calidorus' friend Charinus, whose services Pseudolus had earlier requested (384–6). Charinus also supplies Pseudolus with an assistant, Simia, and (theatrical) resources for the latter's impersonation of Harpax.

Once Calidorus absconds with Phoenicium (1038–51) and Ballio is apprised of his error (1220–35), finances must be squared. Pseudolus had persuaded Simo to pay him 20 minae if he successfully tricked Ballio (535–55). Ballio separately had wagered 20 minae with Simo

[122] Bettini 1991a: 11–76, Lowe 2000: 188–221.

[123] Rape followed by marriage is the most common pattern in Greek New Comedy. With Roman comedy comes increased interest in prostitution: cf. Wiles 1989: 39–45, who observes that (generally) in P., '[pleasure] is incompatible with the married state' (41); similarly Lowe 2000: 194: 'Plautine comedy, especially, is not preoccupied with affirming the family, and more often than not subverts it with *infertile* configurations even in plays where conventional endings operate.' For P.'s plays that do not result in marriage see Packman 1998, Rosivach 1998: 85–99.

[124] Lowe 2000: 208 provides a convenient chart following the money.

that he would not be cheated out of Phoenicium, and added that, if tricked by Pseudolus, he would forfeit ownership of Phoenicium to Simo (1070–5). Once Phoenicium is wrongfully released to Simia, Ballio owes 15 minae to the soldier and 20 minae to Simo. *Ps.* ends with Pseudolus' acceptance of the 20 minae wager from Simo, though the slave promises to return 'half or even more' (1328) if Simo joins the offstage party. This presumably means Pseudolus keeps 5 minae to reimburse Charinus. Simo will use the remaining 15 minae to compensate Ballio for his son's theft of Phoenicium (Ballio still has 5 minae from Simia), unless Ballio's earlier pledge of forfeiture of Phoenicium frees Simo from this liability. If not, Ballio's new-found 15 minae must pass to the soldier. Under any scenario, Ballio is *Ps.*' big loser. A simple narrative core is thus bundled in a complex series of exchanges, which can be squared without charging P. with mangling his Greek source.[125] Shifting from plot abstraction to experienced performance: in a genre of stereotypes and predetermined outcomes, an audience's pleasure lies in *how* a play's inevitable end is reached.[126] This usually involves intrigue and deception in P., often a play-within-the-play. *Ps.* concentrates on the process of crafting comedy itself: *Ps.* is largely a comedy about the making of Plautine comedy.

3.1 The Cast

The significant name **PSEVDOLVS**, derived from the Greek verb ψεύδομαι, for bilinguals immediately associates the character with lying,

[125] This edition generally avoids such analyst critiques, except where extant evidence allows for comparison between P. and his sources. Analytical approaches to P. are speculative and usually enmeshed in subjective, value-laden presumptions about Greek versus Roman comedy. P. is analysed as a Roman dramatist here; cf. Hanson 1959a: 50: '[P.'s source material] becomes Roman as soon as it is written down in Latin and subsequently performed before a Roman audience: that is, it becomes part of a milieu of ideas and expressions in the Rome of that age.' For Plautine comedy as communication with its Roman audience see Halporn 1993.

[126] Pseudolus cleverly describes this aspect of his comic tradition in the opening scene: *tibi inuenturum esse auxilium argentarium. atque id futurum undeunde dicam nescio, nisi quia futurum est* . . . (105–7; cf. 567–8). Cf. McCarthy 2000: 16: '. . . suspense is not among the pleasures that Plautus offers his audience. Instead of suspense, we get the pleasure of experiencing an extremely subtle teasing, as the author capriciously alternates between fulfilling and disappointing our expectations.'

deception, and trickery,[127] attributes which telegraph Pseudolus' role as a clever slave and supreme parodist who delights in defamiliarizing the familiar. The socially mobile trickster/magician is also (à la Socrates) a critically detached *eiron* who exposes and exploits his fellow characters' pretensions, self-deception, sentimentality, and other weaknesses,[128] while remaining acutely aware of his own body's physical vulnerability and textuality.[129] Simo reasonably fears that Pseudolus is plotting to make him a victim *per sycophantiam* to aid and abet Calidorus' romance; though Pseudolus himself cannot carry out the imposture of Harpax because of his relationship with Ballio, he functions like a *sycophanta*.[130] His conquest of Ballio and retrieval of Phoenicium is mock-heroically figured as a Troy-like siege (384, 525, 776, 1310a). Pseudolus' triumph is underscored by Simo's identification of him with Odysseus: 1243 *nimis illic mortalis doctus, nimis uorsutus, nimis malus*.[131] The comic slave's parodic association with the Greek epic hero, himself a transgressive, transcultural figure, suggests Pseudolus' status as a standard-bearer of creative adaptation in P.[132]

CALIDORVS is an apt name for a feckless, aristocratic *adulescens* enslaved by *amor* and overmastered by Pseudolus.[133] True to his type, Calidorus is melodramatic, sentimental, and infatuated with the *meretrix* next door.[134] When Pseudolus suggests hoodwinking Simo, Calidorus enthusiastically approves and encourages an additional scheme against his mother (122 *pietatis causa*)! Calidorus never meets Simo in *Ps.* and instead Pseudolus precariously mediates their father/son relationship.[135] There is little evidence of a familial structure in *Ps.*, as Calidorus suffers no conflict between love and duty. Calidorus demonstrates awareness of his comic stereotype: 238 *non iucundumst nisi amans facit stulte*, and in describing

[127] Some (so the *OLD*) treat the name as a hybrid composed of ψευδής, 'false', and the loanword *dolus*. Rejecting this etymology, Fontaine 2010: 30–3 argues the name is a transliteration of *Ψευδύλος. The spelling *Pseudolus* then arose in transmission, owing to the various puns on *dolus* in the play (485n.; Pseudolus' name is juxtaposed with a form of *fallacia* three times at 1192–5 in interlingual punning). Fontaine's proposal to avoid thematic misconceptions based on the false hybrid by reading the name as *Pseudylus* is not adopted here. Regardless of orthographical issues, the name defines the slave as one who 'cheats, lies, deceives by lies', *et sim.* (cf. LSJ ψεύδω). For Pseudolus' 'magical' powers see 401, 403nn.

[128] Cf. Frye 1957: 40–1, Stott 2005: 51–5; insightful historical analysis of Socratic irony in Colebrook 2004: 22–46.

[129] 544a–5n.

[130] 485n., pp. 30, 38 below.

[131] 1017, 1063, 1064, 1244nn.

[132] Cf. Telò 2019: 49–55, pp. 43–7 below.

[133] 35n.

[134] 3–132, 4, 13, 15nn.

[135] 4, 78, 415–573ann., Fitzgerald 2019: 189–92.

his plight delivers one of P.'s most memorable trochaics: 695 *scis amorem, scis laborem, scis egestatem meam.* Whereas in P.'s Menandrean source the young lover most probably showed some sign of being mature enough to marry and transition to adult citizenhood, the quasi-infantilized Calidorus remains erotically captivated by Phoenicium. After he and Charinus exit in Scene 9, Calidorus does not reappear in *Ps.*, though Pseudolus details his offstage celebrations with Phoenicium in the penultimate scene. Calidorus thus (realistically) remains immature and unfit to assume adult citizenship.[136]

BALLIO, in actantial, Greimassian terms both Phoenicium's 'sender' and the 'opponent' of Calidorus/Pseudolus, is P.'s most notorious 'super-pimp', a vicious caricature drawn in bold strokes, so much so that Pseudolus can refer to him as society's 'common enemy' (584).[137] Ballio's opening song (133–229), during which only one member of his *familia* dares speak (159), dramatizes his extraordinary cruelty and sadism as a slave-dealing *leno.* Early in *Ps.*, to depict him as Pseudolus' worthy opponent, Ballio displays linguistic brilliance, though suffused with the pimp's diseased imagination.[138] While Ballio is self-aware of his stereotype as a perjurious pimp,[139] his grasp of comedy is deficient and leads him to commit critical errors: he is conned by the clever Simia into revealing the soldier's name and places undue trust in the letter the trickster has stolen.[140] The inelastic Ballio commits multiple blunders in assuming the real Harpax is Pseudolus' hired actor.[141] Ballio's static comic agency, in pointed contrast to the dynamic Pseudolus', remains fixed by convention and he is incapable of adjusting to circumstances by improvising. As Ballio ultimately realizes, his birthday becomes his 'deathday',[142] and he is expelled from *Ps.* as a defeated agelast. Ballio attempts one last futile lunge at power and status by appropriating the voice of a Roman praetor as he quits the stage for good: 1231 *peregrinos absoluam, cras agam cum ciuibus.*[143]

[136] This seemingly flouts Greek New Comedy convention, where a young man's marriage quasi-automatically signifies his maturity; spectators have only the example of Simo (below, pp. 28, 35–6) as an indirect promise that Calidorus will assume his expected adult role.

[137] For Ballio's suggestive name see 193n.

[138] 133–264, 145–7nn.

[139] 289, 377, 975, 1081–3, 1081, 1095nn.

[140] 1097n.

[141] 1103–1237n.

[142] 1237n. The subplot of Ballio's birthday underscores both his inept mastery (he must rigorously force his slaves to celebrate it) and the irony that a free person so inhumane has a personal history, parents, etc. (cf. pp. 42–3 below).

[143] Ballio throughout the play behaves magisterially (379n.) and issues 'edicts' to his slaves (143, 172, 855, 903). See further 1231n.

SIMO is not a harsh comic father, though he's *anxius* and *cautus* regarding his son's (and Pseudolus') activities, and displays typically patriarchal concern regarding Calidorus' expenditures on his *amica*.[144] According to Callipho, Simo overindulged in *amor* and *otium* in his youth, which tempers his attitude towards Calidorus somewhat.[145] Simo's main function is to provide Pseudolus with a further (potential) obstacle, along with Ballio and the soldier. Simo demonstrates surprising linguistic playfulness for a *paterfamilias*,[146] and begrudgingly admires Pseudolus' craftiness,[147] dubbing the slave *meus Vlixes* (1063). Simo explicitly identifies with Pseudolus in the fleecing of Ballio,[148] and in the same monologue devises a plan for dealing with Pseudolus in defiance of comic convention.[149]

CALLIPHO is Simo's fellow *senex*, an aristocratic friend[150] who lives next door. His character type, the *pater mitis*, is well represented in P.[151] His primary role in his only scene is to counterbalance the *pater durus* Simo initially appears to be and help soften Simo's attitude towards his son. Callipho poses a question to Simo that loudly resonates vis-à-vis the stereotypical plot of *Ps.*: 434–5 *quid nouom, adulescens homo | si amat, si amicam liberat?* (Pseudolus shortly directs all his efforts at finding a 'new' variant in the execution of such a hackneyed scheme.) Callipho applauds Pseudolus' trickery, even figuring himself as a delighted spectator at the slave's *ludi*.[152] Because Pseudolus asks Callipho to remain in Athens and the *senex* agrees to do so, but does not reappear (547–52), he may have played a larger role in P.'s source, perhaps ultimately discovered to be Phoenicium's father.[153]

HARPAX spends a fair amount of time onstage (Scenes 7, 18) in his role as the soldier's *cacula* on a mission to retrieve Phoenicium. A non-Athenian outsider (as all P.'s soldiers), Harpax is conventionally abrupt, officious, and conceited.[154] Harpax and his boss provide a secondary opponent, after Ballio, for Pseudolus.[155] Pseudolus' success in

[144] 415–573an. For his name see 410n.
[145] 440, 441nn.
[146] 1064, 1100, 1244, 1285, 1306nn.
[147] 546, 1243nn.
[148] 1238n.
[149] 1239–40on.
[150] 411n.
[151] 415–573a, 437–9nn.
[152] 523, 552nn.
[153] 547–52n.
[154] For Harpax's *ethopoeia* see 51, 596, 603nn.
[155] The Macedonian *miles* could have appeared in *Ps.*, though this might have detracted from Ballio's role as the primary villain. The soldier's haughty voice is heard in his letter (read by Ballio: 998–1014nn.).

convincing Harpax that he is Ballio's slave (594–666) so as to obtain the soldier's letter (647–8) is a critical moment in *Ps.* In Harpax's entrance song (1103–23a) before he meets Ballio and Simo, he delivers a 'good slave's speech',[156] deeply ironic in that he has mismanaged his master's charge. Much is made of Harpax's name (cf. ἁρπάζω, 'snatch'),[157] which he fancifully claims as his because he 'is accustomed to snatch his enemies alive in battle' (655); the name proves most ironic in that Harpax fails to retrieve Phoenicium after she is 'snatched away' by the forces of Pseudolus.

Calidorus' friend **CHARINVS** plays an important 'sub-helper's' role in Harpax's imposture. Pseudolus initially requested a helper only to dupe Calidorus into believing he had formulated a plan to trick Ballio (383–6). Pseudolus' description of this individual left open the option of choosing a free person or a slave. Calidorus decides on a trusted friend,[158] fortuitously so, as someone with resources is required. Charinus acts as a stage manager in supplying props and a costume, 5 minae, and his family's recently acquired slave Simia, whose talents as a *seruus callidus* Charinus recognizes (724–50), to impersonate Harpax. Charinus' name is etymologically connected with χάρις ('charm'), which inspires Pseudolus' wordplay in Greek.[159] The name reflects Charinus' aristocratic status, as does his erudite repartee with Pseudolus. Charinus does not reappear in *Ps.* after he fulfils his role (Scene 9).

The diminutive young slave of Ballio, identified only as **PVER**, does not advance the plot. Dramaturgically he serves to remind the audience of Ballio's viciousness, just prior to the pimp's defeat.[160] The boy relates his fears concerning Ballio's command, under threat of violence, that every member of the household bestow a birthday gift upon him. In his pathetic monologue, the *puer* details the challenges of finding lovers and resources as an unattractive boy enslaved in a brothel. The boy's highly personal speech is poignant in its details, some cloaked in sexual euphemism.[161]

The **COOK/COCVS** is a stock figure in ancient comedy, whose conventional attributes include boastfulness, loquacity, and a propensity for theft. In New Comedy cooks are hired to prepare a special meal, often with a team of appropriately equipped assistants for the sake of spectacle (865 *discipulis*). The cook is reluctantly hired by Ballio to prepare his birthday feast, which ultimately is cancelled, and so his appearance

[156] 1103–35n.
[157] 139, 653, 654, 655nn.
[158] 385, 390nn.
[159] 712n. Pseudolus also connects the name with *careo* (736n.).
[160] 767–89n.
[161] 780, 782, 783, 786nn.

is superfluous (in plot terms). P. puts his cook to good use – cuisine was already associated with poetic production in Greek drama[162] – by having him speak for P. in what amounts to the fullest account of Plautine poetics we have.[163] The cook, who is much concerned with his confabulations being believed (*pistis*), is closely identified with Pseudolus, as could be emphasized by having the same actor play both roles.[164] Reflecting the programmatic connections between the two characters, Ballio's thoughts turn to Pseudolus (894–904) immediately after the cook exits (Scene 11).

SIMIA or 'Monkeyman' is a mimetic figure, and in his creative independence and flair for improvisation is Pseudolus' nested double and even becomes a source of fear for him.[165] Simia is a *sycophanta*, in P. a trickster specializing in impersonation,[166] a role Pseudolus contracts out to Simia while he assumes the function of playwright/director of the scheme to dupe Ballio. Like a teeming bazaar,[167] Simia supplies any comic plot-need. An *eiron* like Pseudolus, Simia is intelligent and immune to manipulation, to the point of rejecting Pseudolus' genuine admiration for him, and ultimately serves to bolster his mentor's function as a dynamic trickster.[168]

Of *Ps.*' mute characters – these include Ballio's male and female slaves and the cook's assistants – **PHOENICIVM** merits mention as the commodified object of the play's central transaction; although she remains silent onstage in Scenes 2 and 15,[169] she is given a kind of voice.[170] Her generic name, 'The Phoenician', reflects her geographic origin (we learn nothing else of her history). Her elegant letter to Calidorus indicates she is educated.[171] She is freed from Ballio's ownership,[172] but nothing in *Ps.* suggests she has a longer-term future with Calidorus. When Ballio calls out Phoenicium among her fellow *meretrices* (225–9), he reveals that she

[162] Gowers 1993: 78–87.
[163] 790–904n., pp. 50–1 below; Christenson 2020: 85–8.
[164] 766, 767–89, 789, 790–904, 888nn. For possible distribution(s) of roles among *Ps.*' actors see Marshall 2006: 99–104.
[165] Pp. 41–3 below.
[166] 485, 1197nn. Plautine examples include the *sycophanta* hired for a (failed) forged letter scheme at *Trin.* 843–997; cf. Mercury's approval of Jupiter's impersonation of Amphitruo in deceiving Alcumena, *Am.* 506 *nimis hic scitust sycophanta.*
[167] 742n.
[168] 944, 945nn.
[169] She appears as a vulnerable figure in each instance, the target of Ballio's brutal threats in the first scene (229n.), later seen weeping as Simia escorts her from Ballio's house (1038n.).
[170] This sole female 'voice' is of course constructed and performed by Pseudolus (3–132, 41–77, 64–73nn.). *Ps.* and *Capt.* are the only Plautine comedies without female characters (*Trin.* has only the prologists *Luxuria* and *Inopia*).
[171] 41–77, 64–73nn.
[172] 1311n.

has been prostituted out to others besides Calidorus, which eliminates the possibility of her being discovered to be freeborn and eligible for marriage. There Ballio identifies Phoenicium's area of specialization as upper-class customers,[173] which suggests a Greek *hetaira*, as is consistent with her rhetorically deft letter. We cannot know her status or full role in P.'s source, but some suppose that she was recognized as Callipho's daughter (i.e. after being exposed at birth: cf. *Cas.*).[174]

3.2 Dramatic Structure

A scene summary of *Ps.* provides an overview of the play's movement in performance [**A** = spoken iambics; **B** = *canticum*; **C** = musically accompanied trochaics].

Scene 1 (3–132): Pseudolus and Calidorus set the dramatic situation in a quasi-prologue **(A)**

Scenes 2–3 (133–393): introduction of Ballio's vicious character; his dialogue with Pseudolus and Calidorus **(B to 264, C)**

Scene 4 (394–414): Pseudolus' aporetic 'poet's monologue' **(A)**

Scene 5 (415–573a): introduction of the *senes*, Simo and Callipho; Pseudolus' exit monologue on improvisation **(A)**

[interlude of the *tibicen*]

Scene 6 (574–93): Pseudolus' monody of (pseudo-)triumph **(B)**

Scene 7 (594–666): introduction of Harpax; his interception by Pseudolus **(B to 603b, C)**

Scene 8 (667–93): Pseudolus' monologue on his progress and *Fortuna* **(C)**

Scene 9 (694–766): introduction of Charinus (with Calidorus); arrangements for the imposture of Harpax; Pseudolus' exit monologue **(C)**

Scene 10 (767–89): the Puer's monologue **(A)**

Scene 11 (790–904): Ballio and the Cook argue; Ballio's exit monologue **(A)**

Scene 12 (905–55): Pseudolus rehearses Simia for his role as Harpax **(B to 950a, C)**

Scene 13 (956–1016): Simia dupes Ballio as Pseudolus eavesdrops **(C to 997, A)**

Scene 14 (1017–37): Pseudolus' monologue expressing fear about Simia and their scheme's success **(A)**

Scene 15 (1038–51): Simia and Pseudolus abscond with Phoenicium **(A)**

Scene 16 (1052–62): Ballio gloats in a monologue **(A)**

[173] 227n.
[174] E.g. Lefèvre 1997: 34–6.

Scenes 17–18 (1063–1237): Ballio informs Simo of the sale of Phoenicium; they harass Harpax until Ballio realizes he's been duped **(A to 1102, B to 1135, C)**
Scene 19 (1238–45): Simo's monologue acknowledging Pseudolus' success and promising to compensate him **(C)**
Scene 20 (1246–84): Pseudolus' drunken monody of celebration **(B)**
Scene 21 (1285–1335b): Pseudolus' and Simo's settlement **(B)**

This synopsis shows that *Ps.*, as all early Roman comedies, consists of continuous action, save for the unique interlude after Scene 5.[175] Pseudolus dominates the stage, whether in his unprecedented seven solo appearances or when engaged with other characters in dialogue or song, as he is onstage for *ca.* 75 per cent of the play's lines. In Aristotelian terms, *desis* ('complication') has mostly taken place before the play with the drafting of Phoenicium's contract. The play is set on the day of the scheduled sale; *lusis* ('resolution') is delayed until the arrival of Harpax. Up to that point Pseudolus makes only false starts towards solving Calidorus' predicament, including a pseudo-*metabasis* ('change', 'transition') towards *lusis* in Scene 6.[176] Scenes 7 and 13, the duping of Harpax and Ballio, respectively, are pivotal in achieving resolution, with the success of each hinging on an act of improvisation.[177] Scenes 10–11, the cook's and slave-boy's scenes, both peripheral to the central transaction, stand outside the play's dramatic movement, though each impacts spectators' reception of the play. Pseudolus and Simo achieve final resolution in their closing *canticum.*[178]

3.3 Pseudolus, Master of Language, Illusion, Freedom

A comic slave sporting a mask with bulging eyes and reddish hair, a short-cut costume (and tights?) that exaggerates his stomach and calves, and distinctive clown's feet speaks *Ps.*' first words.[179] This grotesquely distorted body belies a clever mind, soon revealed by the slave's rhetorical dexterity. Spectators realize he is addressing his younger master (4), despondent and clutching a writing tablet (9–10). Seasoned theatregoers grasp that the young man is desperately in love and his slave will offer loyal assistance in removing whatever obstacles stand between the *adulescens* and his beloved. The slave's prolix opening concludes and his name is

[175] 573an.
[176] 574–603bn.
[177] 594–66, 956–1016nn., pp. 37–8, 42–3 below.
[178] 1246–1335bn., pp. 43–7 below.
[179] Harpax's later description of Pseudolus' costume (1218–20) underscores the latter's larger-than-life comic otherness.