

Hurbánková, Šárka

Repertoire of characters in Roman comedy: new classification approaches

Graeco-Latina Brunensia. 2014, vol. 19, iss. 2, pp. [3]-15

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/131945>

Access Date: 20. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

ŠÁRKA HURBÁNKOVÁ
(MASARYK UNIVERSITY, BRNO)

REPERTOIRE OF CHARACTERS IN ROMAN COMEDY: NEW CLASSIFICATION APPROACHES

What is Roman comedy? Which ancient theatre forms can be included under this term? How to classify the characters of palliatae, togatae, atellanae and mimi, having mostly complete texts of Plautus's and Terence's palliatae available on the one hand, and palliatae, togatae, atellanae and mimi preserved only fragmentally on the other? This study presents a method of classifying a repertoire of characters in Roman comedy which I used in my dissertation. Complete texts were analyzed in terms of contrasts and correspondences, allowing me to determine the correspondences and similarities not only among dramatic characters or types separately in Plautus's and separately in Terence's comedies, but also point out certain correspondences and similarities in the entire historical corpus of texts mapping a specific period or genre. Therefore, I determined structural functions of individual types and their roles in the corpus of texts, which, at the same time, provided me with a summary of typical traits of various types of characters, manifested in antagonism or cooperation with other types of characters. I compared this set of "words-signs" with words describing the characters from fragments, using clear arrangement into contingency tables. Due to this comparison and other partial findings enabled by this method and tools used, it was possible to describe, at least partially, not only a repertoire of characters of individual comic forms, but also compare them with each other and determine how the "dramatis personae" of Roman comedy changed diachronically.

Key words: Roman comedy, *atellana*, *palliata*, *togata*, *mimus*, repertoire of characters, contrasts and correspondences, Ancient theatre, structural functions, comic situation, type and typification, stock characters, *personae oscae*, *qui pro quo*, disguise, *dramatis personae*

What is Roman comedy? Which ancient theatre forms can be included under this term? If we want to define the concept of "Roman comedy" objectively, we especially come across these two pitfalls: the inconsistency of terms which were already in ancient times used to define various theatre forms, and the accessibility of the material under study that is nowadays available.

In the 20th century, classical philologists analyzed in detail preserved Plautus's and Terence's texts, which have become representatives of Roman comedy. In fact, these texts represent only one of the comic theatre forms with Latin texts which were performed on the territory of ancient Rome. *Fabula palliata*, inspired by the new Attic comedy, was a rather adapted form (characters and settings remain Greek), while *fabula togata*, *atellana* and *mimi* were born right in the Italic environment (as for Latin *mimus*, we need to consider the possible influence of Greek *mimus*). Unfortunately, *togatae*, *atellanae* and *mimi* have survived only in fragments. Lack of material, Italic character and, in the case of *mimi* and perhaps also *atellanae*, the prevalence of the improvisational component over the literary one condemned these three comic forms to be examined mostly separately as less important.

Plautus's and Terence's *palliatae* have been the subject of a number of scientific research, but none of these studies have applied a concrete analysis of structural functions and relationships to the dramatic characters of these texts.¹ Fragments of *palliatae*, *togatae*, *atellanae* and *mimi* have been mostly discussed only in relevant editions and a few separate studies were published in the 20th century.² Nonetheless, there is no study available, trying to compare the characters of all four Roman comic forms based on their character traits observable even in the fragmented material, although there have been some efforts recently to classify Roman dramatic genres within a broader context – as a whole influenced by various factors.³

The main aim of this study is to present a method that I used in my dissertation and offer a new method to classify the characters of Roman comedy.⁴

¹ The characters of Plautus's and Terence's *palliatae* are discussed e.g. in DELLA CORTE (1973: 354–393), DUCKWORTH (1952: 236–268), KOLÁŘ (1923: 125–132).

² They mostly describe one comic variant, but there are also some which try to compare certain similar phenomena within these variants. E.g. GUARDÌ (1978: 37–45), SVELO (1980).

³ KARAKASIS (2005) offers a linguistic analysis of Terence's comedies and compares them with *togatae* and *atellanae*. Unfortunately, he does not include fragments of Latin *mimi* in the linguistic and stylistic analysis. MANUWALD (2011) describes authors, works and dramatic genres of the Republican Rome. The publication adheres to the older terminology and uses the term *comœdia* to refer only to *palliatae*, yet its main contribution is that it does not focus only on the surviving texts, but also tries to give evidence of all the dramatic genres of theatre and their authors of the Republican Rome.

⁴ This dissertation (HURBÁNKOVÁ, 2012) aims to describe and compare a repertoire of characters of all theatre variants of Roman comedy, on the basis of findings about characters obtained from complete texts (corpus of Plautus's and Terence's comedies), as well as incomplete texts (fragments of *palliatae*, *togatae*, *atellanae* and *mimi*). It also seeks to shed light on the issue of the genre system of Roman comedy and offer a hypothesis how the repertoire of its dramatic characters changed in time.

The surviving material is significantly diverse: there are mostly complete texts of *palliatae* available on the one hand and their fragments on the other. We can examine only fragments of *togatae*, *atellanae* and *mimi*, preserved in the works of ancient grammarians and scholars.⁵ In order to obtain relevant research results, we need to conduct an analysis of a larger sample of the studied material.⁶ Therefore, if we focus on a particular phenomenon, e.g. a repertoire of characters in Roman comedy, we may get interesting insights not only into the whole comic genre, but also into its individual variants.⁷

First, I analyzed Plautus's and Terence's texts in terms of contrasts and correspondences characterizing "dramatic characters" (*dramatis personas*)⁸ and tried to examine comic situations in terms of structural functions.⁹ This enabled me to obtain a comprehensive characterization of dramatic characters from the corpus of texts, since:

⁵ E.g. Aulus Gellius, Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius, Sextus Pompeius Festus, Flavius Sospater Charisius, Diomedes, Tiberius Claudius Donatus, Nonius Marcellus, Priscianus. We can start from the assumption that the fragments and titles selected especially for the grammatical and stylistic comparison of specificities were characteristic for a particular dramatic variant and thus should have a certain informative value about its "nature".

⁶ I achieved partial results in the article HURBÁNKOVÁ (2010: 69–80) where I compared the fractions of *atellanae* and *mimi*, focusing on common characteristics of characters. The fractions of *mimi* and *atellanae* were analyzed in terms of the frequency of words possibly describing characters featuring in these two comic variants. At the same time, I was intrigued by how the detectable characteristic traits of characters corresponded or differed within all available fragmented material of all Roman forms of Roman comedy, i.e. *palliatae*, *togatae*, *atellanae* and *mimi*. I published another article on *atellanae* and typified characters: HURBÁNKOVÁ (2008: 67–79). When I sorted the fragments, I felt an increasing need to further compare the obtained findings with information from complete texts.

⁷ The term "Roman comedy" (*comedia Romana*), including four "types of comedy" – *palliata*, *togata*, *atellana* and *mimus* –, is used here in accordance with the publication *Comedia romana* (LÓPEZ – POČIŇA, 2007). This study inspired me to understand Roman comedy as a whole, whose units deserve equal attention despite the diversity of the surviving material.

⁸ The term "*dramatis personae*" is used by J. Halliday in the English translation of the German term "Personal," which is used by PFISTER (1991: 160). LUKEŠ (1978: 175) translates the same term into Czech as "dramatic personnel" ("dramatický personál") and characterizes it as "a set of dramatic characters" ("soubor dramatických postav") that may be the subject of quantitative and qualitative research; it includes all dramatic characters that act in a dramatic function.

⁹ PFISTER (1991: 163): "...a dramatic figure may also be defined positively as the sum of the structural functions it fulfils in either changing or stabilizing the dramatic situation and the character (in the neutral sense of identity) of a figure as the sum of the contrasts and correspondences linking it with the other figures in the text."

1. The analysis of contrasts and correspondences allows me to determine correspondences and similarities not only among dramatic characters separately in Plautus's and separately in Terence's comedies; it can also suggest certain correspondences and similarities in the entire historical corpus of texts mapping a certain period or genre.¹⁰
2. The definition of structural functions in drama is determined by a recurring role in the text corpus.

Methods of theatre semiotics analyzing characters and situations are relatively young: they started to be developed in the middle of the last century.¹¹ J. A. GREIMAS (1966) borrowed binary oppositional categories from structural semantics applied in linguistics and used them in literature. He was inspired by a Russian thinker V. J. PROPP (1968) and a French theatre theorist E. Souriau and introduced the term "actant" and "actantial role" into literature. In drama, actant actually is the action of an acting character, that is, a function according to PROPP (1968: 25). These functions then attribute a certain role to characters within the whole work or corpus of texts.¹² P. HAMON (1977: 124–125) saw limitations of the analysis summarizing the structure of drama to actants and the characterization of characters only by actantial roles, and suggested understanding all expressions of a character in situations as a blank sign or a moving morpheme, which is reflected as a number of distinctive features, defining the importance and value of a character. According to him, the complex nature of a character is then influenced by several factors associated under this sign.¹³

It should be noted that the repertoire of Plautus's and Terence's characters is subject to typification: dramatic characters are defined by certain types that are superior to concrete characters.¹⁴

¹⁰ LUKEŠ (1978: 184–185) argues that valuable findings can be obtained by conducting a content analysis of the dramatic personnel of the entire text corpora, not only of individual works, and adds that also mechanism and stereotyping of best practices apply especially in comedy (already in the new Attic comedy and Plautus's comedy). For more on the analysis, see PFISTER (1991: 166–170).

¹¹ Information on the development of theatre semiotics is taken from ELAM (2002).

¹² According to LEVÝ (1971: 128), a conflict begins in epic poetry and drama when a character assumes its role. A role can be performed by figures of various characters and therefore represents a structural function within the entire structure (network) of characters of a given social whole or literary work.

¹³ For more on the factors defining a detailed character of a figure according to Hamon, see ELAM (2002: 119–120).

¹⁴ PFISTER (1991: 180): "If the type is divorced from individual qualities so that it can be used to represent some universal or typical supra-individual quality, the intention underlying a figure conceived as an individual is to bring out the features that are unique and contingent."

This means that in terms of relationships and the definition of functions, I analyzed types of characters, not concrete characters, in the corpus of texts under study. This enabled me to obtain a sum of characteristic signs of individual types, manifested in antagonism or cooperation with signs of other types. Subsequently, I was able to determine the functions of types and their roles in the corpus of texts.¹⁵ This could be represented schematically, as follows:

RELATIONSHIP	SIGN	MANIFESTATION	SITUATION
TYPE1 (who)	SIGN OF TYPE 1	Sign manifestation of type 1	
SERVUS	Servus	– Plotting intrigue	
			Function according to the actor
			PLOTTING
TYPE2 (with whom)	SIGN OF TYPE 2	Sign manifestation of type 2	
ADULESCENS	erus	– Asking for help	

Here is an example of a concrete situation from Plautus’s comedy *Bacchides* in which the *Servus* type and the *Adulescens* type are presented in a contrast relationship “slave – master”. In this situation, the *Servus* type appears as a slave who plots intrigue at the request of his master (the *Adulescens* type). The whole situation can be called “Plotting” based on the function-manifestation of the actor:

RELATIONSHIP: Servus – Adulescens

SIGNS: *servus* – *erus* (slave – master)

(concrete characters: Chrysalus – Mnesilochus)

MANIFESTATION: Plotting intrigue – asking for help

SITUATION: Plotting

Plaut. *Bacch.* 728–753: Quick-witted Chrysalus plots a second plan to con Mnesilochus’s father out of his money and dictates to the surprised Mnesilochus a letter to his father, warning the old man to be vigilant:

CH. Cape stilum propere et tabellas tu <h>as tibi. MN. Quid postea?

*CH. Quod iubeboscribitoistic.nampropterea<te>uolo
Scribere, ut pater cognoscat lit<t>eras, quandolegat.*

Scribe. MN. Quid scribam? CH. Salutem tuo patri uerbis tuis.

PI. Quid sipotiusmorbum mortem scribat?ideritrectius.

¹⁵ The examined corpus of texts includes 21 Plautus’s and 6 Terence’s comedies. Altogether, it is more than 27 thousand verses.

CH. *Ne interturba.* <MN.> *Iam imperatum in cera inest.* CH. *Dicquemadmodum?*

MN. *'Mnesilochussalutemdicitsuopatri'.* CH. *Adscribe hoc cito:*

'Chrysalusmihiusquequaque loquitur necrecte, pater;

Quiatibi aurum reddidi| et quia non tefraudauerim'.

PI. *Mane dum scribit.* CH. *Celerem oportet esse amatoris manum.*

PI. *At quidem herclest <ad> perundum magis quam ad scribundum cita.*

MN. *Loquere: hoc scriptumst.* CH. *Nunc, pater mi, proin tu ab eo ut caueas tibi,*

Sycophantias componit, aurum ut abs te<d> auferat:

Et profecto se ablaturum dixit'. plane adscribito.

MN. *Dic modo.* CH. *'Atque id pollicetur se daturum aurum mihi,*

Quod dem scortis quod que in lustris comedim [et] congraecem, pater.

Sed, pater, uide ne tibi hodie uerba det: quaeso caue'.

MN. *Loquere porro.*

CH. *'Sed, pater, quod promisisti mihi, te quaeso ut memineris:*

Ne illum uerberes, uerum apud te uinctum adseruato domi.

Cedo tu ceram ac linum actutum.

age obliga, obsigna cito.

MN. *Obsecro, quid istis ad istunc usust conscriptis modum,*

Vt tibi ne quid credat atque ut uinctum te adseruet domi?

CH. *Quia mihi ita lubet.*

potin ut cures te atque ut ne parcas mihi ?

Mea fiducia opus conduxi et me operic[u]lo rem gero.

MN. *Aequom, dicis.* CH. *Cedotabellas.* MN. *Accipe.*¹⁶

Examining the surviving Plautus's and Terence's texts, I defined twelve main types and several supporting ones based on the analysis of relationships among dramatic characters.¹⁷ The main types repeatedly entered relationships within *dramatis personarum* of Plautus's and Terence's comedies and all, at least in one situation, performed some functions. The twelve types are: *Servus* (Slave), *Adulescens* (Young man), *Senex* (Old man), *Meretrix* (Prostitute), *Ancilla* (Maid), *Matrona* (Matron), *Parasitus* (Parasite), *Leno* (Man running the brothel), *Miles* (Soldier), *Virgo* (Young maiden), *Cocus* (Cook), *Lena* (Woman running the brothel). Considering the twelve main

¹⁶ T. Macc(i)us Plautus – *Bacchides*, versus: 728–753 (pag.: 35). *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*. 2004 [Editio 3]. Available from URL <<http://litterae.phil.muni.cz/>> [cit. 2014–06–25].

¹⁷ The main types appeared at least in seven or more situations. The supporting types entered relationships in five or fewer situations.

types, the most frequent actors of structural functions of the *Servus* (Slave) type, which mostly appear in a relation to the *Adulescens* type (Young man) in contrast to the social relation “*servus – erus*” (slave – master). Examining Plautus’s and Terence’s comedies separately, we can see that both authors employ these types with similar frequency in various situations, but they differ in the type which takes the leading role: while in Plautus, the leading actor is the *Servus* type (Slave), in Terence it is the *Adulescens* type (Young man). In addition, further characteristics of both types (summaries of signs and manifestations of types in situations) vary between the two authors: e.g. “Terence’s sons”¹⁸ try to deceive their father directly, “Plautus’s sons” only via a mediator; a lustful father¹⁹ appears only in Plautus’s *palliatae*, fooled father only in Terence’s *palliatae*; plotting prostitute can be found only in Plautus, while insisting prostitute only in Terence; angry wife appeared only in Plautus, while blamed wife, often wrongly, in Terence; only “Plautus’s parasites” deceive, but also help, “Terence’s parasites” mainly threaten, etc. Generally, based on the distinguishing features of gender, social status, generational and kinship affiliation, which resulted from contrasts and correspondences among dramatic characters of the examined corpus of texts, we could divide characters into masters, servants and relatives, with a category of men and women superior to them.²⁰

The question how to apply the obtained findings to the fragments remains. The acquired signs are actually substantives denoting a specific characterization of types in the surviving texts. In the previous analysis, I got a set of “words-signs” for each type, which can be compared with words describing characters in the fragments.²¹ Hypothetically, it would be possible to describe, at least partially, not only a repertoire of characters of individual comic forms, but also compare them with each other and determine how the “*dramatis personae*” of Roman comedy changed diachronically.²²

¹⁸ The sign *filius* (son) is one of the main signs of the *Adulescens* (Young man) type.

¹⁹ The sign *pater* (father) is one of the main signs of the *Senex* (Old man) type.

²⁰ Pfister (1991: 167) defines three suprahistorically relevant distinguishing features: gender, social, generation.

²¹ For example, the *Servus* type, which is the most frequent actor of functions and most often intrigues, deceives, reproaches, makes fun, plots and teases somebody in situations, is characterized by the following signs: *servus* (slave), *conservus* (co-slave), *amicus* (friend), *rusticus* (rural), *urbanus* (urban), *amator* (lover), *paedagogus* (teacher), *atriensis* (manager) and occasionally by signs *patronus* (patron) and *erus* (master). In Terence, this type was defined only by the signs *servus* and *conservus*, the others appeared exclusively in Plautus’s slaves.

²² According to LUKEŠ (1987: 185), “a genre forms its dramatic personnel (and is formed by this personnel)...”, therefore, “it historicizes with this personnel, or be-

When selecting fractions and titles of the surviving fragments of Roman comic forms, I focused on words describing characters and their characteristic features, i.e. personality traits, whether congenital or acquired, wider family relations, names and occupations.²³

Therefore, I compared the signs of types defined by the analysis of Plautus's and Terence's comedies with the "words-signs" from fragmented texts of authors of all comic variants, which have been preserved the best: Gnaeus Naevius, Caecilius Staius, Sextus Turpilius, Titinius, Lucius Afranius, Titus Quinctius Atta, Lucius Pomponius Bononiensis, Novius, Decimus Laberius and Publilius Syrus.

By comparing these findings with the surviving fragmented texts mainly of three authors of *palliatae* from various periods (Naevius, Caecilius, Turpilius), we can confirm that the repertoire of characters of *palliatae* did not differ significantly and that the older authors were inspired by Greek models at least when naming their texts according to their protagonists, while the younger authors could also influence each other. My analysis demonstrates the presence of at least one "word-sign" defining the main type of all authors, the occurrence of similar "words-signs" characterizing the relationships and character traits and names of the titles of *palliatae* of younger authors similar to those of Plautus's and Terence's *palliatae*.

It seems that the authors of *togatae* (Titinius, Afranius, Atta) let their female characters speak more on the stage; they were also more often protagonists of their pieces than in other comic forms: in fragments and titles of *togatae* I noticed a larger number of substantives, adjectives and verb forms with feminine endings. When comparing "words-signs" with find-

comes impediment to development as anachronistic, and as such, it must either perish or be the subject of innovation, which is always the process of transformation of its dramatic personnel". In the analysis, I used the so-called "contingency (frequency) tables" when searching for the frequency of words and verses in Plautus's and Terence's texts, clarifying mutual relations between two variable signs. For more on contingency tables, see HENDL (2006: 307, 311–317, 485–489). This tool significantly helped me sort the material, assess the frequency of words as well as "words-signs" in various dependencies, define relationships, i.e. in other words, examine the material from multiple perspectives.

²³ Having selected texts for my study, I worked with 73 titles and around 200 verses of *palliatae*, 44 titles and around 230 verses of *togatae*, 70 titles and 60 verses of *atellanae*, and 31 titles and 50 verses of *mimus*. All selected fractions and titles could be fully classified into four working sections, which I called "Features and descriptions of characters," "Family relations," "Proper names, nationalities, mythical figures and gods," and "Occupations and crafts." Titles and fragments were selected from these editions: RYCHLEWSKA (1971), WARMINGTON (1935, 1936) – *palliata*, LÓPEZ (1983) – *togata*, FRASSINETTI (1967) – *atellana*, BONARIA (1965) – *mimus*.

ings from Plautus's and Terence's *palliatae*, I detected that most of them correspond in Lucius Afranius not only within *togatae*, but also within all variants of Roman comedy. This could mean that Afranius, e.g. tried to adapt the repertoire of characters of *togatae* to great models of the previous century and therefore, paradoxically, could hinder the development of this comic variant or to condemn it right to its gradual death.²⁴

In the repertoire of characters of *atellanae* of Pomponius and Novius, in addition to stock characters called *personae oscae* (Maccus, Pappus, Bucco, Dossennus), an important place is also given to characters performing mostly various occupations (as the titles suggest, some crafts were performed directly by these stock types). It is possible that the authors of *atellanae* used similar dramatic resources (*qui pro quo* and disguise) as Plautus. It could also prove a certain influence of *palliatae* on *atellanae* and vice versa. On the other hand, elements of the "materially physical down"²⁵ and a significant incidence of words denoting various occupations in fragments may indicate Pomponius's and Novius's effort to adapt the repertoire of characters of *atellanae* to the taste of the audience. Their earthy Latin could still reflect the original Italic humour.

Palliatae, *togatae* and *atellanae* must have had some influence on the youngest comic variant: Latin *mimus*. However, in my opinion, it was not reflected in the repertoire of its characters and it may have differed from other forms of Roman comedy in order to adapt to the rather diverse audience in the late Republic and early Empire. Very few "words-signs" defined in Plautus's and Terence's *palliatae* correspond to the words from fragments and titles of *mimi* of Decimus Laberius, the only mimograph whose relevant fragmental material has been quite preserved.²⁶ Repertoires of characters of these comic variants, which were quite apart from each other in time, differed widely. We cannot find many similarities even with other comic forms, although the repertoire of characters of *mimi* is the closest to the repertoire of *atellanae*: "word-signs" describing crafts and professions occupy an important place in the titles and fragments of *mimi*, as well as in the titles of *atellanae*.

²⁴ This hypothesis could also be based on a general controversy about the "historicization of dramatic personnel", see LUKEŠ (1987: 185) and the results of linguistic-stylistic analysis of *palliatae*, *togatae* and *atellanae*, see KARAKASIS (2005: 221).

²⁵ See more in HURBÁNKOVÁ (2008: 71).

²⁶ There is only one fragment of Publilius Syrus preserved, containing a word-sign. See HURBÁNKOVÁ (2012: 314).

By comparing the frequency of signs (defined from Plautus's and Terence's texts) across the examined fragmentary material, I arrived at the following concrete findings:

- Characters characterized as the *Servus* type (Slave) probably appeared in all comic forms, since I found the most frequent signs of this type (*servus*, *conservus* and *rusticus*) at least in one author of each form, most of them in Pomponius's *atellanae*.
- The main signs characterizing the *Adulescens* type (Young man)²⁷ could be found in the fragments of all variants of Roman comedy. In terms of number and frequency, the most of them appeared in Caecilius's *palliatae* and Afranius's *togatae*. The sign *erus/dominus* occurred more frequently in *palliatae* and *togatae*, its occurrence in *atellanae* and *mimi* was much lower and only one of the synonyms was represented in both of these comic forms.²⁸
- It seems that the character defined as the *Senex* type (Old man) was frequent not only in *palliatae*, but also in *togatae* and *atellanae* (the sign *pater* is the most frequent one out of all "words-signs"). This type probably played an important role, mainly among the dramatic characters of *atellanae* (various indication of the sign "old": *senex*, *vetulus* and *senica*), while in *mimus*, characters with this characterization were not significant (rare occurrence of the sign *senex* in the oldest period; the absence of most of the signs defining this type, especially the most frequent sign *pater*).
- The main signs defining the *Matrona* type (Matron)²⁹ could also be found in all variants of Roman comedy. The most frequent signs of this type, *uxor* and *mater*, appeared almost in all major authors.
- The *Meretrix* type (Prostitute) is defined mainly by the sign of the same name. The sign *meretrix* and words related to it were detected in all comic forms, most of them in the youngest author of *palliatae*, Turpilius.

²⁷ Signs *adulescens* (young man; young), *condiscipulus* (classmate), *amans* (loving), *amator* (lover), *amicus* (friend), *erus / dominus* (master), *filius / gnatus* (son), *frater* (brother), *frater patruelis* (cousin).

²⁸ There is also a difference in the use of both synonyms in Plautus and Terence: Plautus uses the expression *erus* more often, while Terence the word *dominus*. About half the greater occurrence of the word *erus* in Plautus and more frequent use of the word *dominus* by Terence might, in my opinion, suggest a difference in sociolects, in which Plautus's and Terence's characters speak. According to LUKÉŠ (1987: 66), a sociolect is "a set of signs by which verbal expression reveals belonging to a certain social, professional, generational or regional group."

²⁹ Signs *era / domina* (lady), *mater* (mother), *matrona* (matron), *uxor* (wife).

- The *Virgo* type (Young maiden) is defined by the signs *filia/gnata*, *soror*, *virgo*. I found the sign of the same name, *virgo*, in all major authors, the sign *filia/gnata* cannot be found in *mimus*, while the sign *soror* in the fragments of *palliatae*.
- Other types characterized mainly by the signs of the same name did not have a high incidence: signs of the *Ancilla* type (Maid) could be found sporadically in Titinius's and Afranius's *togatae* and Caecilius's *palliata*, signs of the *Parasitus* type (Parasite) a few times in *palliatae*, *togatae* and in one Laberius's *mimus*, signs of the *Leno* type (Man running the brothel) sporadically in Turpilius's *palliata*, Titinius's *togata* and Pomponius's *atellana*, signs of the *Miles* type (Soldier) only in one Pomponius's *atellana*, signs of the *Cocus* type (Cook) once in Naevius's *palliata*, Titinius's *togata*, Laberius's *mimus*, signs of the *Lena* type (Woman running the brothel) in one Trabea's *palliata*, and signs of the *Piscator* type (Fisherman) once in Pomponius's *atellana* and Laberius's *mimus*.
- Characters defined according to the typology in Plautus's and Terence's texts as *Matrona* (sign *uxor*, *mater*), *Servus* (sign *servus*), *Adulescens* (sign *amicus*), *Meretrix* (sign *meretrix*) and *Virgo* (sign *virgo*) probably appeared frequently in all forms of Roman comedy, since, in addition to general substantives, the words denoting their characteristic features occurred in fragments and titles of all comic forms most frequently.³⁰

In conclusion, we can determine how the repertoire of characters in Roman comedy could change diachronically. First, its distinctive feature probably was typification, which attributed typical features to characters: character types had similar characteristics in *palliatae* and *togatae*, although female roles also occupied a significant position among the characters of *togatae*. Later, the comic force of typifying appeared also in *atellanae*, but the types already had concrete typical names in these texts: stock characters "*personae oscae*" could associate under each name comic character and physical features of people from the poorest classes, reflecting the Italic environment from which they emerged. The comic effect in *atellanae* may have been achieved by *qui pro quo* and disguise, which were dramatic resources used widely in Plautus's *palliatae*. It seems that typification eventually ceases to play an important role: types defined using Plautus's and Terence's texts in *mimi* apparently are not important, as we can see very few similarities there. Characters in *mimi* could be the closest to the common people of *atellanae*:

³⁰ The overall total for each of these signs is 10 and more. These words can be found in greater numbers also in the texts of Plautus's and Terence's *palliatae*.

they represented poor people with various defects and comic features having meagre professions, which – accompanied with skilful mimicry and physical expressiveness – may have contributed to the fact that, out of all forms of Roman comedy, *mimus* retained its popularity among considerably diverse audiences for the longest time.

Bibliography

- Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*. 2004 [Editio 3.]. Moderante Paul Tombeur. Centre Traditionis Litterarum Occidentalium. München: Saur; Turnhout: Brepols. Teubner (ed. G. Goetz et F. Schoell, 1904) [T. Macci Plauti Comoediae, fasc. II], p. 2–57. Available from URL <<http://litterae.phil.muni.cz/>> [cit. 2014–06–25].
- BONARIA, MARIO [ed.]. 1965. *I mimi romani*. Roma.
- DELLA CORTE, FRANCESCO. 1973. “La tipologia del personaggio della Palliata.” *Actes du IX Congrès de l’Association G. Baudé*, 9, 1, 354–393.
- DUCKWORTH, GEORGE E. 1952. “Characters and Characterization.” In DUCKWORTH, GEORGE E. *The Nature of Roman comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton, 236–268.
- ELAM, KEIR. 2002. *The semiotics of the theater and drama*. London.
- FRASSINETTI, PAOLO [ed.]. 1967. *Atellanae fabulae*. Roma.
- GREIMAS, JULIEN ALGIRDAS. 1966. *Sémantique structurale. recherche de méthode*. Paris.
- GUARDÌ, TOMMASO. 1978. “I fullones e la commedia romana.” *PAN studi dell’Istituto di filologia latina*, 6, 37–45.
- HAMON, PHILIPPE. 1977. “Pour un statut sémiologique du personnage.” *Poétique de récit*. Paris.
- HENDL, JAN. 2006. *Přehled statistických metod zpracování dat: analýza a metaanalýza dat*. Praha.
- HURBÁNKOVÁ, ŠÁRKA. 2012. *Repertoár postav v římské komedii: palliata, togata, atellana, mimus*. [online] Brno. [cit. 2014-10-03]. Dissertation. Masaryk University. Faculty of Arts. Department of Classical Studies. Dissertation supervisor doc. PhDr. Dagmar Barboňková, CSc. Available from: https://is.muni.cz/th/40056/ff_d.
- HURBÁNKOVÁ, ŠÁRKA. 2010. “Characters and comic situations in Roman comedy: the Atellan farce and Mime.” *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, Brno, 15, 2, 69–80.
- HURBÁNKOVÁ, ŠÁRKA. 2008. “Personae oscae e il riso popolare nelle atellane.” *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, Brno, 13, 67–79.
- KARAKASIS, EVANGELOS. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
- KOLÁŘ, ANTONÍN. 1923. *Příspěvky k poznání Nové komedie attacké, zvláště Menandroy*. Praha.
- LEVÝ, JIŘÍ. 1971. *Bude literární věda exaktní vědou?* Praha.
- LÓPEZ, AURORA – POCIÑA, ANDRÉS. 2007. *Comedia romana*. Madrid.
- LÓPEZ LÓPEZ, AURORA [ed.]. 1983. *Fabularum Togatarum fragmenta: Edición crítica*. Salamanca.
- LUKEŠ, MILAN. 1987. *Umění dramatu*. Praha.
- MANUWALD, GESINE. 2011. *Roman Republican Theatre*. Cambridge.

- PFISTER, MANFRED. 1991. *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*. Cambridge.
- PROPP, VLADIMIR JAKOVLEVIČ. 1968. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Texas.
- RYCHLEWSKA, LUDOVICA [ed.]. 1971. *Turpiliu comici fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- STEHLÍKOVÁ, EVA. 1993. *Římské divadlo*. Praha.
- SOURIAU, ÉTIENNE. 1950. *Les deus cent mille situations dramatiques*. Paris.
- SVELO, ADELE. 1980. *Un capitolo nella storia del comico del sesso: Atellane e mimi*. Reggio Calabria.
- WARMINGTON, ERIC HERBERT [ed.]. 1935. *Remains of old Latin: Ennius, Caecilius*. Cambridge (Massachusetts).
- WARMINGTON, ERIC HERBERT [ed.]. 1936. *Remains of old Latin: Livius, Naevius, Pacuvius, Accius*. Cambridge (Massachusetts).

RESUMÉ

Tato studie si klade za cíl představit metodu, kterou jsem použila při klasifikaci repertoáru postav římské komedie ve své disertační práci. Pod pojem „římská komedie“ zahrnuji v souladu s pracemi některých soudobých badatelů všechny divadelní komické varianty s latinskými texty, které byly provozovány na území starověkého Říma, tedy *palliatu*, *togatu*, *atellanu* a *mimus*. Dochovaný materiál je značně různorodý: z *palliatu* máme k dispozici na jedné straně většinou úplné texty, na druhé straně fragmenty. Z *togat*, *atellan* a *mimů* můžeme zkoumat pouze zlomky, dochované z děl antických gramatiků a vzdělanců. Abych získala relevantní výsledky, chtěla jsem podrobit určité analýze větší vzorek zkoumaného materiálu. Zaměřila jsem se na repertoár postav v římské komedii: Plautovy a Terentiovy texty jsem podrobila analýze kontrastních a korespondenčních vztahů charakterizujících *dramatis personas* a rozebrala jsem komické situace z hlediska funkcí postav. Nutno připomenout, že tento repertoár postav podléhá typizaci: dramatické postavy jsou vymezeny určitými typy, které jsou nadřazeny konkrétním postavám. Především analýzou jsem tedy získala souhrn charakteristických znaků typů postav a tento soubor „slov-znaků“ bylo potom možné porovnat se slovy popisujícími postavy z fragmentů (s využitím kontingenčních tabulek, které umožňují posoudit četnost „slov-znaků“ v různých závislostech). Nakonec jsem tedy mohla popsat podobnosti a rozdíly repertoáru postav nejen v rámci jedné komické formy, ale také mezi sebou a určit tak, jak se diachronicky obměňovaly.

40056@mail.muni.cz

