Pia Katharina Härter

FROM PLAUTUS TO SHAKESPEARE: THE FOOL AND ITS METAMORPHOSIS IN THE CONTEXT OF CULTURAL DYNAMICS

The original title of the thesis (successfully defended at the Department of Classical Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, University Heidelberg, Germany on 27 September 2017) was *The Metamorphosis of the Fool: Plautus, Shakespeare, and the Fool* .

First PhD supervisor: Prof. Dr. Melanie Möller (FU Berlin)

Second PhD supervisor: Prof. Dr. Peter Paul Schnierer (Heidelberg University)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

I.   Introduction

The deliberate fool figure displays a metamorphosing quality as he transgresses boundaries, takes on different identities, confronts his audience with impromptu action and fantastic creations, and veils his wisdom in performances of folly by mixing foolishness, wit, and seriousness while spicing it with *ridiculum*. He is an actor altering his persona and a creator thematically configuring the space and everything within it, which has an impact on how the audience and spectators experience the show he takes part in. In brief, the fool exemplifies flexibility, change, and complexity.

This dissertation does not discuss the fool in every (at least) European manifestation, which seems to be an endless endeavor,[1] but it searches for the underpinnings of the fool figure's complexity and the transformation from Plautus' clever slaves to Shakespeare's clever servants, witty heroines and most of all, the wise fool. To analyze the relations between those instantiations of one type distanced by centuries and their ideologies, an explanatory model for cultural dynamics will be introduced, necessitating examination of the relations between the individual and the collective, to explore perception, experience, the self, imitation, reception, and their embeddedness in the dynamics. To start, the model will respond to the following questions. How can cultural metamorphosis be delineated? In what kind of structural devices or categories can the overwhelming vastness of cultural objects be segmented? What core and transferable 'patterns' can be traced and what kind of motivation secures their transfer?

A metamorphosis suggests not only transformation but also intermingling and overlapping; when an object takes a different form, the process consists of a beginning, the status quo, and its end, the result, and a sequence of intermediate changes. Such a view enables visualization of the metamorphosis as a process with identifiable steps. Every process does not start out of itself but needs motivation as is the case for cultural transformations, whose stimulus is to be explained. Does cultural dynamics have an inner logic or is it chaotic, consisting of accidental creations upon which scientists try to draw a logical and explanatory schema? This dissertation's objective is to put the abundance of cultural output in a certain 'order' that sheds light on the interrelations in the output and the conditions of the transformations.

The theoretical model starts with culture's foundation: life itself. From a macro-perspective, culture depends on nature. The tough nut to crack is to expound the kind of dependence between these two seemingly worn-out terms. The following verses by Jaques in Shakespeare's *As You Like It* help to clarify the relation:

> All the world's a stage,
> and all men and women merely players.
> (*AYL* 2.7.140-141)[2]

---

1 Indeed, the fool in literature and other forms of media has undergone many metamorphoses to make its audience laugh. When we look for figures or types that are associated with foolishness, we will come across different representations, which can also be seen as different interpretations of the type 'the fool' and its foolishness. In fact, foolishness is a dominant feature of various characters. A fool can take different forms, attributes, and derivations; or concerning the abundance of synonyms, which are often offensive in informal language—fool, simpleton, idiot, snapper, and all other forms of address that are used to describe a 'foolish' figure. Semantic differentiation and their etymological history would be sufficient reason for a dissertation.

2 All further citations of this play will be given from William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, Juliet Dusinberre (ed.), London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

These words belong to a character reflecting upon his own existence and ambiguity in life, the life of men and the relationship between theatre and life. In the following lines, Jaques names seven stages of a man's life, whose time spans are given by prototypical roles. But playing roles can not only be interpreted as the different stages of age but as roles people accept in a certain social environment. For instance, a woman behaves one way when playing with her son and another way when managing her subordinates at work. In brief, a person adapts to the situation, its social tone, and behavioural expectations due to age, class, appearance, and other determinant factors. In *De officiis*—following Stoic philosophy and Panaitios' theory— Cicero speaks of four personae that can be generalized and are immanent to every social being.[3] These four relate to the capacity for rational thinking, acting according to moral standards, particular traits of character, the determination of social class, and the social role in regard to how the single person is active in the social conglomerate and takes his own choices to do so.[4] A key term can be found in 'choice' bound to rationality and morality, which allows the human being in his four personae distinction. In theatre, choice appears to be a simulation—if the actor's individual kind of interpretation and methods of improvisation are left aside. Cicero himself transfers the function and structure found on stages entered by the actor as well as the orator to the performing activity and pluralism of roles in life.[5] Setting stage and life in a correlation underlines their shared aspects of playing roles, the existence and awareness of expectations towards the persona's characteristics, and the embedment in a typological space, which life's social structure illustrates, art mirrors and examines, and becomes reflected by all players regardless if they are 'actors' on stage or in real life. The perspective of the *theatrum mundi* invokes questions of choice, free will, control, (pre)determination, and conduct as well as terms of artificiality, orchestration, and spectacle.[6]

Jaques' wise words address a motif Shakespeare did not invent but one that has been popular in theatre almost from the start. It also belongs to Plautus' treatment and display of theatricality inviting the audience to take a meta-perspective.[7] The motif emphasizes the parallel between acting on stage and acting in life. Imitation was already described and even demanded as the most important criterion for theatre by Aristotle: *mimesis* addresses the inseparable link between action on stage and in the world.[8] The concept of theatre stems from the inner working of natural-cultural or socio-cultural environment and imitates the structure of behaviour and action that this environment creates. Theatre is an art form that illustrates

---

3 Cf. Cic. *off*. 1.107ff. For a precise overview, see Christopher Gill, 'Personhood and Personality—The Four- "Personae" Theory in Cicero, *De officiis* I', *OSAP* 6 (1988): 169-199.

4 Cf. Dieter Teichert, *Personen und Identitäten*, Berlin et al.: de Gruyter, 2000, 93-94.

5 Cf. Peter L. Oesterreich, 'Polypersonalität. Das *grand arcanum* starker autoinvenienter Subjektivität', *Wege moderner Rhetorikforschung. Klassische Fundamente und interdisziplinäre Entwicklung*, Gert Ueding and Gregor Kalivoda (eds.), Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2014, 75-88, 77.

6 Note Kathleen Wine, '*Theatrum Mundi*: An Overview', *Theatrum Mundi. Studies in Honor of Ronald W. Tobin*, Claire L. Carlin and Kathleen Wine (eds.), Charlottesville: Rockwood Press, 2003, 6-22. And esp. 6: "*Theatrum mundi* captures the richness of meaning attached to theatre and theatricality […] when the world was conceived as theater, and the theater was both a mirror of the world and a world unto itself."

7 Cf. Thomas Postlewait and Tracy C. Davis, 'Theatricality: An Introduction, *Theatricality*, Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait (eds.), New York et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 1-39, 15-16. For Aristophanes' awareness and use of theatricality, note Martin Revermann, *Comic Business. Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2006.

8 Cf. Aristot. *poet*. 3.1448a19–24. Aristotle's mimesis does not equate with a mirror of physicality but deals with the mechanical links in our cosmos and between its things. Note the earlier discussion of the notion in Plato's *Republic,* esp. Book 3; for instance, see Stephen Halliwell, 'Diegesis – Mimesis', Paragraph 13. *The living Handbook of Narratology*, Hühn, Peter et al. (eds.), Hamburg: Hamburg University Press. URL= https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/36.html (accessed January 05, 2022).

that dependence most clearly. In fact, Jaques' self-reflection stands for this method and processing of the 'natural' world people encounter in cultural phenomena from the beginning of time: imitation.

A model of cultural dynamics

What we perceive as cultural phenomena and products or what we read, watch, listen to and enjoy—forms of art—emerge from certain dynamics between the natural and cultural worlds. Profanely, the cultural system as the sum of cultural activities converts the natural input to cultural output on the level of imitation.[9] For Western European literature, the starting point is Homer's imitation of nature in his epic poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. According to Alexander Pope, he was a founding father and true poet, who will always influence his descendants since Virgil could not imitate nature (alone) but (also) Homer.[10] Commenting on writing *The Name of the Rose*, Umberto Eco finds similar words as he "rediscovered what writers have always known (and have told us again and again): books speak of other books, and every story tells a story that has already been told. Homer knew this, and Ariosto knew this, not to mention Rabelais and Cervantes."[11] This perspective combines both types of imitation, programmatic and deliberate, where there is a consciousness of past and tradition, and an automatic relationship between a natural framework and a cultural system.[12] For now, it suffices to say the sequence of imitation includes the imaging of nature, the influence of the images, resulting in becoming intertwined as binary and inseparable.

A clear division between the natural and cultural worlds is hardly possible as they are interwoven and interdependent. However, to be operable, this thesis taking a theoretical

---

9 The method does not seek to be a 1:1 or exact image of nature or of the secondary image. This would be far from the pulse of culture since culture does not operate as science, which tries - among other things - to image nature in exact formulae.

10 Cf. Alexander Pope and Samuel Johnson, *Poetry & Prose. With Essays by Johnson, Coleridge, Hazlitt*, Henry V. Dyson (ed.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, repr. 1949, 145 (Preface to *The Iliad*, 1715) and comparing Homer as "the greater Genius", to Virgil, "the better Artist" (148); and cf. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, ²1997, esp. 28.

11 Umberto Eco, *Reflections on The Name of the Rose*, transl. by William Weaver, London: Secker & Warburg, 1983, 20.

12 Compare Paul Ricoeur's *Temps et récit* (*Time and Narrative*), Ricoeur's view and distinction of mimesis in a three dimensional approach starting from thinking of poetic composition and Aristotle's theory: $mimesis_1$ along "a prenarrative structure of experience [or] a prenarrative level of understanding" (William C. Dowling, *Ricoeur on Time and Narrative*, Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 2011, 3), $mimesis_2$ as configuration and creation, and $mimesis_3$ following $mimesis_2$ taking in the reader or spectator reaching beyond Wolfgang Iser's theory of the "implied reader" (cf. Dowling [2011], 14 and Wolfgang Iser, _The Act of Reading_. *A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, Baltimore et al.: John Hopkins University Press, 1980). The act of reading implies the actualization of the text. Also note Loretta Dornisch, 'Ricoeur's Theory of Mimesis, Implications for Literature and Theology', *Journal of Literature & Theology* 3.3 (1989): 308-318.

In analogy to this perspective, mimesis happens as the image of reality, the comparison and adaption to existent images, and as the re-impact on the extra-narrative, cultural world or the interaction between reader, text, and to use a notion from Gadamer 'horizons' (cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2013, esp. 313ff.). Bringing Gadamer and Ricoeur together in an enlightening conversation note the interesting collection of essays in *Gadamer and Ricoeur. Critical Horizons for Contemporary Hermeneutics*, Francis J. Mootz III et al. (eds.), London/New York: Continuum, 2011. All these theoretical approaches to hermeneutics are of great general value acknowledged in this thesis; however, the model must also involve the issues of cultural transfer, transformation, and production deviating from a strictly philosophical account on hermeneutics.

approach suggests a model from a macro-perspective on behalf of deciphering this complex natural-cultural net in its interrelations by identifying single abstract units. The advantage of this artificial categorization is evident in the ability to analyse the core dependence and relationship between the natural input, which is given by what we are, and the cultural output, which expresses and grants access to the individual, what we know about ourselves, and how we perceive ourselves in constructing a natural-/socio-cultural system. The model does not suggest strict boundaries between the natural and cultural world but a cosmos promising permeability. Therefore, notions as natural input and cultural output are only instruments to ease understanding of the complex, while the thesis describes the binary but simultaneously overlapping natural-cultural world by explaining the kind of connections, the processes, and reasons for commonly denoted 'anthropological constants' or universals, which find their correspondences in both worlds.

The term 'constant' might be misleading as it does not seem to be bound to time and space, migrating through socio-cultural systems without alteration or development. The mere existence of reoccurring cultural entities can be observed as being freed not from time and space but at least from ideologically determined periods and canons; they certainly vary in appearance, shape, attributes, and features. Metamorphoses alternate between static moments and dynamic processes, wherein a single manifestation in a synchronic environment can be perceived in its static existence, whereas processes of creation, performances, perception, reflections seen in a diachronic context add up to the dynamic affecting the manifestation and throwing it into a swirl of modification and change. In the terminology of this model, anthropological constant in human nature is replaced by the term *natural drive*, while the universals in culture are addressed by the term *identity* that expresses essentiality as well as complexity and exhibits an open concept, which puts forward distinct formations. Essentiality, complexity, and an abstract concept individualized in concrete forms are the criteria to denote one drive, one identity, and their scope of concretization.

Fear, for example, belongs to a group of natural and automatic reactions to a fatal threat, which causes further sequences of behaviour such as taking refuge to survive. Such inherent emotions or instincts are central to the human concept. In its variations of anxiety, panic, terror or horror, that natural drive has been addressed and imaged in genres, forms, and figures such as Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) or horror movies directed by the master of suspense, Alfred Hitchcock. His American noir, *Psycho* (1960), shocked spectators in cinemas with its scandalous shower murder, when the spectator empathically feels Janet Leigh's character's terror as the hazy contours of a tall woman stab her to death.[13] People who read Stevenson's novel or watch Hitchcock's film have access to sources and demonstrations of fear. It does not matter if the specific representation serves the creation of fear, if it is a form of personification, or if the representation reflects on the process of the emotional experience, on its result or the origin of fear. Primarily, it is about the fact that the natural drive is being represented in the complex of the corresponding cultural identity, wherein the intention and choice of representational realisation varies. It depends on the chosen material, the perspective on the concept, and the addressee's access

---

13 Cf. William Rothman, *Hitchcock. The Murderous Gaze*, Cambridge, Mass. et al.: Harvard University Press, 1982, 245-341, esp. 292ff.; on the effectivity of music and moving picture in the shower scene, see Thomas Rösser, *Bilder zum Hören. Die Zusammenarbeit von Alfred Hitchcock mit dem Komponisten Bernard Herrmann*, Hamburg: Kovač, 2013, 262-268; and on Hitchcock's film noir, note Homer B. Pettey, 'Hitchcock, Class, and Noir', *The Cambridge Companion to Alfred Hitchcock*, Jonathan Freedman (ed.), New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2015, 76-91.

to it.[14] Therefore, the period the addressee and the producer of the cultural product live in and the chosen generic framework shape the instantiation of the concept and highlight the different aspects of it. Gothic fiction struck fear into its reader when it found application in the thematic material of myth and the darkness of nature, represented in dystopias, spaces at the margins of life, the reaction of screaming, contortions of the face or by the figural formation of a monster or ghost, a supernatural appearance between death and life. Unlike fear, laughter usually becomes available and is manifested in a utopian environment in comedy, in distorted grinning masks, in colourful garments, symbols of folly, and figures moving in comic spaces freely and self-confidently while acting like the fool.

Throughout ages and across genres, cultural identity gains relevance not out of something indoctrinated or artificial but out of something essential that can only be traced in the human disposition, or the human psyche. It is generally observable and neither individually bound nor personally defined; the content of a cultural identity in a community cannot be separated from the community members' idea of convention. Groups of people, depending on their collective agreement on an ideological and conventional apparatus of thought, and the single individual as the addressee and creator of cultural products are the ones who decide on the formation and evaluation of cultural identities based upon natural drives. Consequently, cultural identities interpret constants in the natural world, here denoted as natural drives, whereby they grant the human being access to a concept about himself or herself. The cultural world operates with input in imaging the ways in which humans differ from non-humans, what makes us unique and most of all, what is inherent to us. By the way of analogy, everything created in the cultural world can be defined as cultural output. To elucidate both worlds' relationship and the involved processes more intensely, it is necessary to clarify the term 'natural drive' and its place in the model.

Natural input can be segmented into concepts that are here called *natural drives* and form the human being essentially. Drives are inborn and abstract. Besides fear, a second example for a drive and its corresponding cultural identity can be *love*. Love is a crucial part of being human. Forms of love come into play when love is perceived, experienced, and produced. By pursuing and performing that drive, the natural world gains instantiations of it, whose experience enriches our knowledge and skills pertaining to this drive. When teenagers discover sexual love, first love, first intercourse, and first breakup, they learn more about the concept *love*. Besides unmediated experience and examples from daily life, there is another access to the concept of love. It is available via its corresponding cultural identity and its pieces like genres which put the concept at their centre as romantic comedies do or which at least portray aspects marginally. Love can also be found in popular standards such as blockbuster movies needing the seemingly obligatory pair of the hero finding his heroine (or vice versa). Natural drives become available via unmediated and mediated forms of contact and experience evolving the natural drive as a distinct part of an addressee's knowledge and memory.

The essentiality of natural drives is displayed in their pervasiveness and in their universality in cultures and in cultural manifestations across forms of art, reflecting on and enriching the concepts' complexity. Natural drives are shaped and presented to us as manifestations or instantiations defining real formations and building the content of the cultural identity as they belong to the empirical world. Love songs, love poetry, love stories,

---

14 Choice cannot be fully determinable; at least parametres are distinct as how and when the individual takes part in the cultural game: s/he is always confronted with only a pre-selected segment.

or generally, pieces of music, literature, and visual art exemplify the diversity of one cultural identity, while they underline the importance and fascination with love; whether it is tragic as in *Antigone*, romantic as in *Sleepless in Seattle* (1993), or comic as *Much Ado about Nothing.* They take part in the depiction and experience of the concept *love*, influencing how men and women see themselves as lovers and what they expect of being in love. Consuming such instantiations affects the idea of love in the natural world. It also has an impact on how cultural products dealing with love are and will be perceived. The natural drive *love* persists as a stimulus and becomes imaged in the (natural-) cultural identity of love. Identity is here assessed as the acknowledgement of individual experience, the differences that lie therein, and processes of construction, reflection, and development on the collective and individual levels and thus to fit the relationship between cultural and natural worlds.

Experiencing manifestations of love in the natural-cultural world implies a certain dynamic since the addressee of the concept's products learns about the concept and alters his or her scope of identity, which also includes evaluation and criticism. There is dislike or fondness, acceptance or rejection, leading up to the paths of imitation. Hence, the sequence of representation, their perception, and their valuing influences the production and the perception of cultural material since in the cultural system the contact with representations triggers metamorphoses concerning an identity based upon a natural drive. What has been exemplified in fear and love is also valid for the natural drive of laughter, the concept of the fool in the natural-cultural world, and the dramatic realisation of the fool figure that can be subsumed under the relevant cultural identity stimulated by the natural drive *laughter*, whose relations occupy the centre of this analysis and hide in the background of the metamorphoses of deliberate fool figures. The type's transformations are mediated forms of the natural drive, which are stimulated and governed by the same oblique processes of perception, learning, evaluation, inclusion into the cultural identity, and the ability to imitate. Producing as well as perceiving transformed material belonging to one identity can happen consciously or unconsciously.

Before explaining the difference between explicit and subliminal streams of impact and the underlying functionality, the introduction will pin down the so far introduced interrelation as well as intertwinement between the natural and cultural world briefly. A person participating in social reality and living in a cultural system gains an identity of his self that underlies scrutiny, affirmation, and alteration. Experience, knowledge, and performance of the macro cultural identities triggered by natural drives seek meaning making. Natural drives build the universal foundation for human beings to evolve cultural identities; the concepts become constituted in the natural and cultural world. Constitutions can overlap in the formation and transformation of natural drives. These dependent units help to understand how an individual, a group, the participants in a cultural system achieve meaning making of nature, reality, and themselves by their creative, symbolic, and mediating treatment.

That search for meaning leads back to the distinction between conscious and unconscious. The change and enrichment of cultural identities with further instantiations pivot on participation in the production process of culture. The system is never static, passive or momentary but dynamic. Scholars aim at identifying operators to shed some light in that system as the produced and productive cultural system follows some basic agenda and motor, which legitimates the terminology and grouping of cultural identities. This motor is the key

method of the cultural system: imitation.[15] However, imitation does not result in cloning reality but exceeds simple reflection as art operates[16]

> as a special sign system which, notwithstanding its historical imprint, transcends any narrow notion of mimesis that would reduce it to a mirror or a simple image of reality. Whatever the medium of artistic expression, be it literary texts, radio plays, theatre, film, body art, or other performances,[17]

each contributes to "culture's sense of reality".[18]

History, philology, anthropology, psychology, and philosophy have approached and classified that mimetic motor of culture. A scholar of reception studies considers imitation a deliberate and programmatic work, examining *inter alia* the foundation and development of national cultures.[19] The constitution of representations in Western Europe is rooted in classical tradition,[20] in which imitation can be identified as an institution self-fashioning cultural communities. Led by an authorial cultural management, a period like the Renaissance can be described as a bundle of national attempts to define themselves on the ruins of Troy; that kind of cultural transfer should serve the deviation, emphasis of excellence in contrast to other nations as well as the emancipation from darker ages, suggesting *aemulatio*.[21] Whereas reception served the construction of exclusiveness among nations, the programmatic cultural exchange did not stop at national boundaries but is liberated from spatial and temporal limits though restricted by access to sources selected for imitation. Creativity does not stop at remodelling one source but swallows every bite of cultural material since a writer can 'contaminate' his primary source with additional models.

An agenda of imitation establishes and confirms a net of source-target relationships, suggesting tradition. Choosing and using one entity as a model invites its past, its archaeological roots, and known idols; such complex standing behind one primary source for imitation divides reception in direct and indirect ways. The direct way appeals to a deliberate choice and the indirect way implies the entity's own tradition. That dual perspective can be differentiated as unconscious or conscious, which creates two groups of receptions: programmatic direct reception plus an indirect conscious kind or programmatic direct

---

15 Cf. Theodor W. Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory*, Gretel Adorno and Rolf Tiedemannn (eds.), London/ New York: Continuum, 2002, 53 in reference to art: "Art is a refuge for mimetic comportment. In art the subject exposes itself, at various levels of autonomy, to its other, separated from it and yet not altogether separated. Art's disavowal of magical practices -its antecedents-implies participation in rationality. That art, something mimetic, is possible in the midst of rationality, and that it employs its means, is a response to the faulty irrationality of the rational world as an overadministered world." Furthermore on the role of imitation, see 112ff.

16 The method does not seek to be a 1:1 or exact image of nature or of the secondary image. This would be far from the pulse of culture since culture does not operate as science, which tries - among other things - to image nature in exact formulae. See former reference to Aristotle and Ricœur.

17 Stefan Horlacher, 'A Short Introduction to Theories of Humour, the Comic, and Laughter', *Gender and Laughter - Comic Affirmation and Subversion in Traditional and Modern Media*, Gaby Pailer, Andreas Böhn, Stefan Horlacher, and Ulrich Scheck (eds.), Amsterdam et al.: Rodopi, 2009, 17-47, 18.

18 Jill L. Matus, *Unstable Bodies. Victorian Representations of Sexuality and Maternity*, Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1995, 5.

19 For instance, see the typological and theoretical approach on imitation in literature in David West and Tony Woodman's *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*.

20 Not to disregard or diminish the 'Oriental' impact on Europe, on cultural contacts in the Middle Ages, cf. Thomas Ertl and Michael Limberger (eds.), *Die Welt 1250–1500,* Vienna: Mandelbaum, 2009.

21 Esp. cf. Lorna Hardwick (ed.), *Reception Studies*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2003, 25-26. Beyond reception in antiquity, Lorna Hardwick discusses reception studies systematically in a broader context, also involving the medium film.

reception plus an indirect unconscious kind. The latter underlines the use of one primary source without the knowledge of or concern with its past.

The programmatic method provides one stream of influence or can be seen as starting one that a scholar can scrutinize to understand the metamorphoses of a cultural identity.[22] Analysing its activity within and among cultural systems discloses the educational, political, and scientific management of culture in addition to the organization of knowledge: the English canon will not deny Shakespeare; school curricula in Germany are inconceivable without Goethe, Mann, and Frisch; periodization displays clear transitions and relations between periods, giving students of philology, history, and the sciences ideas about an artificially cut-out of time containing one cultural system.[23] The necessity to talk about ideological peaks in history cannot be denied but it could prevent taking the perspective on the constitution of representation in binary terms: not only by *imitatio* in its direct and indirect forms but also by the hidden sub-stream of the unconscious. The latter displays another channel for cultural transfer moving on a non-authorial and mostly opaque sublevel with a certain degree of 'implicitness'.

An episode of the animated series *The Simpsons* exemplifies the open and hidden forms of imitation, while showing an awareness of cultural transfer on both levels.[24] The episode 'The Daughter also Rises' (season 23, episode 13) evokes remembrance of the myth of Pyramus and Thisbe, addressed and narrated by different instruments.[25] Homer's middle child, Lisa, falls in love with a boy named Nick and experiences single aspects of the myth though without its tragic ending. She communicates with him through a crack in the partition between two booths when they meet in a restaurant. Marge, Lisa's mother, does not want Lisa to see Nick too often, seeming to worry about her daughter's crush, when she is really jealous that Nick spends more time with her daughter than she does.

When Lisa seeks comfort and advice from her grandfather Abe, the story Lisa tells him reminds the old man of Pyramus and Thisbe, whose myth he then starts retelling very roughly and euphemistically without the drastic, tragic sequence of suicides committed by the lovers, while Lisa imagines Nick as Pyramus and herself as Thisbe. In Abe's bowdlerised version, after the allegorical metamorphoses of the two lovers in a red mulberry tree symbolizing their

---

22 When reception studies are mainly concentrating on culturally 'valuable' pieces of art following canonization, the scholars tend to exclude popular pieces and modern media like film and series from their cultural sketch, which signifies a weak spot in adumbrating e.g. the 21st century's transforming activities.

23 For a significant theory of the 20th century on cultural production involving terms of intertextuality or canonicity note Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*, Randal Johnson (ed.), New York et al.: Columbia University Press, 1993; and on periodization and canonization especially concerning performance research, see Pantelis Michelakis, 'Performance Reception: Canonization and Periodization', *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray (eds.), Malden et al.: Blackwell, 2011, 219-227.

24 *The Simpsons* contrasts with the other two chosen sources of dramatic texts concerning genre as well as the provided source of material. The series situated in the world of postmodern media cannot be captured easily in their generic nature. The sitcom oscillates between qualities of a cartoon and a realistic depiction (cf. Jason Mittell, *Genre and Television. From Cop Shows to Cartoons in American Culture*, New York/London: Routledge, 2004, 194). In regard to this thesis' categorization, *The Simpsons* belong to the cultural identity of laughter as a comic drawn series depicting and satirizing the life style and stereotypes of the average American. On the series as a parody, cf. Jonathan Gray, *Watching with The Simpsons. Television, Parody, and Intertextuality*, New York/London: Routledge, 2006, esp. 42-43.

25 The episode (no. 499, season 23, episode 13, first aired on February 12th, 2012 by Fox [USA]) provides a comic version of the tragic myth told by Lisa's grandfather as the narrator as it will be outlined. Other parodied material stems from *A little Romance*, a romantic comedy movie from 1979, and involves stereotypical traits of character of Ernest Hemingway and his literary career.

internal love, the story's end is imaged by a closing book '*Disney's Pyramus and Thisbe*'. Bringing up Disney turns the tale into a joke and parodies the company's practices of imitation. This fits Abe's carelessness with details of the sources and about closeness to the original. For instance, he skips naming the first literary presentation of the myth in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and leaves out much of the Ovidian storyline.[26] The episode uses direct imitation to its own ends, while expanding the narrative of the myth by reflecting its use and reception in the industry, which is done by the mocking title '*Disney's Pyramus and Thisbe*'. After her grandfather's 'lesson', Lisa, perhaps inspired, asks to be taken on a foolish romantic mission, meaning that un-revealed allusions to the Ovidian story change into the striking depiction of Lisa as Thisbe. Still, there is more to that episode than disclosed reception and the use of parody.[27] The discourse alludes to famous incidents and transformations of the myth in history since the road signs Abe, Lisa, and Nick follow on their mission read "Mulberry Island" and "Star-Crossed Lovers"; the secondly-mentioned alludes to *Romeo and Juliet*'s prologue, outlining the fate of "a pair of star-crossed lovers".[28]

A second address to reception is done by a minor character, another resident of Abe's retirement community, making a succinct comment on Lisa's experience and the mythological background of the episode, when he responds to Abe's naming of Pyramus and Thisbe, "which inspired *Romeo and Juliet*, which inspired *West Side Story*, which inspired […]".[29] Abe's starting point of disillusion and reflecting on the episode's source persist in the figure's reference to the myth's afterlife. It is partly a way of teaching Lisa and the young audience about the episode's plot and placing the episode's previous narrative within its literary-historic scope. The wise commentator lists famous versions of the recurring storyline when two lovers cannot escape their environment and face a tragic ending. He speaks of a cultural tradition of that scenario and the motif of two young star-crossed lovers, which can be found throughout history.[30] The 20th century musical *West Side Story* is not based directly on the myth of Pyramus and Thisbe but continues its essence via Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*.[31] The minor character's hypotactic, asyndetic sequence depicts the continuation of the tragic motif like a well-known section of its history.

Imitation (or here inspiration) lays the foundation for the integration of the aesthetic effective entity of "a pair of star-crossed lovers" standing for a type that is firmly placed into the aesthetic consciousness of the collective in the Western cultural system, not ceasing in its

---

26 Cf. Ov. *met*. 4.55-166.

27 Not only does parody apply to the depiction of Disney's practices but also to the myth's retelling and portrayal of the lovers. Lisa finally decides not to kiss Nick since kissing under a mulberry tree equates committing yourself "to love someone for the rest of your life". The episode is based on the myth of Pyramus and Thisbe as a model. *The Simpsons*, a popular series watched by adults and children, offers a modern and more pragmatic perspective on the practicability of eternal love among teenagers and in life in that episode.

28 Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, prologue, 6. Citation given from William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, René Weis (ed.), London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2012.

29 There is no reference to Shakespeare's use in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (esp. in 5.1).

30 On its employment in comedy and in Shakespeare, cf. Franz von Mühlenfels-Schmitt, *Pyramus und Thisbe. Rezeptionstypen eines Ovidischen Stoffes in Literatur, Kunst und Musik*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1972, 125ff.; and on the motif's verbal presence, Rudolf Hüls, *Pyramus und Thisbe. Inszenierung einer 'verschleierten Gefahr'*, Heidelberg: Winter, 2005, esp. 127ff. And note Theresia Lehner, 'Liebe mit und ohne Aussicht: Pyramus und Thisbe', *Ovid-Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, Melanie Möller (ed.), Berlin: J.B. Metzler, 2021, 447-449.

31 Cf. Marc Bauch, *The American Musical*, Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 2003, 75-77 and 100ff.; on Shakespeare's sources of *Romeo and Juliet*, cf. Geoffrey Bullough, *Early Comedies. Poems, Romeo and Juliet*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957, 269ff.; and on the connection between *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* through Pyramus and Thisbe, a tragic and a comic metamorphosis of the myth, cf. William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, René Weis (ed.), London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2012, 41-43.

productivity. That perspective does not merely focus on the detection of the original, the primary source, but the persistent realisation of one established type. Simply put, the comment can be read as a sequence of programmatic reception, but it also indicates that the single instantiations are bound together because of the underlying concept and their aesthetic effectiveness though they appear at a distance.

Several instances in that episode of *The Simpsons* create and vitalize the productive entity with all its single items by accessing the diachronic sequence through the media of popular culture, the techniques of animation, and via the method of pastiche. In the framework of the sitcom, the series uses the catalogue of self-reflection, self-awareness, disillusion, and ambivalence—already productive in Old Comedy and now imbued with a postmodern spirit.[32] The parodic path of the episode to the entity appears as an instrument to visualize what culturally diverse essence lies beneath the pair of two star-crossed lovers conquered by love. In Jason Mittell's words and along with Linda Hutcheon's *Theory of Parody*, parody is "a 'pragmatic' component of texts in their cultural encoding and decoding".[33] The example given here sheds light on the cultural dynamics beyond programmatic imitation, unfolded in the binary influence of the conscious and the unconscious as well as the persistence of explicit and non-explicit forms of an aesthetic effective entity or cultural elements.

While explicit elements—an available, directly consumable form—can be offered in a text, a play, a movie, its opposite can be consumed only in a secondary position since it hides beneath the concrete, sticks to the semantic level, and belongs to the abstract sphere of knowledge and to a collective cultural storage. If, for instance, Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* serves as the basis of a movie these days, the movie's heritage also includes Plautus' repertoire of *Amphitruo* and *Menaechmi*, although today's audience will probably not recognize. Even the director does not need to be an expert in Shakespeare and his use of antiquity to adapt the Elizabethan playwright's work to their time and needs, which makes it possible and probable that Plautus' influence remains unrevealed, unrecognized, and imitated unconsciously. Sources or cultural streams of influence staying on a non-explicit level also occur in tracing the effects of folklore, oral, non-written elements and ephemeral moments of cultural performance. European comedy in the 16th and 17th century cannot be thought of without the cross-overs of *imitatio* using Plautus and Terence, impulses from improvisatory stages found in *commedia dell'arte*, and carnivalesque experiences from the marketplace, backyards, taverns, and other occasions that can offer skits and antics.[34] Subtle forms of imitation can thus be differentiated in opaque elements as well as in ephemeral material that occurs as unstable, unconventional manifestations outside of the canon but participating in social interactions in everyday routines and rituals. In other words, the consumption of explicit and non-explicit elements nourishes the aesthetic consciousness.

Indirect and direct, programmatic and unconscious imitation displays the two major streams in that model of cultural dynamics. They negotiate cultural identities and their contents between cultural systems by transferring concepts, motives, devices, and other constituents. Such a negotiation can be exemplified in the history of romantic comedy belonging to the cultural identity of love that can be ascribed a sequence of imitation from

---

32 Cf. Jason Mittell, 'Cartoon Realism: Genre Mixing and the Cultural Life of *The Simpsons*', *The Velvet Light Trap* 47 (2001): 15-28, esp. 16-17 and 24-25.
33 Mittell (2004), 191 and cf. Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody. The Teachings of 20th-Century Art Forms*. New York/London: Routledge, 1985, esp. 34-37 (encoding as the act of production as well as agency also in relation to intention and decoding as the act of recognition and interpretation), also note 53-55 and 84ff.
34 Cf. Wilhelm Süss, *Lachen, Komik und Witz in der Antike*, Zürich/Stuttgart: Artemis, 1969, 19.

antiquity's roots to movies and series until today, which are "reworking the ancient New Comedy formula: a quest for love (usually in the boy-meets/loses/finds-girl sequence), a coherent social setting, […], an action propelled […] by coincidences and misunderstandings"[35]. Folly in love is complemented by the pairing of love and lust since "*Eros* has always driven comic plots and comic characters, as is evident from the phalluses prominently displayed in the early mimes […] and in Greek Old Comedy".[36]

Approaching the dramatic texts, getting access to those underpinnings, and being able to determine such persistent formula first involves the 'revelation' of meaning, a hermeneutic treatment that operates for the decipherment of the form 'text' into a "cultivation of meaning".[37] Reading the dramatic texts evokes the scope of related texts and their reference to reality, life practices, and experiences of the individual.[38] The sequence of letters, the text, becomes an available object activated by consumption and its interrelations between form and content for the reader, poet, artist, and all involving personae in cultural dynamics. In terms of reception, not the single peaks of programmatic imitation are addressed and focused upon but it is about the continuation of an amorphous conglomerate that is here coined the aesthetic consciousness, a notion that was used above and is now in need of definition. The notion is not identical to Hans-Georg Gadamer's; however, its application does not oppose his claim that art and world cannot be separated in aesthetic terms.[39] Considerations about the autonomy of art or understanding of art are not of interest here but the key debate seeks to dismantle the productive and producing channels of culture involving the conscious and the unconscious, the direct and the indirect, and the individual and the collective. With a different focus from Theodor Adorno and Gadamer but with the awareness of their application of the term,[40] aesthetic consciousness is here used to describe an abstract sphere that is not discursive, cannot be grasped but sketches culture as a sum of all experiences, aesthetic stimuli, and its responses, which are transformed to available instantiations in an organized, typologically identifiable cultural system. It is not assumed that the aesthetic consciousness behaves reflexively towards itself and limited within itself; nor does it move in an ahistorical manner as if it is freed from space and time as its artificial existence as a cognitive category is bound to minds perceiving, thinking, valuing, learning, exchanging.[41] Thus, the aesthetic consciousness is nourished through the continuing sequence of encounters with cultural forms. In reality, cultural manifestations receive attention and classification by being assessed as stereotypes or categories such as beautiful, ugly, funny, and the like. Those moments happen on the individual and micro levels adding up to a collective that identifies categories, influences

---

35 Michael Stephen Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow, *The Classical Tradition. Art, Literature, Thought.* Chichester et al.: Wiley, 2014, 132.

36 Robert Miola, 'Comedy and the Comic', *The Classical Tradition*, Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and Salvatore Settis (eds.), Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010, 217-225, 224.

37 Jan Assmann and John Czaplicka, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125-133, 131, ft. 22.

38 Cf. Hans Robert Jauß, 'Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft', *Rezeptionsästhetik*, Rainer Warning (ed.), München: Fink, ²1979, 126–162, 130-31.

39 For a concise and critical overview of Gadamer's aesthetics and his *Truth and Method*, cf. Jean Grondin, 'Gadamer and the Truth of Art', *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics,* Vol. II, Michael Kelly (ed.), New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 1998, 267-271, esp. 269. In addition, the thesis does not deny Gadamer's view that "the experience of art is at its root an experience of truth" (269), which aspect is more relevant for the later discussion of aesthetic experience.

40 Compare to Adorno's understanding of art and its self-consciousness in his *Aesthetic Theory*, see Adorno (2002), esp. 6ff., 25, 53, 128ff., 241ff., 328ff.

41 Cf. *Ibid.*, 65 and 182-3.

expectations, and makes choices of what to read, write, watch, perform—which should not be anticipated as an automatically unquestioned idol but as a potential anti-model.

With such nourishment, impact, and re-influence, the aesthetic consciousness alters steadily and remains flexible in (re)assessing established aesthetic categories as well as concepts of and within cultural identities in the non-stop production and experience of one cultural system and their interrelations. Programmatic imitation cannot be totally separated from the aesthetic consciousness but stands in connection to that abstract sphere as a productive method engaging in a systematic shaping of what contains aesthetic categories.[42] Indeed, the amorphous conglomerate reaches far beyond conscious, deliberate reception but brings with it the formation, change, and transfer processes over time and space, wherein aesthetically effective entities can prevail. The abstract sphere is cultivated by every contact and engagement with cultural objects triggering cognitive processing, evaluation, and aesthetic judgement. The net of cultural systems and their aesthetic consciousness show a world of similarities and differences, creating overlapping spaces governed by conscious and unconscious impulses. In more general terms, the sphere grows by manifestations led by these impulses, while the abstract sphere filled with concepts reflects and becomes reflected in that metamorphosing world. The abstract and concrete levels of how we see the world and ourselves, how we make reality and our existence describable and accessible depend on the inseparable, mutually influential natural-cultural universe, wherein single systems can be determined though intersected and in steady movement as they keep up processes of exchange and transfer.

In Umberto Eco's eloquent words and by the allegorical use of the library as a labyrinth for cultural dynamics:[43]

> Until then I had thought each book spoke of the things, human or divine, that lie outside books. Now I realized that not infrequently books speak of books: it is as if they spoke among themselves. In the light of this reflection, the library seemed all the more disturbing to me. It was then the place of a long, centuries-old murmuring, an imperceptible dialogue between one parchment and another, a living thing, a receptacle of powers not to be ruled by a human mind, a treasure of secrets emanated by many minds, surviving the death of those who had produced them or had been their conveyors.[44]

In accordance with the Barthesian inter-text,[45] the imperceptible dialogue here expressed in a spatial form of knowledge and selection of the literary mass, the library, persists between cultural manifestations, between cultural systems, between past and present, between our

---

42 'Systematic' can be understood as referring to ideological streams as well as models of thinking prevailing in periods and their cultural universe.

43 Thinking a library as a labyrinth or a library as the spatial instantiation of the universe is nothing new but already used for example by Jorge Luis Borges in 'The Library of Babel' to be found in *Labyrinths*. Jorge Luis Borges, *Labyrinths. Selected Stories and other Writings*, Donald A. Yates and James E. Irby (eds.), New York: New Directions, 1964, 51: "The universe (which others call the Library) is composed of an indefinite and perhaps infinite number of hexagonal galleries"; and note Roland Barthes' seminar 'La métaphore du labyrinth: recherches interdisciplinaires' in *La préparation du roman. Cours au Collège de France 1978-1979 et 1979-1980*, Paris: Seuil, 2003.

44 Umberto Eco, *The Name of the Rose*, transl. by William Weaver, London: Vintage, 2005, 286.

45 Cf. Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris, 1973), transl. by Richard Miller, *The Pleasure of the Text*, New York: Hill and Wang, 1975, 35-6.

The abstract sphere of all circulating material in the con-text can be seen as another operable realm set aside to the abstract term of aesthetic consciousness, certainly more helpful regarding literary studies.

states of mind, our imagination and reality, and simply to use grand notions, world and mind, culture and nature.

Imitation and anagnorisis

One main motor within that dialogue has been identified in imitation, a crucial ability for the curious human being as already Aristotle defined imitation as our in-born method to learn,[46] while it participates in the creation of identity: a baby learns the mother tongue by recognizing and repeating phonological patterns heard from the parents. A child, adolescent, and adult never stops to define him- or herself against someone else's behaviour.[47] Imitation provides a method to experience and re-experience of what human beings are, can do, and imagine, which makes the natural-cultural cosmos and all that happens in there available. From a general perspective, imitation in all its applications can be seen as a technique that contributes to the formation of culture and its process of meaning making. There are two processes of interest here: 1) the object or pattern chosen for imitation, *imitandum*, grounds in the perception of the material as 'other' and 2) the entity produced by imitation, *imitans*, deals with and represents the 'other' the addressee can perceive. In both ways, the perception of the other entails the distinction of the self to the other and therefore, prepares the reflection of the self. From there, each reflection of the self initiates a process of constituting the subject.[48] That first step, reflecting the self, means *anagnorisis* on an unconscious level, and exactly this *anagnorisis* provides not only the basis for the constitution of the subject but secondly, for (trans)formations of individual and social forms as well as the realisation of these forms on the level of pragma involving consumption, interaction, creation, and participation.[49]

    Anagnorisis results from the automatic processes of imitation and reflection, which must be valued as utilitarian for breaking up something concealed but existent[50]: the perception of the self, 'learning' about and (trans)forming individual and collective forms, whereby it provides the construction of identity. This identity stands between two dialectic poles. On the one hand, the individual is distinct in its identity towards another being and seen as separate from 'others'. Simultaneously, the individual is embedded in its social and cultural environment. Such integration marks identity as complex and distinguishable as a participant

---

46 Aristot. *poet*. 1448b 4-24; imitation must not be considered to be always positive but it can also be realized in a negative form, respectively when an object is imitated deliberately by the means of *enstrangement* or alienation. Many variables are active in the process of imitation, which must be identified to state the kind and direction of imitation.

47 Imitation as a method to learn at a cross-section of disciplines, note Jean Piaget's famous book *La formation du symbole chez l'enfant : imitation, jeu et rêve, image et representation* or Bryan Warnick's philosophical inquiry into learning *Imitation and Education* or the two volumes *Perspectives on Imitation: From Neuroscience to Social Science* edited by Susan Hurley.

48 The constitution of the subject is inevitably linked to the establishment of a subjective perspective, relating to the subjectivity of culture. On the self and traditions of its theoretical accounts, cf. Hannelore Bublitz et al., 'Einleitung', *Automatismen – Selbst-Technologien*, Hannelore Bublitz et al. (eds.), München: Wilhelm Fink, 2013, 9-16, 10ff.; and note the discussions of different cultural theories involving the constitution of the subject, cultural intervention in identity, cf. the collection *Kulturtheorien im Dialog. Neue Positionen zum Verhältnis von Text und Kontext*, Oliver Scheiding, Frank Obenland, and Clemens Spahr (eds.), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011, esp. 81-82 and 212-213.

49 Compare to the conscious form of *anagnorisis* as "a change from ignorance to knowledge". Fyfe's translation (1973), Aristot. *poet.* 1452a.

50 Cf. Marina Warner, 'Mirror-Readings: An Afterword', *Recognition. The Poetics of Narrative*, Philip F. Kennedy and Marilyn Lawrence (eds.), New York et al.: Peter Lang, 2009, 227-234, 227.

in a social system as a group member.[51] Both—distinction and integration—support the subject in its identity 'parts' or more respectively, roles as a worker, a parent, a friend, a jazz fan, etc. Hence, the forms of the self stand at the centre of these dynamics, which are neither totally governed nor controlled by rational capacity, but they are embedded in the interplay between subject and society and between the automatic processes of constituting individual and collective forms.[52] Basis for the formation can be seen in the method of imitation when the actual process of imitation and the availability of the *imitans* for perception both offer the reflection of the self and as such the constitution of the self and subject.

These automatic processes are relevant in the origin and production of all larger systems of which human beings are part. It is claimed that a cultural system's persistent and universal stimulus is to be found in the urge for *anagnorisis* and all its belonging consequences. The cultural scope contains not a mere static summary of images but expands a massive projection space influenced and influencing, regulating and regulated.[53] In other words, culture can be understood as the sum of trials to realize the concepts of natural drives, whose processes can be found in production, performance, transfer, and experience, wherein the concepts and their manifestations maintain a mutual (re)production in something socially and individually available. On a microcosmic level, the individual is a participant and as such situated in the sequence or simultaneous procedure of all these processes, sometimes actively as a producer or performer, when s/he acts in a play, sometimes passively as a reader, listener or spectator, when s/he is an addressee, and sometimes even as a medium, when s/he writes about his or her experience in a blog or as an authority, when s/he publishes his or her findings in a journal. All these activities can be traced back to *anagnorisis* at a subconscious level, while involved in the constitution of the self.

The recognition of the self can be understood as the result of unconscious cognitive processes taking place in the perception of cultural material. Freud's term of identification is a mechanism used to satisfy the spectator's desires since he "wants to be a hero, if only for a limited time, and playwright and actors make it possible for him through *identification* with a hero."[54] The first step in replacing oneself with a persona and indulging in that role's emotional scope is the perception of oneself apart from the 'other' and the recognition of oneself as existing, acting, performing, feeling, socially interacting, which makes it suitable to take the

---

51 On a concrete level, integration, for instance, means adapting the constitution of the subject to the social group's rights and obligations. Consequently, the individual is accepted in this social system.

52 For scrutinizing automatisms, cf. Bublitz et al. (2013), 9-12; on the subject as the Foucauldian product of dominant discourses and on the paradox found in materialized arrangements of automatisms since they bear the dialectic between longing for control and longing to lose control, see Anil K. Jain, 'Die Dialektik des Automatismus-Deflexion oder das Andere der Reflexion', *Automatismen - Selbst-Technologien*, Hannelore Bublitz et al. (eds.), München: Wilhelm Fink, 2013, 181-191, esp. 181-2. The description of cultural systems, canonization, and similar representations of control oppose instincts, following stimuli, and similar forms of losing control situated in the realms of indirect imitation and unconscious processes.

53 Cf. Jain (2013), 187. The mass of representations—for Jain, the image of reflected reality—is not static or one-dimensional, but relative, contingent, dynamic and complex.

54 Dolf Zillmann, 'The Psychology of the Appeal of Portrayals of Violence', *Why we watch. The Attractions of Violent Entertainment*, Jeffrey Goldstein (ed.), New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 1998, 179-211, 190. Dolf Zillmann emphasizes the process of identification as the entrance into the heroes' emotional lives (cf. 190). In the original, it says that "[d]er Zuschauer […] will fühlen, wirken, alles so gestalten, wie er möchte, kurzum Held sein, und die Dichter-Schauspieler ermöglichen ihm das, indem sie ihm die *Identifizierung* mit einem Helden gestatten." Sigmund Freud, 'Psychopathische Personen auf der Bühne', *Sigmund Freud: Gesammelte Werke. Nachtragsband: Texte aus den Jahren 1885 bis 1938*, Angela Richards (ed.), Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer, 1987, 655-661, 657. This longing can be seen as a stimulus for cultural experience, in particular of heroic stories, but it does not address all forms of empathic responses like the spectator's reaction to the 'evil' persona.

place of this *other* existing, acting, performing, feeling, and socially interacting persona. Consequently, cultural experience discloses occasions for identification, categorization, orientation in the social group and among groups beyond the fundamental *anagnorisis*. The recognition of the self, which is not declared but an immanent result while and after the processing of the cultural material, offers the chance for construction of cultural identity. *Anagnorisis* is an umbrella term for recognition entailing all pieces of information given by imaging natural drives. The self becomes available in images of love, hate, laughter, and other essential drives defining the core of what is human or assumed to be human. In short, cultural experience offers self-revelation and initiates changes from ignorance to knowledge, rethinking of the self and the former knowledge, and defining the self in contrast to the other.[55] Up to this point, the notions imitation, *anagnorisis*, and identity have been crystallized in their relation and relevance for the natural-cultural cosmos and its processes. The production and the productivity of cultural material will now be elucidated by looking at cultural experience and dissecting its components as automatisms.[56]

Inside cultural identity: schemas and aesthetic effective entities

The model is now in need of a more differentiated structure and of the terminology to place the object of interest, the fool, at the centre of the analysis, wherefore the previously introduced cultural identities must be subcategorised with regard to their correspondence, reflection, and satisfaction of natural drives. The natural drive the fool relates to is laughter, which becomes available in the cultural identity filled with images of the laughable. Here, one form is of special interest and that is the text of a comedy play taking in all its possible performances. On an abstract level, the cultural identity consists of all schemas linked to it, which interpret the concept of the natural drive and serve the basis for manifestation like comedy as a dramatic realisation of the laughable does. The schemas are structurally definable pieces, which long to fulfil the need of the cultural identity as comedy, satirical novel, cartoon, or iambic exemplify. Some but not all such schemas can be compared to the category of genre, which tries to define and concretize the structural components and their sequence; the schema of comedy as a foundation for the later analysis will be discussed in the following chapter.

Again, categorization should not be taken as an absolute since schemas can also belong to at least one other cultural identity. They can be varied, mixed with other schemas, and made fruitful for another cultural identity. Intersections are addressed in Plautus' *tragicomoedia* or comedic myth-travesty *Amphitruo* mixing the schematic element of tragedy with the discourse of comedy. It is those schemas that drive literary critics to heated discussions and 'telling names' as 'problem plays' in case of Shakespeare's later dramatic oeuvres like *Troilus and Cressida* perhaps as a travesty of Greek ideals. These examples give a clue to the quality of proximity as well as complexity of cultural identities, the difficulty for classification arising from it, and the chance for exchange and combination between cultural identities.

---

55 The urge to 'know thyself' implies the demarcation of the individual and the collective from each other as well as from other cultural groups: principles of comparison and demarcation as *aemulatio* reiterate.
56 Cf. Bublitz et al. (2013), 9. In analogy with Bublitz et al., automatisms are processes that are not controlled consciously but have a structuring and constructive effect.

The classification in categories to be operable and the same procedure of classification follows a human predilection to build and think in units, which show order, essential when it comes to the compulsion to understand. Before classification can happen, the individual starts to perceive, which becomes the attempt to (re)cognize what is in front of him or her. The cognition and classification of the other allows the individual to define him- or herself on the reflection of the other, which involves a chain of recognition processes. Concerning the macro-level, the ordering of natural drives is reflected in the cultural identities, allowing recognition, comparison, understanding, analysis. The term 'identity' is not meant to mislead but the terminology should show the interrelations between cultural and collective/individual forms. The initiation of reflection or the sum of cultural identities in addition to their instantiations take part in the construction of collective and individual identities, which influence the concretization and rethinking of cultural identities, their underlying schemas and concepts of natural drives. How can this structural approach support the investigation of the metamorphosis of a figure? The response must be sought not in thinking of single variations but in detecting the figure as another operable unit in the cultural identity subsumed under certain schemas.

Within cultural identity, not only can genres be seen as content, making identity more concrete and giving it shape, but so can decisive elements, which support the framework of one schema in its cohesive structure and beyond, appear as a configuration of a natural drive or image of the natural drive in a core way. What would the epic poem be without the hero? What would the romantic comedy be without the happy ending?[57] Both would lose their decisive structure and their inner aesthetic coherence without these aesthetic effective entities set on the abstract level.

Being effective relates to the functional quality the entity possesses in and for the genre. For instance, romantic comedies usually revolve around love and the accompanying struggles of a young couple. From the abstract to the concrete, the natural drive of love is obtainable in the aesthetic effective entity: the loving couple. It can be seen as a central element that varies with the (generic) interpretations of love as it is the case for Renaissance's love elegy by Petrarch, Shakespeare's romantic comedy *As You Like It* or Jane Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice.* The effectiveness and central position of the entity pivots on how supportive and dominant it acts within and for the schema it is applied to—it does not matter what perspective on love is taken. Petrarch depicts love as an unfulfilled longing trapped in unreachability and with no happy outcome, whereas the audience can expect a harmonious marriage by watching Hollywood's romantic movies like *Teacher's Pet* (1958).[58]

The entity shows a second quality: being aesthetic. Body and mind respond to some formula while it does not matter whether the perceived object is considered beautiful, funny, ugly, and the like. When a person responds to this formula, it happens by some physical, emotional and cognitive (re)action**,** an aesthetic experience concretizing the cultural

---

57 Russian Formalists speak of dominant and recessive elements in a text, of which dominance can be seen parallel to productive patterns. Dominance can be understood here as the ability to mainly govern the perception of the recipient. But the quality of recessive and dominant is not inherent to the element but interchangeable. "[T]he Russian formalist idea that the dominant and the recessive elements of any literary text are always present at any time but change places with each other in successive texts." Paul H. Fry, *The Theory of Literature*, New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2012, 183.

58 Of course, the unhappy and unsatisfied lover could be defined as an aesthetic effective entity on its own or as a subcategory and variation of the lover—that depends on the kind of perspective and degree of classification.

experience.[59] This overlap in terminology must be handled carefully; it underlines the relation between the quality of an object and its effect during and after the process of perception. Simply put, the cognitive processing of the aesthetic effective entity is inseparable from the aesthetic experience. To investigate the functionality of the aesthetic effective entity, the researcher must examine the relationship between the object and the spectator, the reader, or the listener beyond *anagnorisis* and the constitution of the subject. The working processes that happen during perception must be considered first since these connected processes grant access to why and how the entity realizes its aesthetic effectiveness, which takes place when the reader reads or the spectator watches. While the latter absorbs the theatrical performance, s/he perceives a machinery of interactive elements: actors, their personae, their words, props, setting, and other devices. To follow the spectacle in front of him/her, s/he automatically engages in cognitive processing that results in a meaningful combination of these elements.

To discuss these processes, Belke and Leder have presented a model of aesthetic experience from a cognitive-psychological standpoint.[60] It is concerned with the interaction between an art object and its recipient, which can mean looking at a painting in a museum.[61] Their approach can be applied more broadly in regard to the consumption of any 'art' object out of a cognitive-psychological perspective under the condition that the model is not sufficient to explain every cognitive-psychological process going on during consumption. First, the perceiver gains the input from the object. This input is automatically 'ordered', analysed, dissected in its components, differentiated in categories, when compared to categories already in store; memory relies on the sum of previous experiences. Recognition can then take place. In a next step, the recipient can define and describe the object explicitly relying on "declarative knowledge", personal taste, and the application of learned and developed analysis competence, which depends on the individual and his or her educational background. That stage can go hand in hand with a cognitive mastering or interpretation. Finally, this series of stages ideally results in the state of comprehension and satisfaction, which both support and end in the binary aesthetic experience, "the aesthetic judgement" as "the evaluation of the cognitive mastering stage" and "the aesthetic emotion as a by-product of the processing stages of the model."[62] The aesthetic judgement decides whether the recipient likes the object in front of him or the temporary selection of the object, like a scene in a play. The successful cognitive performance is rewarded by aesthetic emotion since the moment of comprehension entails satisfaction.[63]

The consumption consists of stages that regress, meaning that the process can revert to a pre-stage and construct feedback channels. In all stages, the affective evaluation continues, finally ending in the evaluation phase, which can be enriched by another intended outcome (besides the by-product): a specific affective reaction to the object like laughing at a

---

59 Cf. Gustav Theodor Fechner, *Vorschule der Aesthetik, 2 Bände*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1876, 33. The sensational perception cannot be thought without the physical and physiological relations (*Verhältnissen*).

60 Cf. Benno Belke and Helmut Leder, '*Annahmen eines Modells der ästhetischen Erfahrung aus kognitionspsychologischer Perspektive*', *Ästhetische Erfahrung: Gegenstände, Konzepte, Geschichtlichkeit*, Sonderforschungsbereich 626 (ed.), Berlin 2006.

61 The term 'recipient' used in psychology replaces addressee, spectator, viewer, listener, and reader.

62 Belke and Leder (2006), Abstract 4, esp. 3-4; and note Helmut Leder, Benno Belke, Andries Oeberst, and Dorothee Augustin, 'A model of aesthetic appreciation and aesthetic judgements', *British Journal of Psychology* 95.4 (2004): 489-508, 492.

63 The question comes up if such emotional reward can be seen as connected to the bottom of unconscious operations regarding *anagnorisis* if satisfaction is not dominated by negative affective reactions triggered by the quality of the perceived object.

joke. This reaction is included in the aesthetic experience and added to Belke and Leder's aesthetic emotion as by-product. Consequently, the full scope of cultural experience involves working processes on the cognitive-psychological level going beyond mere perception and comprehension but counting aesthetic experience in, which must be regarded affectively binary. Describing a perceiver's capacity of emotional response needs the differentiation between the aesthetic emotion as by-product, which is a supportive and self-enhancing part of the processing,[64] and the intended or unintended affective reaction as an outcome of cognitive and affective evaluation. Whereas the aesthetic emotion can be denoted as an underpinning of processing and its result, the affective reaction varies with the quality and intended formation of the object since the spectrum of affective reactions ranges from crying to laughing out loud to being disgusted.[65]

Belke and Leder's cognitive-psychological model explains the series of processes dissecting the cultural experience in single stages. The 'life' on stage and the performance of which the figure is part calls for the spectator's deciphering, a mixture of subconscious and conscious procedures involving cognitive processing, empathic and affective reaction, while the procedures are based upon a combination: past experience and knowledge containing socio-cultural convention;[66] information given by the schematic framework and within the concrete and present performance; past experiences with similar frameworks and figures. These three sources, of which the third can be understood as subsumed under the first, are interdependent. This interdependence precisely exemplifies the dynamism of natural concepts and cultural identities. In theatre, the spectator recognizes the performance as an imitation of social life standing in automatic reflection of the spectator's socio-cultural experiences as he compares and evaluates his perspective and knowledge of reality and past and present cultural experiences, situated in the subjective realm of cultural understanding and tied to the collective scope. Inside that subjective realm, aesthetic experience takes place, marking the perception of the cultural object as an emotional and rational process.[67] In other

---

64 Cf. Belke and Leder (2006), Abstract 3-5, esp. 4; and cf. Leder et al. (2004), 492.

65 The question remains whether the aesthetic judgement is influenced by the affective reaction or both happen alongside. Probably, the spectator laughing at a slapstick performance assesses the performance as 'funny'. Since Belke and Leder argue that there is no linear sequence of stages but that they can happen in feedback channelling, it is probable that the affective evaluation phase and the cognitive (mastering) phases depend on each other.

66 The scope of point (1) involves where we grew up, what school we attended, what books we have read, what friends we have had or simply, where we are and how we are attentive at a certain time influences the quantity and quality of our knowledge.

67 Concerning the focus on drama, a more specific approach that describes a cognitive-psychological response fostering the specific affective reaction adds up to the range of aesthetic experience in its emotional spectrum but leads to far as if to introduce it here at length. A short note is here given: a spectator's reaction to the acting personae in front of him might simply be rephrased as feeling with the characters- loving, hating, crying, triumphing, and other emotional reactions. Succinctly, the spectator is diving into the dramatic action, which mechanism is commonly called identification as it was earlier mentioned concerning Freud. Picking up Freud's term, Friedberg defines identification as […] a process which commands the subject to be displaced by an *other*; it is a procedure which refuses and recuperates the separation between self and other. […] [It] draws upon a repertoire of unconscious processes" (Anne Friedberg, 'A denial of difference: Theories of cinematic identification', *Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, Elizabeth Ann Kaplan [ed.], New York: Routledge, 1990, 36-45, 36); see as well Edward Titchener as a starting point to popularise the concept: "This tendency to feel oneself into a situation is called EMPATHY." Edward B. Titchener, *A Beginner's Psychology*, New York: Macmillan Press, 1915, § 45) Unfortunately, Friedberg leaves the unconscious processes unspecified. This insufficiency encouraged Dolf Zillmann to replace it in formulating another concept: the concept of empathy. Cf. Dolf Zillmann, 'Mechanism of emotional involvement with drama', *Poetics* 23.1 (1994): 33-51. He distinguishes between three different types of empathy: reflexive, acquired, and deliberate. The first is shown in motor mimicry; the second means that the

words, the consumption of the aesthetic effective entity entails the levels of perception, (re)cognition and intertwined reaction of body and mind.

Emphasizing 'effectiveness', the entity exists for the sake of being perceived and becoming functional. The effect is realized in the processing of the recipient, who is always bound to his or her subjective comprehension of the socio-cultural environment; and in that dependence, besides cognitive mastering relying on a decodable or accessible object, the effect consists of the aesthetic judgement, the aesthetic emotion as well as the affective reaction, which are here all subsumed under the aesthetic experience. What is of most significance here is the relevant affective reaction(s) expected from the schema and derived from the correspondent natural drive. The aesthetic effective entity transporting aspects of the natural drive's concept is responsible for the conveyance of the aesthetic experience expected from the schema's realisation, whose condition is met by a formula, the nucleus of the aesthetic effective entity that fits the schematic framework and guarantees its functionality. The recipient is meant to receive an intended effect. The formula must meet the condition of accessibility for the recipient involving comprehension and satisfaction after Belke and Leder's model and culminating in the affective reaction.

Comedy's aesthetic effective entity: the fool figure

A comedy is expected to be funny. Laughter is a psychologically and physiologically complex process, often caused by figures whose existence and persistence are supported by their ability to elicit laughter, an affective reaction. Such conveyers of the comic can be identified in fools, the aesthetic effective entity in comedy. The deliberate fool elicits the affective response, making the audience laugh at the joke. The deliberate fool as found in the clever slave and the wise fool is more than a producer of the comic. Like the loving couple realizing the natural drive 'love' in their aesthetically effective position in romantic comedy, the

---

respondent relies on past experience and the third is seen in the activity of perspective taking. In brief, the witnessing of emotional reaction directly or indirectly given on stage ideally triggers emotional reaction in the observer. The innateness of empathic reactivity as well as the learned sum of concepts for emotional response play a decisive role when it comes to the construction of characters in drama. The audience is supposed to indulge in the play and not to be indifferent to what they are watching and certainly not to the characters, which would be especially destructive if the relationship between round characters as the protagonists or the supporting role and the audience is concerned. Empathic mediation on stage builds up a relationship between the audience and the figures, helping to perceive mere roles and their actors as living, breathing, and feeling beings and to indulge in the illusion.

Zillmann promotes his tripartite division as well as the detailed definition of the different empathic responses in criticizing the studies of Gabbard (1987), Metz (1982), Rimmon-Kenan (1976) and Skura (1981) indirectly as 'mythical conjectures' (34). Metz (1982) is the only to have segmented the process of identification in primary and secondary identification. Primary means the input via visual and audio channels and their influences on the perception of the recipient. For instance, the camera replaces the eyes and the spectator performs identification along with the movement of the camera. Secondary identification stands for the usual use of the term when the spectator identifies him- or herself with the personae and actors.

In general, empathy and identification are concepts of one mechanism that proceeds in the background during the consumption of the play. It is intended to help processing the material given to the audience, who needs to cope with the *other*; empathy and emulation further stimulate the processing of the material and allow the spectator to 'forget' or to push the artificiality of the situation to the back of his or her mind. Of course, this mechanism has not been invented for understanding dramatic action but the imitation of social interaction calls for an automatism humans use to decipher their counterpart's behaviour in social life. In comparison to Aristotle, empathy could be interpreted as a form of imitation and more precisely, a pre-step, which happens on a cognitive and emotional level. Motor mimicry is the most prominent imitative mechanism of empathy.

professional fool supports the coherence in comedy's schema in serving the natural drive 'laughter' and meeting the schema's principles, *ridiculum*, carnivalesque, and utopian. Concerning its structural placement, the professional fool fits the upside-down order of comedy, ridicules hierarchy and upper classes without causing any severe harm. He can receive positive affected dispositions towards his persona, which saves him from punishment since there is no need for retribution. From his dual position as insider and outsider, the fool can engage in communication with the audience, drawing on an emotional repertoire as the joy about good puns or the fear of being punished, underlined by the mimicry of facial expressions.[68]

It is argued that the type's relation to the audience and all his activities confirm his effectiveness. The deliberate fool fosters the aesthetic experience of comedy and the play since his insights grant access to the sublevel guiding comprehension, while serving comedy's schema. His play of sense and nonsense challenges the spectator in the stages of evaluation, releasing him or her in the emotional reward of the aesthetic by-product. The fool enriches the spectator's experience of theatre, performance, and comedy's grounds by his complicity in trickery and deception since he drags the spectator into other roles, illusions, and the stage, offering a complex network of recognition and constituting the subject. The analysis of the play text will describe how the entity serves the schema and what themes and means the figure uses to trigger the aesthetic experience. All these devices and their structural relations realize the aesthetic experience.

Observing, collecting, and classifying the devices crystallize the formula or pattern which conveys the aesthetic stimuli and on which the entity is based.[69] It is argued that the fool's pattern is the pattern *paradox*; it is not exclusively bound to comic realms nor to the fool but its aesthetic effect is evoked in reference to its content and context. The paradox pattern opens up a perspective on the world by offering a structured but fraught access to it in daring the recipient to decode its contradictory, incongruent order of two elements so that he can gain something epistemically valuable by 'dissolving' the paradox. The object of

---

68 Cf. Zillmann (1994), 40ff. and 48-49. According to Zillmann, "[e]mpathy is defined as any experience that is a response (a) to information about circumstances presumed to cause acute emotions in another individual and/or (b) to the bodily, facial, paralinguistic, and linguistic expression of emotional experiences by another individual and/or (c) to another individual's actions that are presumed to be precipitated by acute emotional experiences, this response being (d) associated with an appreciable increase in excitation and (e) construed by respondents as feeling with or feeling for another individual." (40). In brief, the witnessing of emotional reaction directly or indirectly given on stage ideally triggers emotional reaction in the observer. The innateness of empathic reactivity as well as the learned sum of concepts for emotional response play a decisive role when it comes to the construction of characters in drama. The audience is supposed to indulge in the play and not to be indifferent to what they are watching and certainly not to the characters, which would be especially destructive if the relationship between round characters as the protagonists or the supporting role and the audience is concerned. Here, a laughing face or a hearing laughter can be seen as a stimulus on the sensorial apparatus, which can send an impulse to the addressee to laugh, too. Briefly, laughter is contagious to others: when an adult starts laughing, others will be likely to join this laughter. A modern example can be seen in the habit of American TV sitcoms especially from the 90s to use recorded laughter of an imaginative audience in order to indicate that there has been made a joke. They work with the innate affective reactivity of the spectator or audience, and that is to witness laughter from others and to be stimulated to mimic it. Cf. Robert R. Provine, 'Contagious laughter: Laughter is a sufficient stimulus for laughs and smiles', *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* 30.1 (1992): 1-4; and note an earlier account by Spitz and Wolf arguing that a picture of smile or a smiling pattern on a mask stimulates the observer to smile back. (René A. Spitz and Katherine M. Wolf, 'The smiling response: A contribution of the ontogenesis of social relations', *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 34 [1946]: 57-125.)

69 Finding formula or patterns might be seen as an artificial reduction of complex operations but such assumption ignores the fact that the pattern is set on the abstract level. Identifying an identical foundation makes single instantiations of the fool figure comparable.

investigation, the deliberate fool figure, is constructed on that pattern in its programmatic opposition of wisdom and folly, addressing the contradiction in human nature. The figure's pattern comes into existence through a network that pairs incongruous elements, whose sum verifies the functionality of the deliberate fool. While the pairs are not verbalized at the sublevel, their single constituents can be detected and described in the text. When the pattern is applied or if the figure is manifested, the network becomes filled with content and shaped by themes and devices in accordance with the realisation of the schema and the cultural system.[70] Thus, the deliberate fool becomes distinct in varying his repertoire and thematic preferences on the verbal and nonverbal level, entailing acrobatics, dance, irony, ambiguity, and other devices. The more broadly the repertoire is described the more similarity and reoccurrences of successful, 'popular', aesthetically effective constituents can be disclosed among a variety of deliberate fool figures. They become recognized as belonging to one group. In the play, by the playwright, in a certain period, the fool figure, the role and the persona, win 'individuality' and their authenticity, which should not be mistaken for a psychological portrayal. Finally, the pattern at its abstract level allows the entity sufficient functionality and thus, productivity in diachronic terms.

With a similar understanding though without identifying the underlying functional structure of reproduction, Leo Salingar looking at a relative of the deliberate fool argues for the persistence of the trickster:

> And the trickster or the ironies that belong to his part reassume their importance, despite a long series of variations in detail, throughout the tradition of imitating or modernising New Comedy that was introduced by the Renaissance.[71]

Issues of importance, persistence or more generally and theoretically coined, productivity are placed in the streams of tradition and imitation, either consciously and programmatically or unconsciously. The fool's metamorphosis or history of transfer and transformation are here examined from Plautus to Shakespeare, from the Plautine *servus callidus* to the Shakespearean wise fool, both of whom can be traced back to the paradox pattern, manifest the aesthetic effective entity of the deliberate fool for the schema of comedy, and exemplify its binary transfer via *imitatio* and in the aesthetic consciousness, while its productivity relies on its effectiveness, guaranteeing a complex aesthetic experience.

The thesis considers Plautus' *servus callidus* as a prototype of the professional fool, which influenced Shakespeare's conception of comic masterminds and of the New Comedic model of deceit. The most obvious example is the witty servant Tranio in *The Shrew*, who proves Shakespeare's knowledge of how to use the clever slave's concept.[72] Shakespeare appreciated the type's productivity and aesthetic value for comedy, orientating at the type's pattern and adapting it to his period's cultural disposition: he transformed the Plautine type

---

70 The choice and collocation of thematic elements are adapted to the culturally specific environment due to questions of recognition and in dependence on the addressee and the producer of the cultural product.
Besides the cultural context, the given genre determines the choice of constituents due to their effectiveness. For instance, the fool figure in the novel shows a difference in constituents and their methodological realisation in comparison to the fool figure on stage. The fool figure in the novel will never be able to use the exact same repertoire the fool figure on stage has since when s/he can directly show facial expressions without telling the audience that s/he does. It is a question of the mimetic range of a cultural product.
71 Leo Salingar, *Shakespeare and the Tradition of Comedy*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1974, 128 and for the whole discussion, cf. esp. 88-128.
72 The closeness of both figures and their concepts suggest a combination of the mediated use of Plautus via the Italian intertexts as well as an immediate use of Plautus.

into the Elizabethan wise fool. George Duckworth's famous *The Nature of Roman Comedy* noted that

> [t]he English clown, developed in part from the resourceful servant of Italian comedy who in turn is derived from the *seruus* of Roman comedy, no longer controls the plot by his trickery but retains many of the characteristics of the Plautine slave, being fond of soliloquies, clever retorts, abuse of other servants, and comic exaggerations.[73]

But unfortunately, Duckworth leaves it there. Studies of the relation between the *servus callidus* and Shakespeare's transformations are few, though a few scholars acknowledge the clever slave's heritage in Shakespeare.[74] There has not been a thorough analysis of what underlies the *servus callidus* and how the Plautine type survived in Shakespearean drama.

The servant in Roman comedy was a recognized entity in the aesthetic consciousness and was available for imitation in Renaissance, evoked by the popularity of Plautus and Terence on European stages. Robert Miola notes that

> Plautus and Terence found new life in many direct and oblique descendants, which appeared in various venues—academic, courtly, popular—and in various forms, including the Spanish *paso* or *entremés* (interlude), and the Italian scenarios of the *commedia dell'arte*.[75]

Visibility of lineage from antiquity to *commedia dell' arte* and to English drama is an issue many scholars address. As Richards and Richards make clear, "correspondences between the character lineaments, plot functions and costuming of certain of the stage figures [...] tend to be general, rather than so particular that they show a very clear line of direct derivation".[76] Unsurprisingly, the same caution should be applied to any thoughts about the influence of the *commedia dell'arte* on Shakespeare. For Richards and Richards, a detailed description of Shakespeare's use of the *commedia dell'arte* can hardly be done as it becomes almost invisible

---

73 George Eckel Duckworth, *The Nature of Comedy*, Princeton, N.J.: University Press, 1952, 415. Also compare Erich Segal's influential book *Roman Laughter. The Comedy of Plautus*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968, esp. 92ff.

74 Cf. Silk et al. (2014), 123: "It is obvious that wily servants like Tranio in *The Taming of the Shrew* (c. 1594) and Puck in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (c. 1596) declare the lineage of Plautus' slaves," Silk et al. here refers to Miola and Riehle but also to Anderson (2005). Note Linda Anderson, *A Place in the Story. Servants and Service in Shakespeare's Plays*, Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2005, 11: "Early plays such as *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *The Taming of the Shrew* show him working with the type of the clever servant inherited from Classical and Italian comedy."

75 Robert Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy. The Influence of Plautus and Terence*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994, 8.

76 Kenneth Richards and Laura Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte: A Documentary History*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990, 15, here on the relation between religious and improvised drama; they compare that relation to their classical connection: "That there was some influence, then, can be accepted."(15). For relations between Atellan farce and Italian improvised comedy, also note p. 13: "Certainly some of the resemblances and correspondences identified between Atellan farce, later mime entertainment and the Italian improvised comedy are striking, and there are clearly similarities between them in costuming and masking."
It should not be denied that *commedia dell'arte* had a great impact on European theatre with its extempore mode, the types, and the prevalence of the actor's performance without a written basis. Several theoretical accounts try to demystify its origin as it is said to be a continuation of Atellan farce or that Italy took it over from Byzantine mime actors or that impromptu staging of Plautus and Terence plays inspired the form or the Italian farce of the early sixteenth century was its starting point; or that all these theories go hand in hand and Italian improvised comedy grounds on a mixture of these. Cf. Ronald W. Vince, *Renaissance Theatre. A Historiographical Handbook*, Westport, Conn./London: Greenwood Press, 1984, 43ff. and esp. 44.

in the net of sources and relations among classical comedy, Italian dramatic forms, and English native traditions.[77]

In agreement with Richards and Richards, a direct, linear and singular lineage dissolves and should be replaced by strands spanning Atellan farce to Plautus or to *commedia dell'arte*, Roman comedy to *commedia erudita*, Plautus to Shakespeare, Italian drama to English drama, Tudor interludes to Shakespeare, religious forms to improvised drama, and many more diagonal and intersected relations.[78] General correspondences can be understood from the perspective of imitation and the quality of universality like the tricksters are specified in the socio-cultural context and the plot.[79] Their flexibility makes them interesting for improvised and literary drama; their stereotypical persistence highlights such types like a crafty and witty servant as a productive entity spread over comic subgenres and national forms of drama.

For the following investigation, it is of utmost importance that antiquity's impact is not overrated and that the presence of Italian improvised comedy does not prevent any use of Latin originals.[80] The thesis is not interested in explaining every clownish figure nor every comic driver in Shakespeare's comedy that may be traced back to Plautus. Just as Robert Weimann states that Shakespeare's theatre bear "*ein Durcheinander mittelalterlicher und klassischer Konventionen*",[81] the analysis acknowledges the crossovers of influential strands springing from native tradition, medieval roots, antiquity, and Renaissance humanism. Shakespeare's plays are not modelled strictly upon Greek dramaturgy nor do they attempt to become a classicized image but offer contaminated, direct and indirect reworking of classical traditions.[82] Shakespeare's embodiment of the laughable and his devices to expose human vice and handle human folly show parallels to Plautus, Rabelais, and Lucian.[83] One of the aims is to illuminate and verify Plautus' place among them.

It is without doubt that Plautus was present in the Elizabethan age. He was known in text and in performance in Shakespeare's time.[84] Along with Terence, Plautus could be found on nearly every school desk in England by 1520. Though scholars extolled Terence as the

---

77 Cf. Richards and Richards (1990), 263-4.

78 Compare Silk's view that high Renaissance comedy cannot be thought without the *commedia*, its Greek and Roman legacy, and without the pervasive origins in antiquity's rituals and performative occasions. Cf. Silk et al. (2014), 127-9.

79 For example Richards and Richards (1990), 12: "From Campania they [,travelling mimes of Atellan farce about the third century BC,] appear to have migrated to Rome, their multiplicity of masks gradually coalescing into four characteristic masked types: Maccus, a gluttonous fool; Dossenus, a crafty hunchback; Bucco, a comic braggart; and Pappos, a ridiculous old man. The temptation to link these four principal figures with what eighteenth-century and later commentators identified as the four principal masks of the *commedia dell'arte* – the two *vecchi* and the two *zanni* – has remained attractive to some modern scholars".

80 Neither should it be the other way round since Wolfgang Riehle underlines that "Shakespeare's knowledge of the classical tradition was mediated through Renaissance humanism has to be stressed because recent research has tended to overemphasize his indebtedness to the medieval popular tradition, so much so that even a play like the 'neo-classical' Errors has been interpreted in terms of the dramaturgy of the Mystery Plays;" (Wolfgang Riehle, *Shakespeare, Plautus and the Humanist Tradition*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1990, 272).

81 Robert Weimann, 'Das "Lachen mit dem Publikum". Die beiden Veroneser und die volkstümliche Komödientradition', *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 106 (1970): 85-99, 88.

82 Cf. Gordon Braden, 'Shakespeare', *The Classical Tradition,* Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and Salvatore Settis (eds.), Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010, 881-885, 882.

83 Cf. Riehle (1990), 233. Riehle here refers to the construction of verbal games and the abuse of the malleability of language.

84 Shakespeare was not illiterate in Latin or ignorant of the rich stock of *topoi*, plot material or figures as it becomes evident when he relies on multiple sources of Ovid, Seneca, Plautus, or the mythological apparatus at many instances of his plays. Cf. Petrus J. Enk, 'Shakespeare's "small Latin"', *Neoph* 5 (1919-20): 359-65. Enk lists parallels between Latin originals and Shakespeare's plays.

better object of study for his eloquence, Plautus' comedies were not only part of the school curriculum according to Baldwin, but they were also performed on stage in schools and by university companies at Cambridge and Oxford.[85] Between 1548 and 1583, Cambridge colleges hosted seventeen performances of twelve Plautine comedies including *Mostellaria*.[86] This is not at all surprising since Roman poets were held as standards for Elizabethan playwrights. Seneca was considered the master of tragedy as Plautus and Terence were seen as unmatched in composing comedy.[87]

Shakespeare was surrounded by the classics, their popularity, and the belief that the works of Plautus and Terence were standards to be imitated. His first comedies evince an unneglectable, ubiquitous contact with classical comedy concerning school, comedy performances, and the discourse among playwrights, actors and humanists.[88] The availability of the plays' material was secured by "Renaissance editions of Roman comedies and their humanist introductions and commentaries […], especially those by Erasmus and Melanchthon."[89] The problem does not emerge from an incapability of Latin or from the unavailability of the originals or adaptations but for the majority of scholars, it is difficult to recognize, describe, and thus, acknowledge Plautus in Shakespeare. As Colin Burrow notes, "Latin drama was perhaps the deepest and most pervasive influence on Shakespeare, but it is also one of the least visible."[90] On one hand, the problem arises from Shakespeare's fondness for blending his sources, arranging and transforming traditional elements idiosyncratically, and not caring about verbal proximity and demonstrating what a 'learned sock' he became,[91] which makes him the inspiring and original playwright that modernity appreciates so much. Shakespeare kept his originality in the omnipresent hidden stream of classicism, absorbing essentials but managing to retain the status of a prophet for the national self in English drama

---

85 Cf. Kristian Jensen, 'Reform of Latin and Latin teaching', *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Jill Kraye (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 63-81, 72-73.

86 Cf. Fernando Cioni, 'Shakespeare's Italian Intertexts: *The Taming of the/a Shrew*', *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*, Michelle Marrapodi (ed.), Manchester/ New York: Manchester University Press, 2004, 118-130, 122; cf. Thomas W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's small Latine and lesse Greeke*, Vol. I, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944, 7, 325f., 641f. and Vol. II, 561, 673ff.; note Frederick S. Boas, 'University Plays', *Cambridge History of English Literature*. Vol. VI, Cambridge, 1918, 293-327 and cf *Id.*, *University Drama in the Tudor Age*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1914, esp. 18-19; cf. George C. Moore Smith, *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923; cf. Duckworth (1952), 408. Duckworth names St. Paul's School's performance of Plautus' *Menaechmi* in 1527.

87 In *Hamlet*, Polonius metonymically refers to Seneca for tragedy and Plautus for comedy by saying "Seneca cannot be too heavy nor Plautus too light". In Shakespeare, the English language found their own drama elite. In his *Palladis Tamia* (1598), Francis Meres praises Shakespeare by equating him with the idol status of Plautus: "As Epius Stolo said, that the Muses would speake with Plautus tongue, if they would speak Latin: so I say that the Muses would speake with Shakespeares fine filed phrase, if they would speake English." (XV, 13-17).

88 Two plays at the beginning of his career, *Errors* and *Taming*, show clearly Shakespeare's awareness and dealing with Roman comedy and its catalogue.

89 Riehle (1990), 272. For Riehle, it cannot be doubted that the Elizabethan playwright "knew some Plautine comedies in the original" (272).

90 Colin Burrow, *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2013, 133-34. Besides Roman comedy, Burrow is concerned with the influence of Ovid, Virgil, Plutarch, and Seneca. George Fredric Franko argues the same but with focus on Plautus' presence in Shakespeare's plays, . Cf. George Fredric Franko, 'Plautus in Early Modern England', *A Companion to Plautus*, *Id*. and Dorota Dutsch (eds.), Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020, 445-459, esp. 451-52. A major creative impetus stems from Shakespeare's "continued exploration of Plautus, which animates the entire corpus" (445).

91 Shakespeare did not pursue the same academic interest in the classics integrating it into his art as his fellow Renaissance poets like – to cite Milton- the learned sock, Ben Jonson, undoubtedly did ("Then to the well-trod stage anon, If Jonson's learned sock be on." [John Milton, *L'Allegro*, 131-2]).

since "[…] Shakespeare had passed through the whole tradition of classicism and yet retained the full impetus of the archaic *vates*."[92] Shakespeare achieved this not only in his histories and tragedies but also in his comedies, whose creation and development owe a great deal to the playwright's dealing with the Roman idols since

> Shakespeare learnt an enormous amount from classical comedy. His interest in the ways people deceive themselves and the role inference and imagination play in human life and in human loves in particular were substantially developed from his reading in Plautus and Terence.[93]

In regard to Plautus, the importance of Plautus' comedy for Shakespeare should be reassessed otherwise his true contribution will remain invisible since

> [t]he traditional view is that Shakespeare read a worldly materialistic Roman comedy and brought to it the sophisticated scepticism of a Renaissance reader. This is not quite right. Plautine comedy repeatedly suggests that a combination of material evidence and argument can create wonders, or illusions, or even crises in personal identity. Shakespeare did not simply impose these imaginary marvels on Roman comedy. He found them there, and developed them.[94]

A central figure operating with and being aware of these imaginative framework is the clever slave as a prototype for the professional fool. The thesis will explain the development from the Plautine trickster, *architectus* of marvels, and mastermind of fantastic comic.

The clever slave as one popular type, one device to transport the cultural identity of comedy and to image the natural drive of laughter, is an available and productive entity in this binary course of cultural dynamics, here particularly analysed for its transformation(s) in Shakespeare's drama. The metamorphosis of the deliberate fool from Plautus to Shakespeare happens within the movement of episteme expressed in the continuing sequence of cultural plurality;[95] the type's concretization is the dramatization of a pattern with successfully established thematic categories that vary in their culturally specific interpretation. The metamorphosis is thus understood as a course of transfer and transformation the aesthetic effective entity and its pattern faces in the mutual relations and processes of imitation, perception, recognition, and production, whereby the manifestations of the aesthetic effective entity demonstrate the reproducibility of the pattern and its variable realisation in the specific cultural system.[96]

The sources of analysis, Plautus and Shakespeare's comedies, their cultural environment, and their embedding in literary history allow the thesis to demonstrate the

---

92 Johan Huizinga, *Homo ludens, A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*, London: Routledge, 1949 (repr. 2002), 142.

93 Burrow (2013), 246.

94 *Ibid.*, 138.

95 Cf. Sita Steckel, 'Wissensgeschichten. Zugänge, Probleme und Potentiale in der Erforschung mittelalterlicher Wissenskulturen', *Akademische Wissenskulturen. Praktiken des Lehrens und Forschens vom Mittelalter bis zur Moderne*, Martin Kintzinger and Sita Steckel (eds.), Basel: Schwabe, 2015, 9-58, 20-21. Also note the 'SFB 980' (*Episteme in Bewegung. Wissenstransfer von der alten Welt bis in die frühe Neuzeit*) at the FU Berlin, see URL= https://www.sfb-episteme.de/index.html (accessed January 05, 2022).

In a Foucauldian sense, episteme represent macro-categories of knowledge or clusters of scripts that subsume ideas—specific to a period—and dominate the discourse of that period.

96 Transfer refers to choosing and cutting cultural material out of its original context with the relocation into a —culturally or generically— different context. Transformation means the process of changing and fitting the cut-out into that new context with all its related intentions and other influential parameters.

dialectic in cultural dynamics. Both are situated at peaks in reception culture: antiquity's revival in the Renaissance. The thesis describes the programmatic use of transferred cultural material, the awareness of metamorphosis, the attraction of *aemulatio*, and the challenge of idiosyncratic treatment. It is not only another study of Shakespeare's use of antiquity but an attempt to understand the transformation of two popular configurations juxtaposing folly and wisdom, the comparability and continuity of the underlying pattern *paradox*, and its sequence of productivity.

The next two chapters prepare the analysis by introducing the thesis' methodology and delineating the schema of comedy as well as its principles, *ridiculum*, the carnivalesque, and the utopian nature. The second subchapter crystallizes the fool, defines the type of the deliberate fool, and portrays its subtypes in drama and narrative. After explaining the figure's environment and relatives, the thesis offers a detailed description of Plautus' *servus callidus*, his concept, embedment, and function for comedy as a prototype of the professional fool. The concept of the *servus callidus* is identified by his role in the plot, his epithets, themes, behaviour, and employed techniques—his construction and function in Plautus' intrigue comedies (*Bacchides, Epidicus, Miles gloriosus, Mostellaria, Poenulus, Pseudolus*). According to these findings, the paradox pattern elucidates the central functionality of the type for comedy's schema, which means comedy's coherent concept built upon *ridiculum* or the laughable, carnivalesque, and the utopian nature. The identification of the pattern can thus be useful to analyse and compare deliberate fools on stage and in other genres.

The chapters on Plautus' prototype are structured in oppositional pairs that build the *paradox*. They start with the heroic anti-hero operating within the categories of profane and sacred and relating oppositional categories; it continues with the impossible all-license, allowing the deceiver to escape the *senex iratus* in a Saturnalian environment. The third chapter shows that the figure stylizes his intrigue as a competition or agon implying the inversion of inferior and superior. The fourth pair considers the creation and disruption of illusion, emphasizing the actual and non-actual or the possible and impossible; the creative outsider deserves the title *poeta*. The Plautine type's last identity displays the *servus ludens*, who plays with sense, meaning, and logic and temporarily becomes the comic driver by nonsense. The analysis of each chapter explains the title's pair content by its thematic variations in the texts and their contribution to the *ridiculum*, the carnivalesque, and the utopian nature.

After the description of the clever slave and its structure in Plautus' plays, the following chapters concentrate on Shakespeare's insertion of the Plautine type, beginning with Tranio in *The Shrew*. The Italian servant is comparable to the Roman counterpart regarding their functionality. From the obvious clever, tricking servant, the analysis will shift to Shakespeare's pairing of heroines and deliberate fools in *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*. Transferring Shakespeare's knowledge of Plautus' clever slave into the forest of Arden and inside the city of Illyria, Plautus' type becomes fused and invisible in the transformations of Touchstone, Rosalind, Celia, Viola, Maria, and Feste, while they share a functional foundation in the *servus callidus* At the end of both analyses, the last chapters will look at tragic variations of the deliberate fool in Thersites and Lear's Fool as well as at dark architects, present a concise overview of the metamorphoses from Plautus to Shakespeare and give a final definition of what makes the deliberate fool distinctive and why the type is an aesthetic effective entity.[97]

---

97 There are of course more to subsume under the type of the deliberate fool figure in Shakespeare's universe. But the scope of this work must be selective to stay operable. The analysis concentrates on the clever slave's legacy in comedies and especially, in the pairing of the wise fool and astute heroine figures. That is why early but not as substantially developed versions of comic servants such as Launce and Speed were excluded. The same is valid for Falstaff in *Henry IV*, who deserves a chapter on his own since he represents a hybrid form involving the parasite, the braggart, and the bomolochos/clown. Cf. Robert Miola, 'Encountering the Past I: Shakespeare's Reception of Classical Comedy', *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Comedy*, ed. Heather Hirschfeld, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018, 36-54, 37.

II.i. 'Ugly' comedy: a schema and three principles

> "There is a thin line that separates laughter and pain,
> comedy and tragedy, humor and hurt."
> Erma Bombeck (1927-1996)

Indeed, the line between those is extremely thin as the generic closeness and hybrid formats like many modern film projects show the line's fragility and permeability by changing sides of laughter and pain throughout one movie. The line's validity depends on the genre's conservative manifestation and the perspective since it makes a difference whether somebody is laughed at or laughs (along) with the others. The differentiation helps to narrow down the relations between comedy, laughter, and humour in opposition and simultaneous closeness to tragedy, pain, and hurt. The first-mentioned tripartite group gives a traditional starting point and demands to look at both phenomena, laughter and humour, comedy relies on in order to elucidate of how comedy was perceived and influenced in the eras of interest. This chapter wants to elucidate comedy's and thus also the fool figure's natural diachronic surroundings. It is not only about describing comedy's world and its principles but beyond and first, about dissecting diverse factors and authorities that outline the genre since only then previous approaches to the fool figure can be evaluated and the fool figure's concept can be fully understood in dependence upon its environment. To be able to do so, the chapter will examine the comic from different angles by considering the perception of comedy and delineating comedy's various constituents participating in its construction. Questions spring to mind as how much a playwright considers the taste of the paying playgoer, if the play is composed as a reader's drama or for the actual performance in mind, how much the cast and popular actors influence the roles in the play, or if and to what extent critical voices moving in theoretical spheres affect theatrical praxis. The chapter will involve separate perspectives on comedy, including theorists, audience, and playwrights. First of all, from a historical point of view, the reputation and the treatment of laughter and humour in science share some parallels with that of comedy, whose relations and development will shortly be looked at to grasp the idea of the two intertwined phenomena and their significance for the genre.

In Antiquity, Middle Ages and up to the Renaissance, the majority of thinkers approached the phenomenon of laughter and the science of humour prescriptively, partly and/or only superficially. Mainly, they saw laughter as something to be controlled and humour as something to be used carefully; nonetheless, they knew that it could be very useful in certain circumstances since particular disciplines like rhetoric appreciated it as a powerful device. In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle refers to Gorgias, who "rightly said that one should spoil the opponents' seriousness with laughter and their laughter with seriousness".[98] Cicero's *de oratore* lists humour among the essential talents an orator should bring with him to be armed for his speeches, certainly when it comes to making a mockery of the opponent. Indisputably, "[f]or more than any other verbal category, humour was the weapon of choice in personal antagonism, and in the duelling of elite political life."[99] A jury laughing could diminish the

---

[98] Aristotle, *On Rhetoric, A Theory of Civic Discourse*, newly transl. with intr., notes and append. by George A. Kennedy, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. Book III, Ch. 18, 1419b. The different forms of humour are discussed in the second book of the *Poetics* and therefore, lost.
[99] Cf. Elaine Fantham, *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2004, 188 and ff.; Cic. *de or.* 2.216-234.

opponent's authority and concomitantly, could help the orator to win his case. Following Cicero further, his contemplation is one of the most thought-through from this period and distinguish between two different forms of how humour is applied: the first, *cavillatio*, is spread over the discourse as a stretched kind that is based on *re*; the second, *dicacitas*, means the insertion of a short and precise arrangement of wit that mainly relies on *dicto*.[100] Classical scholars recommended the elegant use of the latter in communication and literature, ranking verbal humour much higher than forms of physical comic. Concerning prescription, using humorous devices was restricted to a decent and sophisticated style.

Quintilian preferred the orator's wit following the principle of *urbanitas* to the vulgar, non-educated product a buffoon supplies the masses with.[101] Such a bi-fold quality of comic production is also valid for the professional fool figure's practice moving between vulgar buffoonery and refined wit. He thinks himself as the brilliant orator fitting comedy's world.[102] Analysing humour was furthermore split by the discussion of how much it can be treated as a tactical device that can be taught and learned or as a natural gift.[103] However, Cicero's presentation of humour's usefulness and its recommendation should not detract from the fact that humour and its effect laughter were traditionally tagged with the epithet of minor in contrast to pathos (*leve enim est totum hoc risum movere* [Cic. *de or*. 2.218]). Cicero's systematic approach on humour is one of the most advanced considerations in antiquity.

In the Middle Ages, similar ruminations about humour are hard to find. Under the rising influence of the Christian church, the dogma with respect to laughter appeared to harshen and expressed a more general despise since 'true' Christians should exercise in modesty and not get in contact with that sinful and devilish sensation apart from some official exceptions such as the Feast of Fools. Both phenomena were generally not 'neutral' objects of study but subjected to wariness and thus, authorial treatment because of laughter's great 'danger' of vulgarity and derision. This conformist attitude coincided with everyday life's abundance of laughter. Luckily, clerics and scholars' treatises did not tame laughter's ubiquity. Looking beyond prescriptive and analytical attempts, the following is concerned with the contradictory treatment of laughter from Antiquity to the Renaissance.

Society and its institutions dealt with the phenomenon ambiguously, especially living in the Middle Ages exhibited a double morality. Moral strictness and religious dominance were not as absolute as they were proclaimed to be and did not embrace people's lives completely but got lifted for certain places and times, where excesses for lust and obscenities were allowed.[104] Loud laughter at the sacred, low, high, and profane accompanied such events, hardly sparing anyone or anything. Throughout the centuries, theorists had demanded control, facing the ubiquitous presence of the comic as an unsurprisingly fixed element in society and cultural events across national boundaries. People in antiquity enjoyed a good deal of laughter at Dionysian festivals, banquets, public speeches, and in literature.[105] Athenians loved to get entertained by a *gelotopoios*, a professional jester at private dinners

---

100 See Cic. *de or*. 2.218; cf. Fantham (2004), 188-9; and cf. Süss (1969), esp. 32.
101 Cf. Jorge Figueroa-Dorrego and Cristina Larkin-Galiñanes, *A Source Book of Literary and Philosophical Writings about Humour and Laughter. The Seventy-Five Essential Texts from Antiquity to Modern Times.* With a foreword by Victor Raskin. Lewiston et al.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009, 40-45, esp. 44-45.
102 See esp. chapter *servus ludens* and Shakespeare's wise fools.
103 Cic. *de or*. 2.216.
104 Cf. Umberto Eco (ed.), *Die Geschichte der Häßlichkeit*, München: Carl Hanser Verlag, 2007, 137.
105 Figueroa-Dorrego and Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), iii, 18-19, 190. For the specific use of moments of the laughable in rhetoric, see Gert Ueding, 'Rhetorik des Lächerlichen', *Semiotik, Rhetorik und Soziologie des Lachens. Vergleichende Studien zum Funktionswandel des Lachens vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, Lothar Fietz, Joerg O. Fichte and Hans-Werner Ludwig (eds.), Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996, 21-36.

as Philip was introduced to be at the beginning of Xenophon's *Symposion*.[106] In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, people took part in *festa stultorum*, listened to private and public comic recitations like the higher classes ridiculed the 'smelly' and 'disgusting' peasant farmers. In yards and on marketplaces, actors thrilled their audience with comic performances. Even in monasteries and among clerics, they used to consume parodic texts on biblical figures frequently.[107] Following Bakhtin's classification, Medieval and Renaissance occasions for laughter could be found in three cultural forms: the ritual-scenic appearances, comic texts, and the register of the marketplace.[108] In general, laughing culture was present in public and private spaces, involving sanctuaries, everyday language and media, challenging taboos—not very different from these days.

Nevertheless, laughter's universality in human nature had not guaranteed itself a thoroughly systematic assessment or popularity as a topic in philosophical writing and literary criticism until the beginning of the 20th century. In the Renaissance, Thomas Hobbes (*Human Nature* and *Leviathan*) and René Descartes (*Passions of the Soul*) could not break free from the prejudicial attitude and just started to explain laughter's mechanisms in a more detailed way after the darker period of the Middle Ages. They foregrounded laughter as a passion based upon a composition of hatred and joy, which both relate to some evil.[109] There was still a long path to go to reach the nowadays' objective perspective on humour and laughter since it was underrepresented in a dialectic discourse that could offer a satisfactory and systematic outline of what humour is and how an entity is perceived as humorous. Theoretical approaches will be assessed in due course; the issue is postponed tactically to deal with the foundation of comedy's schema first.

Laughter's bad reputation, its conservative treatment and its disapproval by the church did not cease in the Renaissance and also remained dominant in writings on poetry as Lodovico Castelvetro, whose opinion matches that of scholars from earlier periods and his days, puts emphasis on the ugly, the distorted form of humour, in his *On the Art of Poetry* (1570); he demands to avoid it.[110] In *The Defence of Poesie* (1595), Sidney judges "[l]aughter [to be] almost ever commeth of thinges moste disproportioned to our selves, and nature".[111] Parallel to antiquity, scholars differentiated between negative and positive manifestations since a useful, intelligent laughter was preferred to an idle, wild, and loud laughter condemned for its sinfulness.[112] In sum, when writings on the phenomenon are looked at over the

---

106 Cf. Jan Bremmer, 'Jokes, Jokers and Jokebooks in Ancient Greek Culture', *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*, *Id.* and Herman Roodenburg (eds.), Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997, 11-28, 11-13. Philip's sequence of entertainment starts with difficulties as nobody does laugh at his jokes first, but finally, he wins his spectators over by the burlesque interpretation of a dance performance done by a girl and a boy.
107 Eco (2007), 135-140; and see Bakhtin (1995), 54-55, *parodia sacra*.
108 Bakhtin (1995), 52ff. He speaks of the folk types of laughing culture; the subchapter on carnivalesque will turn to those kind of feasts again (see Saturnalia, *festa stultorum*).
109 Cf. John Morreall, 'Philosophy of Humor', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL= https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/humor/ (accessed January 05, 2022). Their theories were later subsumed under the Superiority Theory.
110 Figueroa-Dorrego and Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), iii and 198-200.
111 Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesie*, 1595, Albert Feuillerat (ed.), *The Prose Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, Vol. III, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963, 40.
112 Compare Aristotle's categorization of joking. For him, comic includes emotions that can be exaggerated, too little or exactly 'in the middle' (see *Eth. Nic.*, IV, 8; *Eth. Eud*. III, 7; *Pol.*, VIII, 3). He distinguishes between false and appropriate emotions. See Aristoteles, *Poetik*, transl. and with notes by Arbogast Schmitt, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008, 306-307.

centuries, the conservative attitude preponderates over more neutral views, separating elegant from vulgar and verbal from physical.[113]

> […] [B]y linking laughter to notions such as scorn, violence, insolence, abuse, foolishness, vulgarity, envy, deformity, and so on, Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle had conditioned the approach to humour for over two thousand years.[114]

Scholars had interpreted the physical reaction as an evidence for vulgarity, violence, mirth, and other negative connotations fitting this context and as the presence of bodily and mental distortion. It cannot be denied that there had always been a certain mistrust against this domain, which was definitely not eased but fostered by its instrumental neglect of reason, morality, and even sense as it lies in its nature to achieve comic moments.

Comedy, a genre of laughter, moved in the same framework and had to cope with a similar burden affecting approaches and attempts to define the dramatic genre. The comic stage was a place, where deformity, inferiority, and misrule prevailed, which was reflected in the laughing and, thus distorted faces of the spectators. Comedy exemplifies a world of laughter's universality, appeal, and unboundedness. It usually enclosed a space the low and the base reigned—if the fusion of *tragicomoedia* is left aside. Its content of figures, traits, and stock features were part and parcel of the laughing culture with its inclination to inversion, verbal abusive game and excesses of human vices. In analogy to the vocabulary of laughter's context in those days, deformation can be identified as the driving force within comedy's contract with laughter when faces deform while they are laughing at deformed imitation of reality. This process belongs to the complex development of how Western comedy became what it is today. Attending to the myriad bits and pieces of influences on comedy in history and determining their precise effect are almost impossible tasks. It is about understanding comedy's space for laughter, embracing the professional fool figure. Comedy's deformation had been valued, attacked, defended, praised, and described; the question is if and how these opinions participated in shaping the genre of comedy. Theorists, critics, and playwrights had a different relation to their object of interest and argued at separate lobbies. In accordance with Aristotle, competitive poets developed their work from simple vulgarity to a cleverly-constructed composition of farcical and elegant imitation. Comedy's connection to the laughing culture and all its surrounding voices decisively took part in the dramatic genre's understanding and development. Looking at the collection of treatises on comedy makes clear that attempts to define the genre were shadowed many times by the bias against laughter; the loss of Aristotle's second chapter gave rise to speculations. If Cicero's words cited earlier are remembered, assigned triviality did not foster its profound, philosophical handling. In other words, as Umberto Eco in his chapter *Pirandello Ridens* affirms, "[t]he problem of the Comic […] had the advantage of always having caused embarrassment to those philosophers who had tried to define it."[115] Laughter, humour, and comedy had often been approached rather with caution and bias as adversaries condemned it for being a genre of revolutionary tendency and threatening morality.[116] Plato saw comedy only as a kind of teaching device to

---

113 Cf. Klaus Schwind, 'Komisch', *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe*, *Band 3*, Karlheinz Barck et al. (eds.), Stuttgart/Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 2000, 332-384, 339.

114 Cf. Figueroa-Dorrego and Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), 180; Plato's considerations on humour and comedy in Plato, *Philebos*, 47d-50b and *Nomoi*, 816d-817e.

115 Umberto Eco, *The Limits of Interpretation*, Bloomington et al.: Indiana University Press, 1990, 163.

116 Note Robert Hornback, *The English Clown Tradition from the Middle Ages to Shakespeare*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2009, 3. Hornback generally attends to the underestimation of the comic in recent literary theory and in the critical tradition.

demonstrate what divides the good and serious from the ridiculous and forbade the members of the polis to participate in the imitations of the ugly, which was left for the socially lowest like slaves and foreigners.[117] Approximately two thousand years later, Puritans in England were even more radical when they blamed comedy to cause moral decline and the loss of grace, demolished theatres, and banned plays. In 1980, Umberto Eco's novel *Il nome della rose* indirectly depicts comedy's 'hardship' by the survival of the lost chapter of Aristotle's *Poetics*. By drawing on the content's threatening capacity and the belief in laughter's heresy, he puts silencing of the philosopher's words and his presumably dangerous chapter on comedy at one of the novel's centre in a medieval setting. One monk desperately tries to prevent its detection and in worst case, publication by all means, even if that means murder. The murderer wants to protect religious order and rule, which is threatened by the content of the chapter since it teaches laughter as a source for wisdom.[118] Of course, Eco's marvellous book is much more complex and manifold than that rough synopsis but serves here to exemplify comedy's and laughter's stereotype assessed from two angles in fiction. Comedy's 'power' misinterpreted as 'threat' centrally relies on its physical impact, laughter, and the web of associations it is linked to, whereby it deviates from tragedy and other genres dealing with pathos. Eco's emphasis on wisdom rehabilitates laughter, hinting at the ambiguous use of that kind of affect since comic moments can draw on a mixture of folly, vulgarity, and mirth but function as the mirror, at which the spectator looks and perceives his self.

The accusations and prejudices against the genre were embedded in the complex discussion on theatre and poetry, led by Plato's criticism.[119] Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* attempts to define comedy:

> […] that the Comedy is an imitatiõ of the cõmon errors of our life, which he representeth in the most ridiculous & scornfull sort that may be : so as it is impossible that any beholder can be content to be such a one […] So that the right use of Comaedie, will I thinke, by no bodie be blamed ; and much lesse of the high and excellent Tragedie […].[120]

In his treatise, Sidney opposes adversaries of poetry accusing verses to nourish abuse, to which—in their opinion—comedy contributes the most.[121] He argues that polemical voices cannot attack the appropriate and sophisticated version of comedy as it does not corrupt but teach. The art of comedy deviates from vulgar and aggressive offence, which is a distinction

---

117 Schwind (2000), 340; and Dieter Kliche, '*Häßlich*', *ÄGB* III (2001), 25-66, 29.; both genres, comedy and tragedy, were ascribed the qualities of teaching and delighting. E.g. see Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, 589, lines 1863-5 (Cambridge Edition, Vol.7, 2012).

118 Umberto Eco, *The Name of the Rose*, translated from the Italian by William Weaver, London et al.: Vintage, 2005, 468 (William reads and translates a passage from the second chapter) and 474 (the murderer justifies his actions, referring to the great danger of the chapter's content). Also see the negative verdict against laughter, e.g. "The spirit is serene only when it contemplates the truth and takes delight in good achieved, and truth and good are not to be laughed at. This is why Christ did not laugh. Laughter foments doubt." (Cf. 132, one remark from Jorge and William's debate on laughter [see 130-133]); also see Indira Ghose, *Shakespeare and Laughter. A Cultural History*, Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2008, 169-170.

119 Note a recent collection of articles on Plato's attitude towards poetry, the poet, and its issues as creativity or mimesis, esp. see Francisco J. Gonzalez, 'The Hermeneutics of Madness: Poet and Philosopher in Plato's *Ion* and *Phaedrus*', *Plato and the Poets*, Pierre Destrée and Fritz-Gregor Herrmann (eds.), Leiden: Brill, 2011, 93-110, 110. At the bottom of criticism, Plato warns 'fearfully' that "[p]hilosophy is always in danger of becoming nothing but poetry."

120 Feuillerat (1963), 23.

121 *Ibid*., 28. "and herein especially Comedies give the largest field to eare". Using 'eare', he refers to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (The Knight's Tale, l. 28).

Aristophanes already used to define himself when he distanced himself from the direct and simple offenses of his predecessors and demanded that he raised comedy to an advanced status because he changed the stitch of mere vulgarity to forms of sophistication and cultivation. Briefly, he added *cháris*.[122]

The proclaimed recipe for a high-quality comedy seems to contain common errors of life in a sophisticated verbal presentation, which repeats aspirations to get free from simply vulgar and offensive laughter. Still, the recipe appears as too vague and too determined by self-fashioning mechanisms. It does not help to establish any nut-shell definition. Old Comedy rather confuses by its great diversity, heterogeneity and multiple voices representing "a permanent carnival as an endless masquerade".[123] Aristophanes' earlier pieces of drama express a potpourri out of "discontinuities, 'sense of duty', obscenity, satire, slapstick, high poetry, one-off jokes, featured song and dance";[124] his comedies show great differences among themselves and supply the laughable by various techniques and entities. Naturally, Aristophanes' plays should not be underestimated as a loosely-knit composition of mocking scenes but as a thematically-tied sequence with a pyrotechnical demonstration of how the laughable can come about.[125] Still, Old Comedy does not bear one coherent concept of what a comic plot should contain or of how the comic mask is embodied by figure and pragma but it determines an autonomous status of varying a rising concept. Jeffrey Rusten summarizes that "Old Comedy was not in itself stable—its form changed even within the lifetime of Aristophanes, and did not become fixed until the age of Menander."[126] Between the two great metonyms of Old and New Comedy, playwrights were active in the period of Middle Comedy; but unfortunately, the period remains a relatively dark chapter because of the enormous loss of their works.

The development between the three phases of Greek comedy, Old, Middle, and New, is worthy of note. They overlap in how distinctly and directly real-life persons and personae are verbally abused. In the course of these phases, a refinement took place as the custom of personal attacks ceased to be used and accepted. Similarly to Quintilian's earlier preference for urban humour, comic moments should not originate from the obscene derision of values and dignity but by intellectually-impressive construction. Splitting humour in two sections that of excellent, gentleman-like and that of coarse offensive humour dates back early in antiquity. Humour practices of both are spread over the public and private sphere and the sanctuary of religious feasts. For the first-mentioned, the course of time from the fourth century BC onwards shows the elite's tendency to welcome only refined humour, whereas invective and obscene tones got more and more banned from elite's etiquette as they no longer accepted it as an appropriate 'leisure' activity for them. Acceptability diminished more and more when people's former openness to a more aggressive humour was exchanged with the cautious handling expected to be always suitable to manners.[127] The conservative dogma against laughter and its uncontrolled and shameful manifestations rose in the fourth century and

---

122 Arbogast (2008), 316. That can be read in two *parabases* (*Vesp*. 1014-1050 and *Nub*. 518-594).

123 Jeffrey Rusten, 'In Search of the Essence of Old Comedy: from Aristotle's *Poetics* to Zieliński, Cornford, and beyond', *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014, 33-49, 47.

124 Michael S. Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 2000, 69.

125 Cf. Warning (1976), 290.

126 Rusten (2014), 33; for the circulation of Menander's works in antiquity, see Sebastiana Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

127 Cf. Bremmer (1997), 18-19.

changed the attitude towards laughing culture in scholarly circles and among the elite, especially with the influential scripts of Plato and Aristotle.

Before, even high-class members took on the role of the buffoon like a club of those, the sixty, did in Athens of the fourth century. The trade of parody and mimicking could earn a family and their tradition of being clowns fame. However, their profession's reputation faced a change when the wide-spread fashion of exposure and ribaldry was subsiding in particular concerning high culture; it was no longer considered an upper-class sport because of an upcoming disdain for buffoons and personal attacks.[128] Of course, mocking of public personae in a public sphere was not common; this habit of mocking was situated outside of those days' standards of behaviour but allowed during festive occasions like the Athenian procession to Eleusis, when well-known citizens were lampooned by a male or female prostitute wearing a veil. In the legitimate nature of such temporary official phases, comedy and its performance could draw upon the license standing in close analogy to the unconventional character of the god Dionysus, a representative for the reversal of order.[129] Outside these phases, comic forms like buffoonery became slowly but certainly stigmatized. From fourth century to roughly the second century, Greek society and saliently the elite had changed their attitude towards obscenity and humorous practices in the public sphere.

Parallel to that decline, Greek comedy's tone changed; open and personal invective decreased with the development of the genre. Several factors can be taken into account to be responsible. The fifth and fourth centuries embraced

> socio-cultural changes at Athens […] relevant to the evolution of comedy: increased specialization, professionalization, and monetization of public, private, and intellectual roles; internationalization of comic playwrights, audiences, and theater practitioners; and the competition and antagonism among art forms and discourses.[130]

That list of factors contains core issues for the development of comedy; it is also applicable to Renaissance's comedy.

Comparing Old with New Comedy shows that Menander's humorous practice appears to be much milder and more generalized than some earlier aggressive and invective tones and not as outspoken by or directed at particular citizens as it is the case for Aristophanes' plays.[131] The 'mildest', the comedy of manner, persuaded by decorous style, apparently more uniformity, and a unique register that gives the impression of being closer to real life.[132] Such differences were even advertised since many critics standing in the tradition of Plato and Aristotle preferred Menander to Aristophanes because they appreciated his correctness, appropriateness and succinctly, his educational value as Plutarch attributes a cultivated and

---

128 Cf. Bremmer and Roodenburg (eds.) (1997), 1.
129 Cf. Bremmer (1997), 13.
130 David Rosenbloom, 'The Politics of Comic Athens', *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014, 297-320, 301.
131 "Crucial to ancient theories on the transformation of comedy is the transformation of personal abuse, from the open attacks of Old Comedy to the veiled ones of Middle Comedy and the lack of invective in New Comedy, or rather its targeting only slaves and foreigners." (Nervegna [2013], 26; on politics, freedom of speech for comic poets, and political comedy, see esp. 25ff. and 32ff.); and cf. Rosenbloom (2014), 297; furthermore, it can be worthy to consider James Robson' account on humour and obscenity in Aristophanes, see James Robson, *Humour, Obscenity and Aristophanes*, Tübingen: Narr, 2006, esp. 70ff.
132 Cf. Silk (2000), 13, 69ff., 103; for detailed examples of Aristophanes' mockery, see Bernd Zimmermann, 'Aristophanes', *Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014, 132-159, 151.

intellectual audience to Menander and the opposite to Aristophanes.[133] Plutarch's evolution of cultivation from Old to New Comedy bears some resemblance to Aristophanes' own claims that he put a more sophisticated comedy on stage compared to his predecessors. Such judging voices were important for the (self-) fashioning of playwrights and their plays. Like Aristophanes, Plautus was a dramatist triggering controversy. By comparison with Menander, Plautus enhanced the element of farce in his plays, which brought him some negative judgement among the critics.[134]

In the Renaissance, judgemental voices argued against Aristophanes and Plautus' comedies as they accused them of showing too much farce and therefore, lacked didactic impulses like Franceso Robortello did in his *Explicationes* (Florence, 1548). Robortello followed Horace's crowning of Terence, one dominant voice in the Renaissance's discourse about Plautus and Terence.[135] As many others, Robortello interpreted Plautine comedy's world of seduction, inversion, trickery, and mocking wrongly as a corrupting comedy. Plautus chose a Greek framework, set unscrupulousness and intrigue in a Greek environment like Athens, the "comic city par excellence". He gave Romans the chance to separate them from this comic pool of vices.[136] Erasmus in his *Letter to Martin Dorp* complains about

> these thin-skinned critics who cannot put up with Folly herself as she makes fun of human life in general, branding no individual by name [.] The Old Comedy would never have been driven from the stage if it had refrained from mentioning the names of famous men.[137]

In regard to the so-far heard and coming voices attacking, defending, and defining laughter and comedy, it is not about portraying a solely restricted framework of laughter in history enslaving comedy, which is simply not true, in particularly, but about the recognition of fashions or better, lobbies. As showing corruption, comedy was misinterpreted as a sort of infectious disease. Direct, non-sophisticated insults were set disparate to the high art of comic and mocking. It is acceptable to say that the outspoken preference for moderate humour from the Greek and Roman period onwards took influence on the evaluation of comedy and with caution, also on the development of comedy.

Accordingly, ribaldry and coarseness were not seen as appropriate and commonly located in the lower social strata, which makes the deliberate fool figure a stereotypical member.[138] Coarse voices should only be sought in the lowest classes and were seen as more appropriate for 'rustic' performances, while simultaneously, 'high' comedy was expected to reduce such tones, in particularly personal attacks and political criticism. For instance, the typical division of refined and vulgar was practised "in Elizabethan England, [where]

---

133 Nervegna (2013), 50. And Plut. *mor*. 854a-c, 634ff.

134 Cf. Duckworth (1952), 28ff., esp. 30.

135 E.g. Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, 589, lines 1847-62 and commentary on those; praising Plautus in English Renaissance, see Francis Meres, *Poetrie*, intr. and notes Don Cameron Allen, *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, William A. Oldfather et al. (eds.), Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1931. Meres marks Seneca and Plautus as reference points for Shakespeare in his success in both genres since he describes Shakespeare as a ubiquitous genius outdoing Seneca and Plautus.

136 Rosenbloom (2014), 297; and see Fritz Graf, 'Cicero, Plautus, and Roman Laughter', *A Cultural History of Humour: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (eds.), Oxford: Polity, 1997, 29-39, 34-35.

137 Desiderius Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly*, transl. with an intro. and comm. by Clarence H. Miller, New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1979, 149. Because of his *Folly*, Erasmus himself had to cope with myriad irritated voices and even attacks against his assumed blasphemy.

138 Cf. Bremmer and Roodenburg (eds.) (1997), 6-7.

neoclassical writers regularly criticized the presence of clowns on stage."[139] Obviously, such attempted separation originated from artificial grounds deviating from theatrical praxis. If high forms of satire or ribald tones, mocking was not and most of all could not be censured in the relevant periods. And what is even more important for a functioning comedy, mockery could not be banned from comic stage in general as that would be the same as an operation on the beating heart. Briefly, pointing the finger on failure coincides with comedy's presentation of error and its perception. Theoretical approaches and theatrical praxis differed in their response to the questions of how failure was contextualized and visualized. This will be addressed more specifically in due course, especially concerning the deliberate fool figure in the Renaissance.

For now, the study will pursue to outline the tradition of comedy as a foundation for neoclassical comedy and understand the genre from the off-stage perspective of theorists and critics. In the comedies of Menander, Plautus, and Terence, the laughable could unfold in the setting of the society's nucleus, the family, its institution marriage, and its embedded generational conflict, but did not attempt to destabilize socio-political order. That quality probably made New and Roman Comedy easily available for later generations of playwrights.[140] Its 'harmless' universality of family issues was transferable to the Renaissance and its standards. According to Manfred Fuhrmann, Hellenistic-Roman comedy was a relatively tame manifestation of the genre if the comic moments are concerned.[141] In addition to the framework of morality and the preservation of certain standards and stereotypes, it was a question of style in accordance with the idea of refinement and professionalization. Beyond humour, from Greek to Roman, from the classics to the Renaissance, theorists claimed that the principle of refinement dominated the sphere of poetry and the process of imitation, a key to neoclassical understanding.

It is the discussion of how comedy's humour fits manners, questioning to what extent deformation is present, how elegantly it is done, and if pleasure and teaching show balance. These issues deal with the distance and closeness between life and stage, their ability to teach and relate to the conflict between truth, reality, and fiction. Comedy's imitation of life was expected to fulfil the task of teaching manners and morals and deny any tendency to corrupt its audience. Adversaries of a too farcical tone condemned Plautus for not serving that demand, whereas Sir Thomas Elyot, who wrote the first English definition of comedy defending comedy as a non-corrupting genre, confronting the attacks against the farcical poet Plautus.[142] The followers of Plautus and Terence formed two camps due to laughter's tone, subject, and object and in regard to comedy's degree of moral restraint and didactic significance in those days. In such black-and-white-shadowing, great poets and thinkers of their time, like Meres, Elyot, or Jonson, were either pro or con Plautus;[143] some even praised him with utmost sweetness or criticised his works with utmost rejection. The two camps seemed to propose a division between farce and utility or modesty and corruption. But it is rarely either/or if the spectrum of comedy is concerned. The deliberate fool exemplifies that

---

139 François Laroque, 'Shakespeare's Festive Comedies', *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. The Comedies*, Vol. III, Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (eds.), Oxford et al.: Blackwell Publishing, ²2006, 23-46, 37.

140 In comparison to Aristophanes' treatment of socio-political values and ideological spectrum, see Rosenbloom (2014), 302-07.

141 Cf. Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Lizenzen und Tabus des Lachen', *Das Komische*, Wolfgang Preisendanz and Rainer Warning (eds.), München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976, 65-101, 101.

142 Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Book Named the Governor* (1531), Henry Herbert Stephen Croft (ed.), Vol. I, New York: Burt Franklin, 1967, esp. 124-7.

143 For a more detailed look at the evaluation of Plautus and Terence, see Riehle (1990), 14ff.

balance since the figure negotiates between and combines the issues of utility and pleasure, especially in regard to Shakespeare's concept of the wise fool.

Indeed, one of the most decisive principles that were taken to evaluate and concomitantly, produce pieces of poetry was the general conjecture in the Renaissance that poetic pieces as 'high' comedy should adopt the Horatian combination of pleasure and utility. Laughter belongs to the instrumental level of pleasure and simultaneously, opens up the access to a utilitarian quality since the laughable guides the audience's evaluation process and their recognition of failure. In the Renaissance, New Comedy was seen as fulfilling the Horatian demand, offering a modest account.[144] This has to be kept in mind for the analysis since manifestations depended on the discourse on the concept of comedy. Nevertheless, the politics of manners should not be mistaken as a too powerful censure. Comedy's development and its depiction of the ugly are linked to its ritual license in the public sphere; it is a question of socio-cultural taste and the presence of shame.

The coming outline of the schema of comedy and its principles provides operable categories on the abstract level to describe superordinate relations among New Comedy and Shakespearean plays, whereas the schema does not explicate to what extent a play corrects vices and teaches manners. Though the study is not interested in judging comedy, the knowledge of these issues is highly important for the understanding of comedy in those days and the study of the professional fool figure, whose metamorphosis from Plautus to Shakespeare includes refinement not in the form of mere teaching but by offering epistemic value, while comedy is placed in the standard framework of family, love, and marriage.

As stated in Ben Jonson's words about Aristotle and Plato's view on comedy and its relation to laughter:

> Nor is the moving of laughter always the end of comedy; that is rather a fowling for the people's delight, or their fooling. For as Aristotle says rightly, the moving of laughter is a fault in comedy, a kind of turpitude, that depraves some part of a man's nature without a disease. As a wry face without pain moves laughter, or a deformed vizard, or a rude clown dressed in a lady's habit and using her actions; we dislike and scorn such representations, which made the ancient philosophers ever think laughter unfitting in a wise man. And this induced Plato to esteem of Homer as a sacrilegious person, because he presented the gods sometimes laughing. As also it is divinely said of Aristotle that to seem ridiculous is a part of dishonesty, and foolish.[145]

Comedy's 'suspicious' treatment can be compared to scholarly attempts to place the genre in a frame of modesty. But fortunately, the controversy between high and low, between modesty and ribaldry did not affect comedy's richness and creative 'freedom' severely. Audiences back then could enjoy comic plays stemming from the feather of most brilliant playwrights thinking outside the box and exploiting the genre's versatility. In antiquity, comedy's communicative function was the escape from conventional forces as watching a comedic play allows the audience to enter an upside-down world embedded outside the jurisdiction. Comedy took her license from the genre's institutionalization as part of festive occasions, whose Saturnalian quality is still palpable in the early comedies of Shakespeare, but its official character faded.[146] Thinking about the comprehension and reception of comedy

---

144 For an overview of Renaissance's comprehension of comedy, see Riehle (1990), 8-10.
145 Cf. Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, Vol. 7, David Bevington et al. (eds.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 590, lines 1866-75. All the following citations will be given from this edition.
146 Cf. Warning (1976), 326-7.

coincides with thinking about antiquity's shaping of comedy, Renaissance's purpose of cultural enrichment, the principle of refinement, and comedy's traditional license linked to its playful and conscious treatment of how the laughable can criticize, attack, and expose. Fortunately, comedy's scope was not limited at all, which can be seen in its great diversity of forms over the centuries and in its 'rural' and 'urban' manifestations: the mime, *Atellana*, *commedia dell'arte*, *commedia erudite*—to name few well-known kinds. Their collection suited every taste—the plebeians, the patricians, the nobles, the scholars or the masses.

The average audience buying tickets and granting comedies and their playwrights popularity and a living did not condemn invective or ribaldry at all—they loved it. With all the appreciation of refinement, overestimated modest humour and overly enthusiastic correction of vices would have got too tiring and boring to watch for one or two hours. As his colleagues, Plautus had to compete with other entertaining options such as fighting gladiators or circus performances. In comparison to Terence, his strategy set on a greater portion of hilarity, funny reproaches, cracking jokes, and thus giving the audience what they longed for: boisterous laughter.[147] The stream of reduced invective, refined humour, controlled and utilitarian laughter are juxtaposed with the appeal of 'unruly' humour, comic stage's feature of relaxing the conventional strictness, and embodied folly. Competing for the playgoer is certainly even more valid for Shakespeare's day, when the dramatic performances no longer pivoted on particular festive dates but public theatres in London. Usually, the playwright, if it was not a mandate from aristocrats or even the Court, had to consider spectators consisting of every social stratum, when he was writing for the public stage.[148] He had to supply appealing material for all of them, which included Latin phrases and mythological references and therefore, the condition that the playgoer was educated in the classics. The groundlings (spectators at the bottom of the social ladder)[149] however enjoyed practical jokes, mimicking, puns, and the comic of the carnivalesque much more as most of them probably lacked the knowledge to appreciate allusions to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. For instance, the average playgoer would not have enjoyed the play Hamlet remembers when he talks to the players since it

---

147 Cf. Graf (1997), 35; in accordance with Michael Fontaine's argumentation, the audience is assumed to be "exclusive" stemming from the Roman elite and aristocracy, which represents the educated and politically-engaged class (Michael Fontaine, *Funny words in Plautine Comedy*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2010, 185). This group knew some Greek, was familiar with myth and shared an interest in theatre. As elite, they had philosophical and rhetoric training heavily drawing on Greek sources and teachers. Accordingly, this kind of elite members can be classified philhellenists, showing an attraction to Greek literature and language (cf. *Ibid.*, 185-6). Here note Donald C. Earl, 'Political Terminology in Plautus', *Historia*: *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 9.2 (1960): 235-243. Personal relationships are set in the context of Roman politics by the use of political terms. Donald Earl sees in Plautus' use even a strategy of romanizing his Greek originals.
For an account on legal language, see Evangelos Karakasis, 'Legal Language in Plautus with Special Reference to *Trinummus*', *Mnemosyne* 56.2 (2003): 194-209. Although Evangelos Karakasis argues that Plautus' audience stemmed from all social classes, the prominence of legal matter and legal language suggests an audience that was familiar with the terminology and the situation in praxis. Hence, they could quickly understand the legal conditioning Plautus often used for the plot of intrigue, e.g. in *Poenulus*.
148 Cf. Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 59ff. esp. 66.
149 For an overview of the notion's origination and placement in theatrical history, see Bettina Boecker, *Shakespeares elisabethanisches Publikum, Formen und Funktionen einer Fiktion der Shakespearekritik und −forschung*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2006, 81ff.

[…] pleased not the million, 'twas caviare to the general. But it was […] an excellent play, well digested in the scenes, set down with as much modesty as cunning. (*Hamlet,* 2.2.428-32)[150]

The target group influences the play's tone or the degree of farce and moral lessons.

In general, the play displays a piece of entertainment one playgoer consumes, while he watches and listens to the play. Consequently, apart from the individual knowledge and social background, the general playgoer can be distinguished differently. He is a spectator and a listener, which brings both senses into the focus and reveals them as demanding entities the playwright should satisfy. A play should offer 'a feast for the senses', which could be satisfied by a fine mixture of performance for the eye and the ear. In Shakespeare's time, some playwrights thought that the spectators did not appreciate their plays as much as they should since they wanted a spectacle, a feast for the eye. They were said not to recognize the value of the 'poetic soul' living in the play. In contrast to Jonson, who complained about the philistinism of his spectators calling for a show, Shakespeare was not as affected by the quarrel of the senses but had a good understanding of how to achieve an appropriate balance in a play for the audience including academics and illiterates.[151] Instead of taking the matter personally and defending his style as a playwright, Shakespeare alludes to the pragmatic background of the issue in London's theatres: when Hamlet comments on the stage types, he links the figure of the clown to those that are eager to watch a spectacle. "[T]he Clown shall make those laugh whose lungs are tickle o'th'sear" (*Ham.*2.2.320-21) and who simply want to laugh like a drain.[152]

Members of this group belong to the spectators, whose eyes seek satisfaction in the populist comic figures. Here, it is important to mention that perceiving by the eye instead of reading or listening was said to be able to enchain reason. In the world of theatre, enchanting reason stands in analogy to love's folly or the typical crisis of identity initiated. In brief, illusion deceives the eye. Ears can listen to wise words as it was the common practice of reading aloud, which set it closer to listening than to the visual perception. Instead, the eye stands in association to ignorance, deception, and base feelings.[153] Hence, spectacle and its followers prefer comic figures of a lose tongue that are not interested in simply pleasing a conservative attitude. Shakespeare's interlacement of wisdom and folly in a single figure, the wise fool, appears to image the combination of both senses and both groups of playgoers. Ears and eyes, education and 'ignorant' spectacle, are both served by this type though its carnivalesque essence probably fascinates lower classes more than the upper. François Laroque confirms the negotiating and central position of the fool figure in Shakespeare's drama since

---

150 William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, George Richard Hibbard (ed.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1998. All further citations will be given from this edition.

151 Gurr (1987), 85-87. Hence, the artist's product as a show for the spectator can differ from the artist's self-concept of being a poet, who produces pieces of poetic value ears can best appreciate, whereas the eye is related to a more degraded and base feeling of ecstasy. And on the emphasis on the former but as a minority among the scope of plays, see esp. 87: "[t]he idea that poets wrote plays more as poetry than as spectacle and more as a treat of intellectual inventiveness than a traditional festival started early in the sixteenth century, and was mostly attached to Court plays. It was a narrow concept, generating plays like *Magnyfycence, King Johann* and *Gorboduc*, the staging of which kept close to the traditions of academic drama and the plays composed in Latin at the universities for audiences trained to listen intelligently".

152 Also see *Ham.* 3.2.36-42. On clowns who improvise and add more to the text in order to gain further laughter but by cheap means.

153 Cf. Gurr (1987), 88-93 and esp. 92-3. In 1600, boy companies concentrated more on the educated audience and tried to win them.

> [i]n the London playhouses that attracted increasing numbers in the 1590s due to the establishment of fixed and professional stages, but also to fierce competition between them, the stage clown was to become a most significant figure for the whole atmosphere, life, and structure of Shakespearean comedy, from Launce and his dog in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, to Feste in *Twelfth Night*.[154]

Plautus' comedies, his *servus callidus*, Shakespeare's plays and his professional fools draw their great popularity decisively from their fineness of presenting spectacles and thereby, reaching a mostly broad mass of playgoers. Instead of Terence's great preference among the humanists, performances of Plautus' plays heavily outnumbered those of Terence at Oxford and Cambridge. In addition, Plautus' plays were a popular source among English playwrights.[155] In comparison to Terence, Plautus' style was closer to the native and 'rural', which probably eased the adaptation of his comedies as the playwrights could harmonize native and classical tradition in their plays. Plautus and Shakespeare's main and sovereign comic figure, the professional fool, exemplifies a multipart version of both traditional streams. The fool does so with an ironic perspicacity in the world of comedy.

In sum, composing comedy in antiquity and in the Renaissance hinged on competition among the playwrights, nations, and the generic professionalization and on rivalry for playgoers; it had to serve the different tastes of the audience.[156] The playwright's ability to realize comedy's nature in action and words was a decisive condition for his success and the satisfaction of the playgoers' expectations. What could be better than a figure that embodies comedy's nature, provides the laughable, while promising a spectacle and adjusting his folly to the poetic ideal, at least in terms of comedy's poetics? Using traditional figures of the trickster, jester, or buffoon makes their adaptation to the play's environment necessary. The metamorphosis of the fool thus pivots on spectators or audience and the playwrights' interpretation.

Transformation happens in a complex, even contradictory environment: a conservative attitude towards 'wild' laughter and the genre of comedy, the challenge of imitation and refinement, the pragmatics of writing a comedy for playgoers with either a mixed or a mono-social background, and the popularity of hilarity and buffoonery.[157] Working in that environment requests a professional poet that knows how to serve "the unskilful" and "the judicious".[158] For Shakespeare, modesty should not be seen as a simple restraint but as "the modesty of nature", the persuasive imitation of life that should not be overdone—or to say it with Hamlet's words when he instructs the players how to act and refers to the tripartite definition of comedy: *imitation vitae, speculum consuetudinis, imago veritatis*.[159]

The best 'recipe' depends on the elements of popularity and uniqueness. It is about the use and abuse of those days' central instruments to civilization—poetry and rhetoric. In other words, the professional jester, poetic creator, and orator are fused in the deliberate fool

---

154 Laroque (²2006), 36.
155 Cf. Riehle (1990), 16-18.
156 These conditions are also applicable to other genres, of course.
157 Note Silk et al. (2014), 123. In the Elizabethan-Jacobean period, theatregoers came from a socially diverse background.
158 See *Ham.* 3.2.24-25.
159 *Ham.* 3.2.18ff.; and see Oxford World's Classics edition, Hibbard (ed.) (1998), 249, on l. 19-23.

figure observing and commenting on the image of truth.[160] In comparison to other types, it is the professional fool figure that functions perfectly to serve the playwright as a combination of refined folly, supported by several features the type brings with him. He is a lower-class member, using obscene tones. Mocking and occasions for boisterous laughter are not spread throughout comedy's discourse but offered in a single figure, whose license for mocking stems from official feasts of Saturnalian quality. His marginality protects him. He is skilled in ridiculing, aware of the challenge of refinement and the body of comic themes.

From the perspective of humanist thinking, the essence of the professional wise fool as the combination of wisdom and folly parallels humanist combination of wisdom and eloquence.[161] From classical tradition, rhetoric knew of comic's value for persuasion. Indeed, the instrumental use of laughter and its subversive mode might have been appreciated by nobody better than some influential thinkers of the 16th century. The humanist that immediately springs to mind in that sense is Erasmus, who

> […] in *The Praise of Folly*, had taken delight in showing the ubiquity of Folly, independent of people's social status. Erasmus' method is characterized by a mixture of irony, satire, and understanding humour resulting in a tone of comic lightness.[162]

Before he started to write *The Praise of Folly*, Erasmus had dealt with Lucian of Samosata's dialogues and translated them with the help of Thomas More. Unsurprisingly, Lucian's model of satire is traceable while reading Erasmus' work. Nevertheless, naming the mock-encomium's single attribute involves a challenge since the content and tone of the book itself cannot be described either by the adjective 'wise' or by 'folly' sufficiently. In terms of a *morosophos*, the figure fuses wisdom with folly and elucidates itself as a paradoxical form that allows itself inconsistency and self-irony. His "mock-encomium on folly—Folly's oration in praise of herself", which implies a paradoxical relation between praise and the assumed unworthiness of the praised, deals with Folly prevailing in the true Christian and men so that they can bear with life because of a Christian joyful vision of life.[163] Like Lucian, the satirical voice questions the reader's illusions of morals or men's tendency for arrogance about their wisdom, while the scripts offer never a tiring reading but a revealing and amusing experience.[164] Lucian and his readers More and saliently, Erasmus with his *Folly* set a high barren for the entertaining, seemingly non-serious accounts on serious matters or witty contradictories that please and teach. In Elizabethan humanism, high comedy should desire nothing less. In its manifestation, the revealing folly did not bypass native and classical elements that already embodied that duality, which encompasses the Vice and the court fool

---

160 Scholars had promoted poetry and rhetoric as the means for civilization in their defensive accounts. See Brian Vickers, '"The Power of Persuasion": Images of the Orator, Elyot to Shakespeare', *Renaissance Eloquence*, James J. Murphy (ed.), Berkeley et al.: University of Illinois Press, 1983, 411-435, 414-15.

161 For an overview on humanism, their focus on eloquence as well as its relation to ethics, and its impact on England, see Jill Kraye (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1996, here esp. Peter Mack, 'Humanist rhetoric and dialectic', 82-99; and esp. on *De oratore*, see Mike Pincombe, *Elizabethan Humanism, Literature and Learning in the later Sixteenth Century*, Harlow/London: Pearson Education Limited, 2001, 22ff.

162 Riehle (1990), 18.

163 Miller (1979), ix and see x-xvii. It is worthy to note that around fourteen indices in France, Spain, Italy listed Erasmus' book among forbidden books after the Sorbonne had censured it in 1543. Also note Erasmus' use of his own *Adagia* (1508).

164 Cf. Clare Carroll, 'English Literature in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Jill Kraye (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 246-268, 250-51.

as much as the Plautine prototype.[165] The deliberate fool or the supposedly foolish figure but a thinker in motley supplies the playwright with the thematic flexibility and unpredictability to establish an appealing scope for each theatregoer. In short, they can be detected as the licensed speakers of "aesthetic trends".[166]

Similar to Laroque's view on the significance of the fool figure, Robert Hornback even believes in the combination of the fool figure and their actors', Tarlton, Kemp and Armin, great achievement of preserving

> the previous status of comedy among intellectuals and elites [as,] [b]enefiting from the Humanist embrace of folly, their appeal to intellectuals was also partly due to the fact that the stakes involved in clowning could once be extraordinarily high, incorporating heady moral, religious, political, philosophical, and educative concerns.[167]

Here, Hornback focuses on another influence determining the metamorphosis of Shakespeare's fool figures since he considers the development of the fool figure going from the more natural instantiations as the butts of laughter like it can be found in Dogberry to the professional fools in Touchstone, Feste and co. to have been encouraged actively by the available and popular actors in Shakespeare's company.[168] The appearance, special skills such as dancing, singing or ventriloquism, popularity, and the improvisatory talent of actors most probably play a role for a playwright's conception of figures certainly if it is the case that he writes for a specific cast. Though, the turn from Kemp to Armin should not be overestimated since the creative process also depends on the play's plot, the atmosphere, the parallel or antagonistically-structured pairing of figures. For instance, *The Taming of the Shrew* and *As You Like It* are separated by utopian prevalence, female domination, the enhancement of private romance, and varied comic drivers. Hence, Hornback's argument has its validity but should be listed among the other influences.

All these points call attention to the persistence and the metamorphosis of the deliberate fool—without denying the censorious, challenging, and controlling attitude towards the comic in history;[169] however, voices of authority should not be overestimated for comedy's conception. There was a balance between conservative dogma, the playwright's education, his choices, his work, its reception, and the audience response.

> Whereas modern tend to hold the comic in low esteem, that attitude did not really become influential *on stage* until well into the Jacobean period. The comic – and the clown – in the Elizabethan theatre was something else entirely, less like neoclassical tragedy as 'caviare to the general' (*Ham.* 2.2.433) and more, to strain the gustatory metaphor, like oysters for everybody, an affordable delicacy widely coveted by high and low. […] The contrasting alignment of a 'purer' form of theatrical genre with an elite group distinguishing between high and low tastes, arguably the goal of the imported neoclassical revaluing of comedy, did not really find strong footing in the

---

165 See ch. II.ii. on the Vice and the court fool.
166 Hornback (2009), 5.
167 *Ibid.*, 5.
168 *Ibid.*, 156-57: "In any case, as remarkable as it may seem to modern commentators, such rapid, *actor-specific* revision and initial creation of parts was characteristic not only of Shakespeare's practice but that of the Renaissance theatre generally and of the King's Men in particular. […] for instance, when Shakespeare himself suddenly shifted from writing the rustic 'ass' Dogberry specifically for Will Kemp to creating the witty fool Touchstone specifically for Armin". Furthermore see 155-59 on Robert Armin and his impacts; see 130-42 on Will Kemp and his role as Dogberry.
169 Cf. *Ibid.*, 9-10. A censorious attitude can be understood while reading critical texts demarking comedy from tragedy, low from high dramatic forms, 'pure' from mingling sorts of drama.

professional theatre until, not coincidentally, the retirement not just of Shakespeare, but of the clown Armin, *c.* 1613.[170]

Shakespeare's deliberate fool figures thus rely on the attraction of the comic on stage, making the performance appealing to all social groups. They can profit from comedy's freedom. The license of the fool figure corresponds strongly to the utopia of comedy, where the vernacular and the standard meet and where kings and clowns, masters and servants are allowed to mingle. His freedom and flexibility are a blank canvas to meet different demands in medieval and Renaissance drama: religious ideology mainly hides in the form of the vice; the image of *poeta* and Erasmian wise folly serves humanist thinking; the education of the masses can be found in the fool's prop and quality, carrying and functioning as a mirror. The striking point is the type's integration into comedy and its texture. The professional fool figure is bound to but cannot indisputably be associated to just one of the following epithets of comedy: jocular, primitive, spectacular, corrective, and other classifications that try to identify a play in the complex of theoretical voices.[171] As Northrop Frye has noted,

> [t]he popular and primitive form of drama is a romantic spectacle, full of violent action, whether melodramatic or farcical, dancing and singing, ribald dialogue, and picturesque settings. Comedy preserves this primitive form better than tragedy, and romantic comedy of Shakespeare's type preserves it better than the comedy of manners.[172]

The question remains how this primitive form can be expounded more closely and what hides beneath the single features as a common ground. Here, primitive should not be understood as diminishing term but as the sub-texture of each comic play, a schema that unites the variations of plot and stereotypes from antiquity to the Renaissance.

Beyond categorizations and dogmatic and pragmatic issues, the following part of the chapter now puts effort in outlining the underlying schema of comedy, the myriad variants and the distinction between high and low. The scholarly attention will concentrate on an abstract foundation by sticking to the understanding of one macro-category the comic with accompanying affect—laughter is connected with the ugly. The account intends to gain a schema of comedy, which means comedy's broad structure, particularly available from New Comedy to the Renaissance, while it bypasses a detailed portrayal of comedy in the Middle Ages as the objects of interest concern Renaissance's reception processes relying on antiquity's material. Here, the account does not focus on a formal, chronological structure but on a universalizing abstract formula, wherein the type of the professional fool figure is situated as a variation of the ugly since the professional fool figure on the comic stage instantiates something ugly, while he moves freely within the framework of failure, distortion, and deformation, knowing of the effect of this category. Therefore, the following part of the

---

170 Hornback (2009), 4-5. And for the period after Shakespeare and the presence of the fool figure, note for example the problematic stake of the fool figure in *King Lear*'s Quarto in comparison to Folio esp. in later periods as the Restoration. And 144: "The puzzling history of the Fool – including his shocking excision for over 150 years (1681 to 1838), initiated for political and aesthetic reasons under the mutually censorious influences of neoclassicism and the 'crisis years of 1678-82,' particularly in the wake of the trumped-up Popish Plot of 1679 – suggests that perhaps we are missing something in the Quarto, for all critics' dismissal of it as inferior."

171 For denoting the terms 'popular' and 'conventional' concerning comedy especially in Shakespeare's time, see Northrop Frye, 'Making Nature afraid', *William Shakespeare. Comedies and Romances*, ed. with an introd. by Harold Bloom, New York et al.: Chelsea House, 1986, 177-198, 188-89.

172 *Ibid.*, 189.

chapter is especially absorbed with the category of the ugly and its manifestations in New and specifically Roman Comedy in order to pinpoint an overall schema, from where the fool figure's performance can be discussed and evaluated for its functionality and fecundity.

The first step should be to clarify the notion of ugly, its position and context in comedy since it is nearly impossible and not advisable to liberate the considerations on comedy from the categorizations of the ugly since these frames of mind attach to the production, criticism, and reception of comedy.[173] A useful starting point for discussing the term 'ugly' and describing comedy is the passage of Aristotle's *Poetics*, where he gives a at least partial definition of comedy:

> Comedy [...] is a representation of inferior people, not indeed in the full sense of the word bad, but the laughable is a species of the base or ugly. It consists in some blunder or ugliness that does not cause pain or disaster, an obvious example being the comic mask which is ugly and distorted but not painful.[174]

Aristotle outlines a semantic net of qualities and a sort of hierarchy for comedy's scope. The notion 'ugly' can be set within the semantic compass of bad [*kakia*], linked to the term '*aischron*' and subsuming the laughable [*geloion*].[175] The ugly, which could be taken as a subordinate form to bad, abandons the characteristic of evil but remains within the framework of shame, baseness, and contempt.

In proportion to tragedy, base and ugly replace excellence and beauty. Imitation concentrates on behaviour and traits of character that are assumed "worse than the average",[176] worse than 'us', and that do not fulfil the aspiration towards an ideal at all, but on the contrary, comedic mimesis loudly expresses the human disposition to make mistakes, to fail, to get lost in excess, vanity and obscenity. These characteristics come together under the category of the ugly; but at all times, it does so with a guarantee that it will not end in disaster. The form of how the ugly becomes instantiated adheres to the promise of being harmless and unpainful, which is comedy's characteristic in contrast to tragedy's catastrophe. In fact, what is left over from Aristotle's definition of comedy mostly depends on comedy's

---

173 Also note Umberto Eco's work *On Ugliness* outlining the concept of the ugly adduced by myriad manifestations (devil, monsters, corpses, caricature, industry) taken from a timespan of almost three thousand years.

174 Aristotle, *The Poetics*, transl. by William Hamilton Fyfe, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973, 18-21 (Aristot. *poet.* 1449a5). All further citations will be given from that volume. Compare the same passage in Stephen Halliwell's later edition and translation in Loeb Classical Library (LCL 199), 1995, where the notion of shame and the effect of error is stressed: "Comedy, as we said, is mimesis of baser but not wholly vicious characters: rather, the laughable is one category of the shameful. For the laughable comprises any fault or mark of shame which involves no pain or destruction: most obviously, the laughable mask is something ugly and twisted, but not painfully." (Aristotle, *The Poetics*, ed. and transl. by Stephen Halliwell, Cambridge, Mass. et al.: Harvard University Press, 1995, 45).

175 Cf. Dirk Westerkamp, 'Laughter, Catharsis, and the Patristic Conception of Embodied Logos', *Embodiment in Cognition and Culture*, John Michael Krois et al. (eds.), Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007, 221-242, 228. Westerkamp outlines a hierarchy, beginning with '*kakia*' followed by its subform '*aischron*' and ending in its species '*geloion*'.

In contrast, some scholars interpret *aischron* as a complex meaning ugly, shameful, and base in a non-hierarchical division. Here compare Kelly Wrenhaven, 'A Comedy of Errors: the Comic Slave in Greek Art', *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greek Comic Drama*, Ben Akrigg and Rob Tordoff (eds.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 124-143, 126.

176 See translation done by Ingram Bywater of Aristotle, *On the Art of Poetry*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

nature in deviation to tragedy.[177] Denoting comedy cannot happen without taking the genres' interrelatedness and their dependency in classical theory into account.[178] They have a complementary relation since comedy starts from and amends tragedy's disastrous outcome. Both are situated in the circular process of constituting order, whose sequence alternates between a corrupt status to the restoration of harmony. The dichotomy of tragedy and comedy is based upon the imitation of human struggling in life divided by their different approaches resulting in differing perspectives, and the attitudes towards flaw. In their basic composition, comedy and tragedy interrelate in the element of failure as the latter shows failing called *hamartia* causing disaster in the end, while the former gains a ridiculous situation by *hamartema* meaning some defect that is only recognized on the background of social convention. On the abstract level of the comic model, the result, distortion, is received out of the action (*hamartema*) and a second element, the assumption to act correctly, the attempt and will to act correctly or the expectation that someone acts correctly according to the moral codex and convention.

The ugly in the nature of action can be detected in the presence of error or in other words, the main course of comic action can be translated as "*totius nodus erroris*, the entire complexity of the entanglements".[179] The core element, error, exposes the manifestations of ugly in action and was taken to distinguish a four-part structure essentially from New Comedy to the Renaissance: *prologue*, *protasis, epitasis*, and *catastrophe*. With regard to tragedy, Donatus and Evanthius partitioned comedy's structure, which automatically issued the idea of Act division, which had an impact on humanist studies and editions.[180] The rule had its significance among playwrights and critics but was still vague enough to allow a free range for interpretation and allows the playwright the decision of how loosely or how coherently the sequence of action is arranged. However, *totius nodus erroris* and the considerations on plot structure and act division, which depend on the playwright, the play, and the period, do not suffice to narrow down one coherent schema of comedy. If it is not chronology or the logical construction of pragma that solely helps to describe what the nature of comedy is, then the study must search for the coherent element that unites comedy's texture and lays the groundwork for communicating the comic to the audience. The comic composition of action realizes the species of the ugly that intends to transfer the distortion of the imitated in a condensed and exaggerated way to the audience.

The spectator laughing at the spectacle deforms his face from the status-quo to a grimace. Clearly, the spectator could enjoy this species of the ugly in a different way than tragedy entertains as comedy got laughter as a hallmark. Comedy's laughable is in conflict with and simultaneously, complements tragedy's pathos, putting the judgement of the representation and its emotional reaction in the centre of the genre and the audience as responding to it. The category can be understood more precisely if the analysis follows aesthetics' approach differentiating form from effect.[181] Like the laughable, comedy's schema

---

177 Aristotle announces the definition of the comic and comedy to come after the chapter about tragedy and the epic poem. Unfortunately, this part was lost at some unknown time. The critics must cope with a brief abstract about comedy at the beginning of the fifth chapter and one codex of the 10th century belonging to the *Coislin* collection of the National Library in Paris, which is said to content some thoughts of Aristotle's theory on comedy. For more details, see Schmitt (2008), 304-5.
178 Cf. Riehle (1990), 101.
179 *Ibid*., 101, also see 97-8. The Latin phrase stems from Evanthius, *De Fabula* in: *Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti*, I, 22. Evanthius puts the initiation of entanglement at the beginning of Act II.
180 Cf. *Ibid.*, 97.
181 Cf. Kliche (2001), 27ff.

is grounded in that duality since staging human vanity, failures, and the deformation of rules and sense presents forms of the laughable; the kind of affect depends on if and how the single spectator reacts to this entity. On the one hand, comedy is determined and confirmed by its long tradition and establishment of a repertoire involving stereotypes, plots, motives, register, metre summing up to a body of forms. On the other, the genre can be defined by the spectator's response and judgement of the dramatic performance as comic, which shapes and selects the body of forms. Of what kind is that response? Comedy is not interested in the reaction of horror or disgust, which also fall beneath the spectrum of affect elicited by the ugly, but in seeking an emotion that is not painful and is associated with joy. What kind of object is needed to receive such responses?

In the 19th century, philosophers on aesthetics approached the category of the ugly with some profound considerations. Christian Hermann Weisse described its species, the comic, as something ugly that lacks evil characteristics or misses the sting of ugliness, which means something ugly that is not ugly any more.[182] It seems that he took the right path but did not pursue it until the very end, which Karl Rosenkranz in his influential treatise *Ästhetik des Häßlichen* (1853) managed to do. For him, the comic comes about in a transformation process that starts with something ugly, dissolves this piece of ugly and releases it into the freedom of the beautiful.[183] Within this process, the ugly is thought as the negation of the beautiful (*Negativschöne*) that diminishes to nothing in the end. There is a moment within the comic and thus, within that process, when the pure ideal is negated but the negation shows itself to be obsolete. The dissolution of the stability of the *Negativschöne* indicates that the positive ideal is not threatened but acknowledged.

Weisse's lack of sting is now precisely put into words, namely in a relation between the beautiful, the ugly, and the comic, wherein the comic form achieves to be a hypothetical union of the juxtaposed poles and rethinks the species of the ugly simultaneously as the dual species of the beautiful and the ugly, which has to be kept in mind for the following as it emphasizes the salient factors of opposition and dissolution. The end of the transformation, the dissolution, manifests a form of a harmless character, which does not undermine ethical stability.[184] The driving force of a possible threat and hostility dissipates with the recognition and acceptance of the comic form. That can only hold valid of course if the emotional response of the single recipient is left aside; namely if the recipient is not the target of laughter but can keep some distance from the consumed comic. Symbolically, form and reaction both are unified in the comic mask Aristotle uses as an example for a form showing the exact kind of affect the representation intends to arouse. For this study, the schema can be expressed in the nutshell of the comic mask and all metamorphoses it can undergo since the comic mask here stands for the materialized essence of how the laughable comes into existence. This analysis thus deals with manifestations primarily as it is simply the factual data that can be relied on, whereas a study of sensual experience is hardly possible here.

Dichotomy in the nucleus of comedy—in the comic moment—can also be found in comedy's macrostructure of action and themes. The semantic level of comedy is shot through with binary oppositions like normality vs. abnormality or rationality vs. irrationality. As the earliest testimony of European drama, Aristophanes' comic world consists of juxtapositions of "the mythical and the familiar, the magical and the rational, the fantastic and the pragmatic,

---

182 Cf. Christian Hermann Weisse, *System der Aesthetik als Wissenschaft von der Idee der Schönheit*, Bd. I (Leipzig 1830), Hildesheim: Olms, 1966, 209ff. (translation is mine); And for an overview, see Karlheinz Barck, Jörg Heininger, and Dieter Kliche, 'Ästhetik/ästhetisch', *ÄGB* I (2000), 308-400, 374.

183 Cf. Karl Rosenkranz, *Ästhetik des Häßlichen*, Dieter Kliche (ed.), Stuttgart: Reclam, ²2015, 7.

184 Cf. *Ibid.*, 14-15, 314-316.

the metaphorical and the literal", conveying a persistent generic foundation.[185] The list of these oppositions easily fits Shakespeare's comedies, for example if *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is concerned. Such general binary codes move beneath the structure of action. In accordance to Northrop Frye, New Comedy can be seen as a tripartite, flowing structure, which relies on an intact order, starts from the order's violation, and ends in its restoration, which process bears opposition and its dissolution.[186] Consequently, it can be said that the schema of comedy knows juxtaposition in the species of the *Negativschöne*, which affects and entertains the spectator as the basic and momentary element, and in the ascending and descending of opposition in the course of pragma until the final dissolution. Comedy's generic idiosyncrasy is the dramatic realisation of juxtapositions, whose perception gives rise to conflicts that must be of such a quality and degree of sustainability that the recipient can accept their harmlessness. The conflict should not cause an emotional response of fear, anger, or other feelings that rather deny laughter than foster it. In other words, comedy urges the recipient to take a certain perspective on the staged matter so that he is able to dissolve the discrepancy between the real world's order, rationality, limitation and freedom and the stage's otherness as non-constitutive beyond the stage and recognize the laughable.[187]

The next step must be to determine the schema of comedy to a greater extent by looking at how the species of the ugly was vivid on stage and especially with respect to the generic manifestations of the base at their peaks of New Comedy and Roman Comedy becoming an important source for modern Western drama culture. The essential development that is fruitful for this analysis is definitely the stabilization of one coherent concept of comedy regarding plot, figures, motives, which transfers the species in pragma and figure that therefore becomes available, describable, and comparable. Roman Comedy and the later European model of comedy were indebted to New Comedy's depiction of error. Error is central to comedy's plot, where the category of the ugly is realized on the level of pragma. Salingar conjectures one of the most common errors in classical comedy to be or stem from trickery. Following Duckworth, trickery belongs to a dual understanding of error involving contrived and not contrived sources of failure. Thereby, thinking of a broader conception of error, he adds 'misapprehension' to be the driving force for the plot and its complications.[188] At the end of the comedy's plot, the essential factor loses its power when misapprehension becomes exposed and is corrected. Duckworth sees a common sequence in the transition from ignorance to knowledge, which can be identified as a foundation for tragedy in terms of *anagnorisis* and for New Comedy.[189] Similarly, Henry W. Prescott sums up the errors of New

---

185 Salingar (1974), 100.

186 Cf. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism. 4 Essays*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957, esp. 163 ("a movement from one kind of society to another"), 163-171 and note 43ff. (comic fictional modes), 162 (on "four narrative pregeneric elements of literature"); for a valuable criticism of how Northrop Frye interprets the tripartite structure, see Rainer Warning, 'Elemente einer Pragmasemiotik der Komödie', *Das Komische*, Wolfgang Preisendanz und Rainer Warning (eds.), München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976, 279-333, 284-5 and 298ff.. Warning uses Lotman's theory, his term 'sujet' and its classifying potential to approach comedy's semantic structure; also, for a chart depicting the tripartite structure in their instantiations of Menander, Plautus, and Terence's comedies, see Fuhrmann (1976), 68 and 71-75. Fuhrmann also inserts columns for 'case history' and 'result in the future' into his tables.

187 On the here-related term 'Enthobenheit', see Karlheinz Stierle, 'Komik der Handlung, der Sprachhandlung, der Komödie', *Das Komische*, Wolfgang Preisendanz und Rainer Warning (eds.), München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976, 237-267, 260-1.

188 Cf. Salingar (1974), 84-88 and 88ff. (the trickster in classical comedy); Duckworth (1952), 141-2; also see Riehle (1990), 102-3.

189 Cf. Duckworth (1952), 140-1.

Comedy in the Greek term '*agnoia*' characters show in ignoring reality.[190] Hence, beyond one particular plot structure containing trickery, errors or failures can be acknowledged as the pragmatic creation of oppositions since false belief or interpretation of actions and words oppose the real state of affairs, while it does not matter whether the mistake is prepared by schema or happens by accident. Both usually complement each other. Deception takes place if a character does not cooperate in the sphere of reality but constructs an illusion that opposes the truth while the other, the deceived, believes and moves in the fake sphere, which comes quite close to Prescott's *agnoia*. A mental error happens if a character does not perceive or comprehend the sphere of reality correctly but unwillingly takes a false image of reality for granted.

Different plots that evolve around error like deception or mistaken identities stabilize types of figures that either fall into or carry out traps, entanglements, and double layers to lose oneself into. Plautus' *servus callidus* definitely belongs to the latter group and recommends himself by his talents of a trickster figure to play the central role in the plots of trickery. Besides plot sequence and stereotypical figures, error originates in behaviour and communication throughout the discourse as sparks of comic moments as Plato's *Philebus* outlines one seminal sort of defect by some brief thoughts:

> Socrates explains the laughable with the revelation of a man's deficit in self-knowledge. The outward attitude towards his self as being smarter, richer, more beautiful than the others ridicules his self-perception as he cannot hold up to these excellences.[191]

Surely, as Plato would agree, one example appears to be the Aristophanic hero, who nourishes mirth by disregarding his inferior position and designing himself the hero he thinks to be. Besides the comic hero, many personae fail in perceiving and judging themselves and their actions adequately, regardless if they are the mocking characters or the ones that are mocked, whereby they offer the audience not ceasing material to laugh at.[192] In close resemblance to Socrates' explanation of the man's failure in self-knowledge, mocking can be identified as one technique to bring about comic manifestations, which sticks to comedy and all its relating genres till today. A stock target of mocking can be found in the old figure of the braggart, who perfectly fulfils the above-mentioned features like Plautus' Pyrgopolynices does every time he believes himself to be the most beautiful womanizer and admired hero of all times. Mocking reveals to be a complementary part in comedy's nature of error since the technique is to point at the failures and expose them as those ridiculous deficits they are. Asides and comments vie for attention. The realisation of failure, the result of distortion or deformation, and pointing the finger at its presence belong to the world of comedy, which is endurable by mirth, separated from the audience's sphere, and mediated by harmless figures. Comedy's vivid conception of error spreads in a topsy-turvy universe of excellence and baseness or superiority and inferiority, whose inversion is played out by mocking.

Error in pragma and Socrates' explanation do not suffice to include all moments of the laughable but hide the important idea of opposition and incongruity since, for instance, what the man designs himself to be is not congruous but opposes the picture others have of him. The terms of opposition and incongruity will later be discussed in depth in their relevance for

---

190 Cf. Henry W. Prescott, 'The Comedy of Errors', *Classical Philology* 24.1 (1929): 32-41.
191 Thomas K. Hubbard, *The Mask of Comedy. Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*, Ithaca et al.: Cornell University Press, 1991, 2 and also see 2ff.
192 Cf. *Ibid.*, 3-4.

Humour, Comic, and *ridiculum*. Now, it suffices to state that these oppositions are nutrients for the laughable, which makes the revelation of misapprehension or error an impulse for laughter. Comedy's heart consists of preparations, realisations, and illuminations of pitfalls, verbal errors, deficits in perception, and all other constructions of harmless incongruities. Their sum can be subsumed under the category of the ugly relying on the temporary opposition to the ideal. In short, comedy's species of the ugly becomes visible on stage.

Concretely, regarding error as building the part and parcel for composition, the comic stage reveals the category of the ugly in oppositions of high and low, defect and virtue or of something base actually appealing to be great by illusion and imagination. For the Roman audience, the 'erroneous' quality was vivid in the Greek lavishness instanced in the unscrupulousness of Greek slaves, who had the skills to cheat their masters defeated by their blindness and habit of boasting. When Plautus' manipulative and dominant slaves indulge in exaggerating and exposing failures, or dressing the base as gloriousness, they are reminiscent of Aristophanes' cheeky slaves and bragging personae and of Menander, Diphilus, and Philemon's manipulative personae.[193] *Mostellaria's* Tranio makes it quite clear that the fooling of Theopropides could inspire both playwrights: "If you are a friend of Diphilus and Philemon, tell them how your slave made fun of you: you'll give them first-rate stories of imposture in their comedies." (*Most*. 1150-51).[194] The classical comic plays and their Renaissance's transformations share the manipulation and inversion of order, structure, and stability; for example, 'real' and firm manifestations like the identity of a figure become distorted in putting a fake double on stage as it is done in *Amphitruo* or in mixing up twin brothers as in Plautus' *Menaechmi* and later, in Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*. The comic action puts forward moments of defects arising from those inversions of various kinds on different levels, while the comic discourse spots all errors that lie therein and thereby, enriches the experience of comedy. In simple words, the comic drama is based on the representation of life moving within the category of the ugly. From the perspective of prescriptive accounts, comedy was seen as an example *ex negativo* correcting the vice.

Renaissance greatly relied on New Comedy, Roman Comedy and their developed stock including structure, plots, types of characters, motives, and techniques, but did not desperately stick to the model since it was eager to adapt the concept to the own period, their comic manifestations, and cultural idiosyncrasies. The genre of comedy underwent many modifications as instanced in one playwright's collection since Shakespeare's comic works indicate a row of various interpretations of the concept of comedy as the early romantic comedies to the late dark comedies.[195] Hence, describing the realisations of the repertoire in each period does not provide a sufficient schema but displays an overview of how and in what degree distortion was made visible, which also pivots on the writer and the period's taste. One of the best examples for such a list can be found in the *Tractatus Coislinianus*. A playwright of late antiquity, composing comedy's moments of *ridiculum*, had catalogues for the production of the laughable at hand that listed methods, actions, and characters.[196] It is about comedy's

---

193 Cf. Philip Whaley Harsh, 'The Intriguing Slave in Greek Comedy', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 86 (1955): 135-142. Harsh argues for Plautus' dependence on Menander in his concept of the clever slave.
And on Roman-Greek context of reception, see Nervegna (2013), esp. 76ff.
194 De Melo (2011), 439.
195 Cf. Silk (2000), 71-73.
196 Cf. Lane Cooper, *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy. With an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the Tractatus Coislinianus*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922, 224ff.; and cf. Warning (1976), esp. 285-7.

repertoire, what is perceived as comic and how comedy recurs in the form of a body of themes, actions, and characters throughout centuries. One of these stereotypes or comic drivers was identified as *bomolochus*, a jester.[197] Comedy seems to need dealers of comic moments, to whom the professional fool figure belongs.

Beyond the poet's idiosyncrasy, how comedy was instantiated highly depended on the classification of the ugly throughout the centuries since it affected the manifestations of the comic and vice versa. In general, what the majority of a culture assesses to belong to the category of the ugly and in particular, the laughable, can be found on their comic stage at least in portion. Including the dogmatic perspective and the prescriptive account again, the discourse on laughter reaffirmed the attribution of loud laughter to the socially base and the moral and ethical negativity to the category of the ugly.[198] Aristotle's earlier-given definition does not promote a simple erosion of morals and balance, which would hardly be of any amusement for the spectator, but foregrounds the source of laughter, some blunder bound to some weaker position of the figures, which can be interpreted as social inferiority. Indeed, the preponderance of hierarchical thinking was reflected in comedy's ensemble and repertoire from Antiquity to Renaissance. That was especially the case for the socially lowest, slaves and servants, who not exclusively, but often embodied the graceless quality of comedy and functioned as the butt of laughter. On the contrary, distinct deformation also happened, when the lowest beats the highest or when the cleverness of the low imbalances social superiority as it was given in the manoeuvers of the clever slave. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to surmise that social inferiority counts as the exclusive condition for the laughable since there are not rarely members of higher ranks turning themselves in as the target of laughter when they overestimate their talents and design themselves greater than they are. Such a scene can even expand its potential for *ridiculum* if it is the servant that ridicules his master's loss of self-knowledge and finally, the character's honour. Thus, error or defect manifests itself not in the one-dimensional level of inferiority but in the imbalance and inversion of the social hierarchy indicating another source for the laughable. And there is still more to say about comedy's handling with the ugly.

Distortion becomes apparent in the plot's subjects offering intriguing deceptions that challenge reality or queries of identity, crossdressing, and mixing up personae, which can drive figures to question their own sanity. Imaging the category of the ugly continues and is spread over the comic discourse as it is filled with a central stock of themes indicating humans' physical weakness and uncontrollability, which neglects moral standards, often puts body over mind, and contrasts the sane and controlled body, while, for instance, natural force, a component of a savage world found in sexual desire, opposes the rational mind.[199] Up to Renaissance, one of the most universal stocks of topics generating moments of the laughable and subsumed under the category of the ugly can be summed up as the trinity of physical needs expressed by lust, drink, and food. This bodily-oriented complex can even augment to excess and be interpreted as belonging to the macro-category of the grotesque subsuming the comic beneath, which is especially palpable in the Romantic era when Victor Hugo asserted the ugly to be a testimony of truth and claimed the grotesque to include the physically bizarre,

---

197 See ch. II.ii.
198 Cf. Kliche (2001), 30-31. In the Middle Ages, for example, they believed in a hierarchical relation of beauty to ugliness and saw it in analogy to good and bad or rather, as suiting God's plan and denying it.
199 Cf. Michail Bachtin, *Rabelais und seine Welt. Volkskultur als Gegenkultur*, Renate Lachmann (ed.), Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1995, 74-6. Among basic motives of the grotesque, a parallel emphasis on physicality can be observed: coitus, decay, giving birth, etc. All that motives involve the process of transformation and the existence of and between two poles.

the ugly, and the comic. Comedy's trinity of lust, drink, and food fits the grotesque's basic motives of coitus, excrements, decay, and other bodily processes that move at the polarities of birth and death.[200] The ugly and its inherent incongruity to the beautiful can be subsumed under the macro-category 'grotesque', which manifests the transformational, sitting at the edge of death and creation, deformation and formation, or old and new.[201] Within the realm of the ugly or the grotesque, comedy is bound up with physicality and the transformational from the macro-category; it is reliant on the culturally-defined species, the laughable, whose instantiation draws upon the understanding of the ugly, its polarity to the beautiful subsuming order, sanity, veracity, and bodily excellence.

The ugly in comedy discloses itself in action, personae, themes, and symbols. It is of high importance to comprehend all these manifestations not only against the background of the formerly-introduced prescriptive accounts but also to evaluate them as compounds grown out of reception processes and situated in socio-cultural discourse about elementary categories of aesthetics. To take Adorno's words about aesthetic theory, it can be pinpointed in the fact that categorization is inevitable and that the construction and content of these "*Kategorien sind radikal geschichtlich*."[202] Scholars up to the Renaissance ascertained the laughable to the negatively-connoted category of the ugly quite often accused of immorality. Most of the presentations of the laughable in life and even art were more likely to be attributed with vulgarity than fineness. It took a long time until modern theories of the comic freed the laughable from the prejudicial marker, backtracking its quality to the abstract structure of opposition and incongruity.

Adversaries of comedy treated the genre as a source for moral decay for a long time, while some saw it as a lesson, a form of correction and education contributing to the moral improvement of society. The humanists knew about the value of the plays of New Comedy since "the humanists used them as a mirror, a '*speculum consuetudinis*', in which manners and mortals are shown in order that they may be corrected".[203] Approaching the matter differently, Samuel Johnson made a step towards a more modern criticism in 1751 when he affirmed comedy's unnecessity to contain morally base figures: "that every dramatic composition which raises mirth is comic; and that, to raise mirth, it is by no means universally necessary that the personages should be either mean or corrupt".[204] Confusing representations of the ugly with the quality of immorality or—in religious terms—of evil is as false as reading a novel as the author's confessions. Western society's associations of beauty with something positive and innocent have always been a given prejudice but those can be highly misleading if it comes to the complex of art and its looking glass on nature. In short, "the distinction between beauty and ugliness in art doesn't correspond exactly to that in nature"—a relation some attackers of poetry across several periods tended to forget.[205] The deliberate fool moves between socio-cultural bias and innovative creativity, addressing and

200 Cf. Victor Hugo, *The Essential Victor Hugo*, New Translations with an Introduction and Notes by E.H. and A.M. Blackmore, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2004, preface from *Cromwell*, 23ff.; see Bakhtin about Hugo (1995), 94; and cf. Kliche (2001), 44.
201 Cf. Astrid Laupichler, *Lachen und Weinen: tragikomisch-karnevaleske Entwicklungsräume*, Münster et al.: LIT, 2002, 11.
202 Theodor W. Adorno, *Ästhetische Theorie*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, Band 7, Rolf Tiedemann (ed.), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998, 532. And for the development of aesthetics, Barck et al. (2000), 309-310.
203 Riehle (1990), 223.
204 Samuel Johnson, *Selected Poetry and Prose*, Frank Brady and W.K. Wimsatt (eds.), Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1977, *The Rambler* No. 125, p. 202-03. And see Silk (2000), esp. 74-75 and ff.
205 Hugo (2004), preface from *Cromwell*, 24.

abusing that stereotypical features. It means that crafting comedy, its errors, and forms of the ugly pivots on wit and variety as much and maybe, even more than any other poetic work that wanted to be accepted as belonging to 'high' culture. In regard to the critical view on the comic and its category, critical voices called for subtlety and implication as hallmarks of a non-vulgar form of the laughable.[206] To apply Victor Hugo's observation freely here, "this fertile union of the grotesque with the sublime has been the origin of modern spirit".[207]

It has hence become clear that looking at those categories implies the danger of mixing up between the history of culture and those of criticism. Comedy's development and its variants cannot be said to depend on either or but had been determined by both, while a greater credit should be given to the former. As it has been outlined for the European model, the schema of comedy this analysis is interested in draws upon the socio-cultural category of the ugly and crystallizes into the abstract universal formula of error in pragma and discourse, forming the source of the species of the ugly, the laughable, since error is accompanied by opposition and incongruity between the distorted or violated and the ideal or conventional.

This study of the laughable relies on a modern, commonly-accepted model that will later be introduced in the subchapter on *ridiculum*, while the instantiations in the respective comedies are always seen against the socio-cultural background and attitude towards the laughable as part of the ugly. In detail, the analysis will identify how the laughable is personified in the professional fool figure and how distortion is included in the figure's concept by revealing how the figure speaks and acts to create entities that trigger laughter in the recipient or forms that bear the potential for the laughable. The professional fool's activities and identities are judged on the foundation of the discussed definition of comedy that will now be summed up finally.

Comedy and the fool developed within the streams of conservative voices and laughing culture. Playwrights were aware of these streams, trying to cope with the power of laughter, the conservative rules of the comic game, the audience's hunger for the laughable to break free from everyday life's limitation, their own ambition in poetry, and the challenge to present the species of the ugly in the realm of poetics. Outside the stage, it was the professional jester with all his various pseudonyms that could fulfil those demands. Evolving in comedy, the professional fool figure and its characteristic of deliberate folly on stage operated against the background of feasts excesses, private recitals of verbal abuse, and public parodies. His aggressive counterexample of vice amused and taught, while he could achieve the same by reflecting the vice of others. The fool figure was at home in the laughing culture, where the New Comedy's type particularly put forward the nature of error in a Saturnalian framework. In his professionalizing type, his understanding of what comic potential the ugly could unleash secured him an active and valuable position in the errors' preparation, realisation, and illumination, while he carried the comic mask as a mirror.

The schema of comedy entails the (re)presentation of deficit, failure, error, distortion in pragma and discourse with the eagerness to dissolve the *Negativschöne* into nothing. The most condensed realisation of the schema has been detected in the comic mask, a piece of performance and visualization, imaging reality's category of the ugly, which means representing but also reflecting the ugly on the other. For Bakhtin, the mask stands for transitions, metamorphoses, violations of natural boundaries, ridiculing, and the use of nicknames. It embodies the playful spirit of life and is based on that specific mutual relation between reality and image, which is also valid for the oldest ritual-scenic forms. Parody,

---

206 Cf. Nervegna (2013), 48.
207 Hugo (2004), preface from *Cromwell*, 25.

caricature, grimaces, wry faces, and contortion are expressed in the mask. The mask shows the essence of the grotesque very prominently.[208]

Thus, the comic mask exemplifies comedy's physicality, while the mask's scope and use makes it exclusive and differentiable within the framework of art.

Comedy itself is different. As a mode of art […], it is indeed not recognizable by a cluster of fixed textual features, yet it remains recognizable. It has its repertoire of 'family' characteristics.[209]

On the abstract level, those characteristics are identified in distorted and distorting elements that are likely structured in oppositions as it can be found in hierarchical inversions or themes exposing human nature that deviates from the catalogue of strict morals, rationality and logic; there is a tendency to depict physical needs, excess, and playfulness. Boundaries become weakened so that transitions and metamorphoses can be vigorous in an illusionary space that allows chaos and defect but denies pain and disaster by dissolving distortion in laughter.

Comedy's schema is grounded in three principles: utopian nature, formerly introduced as the conflict between truth, reality, and fiction; the carnivalesque, the laughing culture's epithet, the inversion of hierarchy and the imbalance between body and mind; and the *ridiculum*, the laughable on stage. The principles meet in the category of the ugly; their universal structural component can be found in opposition and incongruity. They confirm and support each other as carnivalesque hierarchy can only be licensed in utopian grounds, while its harmless ridiculing character fulfils and fosters the temporary utopian framework. Consequently, the schema of comedy draws on the category of the ugly, is built upon three linked principles that guarantee its coherence and is concretized in the presence of error.

The principles and the schema of comedy is valid for non-hybrids and premodern types of comedy not crossing the thin line between laughter and hurt. Simply, comedy is amusement, but not every amusing literary piece is comedy. Nevertheless, comedy conveys amusement in its generic specification; it is its ability to laugh at itself. With its polyphony and multiple intertextual parodies, it is more autonomous in creation than other genres.[210] And hypothetically, the genre allows a creative approach towards its playground as it grants a huge scope of how the comic mask can look like. In reality, a playwright usually interprets the traditional repertoire, whereby he should meet the contemporary taste.

Now, it is time to dig deeper into comedy's schema and partition the three major principles: utopian nature, carnivalesque, and *ridiculum*, while the last mentioned has already been discussed more intensely as an emphasized part of the category of the ugly; there is still more to say in order to define the term *ridiculum*. All three will be dedicated an own subchapter to explicate the professional fool's realisation and use of the comic mask.

---

208 Cf. Lachmann (ed.) (1995), 90-91. The above given translation of the following abstract is mine: "Die Maske steht für Übergange, Metamorphosen, Verstöße gegen natürliche Grenzen, für das Verspotten, für den Gebrauch von Spitznamen. Sie verkörpert das spielerische Lebensprinzip, und sie beruht auf jener spezifischen Wechselbeziehung zwischen Realität und Bild, die auch für die ältesten rituell-szenischen Formen gilt. […] Doch wir können sagen, daß die Parodie und die Karikatur sowie Grimassen, Fratzen und Verrenkungen sich von der Maske herleiten. In der Maske offenbart sich sehr deutlich das Wesen des Grotesken." Bakhtin writes about the festive and traditional mask in antiquity and the Middle Ages but leaves out its earlier meaning in the cult.
209 Silk (2000), 93.
210 Cf. *Ibid.*, 73.

The visible and audible sign if the audience enjoys a comedy is laughter. The expectation we have against a comedy's text and its performance is to make us laugh, a generic kernel feature which distinguishes it from tragedy. If tears signify tragedy, then laughter as an emotional reaction signifies comedy. This rough distinction foregrounds the need to identify the source of laughter or the trigger of the reflex, formulate its concept and differentiate between the working levels. This will help to know more about comedy's schema that is here described to rely on three principles: carnivalesque, utopian nature and *ridiculum* or the laughable. While all of them are connected to laughter in a certain respect, the latter refers most obviously since laughter emerges at the end of a moment of *ridiculum* that entails the sensual perception, the cognitive processing and finally, the evaluation of a certain situation or entity as funny. That makes laughter a regressive signification of the past, a just perceived moment. It is argued that the potential for laughter, moments of *ridiculum*, pervades a comic play and the figures playing in it. Some figures, the comic drivers, primarily serve this purpose, among whom fool figures, masters of *ridiculum*, could be rated.[211] To understand their premise, concept and the later used terminology, it is essential to sort out the cornucopia of notions in respect of the source of laughter and to give an outline of what laughter, Humour, the Comic, and moments of *ridiculum* are and how they relate.

Before the relation between Humour, Comic, and *ridiculum* is adumbrated, the choice of the terms will be justified to avoid ambiguity. The nouns 'Humour' and 'Comic' are part of the terminology and signify abstract domains exclusively, which the writing in big letters suggests, whereas their adjectives 'humorous' and 'comic' are interchangeable with each other and correspond to the common use. Still, the study sought for a more cautious terminology as the term comic is too outworn to be used exclusively, denote the sum of findings in the analysis and to include all levels of abstraction. In *Frames of Comic 'Freedom'*, Eco calls attention to the same problem:

> From antiquity to Freud or Bergson, every attempt to define comic seems to be jeopardized by the fact that this is an umbrella term (referring, in a Wittgensteinian jargon, to a network of family resemblances) that gathers together a disturbing ensemble of diverse and not completely homogeneous phenomena, such as humor, comedy, grotesque, parody, satire, wit, and so on.[212]

Exchanging all these known notions with new terms is not useful. Therefore, this study introduces an option how to order them. Usually, the ridiculous is subsumed under the techniques of the Comic,[213] which is not meant to be falsified here, since the ridiculous should not be mistaken with the here applied notion *ridiculum*. The Latin term *ridiculum* is used to stress the aggressive quality in the laughable as it forces an emotional reaction and relates to how a situation is experienced and evaluated. Laughter is directed at the moment of *ridiculum* and all its components, objects, and figures within but simultaneously, affects the person laughing, who participates visibly and audibly in the creation and final phase of the comic, while he or she experiences a complexity of psycho- and physiological processes often

---

211 Morton Gurewitch suggests four main constituents of comedy: satire, humor, farce, and irony. Interestingly, he defines them by looking at how folly is present and used in these four. Cf. Morton Gurewitch, *Comedy. The Irrational Vision*, Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1975, 9-10.

212 Umberto Eco, 'The Frames of Comic 'Freedom'', *Carnival!*, Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1984, 1-9, 1.

213 Cf. William F. Fry Jr., 'Humor and Paradox', *American Behavioral Scientist* 30.1 (1987): 42-71, 62.

summed up as cathartic in analogy to tragedy. Adding *ridiculum* to the tripartite group of principles signifying comedy underlines the generic deviation to tragedy and the relation between audience and the imitation of the ugly, which is highly relevant for the professional fool figure.

Now, a first attempt is made to clarify the terms Humour, Comic, and *ridiculum*: Humour describes the inert ability to laugh and scientifically, stands for the universal formula unifying all possible verbal and non-verbal variations of it. The concept of what a culture can appreciate as humorous, which means that it is of such a quality to cause laughter, is defined as the Comic dealing with the culturally specific knowledge and still, operating on the abstract level. The concrete realisation of the concept, for example, in text or performance, is determined as moments of *ridiculum*, whose perception ideally triggers laughter. If the recipient belonging to the target group laughs, his laughter, the final and closing phase in the moment of *ridiculum*, confirms the presence of the humorous quality based on the concept of the Comic. Each concept of the Comic should be possible to be deduced from the universal formula of Humour. Arthur Koestler values laughter similarly as the complementary part to the stimulus:

> Humour is the only domain of creative activity where a stimulus on a high level of complexity produces a massive and sharply defined response on the level of physiological reflexes. This paradox enables us to use the response as an indicator for the presence of that elusive quality, the comic.[214]

Koestler's definition gives two salient notions that will help to narrow down the distinction of the three levels: creativity and complexity. These two notions often occur later in the chapter on Plautus' prototypical professional fool to describe his scope of themes, his extravagance, and unusualness to behave and speak in certain situations reaching out of his limited concept of a slave, simulating the absence of class' restrictions. His abilities unsurprisingly recommend him as an expert of the Comic and producer of *ridiculum* since his creative activities not only prove his knowledge and delicate dealing with culturally specific themes, for example when he designs himself as a military leader but he also knows how to free himself from reason when he jokes and indulges in fun and chases after laughter.

In such situations, *ridiculum* aims at one response, laughter. The complexity of its physiological processes and its cause—an entity carrying a potential for laughter—contrasts the simplicity and inferiority, which people associate with the comic and the physiological reaction 'laughter'. To explain laughter's trigger and crystallize the structure of *ridiculum*, Koestler relies on the constellation of paradox, describing the relation between the abstract and the concrete level. As the introduction foreshadowed, paradox is an important notion throughout this work since it stands for an oppositional and incongruent structure, a kernel part in traditional humour theory, and characterizes the pattern of the professional fool, e.g. high vs. low, simple vs. complex or inferior vs. superior.

Koestler's paradox, the creative unpredictability, and unlimited production of the *ridiculum* and the high complexity have complicated the construction of a universal formula for the concept of humour. In other words, coming up with a formula intended to fit in one nutshell seems to be a Rubik's cube—a seemingly unsolvable task as it faces a mass of cultural diversity the creative mind produces and develops endlessly, which makes the jungle of the complex structure not easier to unriddle. The same is true for the fool figure, whose definition can only be valid on an exclusively abstract level in order to subsume all realisations and thus,

---

214 Arthur Koestler, *The Act of Creation*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964, 31.

variations of the same functionality. The two terms' broadness and vagueness equate the challenge of pinpointing what Humour's formula consists of and especially how it works generally in order to gain a valid theory or universal formula embracing all possible comic moments. How hard it is to complete that scientific mission can be measured at the over hundred treatises to explain why something is laughable and what it is exactly that we laugh at. Besides, the abundance in terms to give a name to and describe the laughable make the mass not quite clearer: parody, nonsense, ridiculous, irony.[215]

Three main streams of theories have been trying to do so, taking different perspectives from where all laughable events can be analysed. Victor Raskin achieves a classification of humour theories by naming three parts that are involved in the "humor act" in order to distinguish the different models: speaker, stimulus, and hearer; or to put it more generally, producer, stimulus, and recipient. That is how he could divide three categories of theories: incongruity, disparagement, and suppression/repression.[216] "[T]he *incongruity*-based theories make a statement about the *stimulus*; the superiority theories characterize *relations* or *attitudes* between the speaker and the hearer; and the *release / relief* theories comment on the feelings and psychology of the hearer only."[217]

From Kant to nowadays, all these theories of humour do not cope with all comic moments in their complexity but are specialized and give at hand useful tools to visualize the structure, the semantic web that seems to be funny and the effects. Their sum explains in depth what is laughable since "[t]he three approaches characterize the complex phenomenon of humor from very different angles and do not contradict each other - rather they seem to supplement each other quite nicely".[218] In terms of the figure of interest, this work is far from listing every theoretical approach to humour and valuing them critically—instead, this endeavour is left to humour theorists. The analysis sticks to the most useful for the approach, which is accepted as the *opinio communis*. Most well-known theories from the last four decades promote an oppositional structure wherein two frames, matrixes, codes or two scripts stand in a relation of incongruence and build such a contrast that can dissolve in laughter.[219] Thus, the analysis draws upon the influential tradition of incongruity and, in

215 Cf. Tom Kindt, *Literatur und Komik. Zur Theorie literarischer Komik und zur deutschen Komödie im 18. Jahrhundert*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011, 1-10 (overview and introduction to his elaborate theory of the comic). And note N.E. Schmidt and D.I. Williams, 'The Evolution of Theories of Humor', *Journal of Behavioral Science* 1 (1971): 95-106. Herein, the scholars collected circa 100 theories, which was valid in 1971. And see Eckhard Henscheid, 'Humor. Ein ewiges Trauerspiel', *Kulturgeschichte der Mißverständnisse. Studien zum Geistesleben,* Eckhard Henscheid et al. (eds.), Stuttgart: Reclam, 1997, 51-67. Eckhart Henscheid speaks of a "*expandierenden Begriffskonfusion*" (59).

216 Victor Raskin, *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*, Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster: D. Reidel, 1985, esp. 30 and 30-40; and cf. Tom Kindt (2011), 25-26.

217 Raskin (1985), 40. Raskin uses bold letters instead of the here applied italic writing.

218 *Ibid.*, 40. And see Kindt (2011), 25-29, for a discussion on the classification of humour theories, esp. concerning Victor Raskin and Robert Latta's approaches (Robert L. Latta, *The Basic Humor Process. A Cognitive-Shift Theory and the Case against Incongruity*, Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999). Latta votes for the abandonment of incongruity theory after discussing its weaknesses and fallacies (see 234).

219 For a recent overview of the theories of humour, see Stefan Balzter, *Wo ist der Witz? Techniken zur Komikerzeugung in Literatur und Musik*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2013, esp. 44f. Other known elder approaches focus on the element of superiority, whose most famous representatives were Aristoteles, Hobbes, and in modern times, Bergson and Lipps. Bergson foregrounds the term 'mechanisation' since for him "[t]he attitudes, gestures and movements of the human body are laughable in exact proportion as that body reminds us of a mere machine." (Henri Bergson, *Laughter*, chapter I.IV, Ebook posting date in 2009, URL= https://www.gutenberg.org/files/4352/4352-h/4352-h.htm [accessed January 05, 2022]); Anz chooses a different, functional perspective and takes the social component and the understanding of peer culture in the experience of comic and its result laughter into account since it describes "*Lachlust als Solidaritätserlebnis*"

particular, two theories set within the modern development of the tradition,[220] which was mainly influenced by the disciplines of psychology, linguistics, and cognitive science and their interdisciplinary work. The ability of explaining the generation of the laughable is claimed by the theories Arthur Koestler's theory of *bisociation* and Salvatore Attardo and Victor Raskin's GTVH, the General Theory of Verbal Humour evolved from Raskin's SSTH, the Semantic Script Theory of Humor.[221] Their essential ideas lay the foundation for this approach, which modestly proclaims an own concept in accordance to this treatise's perspective and the object of analysis.

It was not as late as the 20th century that scholars attributed an incongruous quality to humour, but rhetoricians like Cicero and Quintilian already wrote about the incompatibility between expectation and the actual. In Antiquity, essential components to rise laughter were the violation of expectations, surprise, and defect. Rhetoric mainly made use of this knowledge.[222] Modern theories still deal with incongruity but do not accept that upsetting expectation is the only cause for the emotional reaction since there are counterexamples, where repeating a phrase, expected by the audience, is still experienced as funny.[223] For Koestler, Attardo, and Raskin, the kernel element of the underlying concept is truly incongruity, though not between the expected and the actual, but between two frames of reference (Koestler) or two scripts (Attardo/Raskin). They operate on the cognitive level how the situation or entity is comprehended as laughable and can unfold its comic quality. While Koestler integrates all laughter-producing situations, Raskin and Attardo limit their considerations on exclusively verbal entities, regardless if these are narrative or non-narrative texts.

(Thomas Anz, *Literatur und Lust. Glück und Unglück beim Lesen,* München: C.H. Beck, 1998, 200 and cf. 172-204, esp. 200-204); Koestler (1964). Koestler coins the notion 'bisociation'.

And see Victor Raskin, 'Script-based lexicon', *Quaderni di Semantica* 2.1 (1981): 25-34. Victor Raskin suggests the term 'script'; and Volker Schulz, *Studien zum Komischen in Shakespeares Komödien*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971, esp. 11-14. Volker Schulz values Koestler's theory of bisociation and highly depends on his considerations from *The Act of Creation* and *Insight*, while he exchanges Koestler's term '(selective) operator (of the field)' with 'codes' (Arthur Koestler, *Insight and Outlook. An Inquiry into the Common Foundations of Science, Art and Social Ethics*, London: Macmillan, 1949, esp. 39ff.). Schulz' approach highlights the dependence of matrixes or operative fields on codes or norms and describes the logical structure of comic as the violation of norms (see esp. p.14). Unsurprisingly, the notions of inadequacy (*Unzulänglichkeit*) and (playful) superiority (*übermutiges bzw. heiter-überlegenes Spiel*) stand at the centre of Schulz' method of how he classifies different comic instantiations, herein following Rommel's distinction (Rommel [1943]). Schulz distinguishes between four basic types both categories of inadequacy and superiority share: physical, verbal, figure, and situation (see esp. 30-32); for a discussion and application of Schulz' theory on some of Plautus' texts, see Gudrun Sander-Pieper, *Das Komische bei Plautus*. *Eine Analyse zur Plautinischen Poetik*, Berlin et al.: de Gruyter, 2007. She foregrounds the relation and progress from Koestler's theory to Schulz' categories.; for a discussion of the differences and development in terminology, see József Andor, 'On the Psychological Relevance of Frames', *Quaderni di Semantica* 6.2 (1985): 212-221, esp. 212-13.

220 On Koestler and the initiation to focus on a cognitive approach in humour theories, see Kindt (2011), 56f. And a defence of the incongruity theory in general and Kindt's own very detailed modification, see *Ibid*., 59ff.

221 Note Salvatore Attardo and Victor Raskin, 'Scripty Theory revis(it)ed: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model', *Humor* 4.3-4 (1991): 293-347; the analysis will not deal with the development of the GTVH from the SSTH, the Semantic Script Theory of Humour (first presented by Raskin, [1985], and further developed by Attardo in cooperation with Raskin) and the development to the OSTH as Raskin et al. presented the OSTH, the Ontological Semantic Theory of Humor in 2009. For further readings, see Victor Raskin, Christian F. Hempelmann, and Julia M. Taylor, 'How to Understand and Assess a Theory: The Evolution of the SSTH into the GTVH and Now into the OSTH', *Journal of Literary Theory* 3.2 (2009): 285-312.

222 Figueroa-Dorrego and Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), 190. And for instance cf. Cic. *de or.* 2.216ff. and Quint. *inst.* 6.3.24ff.

223 "However, unexpectedness alone is not enough to produce a comic effect." Koestler (1964), 35.

For Koestler, the comic becomes effective in an explosion of tension that rises when the recipient perceives "a situation or idea, L, in two self-consistent but habitually incompatible frames of reference, M_1 and M_2."[224] The crucial point in his pattern explaining all realisations of humour is bisociation and its involving process he describes as the following:

> The sudden bisociation of a mental event with two habitually incompatible matrices results in an abrupt transfer of the train of thought from one associative context to another.[225]

He varies in his terminology for M1 and M2 between "associative contexts, types of logic, codes of behaviour, universes of discourse"[226]—and what he mostly uses—matrices of thought and behaviour, which resembles the manifoldness of incongruous constellations. Nevertheless, the terms imply the feature of abruptness and suddenness, dominating the recipient throughout his thoughts; it must not be mistaken with the upsetting of expectation but with the recognition of incongruity, when two matrices of thought or behaviour are tried to be matched but collide at one or several points.

Koestler, Attardo, and Raskin share the idea of two incompatible elements carrying the comic quality and the problem of complexity; they trace the source for laughter on the cognitive level when the entity is deciphered. The scholars have a similar starting point for the description of the pattern: while Koestler foregrounds the dynamic, describing even an aggressive process in the form of clash and denotes the pattern for all laughter-producing situations, Raskin and Attardo limit their pattern's validity for verbal humour and approach the problem from the linguist's perspective, concentrating on the term 'script', whose importance demands a separate explanation first. For Attardo,

> [a] script is an organized complex of information about some entity, in the broadest sense: an object (real or imaginary), an event, an action, a quality, etc. It is a cognitive structure internalized by the speaker which provides the speaker with information on how a given entity is structured, what are its parts and components, or how an activity is done, a relationship organized, and on so on, to cover all possible relations between entities (including their constituents). Needless to say, this definition is impossible vague.[227]

In relation to this work's aim, the analysis intends to sketch the set of scripts defining the professional fool, that of the prototypical *servus callidus* and Shakespeare's wise fool. The definition of what scripts are and how they become relevant for understanding verbal humour is still too broad and should be concretized. Scripts as cognitive structures underlie a learning process. A complex of information can grow if new pieces of information about the entity, for example in another context, are learned. In short, they enter the script. Thus, it cannot be assured that a script is complete, but it remains open for an update as scripts are subject to an ongoing testing, which can happen if someone reads about the entity in a particular text. If we gain some new information about the entity while reading, the content of the script is

---

224 Koestler (1964), 35. In other words, "[i]t is the clash of the two mutually incompatible codes, or associative contexts, which explodes the tension." And *Ibid.*, 33: "[T]he tension is suddenly relieved and exploded in laughter."

225 *Ibid.*, 59 and 95. As he puts it, his formula here combines "the logic of humour" and "its emotional dynamics" (59).

226 *Ibid.*, 38.

227 Salvatore Attardo, *Humorous Texts. A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*, Berlin et al.: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, 2-3.

tested and can be revised. Constantly dealing with and encountering scripts in possibly new contexts reveal the scope of a script as potentially dynamic but usually stable after a certain period, wherein the speaker has acquired the common available information concerning one lexeme's script.[228] The script of the lexeme 'table' will grow decisively for a language acquisitor at the age of two, whereas an adult will hardly revise his script TABLE. Thus, a script's content is not being expanded endlessly but appears as a stable but potentially open complex tested when used.[229]

The focus turns to what types of scripts can be distinguished. Attardo et al. list three types: lexical, sentential, and inferential scripts. A lexical script is bound to a lexeme and remains on the abstract level. Sentential scripts refer to a more concrete level as they mean instantiations in context, whereas inferential scripts are not bound to single instantiations but become actuated in context.[230] For the text analysis, all three types are relevant and will not be considered separately but the corpus of comedies from each playwright is treated as one organized complex, within which

> the information stored does not travel in discrete units, but consists of clusters of information (scripts, frames) which in turn come surrounded by a web of associations and links to other clusters of information […]. [And] […] these clusters of information may consist of scripts nested one inside the other.[231]

Of course, scripts could be looked at separately but reading a text, cognitively processing and understanding the meaning of a text implies the connection and hierarchy of scripts, drawing on the web of associations and organization of scripts. To cope with these conditions, Raskin argues for the terms of complex scripts and macroscripts, which differ in their dependence on chronological organization. A complex script is built out of other scripts whose relation is not determined chronologically, which could be 'love', whereas a certain number of scripts construct a macroscript in a chronological order like it is the case for the script 'driving a car'.[232] 'Love' implies the scripts of 'lovers', 'heart', 'sex', and all scripts valid in the web of association. 'Driving a car' consists of the chronology of 'get in the car', 'start the engine', 'shift into first gear', and the following and in between necessary activities that make 'driving a car' consistent.

For this project, after introducing the concept 'scripts', it is important and sufficient to note that the analysis is aware that scripts are interrelated and organized with a specific logic. The terms of macroscript and complex scripts are definitely helpful to distinguish certain script organization but will not be of use for this approach. For this analysis, it is important to acknowledge that scripts can be grouped together to clusters, ordered in a hierarchy and regarded on different levels of abstraction. For example, clusters of scripts can be activated by the instantiations of a figure's stereotypical behaviour; a recurring topic can be regarded as a cluster of scripts. Though this project will not engage in a thorough analysis after Attardo's

---

228 Cf. Attardo (2001), 6.

229 On having elaborate scripts and on learning scripts, see Roger C. Schank and Robert P. Abelson, *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding. An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1977, esp. 55 and 222ff.

230 Cf. Salvatore Attardo, Christian F. Hempelmann, and Sara di Maio, 'Script oppositions and logical mechanisms: Modeling incongruities and their resolutions', *Humor* 15.1 (2002): 3–46, 21.

231 Attardo (2001), 48.

232 Cf. *Ibid.*, 4 and 54. Attardo here refers to Schank and Abelson. On interaction of scripts and on types of scripts, see Schank/Abelson (1977), 57-66. Nevertheless, though Raskin's considerations are quite helpful, they have been subjected to criticism.

theory and comprehends itself as a literary analysis, both approaches share the perspective of working on different levels of abstraction and the aim of identifying a pattern lying beneath a phenomenon or type.

Besides the detection and description of salient clusters of scripts for the professional fool figure, Attardo and Raskin's concept also provides the foundation to comprehend verbal humour. Therefore, scripts will now be looked at as complexes generating the laughable. A text that carries a single joke and produces the humorous effect through two scripts must fulfil several conditions according to Raskin:

1) The text is compatible, fully or in part, with two different scripts.
2) The two scripts with which the text is compatible are opposite […]. The two scripts with which some text is compatible are said to overlap fully or in part in this text.[233]

Attardo continues that "the overlap between the two scripts may be partial or total. If the overlap is total, the text in its entirety is compatible with both scripts; if the overlap is partial, some parts of the text, or some details, will not be compatible with one or the other script."[234] For example, an ambiguous piece of text shows total overlapping of two scripts but ambiguity is not sufficient to evince comic quality. The second salient condition for a joke text that is perceived as comic is found in the opposition of the two scripts. Opposition can rise when one script establishes the negation of the other or occurs as the antonym.[235]

Raskin classifies three general abstract types of oppositions that can occur between scripts: actual vs. non-actual, normal vs. abnormal, and possible vs. impossible.[236] Comedy's stage is the ideal place for the flourishing of these pairs as comedy can be interpreted as a set of scripts reflecting reality in an upside-down relation. As Attardo sums up, "the three classes are all instances of a basic opposition between real and unreal situations in the texts."[237] Though the validity of the terms can be questioned as the pairs can be replaced, their generality is just a starting point for classification and helps to describe the creative scope of joke texts. In analogy to Attardo and Raskin, the analysis will later speak of the instantiation of a 'second reality' by the joke text. The discrepancy between or the play with real and unreal situations, whose boundaries are blurred in the comic discourse and can disappear away as swiftly as they appeared, will later reveal itself as a mastery of the professional fool figure. Unsurprisingly, Raskin's classification can be applied on the professional fool's humorous activities though they will be dissected in pairs of scripts as their concrete realisation and variations depend on the period and the play. These pairs subsumed under the classes are of high importance since these explain the professional fool's relation to his surroundings and his functionality for comedy.[238]

He specifies the vaguely formulated oppositions further by five general pairs he found in his analysis of 32 joke texts—rather a small number to deduce a generalization from it. However, the chosen scope of scripts still remains broad enough to include most joke texts since their oppositions are "essential to human life".[239] Their universality of theme in cultures

---

233 Raskin (1985), 99.
234 Attardo (2001), 17; these considerations are not found in Koestler's model.
235 Cf. Raskin (1985), 108.
236 Cf. *Ibid.*, 107ff. and esp. 111; in 1987, Chlopicki replaces Raskin's three pairs with his own: absence/presence, necessary/unnecessary, much/little. See Chlopicki (1987), 18.
237 Attardo (2001), 20.
238 See ch. III.i-v.
239 Raskin (1985), 113.

is especially true for the first four: good/bad, life/death, obscene/non-obscene, high/low stature, and money/no-money.[240] Nevertheless, there are some differences between western and non-western cultures as they also add the pair 'excrement/non-excrement' to their list.[241] Reading the first five universals as basic to primarily western humour, a scholar of Plautus cannot help but think about certain scenes and themes as the bad *leno* Ballio quarrels with good poor Calidorus in *Pseudolus* or how often threats against life are ridiculed. Raskin's five pairs subsumed under the three classes as instantiations give a first hint how to outline the professional fool's concept and what kind of aspects should be taken into consideration in the analysis of the play texts. This work's table of contents with respect to the text analysis of Plautus' comedies fits Raskin's classes and their pairs since it starts with a heroic anti-hero and continues with the impossible all-license, the competition and inversion of high vs. low, and creating and disrupting illusion or emphasizing the actual and non-actual. The analysis in each chapter then explains the title's pair content by its concrete thematic variations in the several play texts and their contribution to the realisation of the *ridiculum*.

Thus, the results are described on different levels of abstraction: the first of which denotes the most abstract and universal; the second concerns the grouping of instantiations that can be compared between cultures and fulfil a certain degree of essentiality to human life; and the third relates to the concrete realisation and opposition distinct for the particular text. The first to choose to distinguish three levels of abstraction in script opposition has been Sara Di Maio in 2000,[242] whose thinking is similar to the previously-presented definition of how Humour, Comic, and the moment of *ridiculum* are connected and how laughter's verbal *stimulus* can be dissected in its structure becoming three-dimensional by the degree of abstractions. It should be worth noting here that a tripartite division could be useful for every instantiation of the laughable, whether verbal or non-verbal, to recognize the universal, cultural, and generic-contextual. This challenge, however, to find a formula the world can agree upon must be left to the great theorists on Humour. Here, the challenge remains to introduce further why incongruous pairs are perceived as comic, how Attardo makes the oppositional structure visible, and to what extent this analysis will avail itself of Attardo's theory.

The image of opposing scripts is a construction to be filled with content, the sort of information that conveys *ridiculum* by its opposing and incongruent structure. The moment of *ridiculum* is built upon two concrete scripts presented in a certain style in the joke text and embedded in a particular context, while the joke text itself can be part of a greater generic piece. The effectiveness of the *ridiculum* depends on devices and the pattern of incongruity but also on the context, in which it is set. Opposition of two scripts or the incompatibility of two can trigger different effects since texts circling around the oppositional clusters of 'life/death' can also arouse emotions of fear, horror, disgust, pity, and others that are quite contradictory to what a recipient feels when laughing. The context guides the expectation of the recipient and how to resolve the opposition and its logical mechanism. It might even influence the recipient's mood. To put it easily, the audience of a comedy searches for the laughable in contrast to the audience of a tragedy. A comic stage and its atmosphere prepare the audience to recognize the laughable in exaggerations, defects, and miscommunication.

---

240 Cf. Raskin (1985), 113-14 and 127.

241 Cf. Mary Douglas, 'The Social Control of Cognition: Some Factors on Joke Perception', *Man* 3.3 (1968): 361-376. Rpt. in *Implicit Meanings*, London: Routledge, 1978, 90ff.; and see Attardo (2001), 20.

242 Note Sara Di Maio, *A Structured Resource for Computational Humor*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Siena, Italy: University of Siena, 2000. The levels are divided into concrete, intermediate, and abstract scripts opposition. See Attardo (2001), 20.

The comic writer and the actors contribute to the success of the laughable by presenting and performing these moments of *ridiculum*. Conclusively, the condition if the incongruity reaches its recipient as a carrier of laughter depends on how it is embedded, presented and if the recipient recognizes and accepts it. How the joke text carries the laughable depends on various factors, which Attardo and Raskin tried to distinguish and classify in order to be able to compare joke texts with each other.

For verbal humour, non-narrative or narrative, Attardo and Raskin expanded the SSTH, which promotes the above-outlined idea of script opposition, into the GTVH, a wider approach that presents five more categories incorporated in the generation of a joke besides script opposition. They are termed Knowledge Resources (KRs): Language (LA), Narrative Strategy (NS), Target (TA), Situation (SI), Logical Mechanism (LM), and Script Opposition (SO).[243] The first KR, language, refers to the constitution of a text by verbal elements and their order. For joke texts, LA includes the position and the wording of the punchline in addition to how incongruent scripts are verbalized, which is a process a comedian pays attention to as he wants his joke to be effective. NS includes how the verbalization is organized narratively. TA looks at who or which a joke aims at. Attardo argues that "jokes that are not aggressive (i.e., do not ridicule someone or something) have an empty value for this parameter."[244] In contrast to Attardo's view, aggression is here seen not as an exclusively "social business" but as emerging in every joke text as laughter is forward, loud and directed towards 'something' that can even be the person laughing. What Attardo understands as an aggressive potential is here named hostile. Consequently, every moment of *ridiculum* contains some aggressive quality but only specific jokes can be evaluated as hostile.[245] SI means the image with all its containing elements like scenery, figures, objects, and the like that occur in front of the recipient's eye when he reads or listens to the joke text. The situation seems very similar to a stage where the joke text becomes visible. The fourth KR, logical mechanism, is found in over 27 different types, among which Attardo lists exaggeration, juxtaposition, analogy, parallelism, chiasmus, faulty reasoning. Attardo admits that this KR "is by far the most problematic parameter" since the list of the KR depends on the range of examples.[246] The logical mechanism "presupposes and embodies a 'local' logic, i.e. a distorted, playful logic, that does not necessarily hold outside of the world of the joke."[247] The list offers forms of organization of how scripts are presented and tried to be linked with each other so that the recipient comprehends the text as a joke whose 'rules' deviate from the world's reality.

As the term 'resource' says, the six KRs display sources for a comedian to generate a humorous text and create a moment of the laughable. The broadness of the resources embraces all joke texts as these categories at large stand for components that belong to the construction not only of a joke text but of a text in general and its meaning. Hence, most of the five introduced Knowledge Resources are at the centre of a literary analysis, which crucially examines language, narrative strategy, situation as here the plot, and logical mechanisms often in terms of rhetorical devices. Consequently, the following analysis

---

243 For the definition and listing of knowledge resources in the GTVH, see Salvatore Attardo, *Linguistic Theories of Humor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994, 222ff.; *Id*., 'The Semantic Foundations of Cognitive Theories of Humor', *Humor* 10.4 (1997): 395–420; and cf. *Id*. (2001), 22ff.

244 Attardo (2001), 23-4.

245 The thesis follows Fry's view in Fry (1987), 60-61; and see William Fry, 'The Power of Political Humor', *Journal of Popular Culture* 10.1 (1976): 227-231.

246 Attardo (2001), 25. For the complete list, see p. 27.

247 *Ibid*., 25.

captures all these categories although Attardo's nomenclature and his depiction are not applied.

Attardo's model is very useful for a detailed linguistic analysis of how a verbal entity is perceived as containing something to be laughed at. However, the empirical studies regarding the SSTH and GTVH chose joke text separated from longer narrative sequence and the model's apparatus was not created to apply to long discourses in order to disclose the laughable throughout the text. In short, the applicability of model's kernel, binary script opposition, hardens along with the length of the text.[248] Nevertheless, the kernel mechanism that remains valid regardless the length of the humorous text is the main thesis of SSTH and GVTH, the binary opposition of scripts, upon which this treatise draws upon in the theoretical approach. But it leaves out the complete analytical apparatus and the recent update of the GTVH by Attardo in 2008 as this treatise is not a linguistic analysis of Plautus or Shakespeare's dramatic text as a joke text or containing several of them but the literary analysis is interested in describing the concept of the fool, its culturally specific occurrences and its embedment in comedy. His contribution to the laughable is only one of the fool's functional components that secure his integration into comedy's schema. The SSTH and later the GTVH suggest the key to detect the laughable in play texts: identifying two incongruent opposing scripts on different levels of abstraction. Beyond that, the literary study aims to indicate the scripts' relations and interdependences that construct the fool figure's concept as it wants to outline the figure's single manifestations and their type across plays and its productivity. It intends to evince that the pattern in which the scripts are organized can be classified as paradox pattern. The identification works on different levels of abstraction, already proposed by Raskin and later Di Maio. Consequently, the steps of the analysis and the process of classification accord with these levels.

The starting point can only be the text broken into puzzle pieces where the fool figure is active and becomes present through other characters' references. The analysis of these text pieces enables the thesis to recognize scripts that determine the fool figure in the chosen scenes and passages. The pieces are ordered in groups if they resemble each other in structure and show repetition of certain scripts, style, and other devices. These scripts describe the presence of the fool figure in the play text. In detail, the knowledge of the cultural context the text was written in is taken into account to describe essential recurring scripts, recognize their clusters, classify them, and evaluate their effect on the audience. This step allows to recognize the repertoire of the Comic. The Comic includes all techniques, for example irony, and thematic categories that are available in the cultural sphere in order to create opposition and incongruity and finally laughter. The analysis looks at what these clusters share and what kind of pattern becomes apparent, the pattern that underlies the fool figure's concept and that allows the thesis to compare different fool figures. The pattern is placed on the same abstract level as the generally accepted formula of Humour, that of incongruity; the type of the fool figure is situated on the same level as the Comic and its realisation in the text is comparable to the moment of the laughable. It is very crucial to understand that the concept of the fool figure is not thought to be identical with Humour's pattern. Both approaches only share the perspective of differentiating between three different levels.

The stereotypical trait of the fool figure is often simply termed to be funny and to make people laugh, but that does not pay attention to the artful and complex concept of the

---

248 See Attardo (2001), 25. He refers to Wladyslaw Chlopicki, *An Application of the Script Theory of Semantics to the Analysis of Selected Polish Humorous Short Stories*, Unpublished M.A. thesis, West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, 1987, 18ff. and 60ff.

professional fool figure. His productions of the *ridiculum* are part of his functionality and subsumed under comedy's schema, where it is inseparably linked with the other two principles. This analysis dedicates a great deal of effort to seeking recurring clusters the concept of the professional fool figure contains.

Until now, this chapter has been concerned with the theoretical foundation to be able to trace the laughable. Now, the question of how the laughable comes into existence needs more consideration. The analysis will look at how the fool figure speaks and acts; this makes it necessary to outline the tools that are used to visualize it. As the analyst sees herself as a literary scholar, the corpus is the object of a detailed literary analysis. In addition, the literary study draws upon a model from pragmatics, seeking support in Grice's account on logic and conversation to demonstrate the fool figure's communicative strategy.

Examining the foundation of 'successful communication', Grice formulated one main principle in the form of an imperative, the Cooperative Principle he shortens to CP:

> [M]ake your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.[249]

His model reads itself like a handbook for the participant in a dialogue, yielding him with four categories and their specific maxims telling him how to behave. The four categories are Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. The maxims of quantity demand that you "[m]ake your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)." Secondly, "[d]o not make your contribution more informative than is required."[250] Grice presents Quality in one supermaxim – "Try to make your contribution one that is true", which is divided into two more specific maxims: "Do not say what you believe is false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence." The third category Relation contains one single maxim, which says you should "be relevant".[251] The last category puts emphasis on one supermaxim "Be perspicuous" but also offers four minor maxims: "[a]void obscurity of expression"; "[a]void ambiguity"; "[b]e brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity); [be] orderly." Besides, Grice adds that the list of this category might not be sufficient.[252]

This analysis is aware that dialogues in literary texts interpret these categories, especially that of Manner and its maxims, differently as there is no intention to provide "a maximally effective exchange of information".[253] The premise of effectiveness lies in an aesthetic relation between content and format, between what is said and how it is said, for example to produce some emotional experience in accordance to the specific genre. A playwright of comedy is interested in an exciting plot heading towards a happy ending and a discourse full of moments of *ridiculum* and not to present conversations that strictly follow

---

249 Herbert Paul Grice, 'Logic and Conversation', *The Discourse Reader*, Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), London/New York: Routledge, ⁴2002, 76-88, 78.
Note that Grice names the following former article as his source: Herbert Paul Grice, 'Logic and Conversation', *Syntax and Semantics*, Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), Vol. 3: Speech Arts, New York: Academic Press, 41-58.
250 *Ibid.*, 78. Grice restricts that "the second maxim is disputable" and could just be seen as "a waste of time" and not as a true "transgression of the CP".
251 *Ibid.*, 79. He admits that "its formulation conceals a number of problems that exercise me a good deal: questions about what different kinds and focuses of relevance there may be, how these shift in the course of talk exchange, how to allow for the fact that subjects of conversation are legitimately changed, and so on."
252 *Ibid.*, 79.
253 *Ibid.*, 79.

Grice's CP. A dramatic dialogue as an artificially-created discourse, whose process and end is already determined, underlies different purposes than common conversation in reality.

Besides artificiality and predetermination, another important factor is the presence of a constant but silent second addressee at the side of the dialogue partner. Implicature and implying carry a different significance in dialogues than in real-life conversations since the audience's perception and response usually rank higher than that of the dialogue partner. The supermaxim of Manner 'be perspicuous' can be fulfilled for the audience – with the restriction of ambiguity – but not necessarily for the dialogue partner. If an audience imagined a comic figure sticking to Grice's supermaxim 'Be perspicuous' strictly, watching such a performance would blatantly be too boring and probably, not good a laugh. A dramatic text essentially relies on the condition of how what is said is to be said or in other words, of how the fool figure dresses and delivers *ridiculum* verbally, how he constructs his joke texts, and in what degree he communicates openly with the figures on stage and those sitting and standing in the auditorium. In sum, the act of flouting maxims does not automatically prevent, endanger or end (successful) conversation on stage in comparison to reality, but it has the advantage to play with expectation. It adds some information or effects that are meant for the audience rather than the participant in the dialogue. It is argued that flouting is applied programmatically to generate ambiguity, excess, imaginative constructs, or generally joke texts.

Therefore, comedy's dialogue is not expected to follow Grice's categories precisely but their maxims outline a prescription of behaviour in a dialogue, generating expectations for figures' behaviour, in figures towards others and in the audience towards the course of the conversation if the course is meant to be effective, while the free alternation between fulfilling and flouting the maxims in the dramatic discourse creates conversation to a mostly unexpected, hopefully entertaining but certainly imbalanced course of a head-to-head situation, wherein the professional fool figure wants to dominate. The figure can place moments of *ridiculum* also unnoticed for his dialogue partner by violating Grice's maxims, which method seems to lie beneath jokes in general, a conclusion Raskin took in the SSTH. Not only did Raskin state but defined a mode of communication producing humorous moments, the *non-bona-fide* (NBF) communication mode, which he defined by four maxims of his own relating to Grice's categories:

1. Maxim of Quantity: Give exactly as much information as is necessary for the joke;
2. Maxim of Quality: Say only what is compatible with the world of the joke;
3. Maxim of Relation: Say only what is relevant for the joke
4. Maxim of Manner: Tell the joke efficiently[254]

The cooperative principle established by these four maxims tells the hearer that he does not expect truth or consensus and knows that the speaker does not pursue the exchange of relevant information.[255] But it is only valid to speak of cooperation if both partners in the confabulation are conforming to one and the same set of maxims. If the hearer believes in a *bona-fide* communication and his partner follows the *non-bona fide* mode instead, a common principle governing the conversation cannot be identified. Watching such a discrepancy for conversational process is highly amusing as one of comedy's typical dialogue types evinces. Though Raskin devaluates his own maxims and its mode as too trifling, his maxims and their

---

254 Raskin (1985), 103.
255 Cf. *Ibid*., 102-104; and Attardo (1994), 205-6 and 289ff.

contrast to Grice's illustrate the change in communication mode, the difference between speaker and hearer, and in case of the figure's non-serious and apparently foolish but still, arranged, strategic verbal operations.

Since Grice's maxims are prescriptive and offer a conventional perspective on communication, their application makes the defective and 'abnormal' behaviour of the fool figure and his abuse of 'trust' the other figures put in his communication describable. Still, not every participation of the fool figure in a dialogue will be evaluated with the help of the maxims since this study is not a linguistic one. The analysis will use Grice's maxims for specific passages to exemplify instantiations of miscommunication and disclose their elements to prove a point, especially in the chapters of agon and *servus ludens*. Here, the fool figure confronts the speaker relying on the *bona-fide* mode with his own *non-bona fide* communication. The fool's verbal abuses exemplify moments of *ridiculum* and constitute the demonstration of the species of the ugly.

In sum, the laughable instantiates as part and parcel of comedy's schema, while all moments of *ridiculum* therein concretize the natural drive, laughter, science attempts to pinpoint in the concepts of Humour and Comic. *Ridiculum* has been assessed as one of the principles in comedy's schema, showing the structure of opposition and incongruity. On comedy's stage, the laughable and witty users are set free in a seemingly unlimited playground, which is the second principle that is now to be defined as utopian nature.

Utopian comedy, comic utopia

A play in performance is bound to the limits of the stage or what the director claims as his stage. Physical boundaries shape the space, where the theatrical utopia can evolve: a second, coherent, small cosmos originates, where the bodies of actors become the bodies of the figures. A two-dimensional scenery becomes three-dimensional, simulating streets, houses, several rooms, a garden, or other chosen places. It can storm on stage although the sun actually shines brightly. Objects can come alive and supernatural beings can come into existence, speak, and act; even ghosts and fairies can enter the stage. Physical presence of a human body or an object can be perceived as something different from its real appearance. That is the wonder of theatre, a place that is seen only through the glasses of imagination and whose existence is accepted for a short and defined period of time. Only within these conditions, everything is possible since limitations of physicality are not binding, at least that can be claimed but not actually realized as no actor can fly across the stage without the help of ropes and a winch. Actions and their consequences do not last but dissolve after the final curtain. On stage, events of death and birth are reversible; hierarchical inversion does not reach social reality and wedding vows exchanged between figures do not have any legal binding for the actors speaking them. This does not include any persistence of a play's content and its lasting effect on the audience's life after the consumption and on the particular culture.

All these processes of becoming belong to the realms of art, wherein the creativity of mind determines and increases them, while it always works with the dimension of reality in a certain manner. Thereby, it forms a utopia embedded in the real world, which is still undecided, whether it is positive and light or negative and dark or a mixture of both.[256] Art, a domain for utopias and creation of the utopian, is integrated into the operations of a culture,

---

256 The term utopia does not correlate to the specific literary genre of utopian novels or such kind of texts that offer 'new' forms of societies.

which "imagines its relation to the conditions of its existence".[257] The utopia that springs from the workings between the symbolic system and its interpreter is perceived by the recipient comparing the utopian and his world as the recipient is dependent on his knowledge to evaluate and understand the piece of art he consumes. As the interpreter starts his imaginative work from his knowledge of the symbolic system as does the recipient rely on it, which makes the interaction an exchange between two worlds subsuming individual perceptions. The piece of art in its production and its consummation displays a constant dialogue between two worlds, the recently produced one constituting meaning and reflecting the already existent. As Nelson Goodman argues, nobody can think *ab nihilo* since everybody has some given horizon and is situated in his or her culture, from where he or she cannot separate himself or herself completely to think absolutely outside and apart from his or her 'box'. He formulates five principles for constructing worlds that rely on something already existent: composition and decomposition, deletion and supplementation, deformation, weighting, ordering.[258] For instance, comedy deforms and orders a social system and their constituents reversely if its upside-down structure is concerned. The genre generating a utopia is defined by its structure, its techniques, and its reflection of reality. Utopia, a non-existent place, designates a selective idea of a cultural system, which is stabilized by the parameters of time and place and by cognitive categories to achieve an in itself coherent but not necessarily closed cosmos.

Like all genres, theatre's operations and its core cannot be separated from reality absolutely but it is subsumed under the realms of art depicting reality in possible, probable, impossible and improbable variations. The relation between reality and art has always been subjected to great discussions circulating around the principle of mimesis, which is here not understood as the objective and exact image of reality, but as reality's interpretation and on that basis, imitation. It can be looked at from two perspectives – either from the recipient or the object of art bypassing the producer. For the recipient, mimesis yields the potential for recognition of themselves and the surrounding world, which Gadamer coins *Wiedererkennung*, explaining it in the following:

> *Was man eigentlich an einem Kunstwerk erfährt und worauf man gerichtet ist, ist vielmehr, wie wahr es ist, das heißt, wie sehr man etwas und sich selbst darin erkennt und wiedererkennt.*[259]

The potential for recognition presupposes a degree of 'truth' in the work of art, which can only be classified as a subjective category. Still, the mimetic process does not produce a clone of reality but simulates human thinking and actions in the form of an art-specific depiction depending on the contemporary context and genre. Theatre recommends itself for one of the closest representations of life in offering humans in physical presence, words, and deeds of life. The etymological root of drama in *dran* highlights the essence of mimesis for this particular form of art. However, comedy seems to take an exceptional position here, which has given rise to discussions of how close comedy moves to life and reality with its tangle of lie, illusion, and deceit. Aelius Donatus refers to a definition he ascribes to Cicero: "comedy is

---

257 Matus (1995), 5. She here refers to the larger symbolic order, culture's instrument to achieve such acts of imagination.

258 Cf. Nelson Goodman, *Ways of Worldmaking*, Indianapolis, Ind. et al: Hackett, 1978, esp. 7ff.

259 Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode*. *Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*, Gesammelte Werke, Band 1, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, [7]2010, 119. Such a comprehension of mimesis and the relation of effect between the piece of art and its addressee is appropriate for Shakespeare and Plautus' period. For a critical discussion of the term and its applicability, see Jauß ([2]1979), 132ff.

an imitation of life, a mirror of custom, an image of truth."[260] Recent voices value the proclaimed imitation of life more critically like Kern puts it into "the realm of fantasy and play rather than mimesis," and David Scott Kastan negates that it is "a representation of life."[261] In fact, for comedy, an audience does not watch a performance of reality but of the complexity of life, whose interpretation can vary and whose metamorphosis could reach as far as to the utmost fantastic foregrounding its utopian nature but still not preventing *Wiedererkennung*. The genre attaches to irrationality and excess rooted in the "Dionysiac possession in mimesis".[262] It is the utopian ground promising happiness in its kernel and accompanied by a comic tone; the spectator can recognize life, its structures, and stereotypical actors in comedy's disguise.

The dramatic text—the product of the mimetic process and vehicle for *Wiedererkennung*—remains within the restrictions of 'pre-determination' since the given text states the unchangeability of the discourse. The utopian nature of theatrical performance that is based on a given text and is not of an improvisatory nature allows simulated autonomy of the characters. The relation between the written, fixed word and the simulation of spontaneous action could also be interpreted in the phantasma of self-determination, intuition, and immediate experience. Thus, the imagination of the freely acting character on stage taking decisions, making plans, defending and attacking just resolves in the irony of fiction. Nevertheless, the spectator accepts the phantasma in analogy to the demand that he adapts to a play's rules in order to plunge into the sensual world opening up on stage.[263] Appealing to and breaking the illusion are a writer's devices to refer to the irony of fiction and to change the distance in which the spectator perceives the play; concomitantly, he is confronted with his own status as a witness of imitation. Briefly, theatre stands for a dialogue of mimetic nature and interpretative imagination or to put it more commonly, fantasy, which achieves world-making, whose process can be articulated and visualized on a meta-level.

Comedy's utopian quality goes beyond the nature of theatre as an incongruent imagery of reality existent in a temporal-spatial boundary. The instrument and the key of imagination open up a space, which has an enormous potential for "the unthinkable, the liminal, the forbidden, and the experimental, in the sense of Raymond Ruyer's utopian mode (*mode utopique*)".[264] Logic can be distorted; rules can be disregarded, and seriousness can be absent. Restrictions of any sort, physical, social, gender, etc. must give way to comedy's power

---

260 Aelius Donatus, 'A Fragment on Comedy and Tragedy', transl. by George Miltz, *Theories of Comedy*, Paul Lauter (ed.), New York: Anchor Books, 1964, 27-32, 27. These words cannot be found in Cicero's writing at least in the works handed down. Livius Andronicus, who Donatus cites too, puts comedy similarly as "mirror of daily life" (Donatus, 27). And cf. Rainer Jakobi, *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*, Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996, 176.

261 Edith G. Kern, *The Absolute Comic,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1980, 26; David Scott Kastan, *'All's Well That Ends Well* and the Limits of Comedy', *English Literary History* 52 (1985): 575-89, 576. Also see Richard F. Hardin, 'Encountering Plautus in the Renaissance: A Humanist Debate on Comedy', *Renaissance Quarterly* 60 (2007): 789-818, esp. 791-2.

262 Salingar (1974), 104. In Salingar's words, "[m]imesis is both 'imitation' in the rational, Aristotelian sense, a semblance of voluntary human actions transferred to a special medium, and 'impersonation' with an irrational, quasi-magical overtone of possession through contact with an alien power, somewhat like the state of possession that Plato attributes to the declaimer of poetry in his Ion." (102).

263 Cf. Dieter Wellershoff, 'Die Irrealität der Komödie als utopischer Schein', *Das Komische*, Wolfgang Preisendanz and Rainer Warning (eds.), München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976, 379-383, 382. Comedy openly shows itself as fiction and thereby, negates to be a lie.

264 Horlacher (2009), 19. Horlacher speaks of the realm of art in general. He here refers to Raymond Ruyer's monography *L'Utopie et les Utopies* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950). For *le mode utopique* and its examination, see Ruyer (1950), 9-28.

to turn their status and relation upside-down. All those sum up to comedy's procedure of world-making, whose earliest testimony therein can be found in Aristophanes' great worlds, which recommend themselves as a prime example of utopia. He constructed states that are placed in the clouds or run by women. For instance, *Birds* reaches beyond earthly limits, presenting the 'cloud cuckoo land', a wonderland to be.[265]

Impossibility is an important notion when it comes to comedy's utopia expressing itself in the development of the plot and the processes of becoming on the verbal level. First, comedy's plot can wander from a desperate situation and some seemingly unavoidable catastrophe to the magical resolution sometimes secured by a *deus ex machina*. New Comedy's plots repeat this certain structure. The happy ending is not surprising but expected; the courses of action how the impossible mission is achieved are part of the entertainment the audience enjoys. These steps in the plot are secured by the guarantee of wonderful incidents only comedy's utopia allows, especially if the two corpora of plays, Plautine intrigue comedies and Shakespearean comedies partially following the Arcadian tradition, are considered. Romantic comedies heal the lovers' folly by getting married and intrigue comedies undo a financial crisis, the devastation of the young, and also, the dominance of the elder generation. The path of lucky incidents though undermined by challenges and impediments always leads to the resolution of all conflicts by the craft of imagination, which characterizes comedy's utopian nature on the level of the plot.

The realisation and design of the course of action are salted with many processes of becoming on the verbal level and to put it more abstractly, with utopian nuclei. Metaphors, similes, and similar techniques that usually install moments of *ridiculum* in comedy initiate a process of turning somebody or something into some other, which lasts at least for a second and for the time of laughter it causes. When men are referred to as sheep or other animals and a woman's wardrobe is compared to an estate, fantastic images can appear in front of the spectator's eye. The verbal utterance initiates a process of changing e.g. the appearance of something as something other, which still remains in the sphere of imagination and normally, does not come into existence. The word 'if' seems to be very appealing in that sense and is often applied to instate a phantasm since it states a hypothetical condition, whereby it creates another illusory, non-existent tempo-spatial image. Metamorphosis in a utopian environment can affect social status and usually inverts the hierarchical structure. All these instantiations share the deviation from common sense and from logic and therefore, show some absurd quality realized in a second world apart from the common and real. "Comic absurdity is of the same nature as that of dreams" if both are interpreted as relying on the freedom and playground of a utopian scope the comic mask makes use of.[266]

There are certain stereotypes in comedy that engage in the stabilization of utopian nature in several ways. The professional fool definitely belongs to them, if not represents the ultimate incorporation of comedy's schema, which includes the utopian nature. On the verbal level, they can present imaginative constructs that foster the upside-down characteristic of comedy. They can disseminate the role from the physical presence and foreground the

---

265 Some of Aristophanes' comedies, especially those referred to above, contain complete utopias in the sense of Morus' *Utopia*, the prototype of the genre. See Dirk Otto, 'Utopie', *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, *Band 9*, Gert Ueding (ed.), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003, Sp. 982-997, 986; furthermore, Aristophanic tendency to "[make] wasps, birds, and frogs the subject of […] comedies" does not spring from the writer's extravagancies, but "the whole tradition of the theriomorphic personification is at the back of it." (Johan Huizinga, *Homo ludens. A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*, London: Routledge, 1949 [repr. 2002], 144).
266 Figueroa-Dorrego and Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), 620. They refer to Henri Bergson's *Laughter* (1900) in the translation by Wylie Sypher (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956).

illusion, which highlights the dialogue between stage and reality. On the level of the plot, they as tricksters undertake the impossible mission to manage a denouement at the end. The professional fool figure that is also often central to the development of the plot by nesting manipulative strands into each other incorporates the subversive energy as no other figure. Plautus' *servus callidus* plays such an important role in the intrigue plot, whereby he gives the impression that the utopian space is permanently customizable until the balance is restored again. Until that point, his activities revolve around two related key terms, 'deception' and 'illusion': the theatrical figure living on stage and the trickster forming illusionary frames within the theatrical illusion. Both provide a tension between seeming and being or the actual and the non-actual, which spreads itself on the level of words and deeds and between those two. Even if some instantiations of the fool figure do not manage the progress of the deceptive plot or function as a protagonist trickster, as it is the case for the later wise fools in Shakespeare's plays, they express ambiguous sentiments underlining the discrepancy between truth and false belief. They also invent second, illusionary realities in articulating new words, metaphoric landscapes and imaginary conditional sentences. Briefly, the fool figure's words and deeds stabilize utopian nuclei within comedy's space. The constitutions of comedy's utopian nature on the verbal level and the level of the plot supplement and combine each other to a subversive energy that is essentially responsible for the experience of the species of the ugly and comedy's upside-down world.

Like the opposition of truth and illusion, comedy is a home of binary oppositions that spring from a certain degree of impossibility and irrationality and mostly, create comic moments. The professional fool who is aware of these conditions is empowered over the other figures and can capitalize on the freedom of comedy's utopia and the full repertoire attached to comedy's schema. Plunging into worlds of senses can free participants, figures, from consequences that would be probable and expected in the real world. How the figures act and react follows the parameters of the utopia, determining the atmosphere of and the attitude towards a situation, an action, or a statement. Though comedy shows aggressive humour, it does not cause true pain nor is it interested in destruction and devastation. The professional fool's concept and effect rely upon these conditions. For instance, the audience can evaluate irrational behaviour as funny and not as madness. However, if the fool's concept is placed in another environment, the concept, its functionality, and its realisation adapt to the other genre's schema and its parameters. A dark and destructible atmosphere of tragic or gothic products raises an alternative professional fool figure moving much closer to madness, pain, physical aggression, and hostility, which could be found in Thersites in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* or in the modern Joker figure of psychopathic extremes, a villain of the DC Comics attacking Gotham City.

As a theatre's stage, comedy becomes an alternative universe that can function as an exaggerated, extreme and one-sided kind of mirror foregrounding certain human characteristics and cultural specifics the 'other' can recognize and reflect his knowledge of the world and himself upon. Here, the comic mask inherits the license to cross natural and conventional boundaries, which is protected by the character of playfulness since

> it is essential to grasp [comedy's] playfulness as not to be offended [...]. For if we assume [...] that all theatre is essentially ludic, then we must conclude that the absolute comic, in particular, appeals to man as *homo ludens*, and it is by announcing itself as belonging to this realm of imagination that it prepares us to accept its lewdness, its

violence, and its immorality as well as its special notions of justice—so different from those prevailing in tragedy.[267]

The spectator is open for the utopian framework and all its comic caprices, which can emerge, for instance, in telling a joke. Acceptability grows when the utopian world remains intact and is proclaimed as such, which is highly important if one thinks back to the style of mockery. In accordance to Freud's theory, Mary Douglas sums up that

> [a] joke is a play upon form. It brings into relation disparate elements in such a way that one accepted pattern is challenged by the appearance of another which in some way was hidden in the first. […] Its excitement lies in the suggestion that any particular ordering of experience may be arbitrary and subjective. It is frivolous in that it produces no real alternative, only an exhilarating sense of freedom from form in general.[268]

Theatre's utopia rises by the power of illusion, wherein the generic *specificum*, comedy, allows processes of metamorphoses and constructions under the premise of lightness discarding true pain as despair, horror, and destruction, but inviting the laughable. Comedy's classical form of utopia ends with happiness, governed by the circular schema alternating between harmony and disharmony or construction and destruction. Thus, as long as comedy's utopian nature exists and its playful character is ensured as long can the relaxation from convention endure and comedy's sign, the professional fool figure, be active and functional. He contributes to utopia's visualization and stabilization when he communicates its ludic and creative quality to the spectator directly and indirectly by his words and deeds: it is a play.[269]

In other words, the deliberate fool figure helps to guarantee the coherence of the comedic utopia and its recognition by the audience since

> [t]he comedy of life is a play that can be entertaining only so long as its basic illusion is kept up. To strip away disguises ruins the play and leads only to disillusionment, futility, despair, or even suicide. [270]

From the beginning of drama, the irony lying in the double vision of disguise, (re)disguise, disclosure has been immanent in its nature and took a pivotal role in theatre's self-concept.

A carnivalesque world

Comedy's utopia is popularly referred to as an upside-down or topsy-turvy world, where disorder prevails over order and the lowest can surpass the highest. In brief, it is shaped by a second principle, the carnivalesque, which means that the imitating contrasts the imitated by the application of inversion. Entering comic stage resembles coming into a house, where

---

267 Kern (1980), 34. Here, Kern relies on Huizinga's treatise *homo ludens*.

268 Mary Douglas, *Implicit Meanings*, London/Henley/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975, 96; and cf. Sigmund Freud, *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten. Der Humor*, introd. by Peter Gay, Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, [8]2006, esp. 247-8, and Freud differentiating between the joke and the comic, see 193ff. and 221: "*der Witz ist sozusagen der Beitrag zur Komik aus dem Bereich des Unbewussten*."

269 Kern points at metacommunication in Molière's comedies that tells the audience about how to understand verbal attacks as well as immorality and not to be offended. Here, she highly criticizes Bergson, who "was blind to and misunderstood all that was playfully carnivalesque in Molière's comedies". Kern (1980), 36.

270 Miller (1979), xxii.

everything sticks to the ceiling. The first association that springs to mind when the structure of carnivalesque is mentioned is most probably the inversion of hierarchical structure or the deletion of class distinction, which can look back on a long tradition of rituals in Western history. The seemingly anarchic condition was part of a regular and controlled event that offered an experience of a more homogeneous society, when the upside-down architecture in the house of society deviated from the norm temporarily, attached to a certain festivity that licensed the violation of rules. With Bakhtin's words, "[c]arnival is the festive embodiment of change and disorder."[271]

Carnival stands for the opportunity when people can exchange ranks, move out of their daily role and put on different roles in the utopia of extremes, wherein they are part of the overall performance. During such official and legal events, they can enjoy freedom not in an absolute form but restricted to a festive framework.[272] The English calendar of the 16th century, for example, knew a type of abnormal conduct and hierarchical inversion: the Feast of Fools "on which a bishop of fools was elected to conduct a mock or inverted mass."[273] The procession was not led by a genuine man of the church but by a man performing the bishop. The ceremony contained the reversal of roles involving appearance, clothes, mimic, and register, but was not intended as an exact imitation. Instead, the name of the feast was programmatic for the performance's style since folly entered the church and made the ceremony to a parody, which finally dissolved in the renewal of the serious and sacred.[274] Carl Jung speaks of the excessive dances and singings in many European churches under the name of the *festum stultorum* at the end of the 12th century by relating to a report from 1198. The feast's processes, in particular its Parisian form in Notre Dame, raised shocked reactions among the higher clerics since

> so many abominations and shameful deeds were committed that the holy places were desecrated 'not only by smutty jokes, but even by the shedding of blood.' In vain did Pope Innocent III inveigh against the 'jests and madness that make the clergy a mockery,' and the 'shameless frenzy of their play-acting.' Two hundred and fifty years later (March 12, 1444), a letter from the Theological Faculty of Paris to all the French bishops was still fulminating against these festivals, at which 'even priests and clerics elected an archbishop or a bishop or pope and named him the Fools' Pope' (*fatuorum papam*).[275]

Like the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Antiquity knew more than one feast of that type, amongst which the feast of Saturnalia is probably the most prominent, where the social order became largely obsolete for a couple of days, which was essentially notable in

> the temporary setting aside of the social distinction between masters and slaves. This manifested itself particularly in banquets, in which slaves dined either with their masters […] or before them […]. The Saturnalia were considered nothing less than a

---

271 Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his world*, Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1968, 10.

272 Lachmann (ed.) (1995), 32ff.

273 Tim Prentki, *The Fool in European Theatre. Stages of Folly*, Basingstoke et al.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, 25; Figueroa-Dorrego and Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), 63. In the Western culture, the Feast of Fools or *festa stultorum* was a widely-spread celebration among students and clergymen from the 13th to the 15th century. Also, Easter and Christmas' processions saw mockery and obscene elements from 14th to the 16th century.

274 Prentki (2012), 27. "The Feast of Fools sprang from the official liturgy as a way of both mitigating and reinforcing the hierarchical distinctions of the Church."

275 Carl G. Jung, 'On the Psychology of the Trickster Figure', *Four Archetypes. The Collected Works*, Vol. 9, pt. 1, transl. by Richard Francis Carrington Hull, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010, 137; Kern (1980), 81-83.

festival of slaves […], who were granted particular liberties during this period […]. This temporary suspension was sometimes interpreted as a reflex of the Golden Age of Saturn.[276]

At the private banquets, they celebrated those days with an indulgence in drinking and eating and entertained themselves by reciting mocking verses, puzzles, and riddles.[277] Virtues as decency and modesty were outvoted by luxury and physical needs. For the slaves, the occasion raised them to a new status—from an object in legal thinking to a person with certain liberties, who could actually celebrate with their masters, sitting next to them. The image of a Golden Age evolves and a different world opens up since the Saturnalian period and its social equality can be seen in association with peace, prosperity and pure happiness only a utopia could guarantee.[278] Similarly, Bakhtin sees the disclosure of a new world realized by the grotesque as "*die lebendige Wiederkehr des saturnischen Goldenen Zeitalters*" or to put it differently, "*die Welt des Goldenen Zeitalters, die Karnevalswahrheit*".[279]

The new promising world and the belonging processes fascinate with two paradoxes. First of all, Saturnalia, the Feast of Fools, and carnival work destructive against society's structure and institutions as they undermine them but simultaneously, they work constituting since they initiate renewal and even reinforcement of the old existing structure. It seems that a system demolishes itself since society executes an official act that softens its institutional system of classes at least temporarily, which causes a paradox that is only explainable and accepted under the premise of festivity creating a second world and establishing a pause from the toil of the real. Such festive quality implies regular assemblies of a spatio-temporal framework based on a catalogue of rules determining the social interaction by activating a protocol of behaviour. Rituals image and look at social life from different perspectives by the important mean of performance; this connects Saturnalia/carnival with comedy. Comedy testifies the same framework remaining in its festive stability and containing a foil to the real, whose relation is usually built upon some oppositional quality showing the tendency to lift restrictions; opposition and destructive forces cease in the end, inviting renewal. Opposition, tension, and contrast dissolve and are replaced by processes of balancing constitution. Consequently, the carnivalesque prepares the final outcome and belongs into the circular process of distortion and harmony. The comic mask could draw upon this licensed world of inversion in accordance with the utopian framework.

The Dionysian Games contained the liberating and renewing force of the reversal of order, whose elements became fixed in the motives of Old Comedy.[280] Greek and later Roman comedy depicted reconciliation at the end by sitting slaves next to their masters. The *Palliata*

---

276 Götz Distelrath (Constance), "Saturnalia", in: *Brill's New Pauly*, Antiquity volumes edited by: Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Consulted online on 05 January 2022 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1102380. (citation style given by website). Textual evidence is given for cases, when the slaves dined with their masters, as in Acc. fr. 3 *Morel*; Just. *Epit*. 43,1,2 f.; Sen. *Ep*. 47,14; Macrob. *Sat*. 1,11,1; when the slaves dined before them in Macrob. *Sat*. 1,24,23; and the focus on slaves, in InscrIt 13,2,275; Auson. *Eclogae* 23 (*de feriis Romanis*); the partial abolishment of legal restrictions for slaves during the period in Macrob. *Sat*. 1,7, 26; On the Golden Age of Saturn, see Hendrik S. Versnel, 'Two carnivalesque princes: Augustus and Claudius and the ambiguity of Saturnalian imagery', *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*, Siegmar Döpp (ed.), Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1993, 99-122, esp. 99-100; cf. Jung (2010), 137. He sees "the strange ecclesiastical customs based on memories of the ancient Saturnalia".
277 Cf. Distelrath, '*Saturnalia*', web.
278 Cf. Versnel (1993), 101-5. On *Saturnia regna* and its difference to the Age of Kronos.
279 Lachmann (ed.) (1995), 99. Bakhtin speaks of the grotesque opening up a new world.
280 Cf. Bernhard Zimmermann, *Die Griechische Komödie*, Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Antike, 2006, 30ff., esp. 34.

knew slaves surpassing their masters in wit in addition to masters who got subject to subversion. New Comedy's world in sum showed analogies to Saturnalia.[281] Saturnalian or carnival atmosphere matches the lightness and unpainful characteristic of comedy since it promises joy, and ceases in its forceful, aggressive power at the end without threatening reality's order. Within theatres and festive spaces, people can become others while the element of performance keeps the coherence of the utopia intact. Comedy and carnival establish a similar alternative universe, founding on the same dialectic of order and disorder though this study does not investigate their historical interdependence.[282]

The vision or the idea of carnival has appeared in many different names and rituals across Western cultures and throughout time but the kernel pattern of inversion and flouting order and rule makes them all comparable. Hence, two phenomena should be distinguished since festive misrule, carnival, cannot be interchanged with the notion of carnivalesque as carnival stands for a widely spread social phenomenon and denotes a festive activity realized in a culture, whereas carnivalesque describes a repetitive structure that can emerge in different cultural forms and can be perceived separately from the event 'carnival'.[283] Arthur Lindley puts it more precisely when he says that

> [t]he carnivalesque survives as a concept of literary theory, not of social history. It does so because it describes an element, a process of demystification, manifestly present in a great range of Western literature, whatever the social sources or political consequences, if any, of that element may have been outside the text. Bakhtin is not writing – at least not directly- about social behavior but about the ways in which social practice ('carnival') is refracted and reimagined in literary texts ('carnivalesque').[284]

It is the form of repetitive structural element and its presence in the generic world of comedy this analysis wants to capture and how the concept of the fool figure is involved in it.

Bakhtin saw the Renaissance novel of Francois Rabelais, *Gargantua et Pantagruel* (1532/1564), as the initiation of the carnivalesque in literature. According to his interpretations of the influence and advent of the phenomenon 'carnival' into literature, four criteria manifest the carnivalesque and determine the perception of the carnivalesque world: familiarity, eccentricity, mésalliance, and profanation. They share the common structure of opposition with *ridiculum*; however, carnivalesque involves a process of liberation that transforms and reverses order. Familiarity suggests that hierarchical restrictions are lifted and the hierarchical order is put upside-down, as the servant then rules the master. Eccentricity

---

281 Cf. Siegmar Döpp, 'Saturnalien und lateinische Literatur', *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1993, 145–177, 157-59 (esp. on Plautus' comedies).

282 Cf. *Ibid.*, 145. And Segal (1968), 177, ft. 27. "There was never any drama associated with the Saturnalia in classical times (perhaps because of the weather), although it was the occasion for the revival of Roman comedies during the Renaissance."

283 Cf. Arthur Lindley, *Hyperion and the Hobbyhorse. Studies in Carnivalesque Subversion*, Newark/London: Associated University Press, 1996, 25.

284 *Ibid.*, 22. Arthur Lindley admonishes to be cautious with reading Bakhtin as an unambivalent theory since "Bakhtin's treatise is an exercise in mythmaking and covert allegory, as much a program for subverting Stalinism […] as it is a commentary on late-medieval literature and culture. As a description of the social phenomenon of carnival, the chapter is frankly speaking, if implicitly, fictional." Lindley primarily speaks about the first chapter of Bakhtin's 'Rabelais and his World'; it is neither "history or – strictly speaking- literary interpretation" (17); Also see Bernhard Teuber, *Sprache, Körper, Traum: Zur karnevalesken Tradition in der romanischen Literatur aus früher Zeit*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989, 10-11 and 11: The carnivalesque can be thought as "*thematisches Dispositiv, welches epochen-, gattungs- und formübergreifend wirksam ist und mithin an generisch unterschiedlichen Stellen zu Tage treten kann.*"

allows the human being to leave his routine and ruled life and visualize human nature as it raises the body, its basic functions, and its longings above decency, (moral) control, and shame. The lower bodily *stratum* dominates the higher rational spirit, which aspect is of special interest here. Similarly to familiarity, mésalliance opens up closed categories and combines separate values, classes, thoughts and things in mixing high and low or wise and foolish. Close to the latter criterion, profanation does not know modesty but demonstrates a debasing attitude towards everything. It affects the sacred and downgrades it to a level it ranks usually most apart from.[285] All these oppose the conservative doctrine of modesty and manners but show great popularity and effectiveness for the preparation of *ridiculum*.

These four criteria are helpful devices for classification but as Lindley remarked, Bakhtin's model and conclusions should be treated with caution not to entrap in an allegorical reading. In accordance to Bakhtin, the sum of these four establishes a counter discourse in literature and art starting with Rabelais' novel and realizing a cosmos, whose order is anti-proportional. The experience of such a utopia invites the reader to take a different perspective on the imitated as he participates in the dialogue between the two poles. Bakhtin attributes the potential for change to the reception of the counter discourse classified as the laughing culture since it can relativize the existent system of values and break through limitations and boundaries of oppositional pairs. He even speaks of a revolutionary impact that steadily undermines non-homogeneous concepts and promotes democratic thinking. The lower bodily *stratum* reveals heterogeneity as an illusion, falsely interpreted as a threat to hierarchical systems and their classes.[286] Analogically, comedy's nature of inversion is often said to carry impulses for revolution, too as it provides a different perspective and an alternative version to the existent system, which can have the effect of questioning its validity and initiating a change in ideology. How people feared, forbade, and misunderstood elements of laughing culture refers to the above-mentioned prescriptive accounts on laughter in history. Naturally, consequences for the social system consuming products of the laughing culture are not predictable in that way and should not be reduced to an automatism.

The focus is on comedy's realisation of the carnivalesque and how Bakhtin's criteria can help to approach and backtrack certain re-occurring pairs of themes and major categories of the species of the ugly. As it was outlined the principle carnivalesque cannot be explained sufficiently only by the hierarchical inversion but the bone to carnivalesque can be found in an ongoing dialogue that is caused by the instantiation of a counter discourse subverting the original, conventional or simply, real. Boundaries become permeable and lose their strictness like the boundaries between seriousness and play, bottom and top, in and out fade.[287] The structural starting point is identified as opposition from where the dialogue can arise. Concrete oppositions originate between social groups, objects, behaviour, etc. Mental categories such as high and low or profane and sacred subsume the concrete and display oppositional poles on the abstract level matching Bakhtin's criteria, which essentially culminate in macro-categories not rarely standing in juxtaposition. Four macro-categories, which can be grouped to two oppositions, have been identified as being reissued and varied

---

285 Cf. Lachmann (ed.) (1995), esp. 48-49 and 50-60.

286 Cf. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World*, transl. by Hélène Iswolsky, Bloomington et al.: Indiana University Press, 1984 (repr. 2002), prologue (by Michael Holquist), xviii: "Bakhtin's carnival, surely the most productive concept in this book, is not only not an impediment to revolutionary change, it is revolution itself."

287 Cf. Christoph Strosetzki, *Einführung in die Spanische und Lateinamerikanische Literaturwissenschaft*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2003, 110ff.; and see Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin. Creation of a Prosaics*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990, 51, on Bakhtin's understanding of boundaries in culture, whose entities show an always liminal quality.

across the studied comedies: body/mind and individual/society. Those are suggested to provide the salient content for the carnivalesque in comedy from Plautus to Shakespeare and are introduced to make the relevance of Bakhtin's criteria for comedy clearer. Of course, these vaguely appearing macro-categories only serve the function to order themes, motives, and similar devices.

Carnivalesque phenomena rely on the recognition that mankind is faced with dilemmas, situated between boundaries; they offer to cross such boundaries, revert their structure, and to enter an alternative universe. Similarly to Raskin's determination of universal oppositional pairs, carnivalesque criteria relate to two all-embracing dualities meandering between harmony and conflict. One salient dilemma is identified in the opposition of body and mind or more specifically, excess and *ratio*: the latter promises freedom of thoughts and physical unrestrictedness, is ranked higher, and defines human strength over the animalistic bodily functions, while the former liberates desire, seems to disempower, limits the mind, and expresses weakness—ideologies and myriad doctrines established such an evaluation in the minds of people. In the last two thousand years, considerations on body and mind, their opposition, separation, and balance have always been a central part in socio-cultural discourse and a source for art. For instance, they were and are opposed to each other if physical needs are believed to dominate and prevent the aspirations to gain a higher spirituality. Replacing mind with soul, from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance and even beyond, one main abstract juxtaposition was the conflict between body and soul or between spirituality and earthly boundaries. In those days, Christianity's dominance about people's thinking in Western Europe proclaimed the doctrine of the weak flesh preventing the soul on its way to God. In the carnivalesque, low instincts can prevail over rational doctrine; the satisfaction of physical needs can dominate, while profanity confronts something sacred or sublime; mythological heroism is diminished by rupturing honour and adding ordinary elements.

Partitioning carnivalesque in its major aspects adds to the conflictual dialogue of body and mind another dilemma, that between individual and society. Social classes, their restrictions, and hierarchical relations determine individuals not as absolutely free but as members of their specific class. Society dominates their position and behaviour, prescribing certain roles, whose rigidity comedy weakens partially, making its institution less powerful. The genre shows figures challenging their class limits not in a Marxists understanding but in a non-serious atmosphere by playfully exposing hierarchical relations and their stereotypical behaviour to ridicule. Social categories in the form of roles become available and questioned when identities are taken, changed, inverted, and restored. Personae represent the social being with all its duties, rights, and limitations. The individual can question, disregard, and alter them to some extent, constructing another identity, regardless if it is valid or accepted. Finally, the carnivalesque relies on these four macro-categories, turning their conventional content and relations inside out, disturbing order and putting emphasis on the extremes, which can happen in a dystopic or utopian environment. The genre's carnivalesque sees both dilemmas from a light perspective that sets aside any truly desperate feelings and opens up a trivial(izing) treatment by answering conflict with *ridiculum*, offering a cathartic experience.

Farce shows the tendency to prefer defects to virtues since it clings to the motto '*acutius cernuntur, vitia quam virtutes*' satisfying the expectation of the laughable and primarily aiming at mirth. Concretely, the tripartite comic ensemble of food, drink, and lust exhibits human vice and does not spare with obscene allusions or even actions and luxurious habits. Such low-level themes and their deriving oppositions saliently nourish the laughable.[288]

---

288 See on *ridiculum* in this chapter.

The figure demonstrating 'the vice' and subversion is the professional fool, who deploys elements fitting Bakhtin's four criteria of the carnivalesque. As a source for *ridiculum* and fitting his clownish feature, he is mostly fond of the triple, food, drink, and lust, and knows how to mock the dominance of physical needs over the individual and his reasonability. He usually embodies the *lower bodily stratum* himself by dancing drunken on stage or affirming his participation in lustful symposia. Simultaneously, he encourages others on stage to behave non-virtuously by promoting the triple, including fostering the longings of the young. He confronts the audience with bawdy allusions from time to time.

In Plautus' intrigue comedies, Bakhtin's first criterion, lifting of class distinctions, can be found when the *servus callidus* designs himself as the master of the others and their behaviour. Showing similarities to the trickster, he invests in deception throughout the plot and manipulates the social superior persona, usually his master, ruling over his master. The fool figure of an inferior social position questions the superiority of the powerful by his superiority of wit. The supposed inferior turns the table and triumphs by his talents, if not (only) in trickery, then (also) in repartee. Social hierarchy is not anarchically lifted, but gains an asymmetrical double in the activities on stage, where masters officially rule their servants and concomitantly, are duped by those, who move outside their strictly serving role. Such actions are accompanied by an apparatus of threat, punishment or physical and verbal abuse in addition to a context of triumph and praising. Victory in an inverted world is allowed to women over men, young over old-age, and lower over higher classes; this reversal continues in intertextual arrangements, when tragic and epic matters are lain in comic mouths.

Carnivalesque is a (dis-)ordering force, achieving a dialectic and a tension between two poles and their unconventional arrangement. Comedy's utopia allows the principle to be operative, while it is confirmed and structured by the carnivalesque at the same time, which frustrates "the desire for firm conceptual boundaries" but fosters the distortion of everything normative,[289] while it stays harmless. In contrast to comedy's use, the carnivalesque can of course participate in construction of dystopias, leaving the framework of final harmony.[290] The dialectics offer myriad subcategories to be realized in depiction and performance in comedy, which uses the inversion of order, the violation of convention and expectation as well as contradictory pairs of high and low, profane and sacred or norm and its distortion as a constitutive force. The professional fool points his finger on the carnivalesque in comedy when he takes on identities that surpass his own, exhibits baseness and bodily inadequacy, and brilliantly combines sense with nonsense. Consequently, with its four criteria demonstrating opposition, carnivalesque has been identified as the third of principles that constitute, structure, and stabilize comedy's schema. For the genre, it is active and supportive in combination with the other two discussed principles. All three show a complementary and dependent relation that strengthens the coherence and aesthetical effectiveness of comedy.

Carnivalesque is part of that tripartite schema of comedy, in which it participates in the realisation of the species of the ugly. It can display a thematic and technical resource for *ridiculum* with a scenery of slaves ruling masters, women beating men, giving access to a process of profanation. The modes of acting, speaking, moving, and becoming can be analysed under its criteria. The extent to which they are used depends on the playwright and the time he is working in. In comparison to Terence and later playwrights, Plautus' comedies impress

---

289 Lindley (1996), 23.
290 Lindley even argues that carnivalesque "does not operate, however, in the simply positive way that Bakhtin mythologizes. It is used more to interrogate dystopias than to establish utopias. In the carnivalesque, utopia is, pace Hirschkop, a dubious memory." *Ibid.,* 24.

their audience with their verbal extravagancies, direct inversion, and mockery. The extent of how farcically, aggressively, verbally abusing the comedy reveals itself to be pivots on the application and extent of the carnivalesque. Its use can even change to a darker anarchic form, disregarding a modest and harmless concept of humour. *Ridiculum* can turn into a satirical version of Gargantua's mouth that exceeds the limits of utopian harmlessness.

For the Renaissance and poetics' determination, comedy's schema becomes instantiated mainly as the harmless, cathartic imitation of human life that foregrounds the disposition to failure in human nature, looking back at the classical sources and medieval religious ideology. Herein, that imitation of human life is shown in a carnivalesque-designed utopia that is effectuated and visualized in moments of *ridiculum*, while utopia licenses such a structural state of abnormity and incongruity in its promise of spatio-temporal fictiveness. Apart from censorious attitude, comedy knows no "modest limits of order" (*TN* 1.3.8).[291] Thereby, comedy offers the audience entrance to a Dionysian environment.

In their combinatory relation, all three principles circle around the species of the ugly that is essentially recognizable in oppositional structures, whose conflict and hierarchical reversal, for example, confirm and can happen in utopian grounds. 'At best', simple invective turns into subversive energy the humanist could appreciate and praise. That energy results in some distance from the ridiculed object and makes comedy a source for sociocultural commentary.

Regardless if it is used or seen as a medium for satire, comedy comes alive by the construction and representation of life's anomalies in the veil of the laughable, finally ending in the anomalies' grand harmonization. As long as comedy's utopia and disorder are in force, the laughable can flourish exceedingly, wherein it can be perceived in two different aspects and thus, achieve two effects. On the one hand, the laughable and its following laughter can expose vice and stimulate or simply intend a process of correction. In short, the Latin proverb *castigat ridendo mores* promises to do so. On the other, laughter can unite a group, release *gravitas*, and spread mirth in a festive atmosphere. Both perspectives on the laughable do not exclude each other but often happen to occur together in one comedy.[292] Comedy knows "laughing *at* and laughing *with*"; that dichotomy is significant when it comes to the distinction of fool figures in the following chapter.[293]

Comedy in history off stage and on stage bears a king of helix that seems to be more difficile, triggers more debates, and allows more freedom than its tragic counterpart. The genre of comedy moves in the spheres of refinement and imitation, prescriptive accounts or generic definition, other cultural encounters with laughter, condemnation of theatre, average taste. In other words, Comedy and its background of laughter, comic, and mirth can be seen under the aspect of education and morality; it can be seen under the aspect of entertainment and social gathering; it can be understood from the perspective of a playwright, actors, directors and other involved people living from theatre; alternatively, it can be looked at from philosophical theory or literary theory. It is the perspective and approach that matter. All these various streams and factors of how comedy was perceived, expected, and realized sum up to a world of possible influences, of which it is hard to state how, if, and mostly in what proportion they contribute to the genre's development and its stereotypes. The phenomenon

---

291 Here, Maria advises Sir Toby not to be that stereotypical comic figure, the parasite, who is mostly drunken and fond of sports. William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*, Keir Elam (ed.), London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2008. All further citations will be given from this edition.
292 Cf. Laroque (²2006), 38-39.
293 *Ibid.*, 40.

of the fool figure belongs to this world, while it does not do so exclusively and is spread across genres.

After dissecting the different discourses, perspectives, and forms of comedy, it became clear that an artificial division is helpful for an investigation and to understand the complexity of comedy. Throughout centuries, comedy has been flourishing as an entertaining product, which includes its variants and hybrids of popular and sophisticated forms. Indeed, it is not valid to divide sharply between high aspiration and popular entertainment but to look at comedy's development as a "kind of interplay between popular and elite".[294] In other words, "cross-overs between popular and high" have always been in practice.

> Ancient drama itself had its 'popular' aspect. Plautus in particular hybridized *his* Menander with the native Italian traditions of popular performance that modern scholarship associates with the 'Atellan farce' (*fabula Atellana*) – whence (seemingly) Plautus' inspiration for song and (perhaps) wordplay and coarse humour, along with his amplification of the 'trickster slave' (*servus callidus*). And between Plautus and our era of sitcoms and musical comedies, there have been notable instances of convergence between 'low' and 'high', popular and elite.[295]

As it is the premise of this thesis, the process of convergence and productivity can be epitomized at the concept of the deliberate fool figure Plautus' clever slave belongs to. The concept evinces universality and phenomenological persistence in the genre and subgenres of comedy, while it relies on the underlying paradox pattern.

In general, this study agrees with Gurewitch's claim that "'[c]omedy' has to be recognized as a matrix term that embraces miscellaneous impulses, which can be sensed empirically as effects before they are regarded as intentions."[296] On specific terms, comedy is here made accessible by the above-outlined schema, the understanding of the species of the ugly, and the three principles displaying instruments since the analysis will draw upon this network in order to identify the deliberate fool figure and describe his performance if and how he manages these processes of constructing oppositions, inversions, and negotiating between boundaries of illusions. He will be shown as a central element that contributes to the coherence of comedy as he makes use of and is essentially linked with the three principles the schema of comedy relies on.

Now, with the knowledge of the schema of comedy, it is time to crystallize what the common and inflationary term 'fool' is within the compass of comic realms, under what types fool figures can be subsumed, and to denote more clearly what is meant when the analysis speaks of a deliberate fool figure in the following chapter before the analysis can start with disclosing the metamorphosis of the fool figure involving the ongoing convergence of 'low' and 'high'.

---

294 Silk et al. (2014), 122. Silk et al. speak of a common phenomenon that is not genre-specific.
295 *Ibid*., 123.
296 Gurewitch (1975), 48.

II.ii.   What about a fool?

The natural and deliberate fool

Throughout history, spectators and readers have seen innumerable representations of fool(ish) figures on stages, in texts and on screens: Homer's and later Shakespeare's cacophonic Thersites, the entertaining parasite in the *Nea* and beyond, the ridiculous simpleton like Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Pope's Dunces, *Atellana*'s stock character Maccus, *commedia dell'arte's* zanni, circus clowns, slapstick characters like Laurel and Hardy or the cartoon figure Homer Simpson. Fool stands for an abundance of synonyms such as buffoon, clown, jester, wit, harlequin, vice, joker, knave, devil, etc.

> But these words do not offer consistent qualitative or quantitative differences that might separate fool types from one another. Etymologies of these terms are similarly overlapping and general. The implicit meanings most common in the late twentieth century identify jesters as verbally witty, buffoons as stupid, clowns as common circus figures providing visual foolery, and fools as dupes or fops.[297]

The 20th century's perspective does not suffice to adumbrate the cross-overs, changes, limitations and expansions that the fool and its concept has faced. Simply, names and implicit meanings are not helpful to detect the 'secret' of the figures' universality. At least, it can be said that if one characteristic is sought that links all representations, then it is their connection to laughter. As the model for cultural dynamics proposes, the concept of 'fool' can be considered a cultural entity availing of Humour and belonging to the category of the Comic, whose occurrences can be seen as pervasive across cultures since this entity embodies the human fascination with the laughable and caters to our affinity for laughter and entertainment. Without doubt, the comic folly found in such characters and performances shows a great diversity across genres and media. But how can these innumerable fools be differentiated from each other? Into what subtypes can they be divided and what are their concepts?

> First, it is claimed that all of the figures mentioned above are linked to an environment of 'laughter' or a space where the laughable can become active and is created in different ways and with dissimilar intentions. Comedy's stage, for instance, is a typologically loaded place a figure 'enters', manifests in adaptation to that framework and thus, establishes a mutual relation since the figure simultaneously supports the stage as the place of laughter and utopian nature. That is valid for a figure that knows of how to pursue the laughable and that is ignorant or incapable about the dynamics of the Comic. Homer Simpson, the satirical version of the average American in *The Simpsons*, recommends himself to belong to the latter group by the following incident. While Homer is on duty in his job as a Nuclear Safety inspector, who is in command of a large monitoring board with lots of blinking and colourful keys of different sizes (one could expect a skilled worker), a collapse of the system lies ahead, which only he can prevent to happen by pressing 'any key'. It looks like a simple task but instead of doing so, Homer feels totally overstrained and asks helplessly where this 'any-key' is. The audience watches a foolish man failing at a challenge that does not seem to be any. In comparison, Shakespeare's romantic comedy presents Touchstone, a smart jester, who makes fun of the male anxiety of cuckoldry as "[m]any a man has good horns and knows no end of

---

297 Vicki K. Janik (ed.), *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History. A bio-bibliographical Sourcebook*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998, 2.

them" (*As You Like It,* 3.3.47-48). Touchstone creates a speech osf contradictions, fantastic images, and unconventional verbal constructions. He deliberately fails in speaking clearly and conventionally correctly, presenting a mixture of sense and nonsense.

Although Touchstone and Homer Simpson differ in their demonstration of skills specifically, they both engage in a sort of failing process, wherein they offer their audience moments of laughter; they can be described roughly as fools. Still, these two examples suggest the division of the 'fool' figure into two subtypes according to intentionality, the cause, and creation of the laughable. The first subtype of the type 'fool' can be identified as being an unwilling source of laughter and a target of ridicule, whereas the second subtype can be marked as an active and deliberate part in the process of ridiculing the 'other'. The first is not aware of the typological space he inhabits while the second is conscious of the place where he can unleash his full potential.

Both subtypes belong to the cultural entity 'fool', while they contribute to the creation of laughter essentially, but they differ in the ways how they generate that moment of *ridiculum* and therefore, how they contribute to the aesthetic category of the laughable. In general, the fool figure could be defined as one of the following: a) the natural fool who creates or is involved in the moment of *ridiculum* unwillingly and/or passively,[298] b) the professional and deliberate fool who uses and plays with the moment of *ridiculum* actively and intentionally. This distinction accords with the traditional division between a natural and artificial fool, first applied during the reign of Elizabeth I.[299]

Both types fit into the schema of comedy the previous chapter introduced by Aristotle's following classification:

> [...] a representation of inferior people, not indeed in the full sense of the word bad, but the laughable is a species of the base or ugly. It consists in some blunder or ugliness that does not cause pain or disaster, an obvious example being the comic mask which is ugly and distorted but not painful.[300]

Following that definition, the natural fool might be interpreted as mostly unaware of being ugly or distorted, while the professional fool is conscious of the effect of the ugly and distortion when putting on the comic mask and imposing it on the 'other'. This kind of distinction is not entirely new as from the end of 19th century onwards, theorists began to distinguish the two forms of deliberate and non-deliberate comic and to develop a systematic model more clearly. Early attempts of Schopenhauer (1819), Bohtz (1844), Wolff (1921), Jünger (1936), or Eastman (1937) were followed for example by Otto Rommel, who continued the division of comic in deliberate and non-deliberate comic by phrasing them as "the comic of inadequacy" (*Unzulänglichkeit*) and "the comic of playful superiority" (*übermütig, bzw. heiter-überlegenen Spiels*).[301] In his Shakespeare studies, Volker Schulz drawing on Rommel

---

298 Compare Enid Welsford's definition in Enid Welsford, *The Fool. His Social and Literary History*, London: Faber and Faber, 1935, 314 and ff. Welsford defines the fool too narrowly as "[h]e who gets slapped. The fool or clown is primarily a butt or laughing-stock whose function is to minister to the vanity of the public." (314).

299 Cf. Janik (ed.) (1998), 1; William Willeford, *The Fool and his Scepter. A Study in Clowns and Jesters and their Audience*, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1969, 10: "In the time of Elizabeth I a distinction came to be expressed between the 'natural' and the 'artificial' fool".

300 Aristot. *poet.* 1449a.

301 Cf. Schulz (1971), 21. Schulz refers to Otto Rommel, 'Komik und Lustspieltheorie', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* 21 (1943): 252-286, esp. 261-4; also note the more recent edition in *Wesen und Formen des Komischen im Drama*, Reinhold Grimm and Klaus L. Berghahn (eds.), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975, 39-77, esp. 49 and 58; translations are taken from Schulz's English summary at the end of his German monography (Schulz [1971], 237).

speaks of a pretended inferiority (*Unzulänglichkeit*) or an in-born or temporarily natural inferiority. Expressing inferiority can be found in violating norms directed at the logical structure of the comic.[302] Such differentiation seems helpful to grasp the first impression of hierarchical confusion on the comic stage but is not sufficient to examine and discuss the whole concept of the fool figure since it does not pay enough attention to his mock heroic tendencies, the inversions not only of hierarchical structure or in general the contradictory processes inherent in the deliberate fool figure's activities. The terms of inferiority and superiority as well as the aspect of playfulness and acting remain significant elements in the approach to the fool figure's concept.

As it is true for theatre and literature, figures and their characteristics are usually 'overdrawn' and exaggerated—which is, for instance, valid for allegorical depiction—in order to be recognized like the natural fool inherits men's stupidity while the deliberate fool figure inherits the ability to play with it and acts as the conscious and more 'mature' brother of the natural fool. They share their inclination to failure; while the simpleton carries stupidity as a stigmata, the deliberate fool figure uses failure and folly as toys, never representing stupidity truly. Briefly, they show different self-perception and control over their body and mind. The proper fool stumbles over his feet inadvertently. In contrast, the figure acting the fool jumps frivolously, dances across the stage, pulls faces, and presents skits on purpose. Whereas the natural one cannot look through the complexity and potential ambiguity of language, the deliberate fool makes it his instrument and object in the conscious production of *ridiculum*. The non-deliberate and deliberate fool equate in offering moments of *ridiculum* but differ in constructing juxtapositions of scripts consciously and non-consciously; in addition, the audience can laugh at and with a fool figure.[303] The deliberate fool can steer comic's wheel and perfectly suits comedy's habit of making everybody laugh at everybody; comedy's stage can disclose every human being to serve as a target for laughter, which the fool knows and uses to his advantage. In Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor*, for instance, "all are made fools of – in a humanist and typically, Lucianic sense", where "nobody can afford to laugh at anybody else".[304]

Laughing at and with evokes social processes, for example, demarcating the butt of laughter from the laughing group or integrating the 'laughed-at' into the group and expressing sympathy.[305] While the natural fool does not take any influence in the process actively and often is not even aware of the reaction his behaviour triggers, the deliberate fool figure decides which reaction he wants to receive, availing of both directions of laughter. The differentiation between laughing at and with drives the non-natural fool figure at a marginal position, where he can participate as an out- and insider in the dynamics of *ridiculum*. He designs himself as foolish to fool others and mirror their vanity.

---

302 Cf. Schulz (1971), 11ff. (logical structure of the comic) and 36ff. (forms and types of inadequacy).

303 Compare to Hornback's too narrow distinction: "The natural fool was an 'innocent,' a butt who was generally laughed at for mental deficiencies, the artificial fool distinguished himself and his fooling with his clever, bitter wit, as he provoked laughter at others." (Hornback [2009], 151). The definition entails the condition of only mental deficiencies for the natural fool and bitterness in the artificial fool, which leaves aside the full range of deficiencies as well as attitude and tone in the fools' behaviour.
And see previous chapter on the distinction of laughing at and with, cf. Laroque (²2006), 38-40.

304 Riehle (1990), 226. It is about Falstaff's final comment in the play (5.5.235). Riehle here notes the discussion in the Arden edition edited by Harold J. Oliver (William Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *The New Arden Shakespeare*, Harold J. Oliver [ed.], London: Methuen, 1971, 76).

305 It should still be noted that emotional reaction can differ and does not automatically correlate with the direction of laughter. A stock of laughter can still be a carrier of sympathy, of pity or of another emotion with respect to the context.

Finally, whereas the natural or 'innocent' was an unconsciously transgressive social deviant who innocently flouted customary rules and thus unwittingly turned the world upside-down, the 'fool by art' regularly self-consciously flouted such transgression, exposing the socially deviant as natural fools.[306]

To sum both types up in their characteristics, it can be helpful to consider the word 'fool' more closely. When it comes to the word fool and its etymology, the Latin word *follis* is most commonly issued as the source for derivation. *Follis* in the singular means a windbag, which makes the fool a vessel of air without substance. His characteristic is seen in prolixity.[307] Simultaneously, wind "is one of the most archaic representations of spirit", whose movement is associated with freedom.[308]

The fool has the freedom and unpredictability of spirit, but in his show it seems to issue into mere air, a commotion of spirit with neither focus nor direction. The fool's wind scatters things and meaning yet in the confusion reveals glimpses of a counterpole to spirit: nature with the purposes and intelligence of instinct, which, like spirit, cannot be accommodated to rational understanding.[309]

The fool's show, his juxtapositions, and his licensed freedom do not last for good; nor are they expected to have any relevant influence on the conventional thinking and social order. It is the fool's spectacle that is often created impromptu and vanishes after the explosive laughter. The fool's deviation from the usual and normal and his play with it can also be detected in his physical peculiarities. Here, the plural '*folles*' images his usually abnormal presence as it describes 'puffed cheeks', which reminds us of a fool's capability to do grimaces.[310] The figure seems to be full of peculiarities, while he tends to deform the body and the rational. His verbal 'wind' belongs to the fool's great talents, while he remains protected by his special license. The deliberate type is aware of his stereotype, its effects, and his functionality in comedy's schema, whereas the natural one does not know himself and his contribution to comedy's coherence; he is restricted by his own foolishness.

The artificial fool's primary association with the laughable evokes a repertoire of activities that are part typical plots of comedy as ridiculing can happen during hidden or open quarrels with other figures that serve the course of challenge, degradation, deception, manipulation or the disruption of order. The next step will be to introduce a certain catalogue of stereotypes that draw upon such actions; they had appeared particularly in drama until the Renaissance and stand in noteworthy relation to Plautus' *servus callidus* and Shakespeare's wise fool; there are various but similar (proto)types that must be discussed to understand the metamorphosis of the fool figure as non-linear and an interplay of more than one line of tradition. The catalogue includes the stereotypes of Greek Comedy, particularly the bomolochos and the eiron, the parasite, the mythological trickster figure, the Medieval Vice, *commedia dell'arte*'s world and its comic servants, and the Elizabethan court fool. The outline of related types starts with comedy's Greek roots and two of the genre's figurative standards, bomolochos and eiron.[311]

---

306 Hornback (2009), 151.
307 Cf. Willeford (1969), 10.
308 *Ibid.*, 10.
309 *Ibid.*, 10-11.
310 Cf. *Ibid.*, 11.
311 Concerning comic drivers in Western literary history, Plautus and Shakespeare's fool figures are both preceded by Margites, the archetypal fool. Homer's *Margites* can be understood as one of the earliest

In accordance with Aristotle, Gerrit Kloss defines the bomolochos as a figure that ridicules everything without exception.[312] He does not care about the quality or offensiveness of his jokes but is teleologically just interested in its effect, laughter.[313] His behaviour cannot be assessed to be 'intermediate', departs from a sort of arithmetic mean, but moves towards an extreme, which stands in contrast to 'metriopathy'. The figure does not show an appropriate judgement of a human being listening, watching, reading with rational capacity and ability to recognize the right middle.[314] The figure already occurred "in pre-Aristophanic Doric farce"[315], while in Old Comedy, the term was applied to express "different forms of inappropriate and coarse behaviour".[316]

He takes part in violating the communication in a scene without fostering or contributing anything essential to the action as he is not interested in a cooperation and serious participation in the conversation or argument going on in the relevant scene.[317] Under that perspective, it is not necessary to recognize bomolochos only as one type but also as a technique how to insert comic moments into the play since a figure can show features of a bomolochos in his behaviour temporarily. Such an approach releases the term 'bomolochos' from too strict categorization and allows to acknowledge the term as an integrative part in Greek Comedy and available entity to produce comic moments, while it is open to be fused with other types, contrasted to different kinds of figures—not only the alazon—and applicable to different kinds of plots.[318] Therefore, bomolochos is here broadly understood as a figure or temporary feature of a figure that miscommunicates to install *ridiculum* without any limitation. That wide scope of category suits the translation of *bomolochus* with buffoon, "[a] man whose profession is to make sport by low jests and antick postures' (Johnson); a comic actor, clown; a jester, fool."[319] In 1589, George Puttenham in his *The Arte of English Poesie* describes their profession: "Buffons, altogether applying their wits to Scurrillities & other ridiculous matters."[320] Bomolochos or buffoon has become a synonym for clown or a clownish figure; it is not clear whether it is a natural or deliberate form of fool.

In sum of such definitions, the bomolochos comes along as a deliberate or non-deliberate comic driver, while here the former is of key interest as it bears resemblances to

---

testimonies for a comic protagonist and type of fool. See Manfred Forderer, *Zum Homerischen Margites*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1960, esp. 16ff. for a discussion of *polymathia* (Margites' failure or bad quality as a probable source for *ridiculum*).

312 Cf. Gerrit Kloss, *Erscheinungsformen komischen Sprechens bei Aristophanes*, Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001, 133, ft. 274. Here, Kloss refers to Aristotle (*MM*, I 30,1, 1193a 11ff.). For a discussion of bomolochos in Aristophanes, see 132ff.

313 Cf. Schmitt (2008), 306-307. Here, Arbogast refers to *Eth. Nic.* at IV, 8, *Eth. Eud.* at III, 7, and *Pol.*, VIII,3. The activity of joking and ridiculing and the reaction of laughter involves emotions that can be exaggerated, too little or exactly 'in the middle'.

314 Cf. *Ibid.*, 316. Here, he refers to *Eth. Eud.* at III, 7, 1234a20-25 and *Eth. Nic.* 1128a9f. Compare bomolochos to the contradictory qualities of *epidéxios*.

315 Lesley Wade Soule, *Actor as Anti-Character, Dionysus, the Devil, and the Boy Rosalind*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000, 44.

316 John Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2000, 88.

317 Cf. Kloss (2001), 132-33.

318 Cf. *Ibid.*, 136. Also note Arbogast (2008), 306-7. Bomolochos' anti-figure can also be identified in the *ágroikos*, who is stubborn, uncultivated, and unresponsive to every joke.

319 *OED*, s.v. 'buffoon, n. 2.a'.

320 *Ibid.* (George Puttenham, *Arte Eng. Poesie*, i. xxxi. 50).

the concept of the clever slave and the professional fool in Shakespeare. They share their use of wit for some verbal dance and their non-restriction when it comes to ridiculing matters.[321] But as it will be shown, providing moments of *ridiculum* intentionally does not suffice to describe the concept of deliberate fool figures sufficiently, which is more intricate in its functionality.

Besides the bomolochos, Old and New Comedy put forward instantiations of types presented in the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, whose concepts can be understood as productive entities in comedy realized as stereotypical features or figures: the *alazōn* and the *eirōn*. The first can be described as a persona that boasts about his skills and designs himself greater than he actually is, whereby he offers a popular target for ridiculing. The audience encounters such a figure in Aristophanes' Lamachus (*The Acharnians*) and in Plautus' Pyrgopolynices or Terence's Thraso. In these cases, the *alazōn* appears as the braggart soldier, a wide-spread figure in comedy, and can be understood as material for the attentive comic driver.[322] In contrast to the impostor, the *eirōn* chooses caution instead of naïve boasting and knows how to veil his true quality. His motto is to hide his genius and pretend to be or to be able to do less than he is actually capable of.[323] A popular version can be identified in the unruly servant if they are not bragging about their cunning, or in the cheeky trickster proving his wit and deploying illusion.[324] Such roles involve the ability of acting, telling *fabula*, and becoming a different persona temporarily, which can even include to become a bomolochos temporarily and act out deliberate folly as it is the case for Hamlet, a kind of eiron in tragedy, for instance. Here, it becomes evident that types and their features do overlap. All three give the opportunity to install comic moments either by instigating actively or by remaining passively the object of *ridiculum*. For the examination of the deliberate fool figure, only those are interesting that participate actively and intentionally in the comic game and the (re)presentation of the ugly.

Being a comic driver and integrating subversive energies into the dramatic discourse evoke qualities from the bomolochos and the eiron, "the wittily ironic man".[325] Aristophanes' comedy usually knows the former as a secondary role and a "cocelebrant" to "the prime celebrant and anti-hero", the eiron.[326] Their configuration is essentially bound to *ridiculum* while playfulness and exaggeration belong to the former and the agon of wit is expected from the latter. The more conscious they are of their own concept, the more they can be described as not only inhabitants of the upside-down universe they move in but also as commentators and manipulators comprehending the double vision in the dramatic performance. Then, they can make use of the art of becoming and the thematic and structural element of

---

321 On comic driver and the partition of organic and inorganic scenes, see ch. III.v.

322 Cf. Robert Miola, 'Comedy and the Comic', *The Classical Tradition*, Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, Salvatore Settis (eds.), Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010, 217-225, 222.

323 On Aristophanes, his characters and their description with these three roles, cf. Silk (2000), 232: "Many have tried to identify Aristophanes characters with a neo-Aristotelian set of character-types derived from the *Ethics* and elsewhere: notably the *eirôn* (the dry wit who understates himself), the *alazôn* (the pretender who overstates himself), the *bômolokhos* (the buffoon)." Silk proposes not to see the set too instructive but to understand them as functions to be applied, varied, and transferred (cf. 232ff.). And see Uwe Wirth, 'Ironie', *Komik. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*, Uwe Wirth (ed.), Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag, 2017, 16-21, esp. 16-17. And on irony see the discussion of Chrysalus' monody.

324 Cf. Soule (2000), 44; and cf. Miola (2010), 222-223.

325 Erich Segal (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1996, 334 (glossary).

326 Soule (2000), 43.

carnivalesque, while they support utopian nature. Mostly, the eiron persuades by "his fluidity demonstrat[ing] the ephemerality and unreliability of 'character' itself."[327] Conclusively, both types' features can be detected in the concept of the deliberate fool figure and reveal a significant functionality concerning the three principles and productivity for comedy as their broadly defined characteristics recur in myriad configuration in comic plays across cultures and throughout centuries.

The parasite

The parasite is a type that avails himself of his wit and self-ridiculing, aiming at an invitation that allows him to participate in a feast. The figure was used in Old Comedy but was established as a common element in Middle and New Comedy. His 'profession' is motivated by existential needs, hunger, but also sometimes, greed and lust for joy.[328] To reach his aim, he relies on his quality of being "a man of many names and many turns of phrase who can invent new strategies to defend his position and new ways to delight his audience"[329], which explains the figure's applicability and functionality for comedy. Being parasitical, hunting for food, overlaps with the portfolio of the *kolax* exchanging food and drink for compliments and praising. Beyond stage, the *kolax* or flatterer took his seat as a typical guest of the Aristocrats' private banquets starting around the middle of the fifth century BCE when the politically-determined banquet, the symposium, retreated into the realm of privacy and leisure.[330]

    A relative to the flatterer and later parasite can be identified in the buffoon as they bear resemblances in the habit of offering their talents with words to gain food and at best, invitations to dinner. The buffoon's 'goods' were jokes and verbal extravagancies, showing them off in the private rooms of Athens' aristocratic circles. The bomolochos is now perceived from another extra-dramatic perspective because the term bomolochos means "he who lays an ambush at altars", "namely to beg food".[331] Probably, the buffoon left the altar and sat down at the 'profitable' dining table when he saw his chance. The main trade of these jokers for food was parodying and mimicking other professionals like boxers, wrestlers, dancers, politicians, probably people of the public sphere. Their mocking subjects contained physical weaknesses and verbal peculiarities.

    In contrast to the usually low-ranked jester in drama as it is the case for comic servants, extra-dramatic, real-life buffoons or semi-professional and professional jokers were not necessarily low in reputation or in status for a certain period. Among the members of that trade, there can be read popular and high-class names; so was Agathocles, the tyrant of Syracuse, known for buffoonish nature and as a talent in mimicking people taking part at the popular assembly.[332] In the second half of the fourth century, every Athenian probably knew of 'the sixty', a club of amateur buffoons, consisting of politicians and citizens of the upper-class since their pseudonym made it into sayings and was seen as an entertaining authority. But with the 'sixties', buffoonery had already reached its climax and were beginning to decline

---

327 Soule (2000), 44.
328 Cf. Wilkins (2000), 71.
329 *Ibid.*, 72.
330 Bremmer (1997), 13-14.
331 *Ibid.*, 14. And cf. Arbogast (2008), 306-7. A bomolochos hangs around the altars and acts parasitically. And note bomolochos in comparison to the role of the cook and the parasite, Wilkins (2000), 88ff. and on the parasite, see 71ff.
332 Bremmer (1997), 14.

since the buffoon should soon find himself at the bottom of the social scale, sitting next to the mime as it was definitely the case for the later Roman period.[333] Analogically, they were now associated with stereotypical prejudices since *bomolochoi* equated with "ne'er-do-wells"[334] belonged to the group of "mimes and jesters signify[ing] trickery and treachery" as the *Oneirocritica* (*Dreambook*) of Artemidorus in the second century CE says.[335]

In their concept, the group of buffoons, parasites, and flatterers face the same fortune of being excluded from society as outsiders and low-status figures and from social rituals like feasting, to which they try to get access. On stage, 'parasitical' jesters are limited to their low rank, its characteristics, and the image of knavery negating any possibility to become a talented, famous member of the elite. That inferiority and exclusion is made effective in comedy's upside-down universe, wherein an unsurprisingly rich catalogue of low-status figures moves. A carnivalesque nature offers hierarchical inversion and thus, an illusion of breaking free from exclusion. It allows them to use obscenity and animalistic, bodily themes. On the other side of the dining table, their audience, food-suppliers, or coin-givers expect them to deliver them with ingenious comic products putting them in the position of an attentive, flexible, and unpredictable persona—qualities that are inevitable for a successful deliberate fool figure and should be kept in mind not only for the following stock characters and types but also for the coming analysis of the dramatic texts.

Looking at the richness of such low-status types that are mainly bound to the production of *ridiculum* either by their active verbal abuse or passivity turning them to the abused, Plautus' comedies exemplify a wide range of such figures: cooks, parasites, clever slaves, and mixed forms of bomolochian characteristics. For instance, Plautus' comedies present the audience the figure of the typical parasite as Gelasimus, whose Greek name hints at *gelotopoios* and clearly cites his characteristic of being a man that survives by laughter.[336] There are also variations of this figure since New Comedic plot knows a parasite that deploys deception and intrigue like a clever slave.[337] Curculio and Phormio behave similarly to the *servus callidus*, while Peniculus and Gelasimus do not engage in trickery but try to get access to dinner, while functioning as the aim of laughter; they are not allowed to participate in the feast.[338] The figure of the parasite and its features occur in different shapes in Roman comedy and were preceded by their use as stock characters in Greek Comedy and by the traditions of Greek real-life buffoons, flatterers at the banquets, and performing jokers for food on stage. The buffoon, *kolax*, and deceitful slave continued and shared their stereotypical features and entertaining qualities as figurative and thematic elements in drama.[339] It is not surprising that the type of the clever slave and that of the parasite become combined since they bear many resemblances, in so far as they draw upon the play with reality as they make their living from crafting illusions. They tell little lies to entertain and add some 'invented' details to the story here and there in order to praise their food-giver. The use and abuse of *ridiculum* for their purposes belong to their craft as much as their skill to juggle with words and perform songs

---

333 See ch. II.i. on the change of the profession's reputation and the upcoming disdain for buffoons and personal attacks as a form of entertainment performed by upper-class members.

334 Daniel E. Harris-McCoy, *Artemidorus' Oneirocritica. Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2012, 542. McCoy comments on 2.15, where frogs are ascribed to have bomolochian features.

335 *Ibid.*, 133 (1.76) ; and cf. Bremmer (ed.) (1997), 15-6.

336 Cf. Bremmer (1997), 16.

337 Cf. Duckworth (1952), 265-7.

338 Cf. Miola (1994), 42. Miola considers Sir Toby in *Twelfth Night* a mixture of both subtypes.

339 For instance, note Eupolis' comedy *Flatterers*.

does, if they are a witty and deliberate manifestation of their species. Such creativity often designed as extempore is inherent to their existence in comic drama.

All in all, the 'bomolochian' behaviour found in the clever slave, the parasite, and the buffoon took its universal path from private and public forms of entertainment, the genre of Greek Comedy and became an integrative part in comedy as a stereotype in Italian, English, and French theatre of the Renaissance. "The evolution of the parasite-*bomolochos* to rogues and rascals can be connected to the trickster, villain-like traits pertaining to the *bomolochos*."[340] These types share craftiness and a calculating character as it is also true for the eiron and the clever servant figure deceiving the master—to adumbrate all types or common features discussed so far.[341] Such manipulative activity and the tendency to adopting ambiguity also belong to the type of the trickster, a figure that originates from mythological grounds but recommends itself to comedy's schema by its nature of ambiguity, illusion, and support of error.

The trickster

For Kern, the trickster figure carries an inborn ambivalence, which makes it bound to the absolute comic—to put it with her fine words, "the absolute comic is played out today against a backdrop of fear and death, and it is there that it most strongly asserts its ambivalence, centered above all in the figure of a trickster as ancient as it is modern."[342] According to Dean Miller, "[…] those confusing-reversing tendencies of the trickster almost invariably seem to create, or at least sketch, a comic situation, with what we can recognize as potentially comic energies emergent and deployed."[343] The trickster's concept seems to be quite attractive to comedy's world, not only because of its inherent opposition and inversion that are pervasive in discourse but also because of the chaos, conflict, and error accompanying comedy's plot from the beginning until its solution.

It is thus not surprising that such broad definitions of the trickster approximate quite closely to the understanding of the contradictory figure, the professional fool in drama, exemplified by Shakespeare's wise fool most prominently for the modern reader. As now the study is looking at the Shakespearean figure's relatives and 'forefathers', the trickster figure recommends itself as a universally productive and prominent entity of that catalogue. Paul Radin's book *The Trickster* adumbrates a mythical hero of North American Indians, a "clownish figure of mercurial unpredictability and changeability" metamorphosing in a series of episodes.[344] His behaviour can range from that of an animal and of a human being. The episodes show him triumphing, losing, stupidly deciding, ruthlessly acting, maturing, changing from selfishness to unselfishness, suffering and causing suffers. He seems to be the anti-

---

340 Iuliana Tanase, 'The Italian *Commedia* and the Fashioning of the Shakespearean Fool', *Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance. Appropriation, Transformation, Opposition*, Michele Marrapodi (ed.), London/New York: Routledge, 2014, 215-234, 216.

341 Cf. Gordon Braden, 'The Parasite', *The Classical Tradition*, Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, Salvatore Settis (eds.), Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010, 688-689.

342 Kern (1980), 116.

343 Dean A. Miller, *The Epic Hero*, Baltimore et al.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000, 255. In his study, Miller draws a complex picture of the hero, wherein he sheds light on the trickster figure used in the epic, tragic and comic cycles as a foil and adjunct to the hero and its representations in the Indo-European culture (cf. 242-95) and also as a foil and adjunct to the hero and its representations in the Indo-European culture (cf. 242-95), while he also focuses on the smith, the villain, or mixed types as the heroic trickster (cf. 272).

344 Kern (1980), 117.

paragon of steadiness, which has been given many faces and names throughout time. Beyond North America, Radin states that

> [t]he Trickster myth is found in clearly recognizable form among the simplest aboriginal tribes and among the complex. We encounter it among the ancient Greeks, the Chinese, the Japanese, and in the Semitic World. Many of the Trickster's traits were perpetuated in the figure of the mediaeval jester, and have survived right up to the present day in the Punch-and-Judy plays and in the clown. Although repeatedly combined with other myths and frequently drastically reorganized and reinterpreted, its basic plot seems always to have succeeded in reasserting itself.[345]

In his commentary on Radin's records, Jung agrees with Radin's conclusion for universality and stresses the rootedness of the figure in the abyss of the human psyche as "an archetypal psychic structure of extreme antiquity", moving close to the animalistic roots.[346] The figure's universal quality suggests the comparison of its culturally-diverse manifestations like Jung draws parallels between the figure's appearance in Indian rituals and European carnival procedures inverting hierarchy. The tricking figure is often embedded in a society that holds honour and shame as a balance of values. Being cunning is a worthy trait of character, a talent that brings the family rather honour than shame, but keeps the enemies at distance as it promises shame for them.[347] The intermediary position between honour and shame signifies the trickster as an ambiguous figure that is equipped with a license allowing him not to follow the social system in essence. This characteristic discloses him as an anti-hero that can act as a contrast or supplement to the hero.[348]

Thinking of the trickster in the binary image of the hero and anti-hero interprets the figure as embedded in the larger compound of understanding and processing of justice, which is instantiated in rituals first destroying and then reconstructing the social order. Starting from his mythological roots, the concept of trickster figure can also be read as a seminal component in the structure of both dramatic genres, tragedy and comedy, since they both evolve around the becoming of a scapegoat. Tragedy identifies the hero as a scapegoat losing its orientation in the value system, while comedy gives the audience the scapegoat, the anti-hero, indicating the species of the ugly.[349] This is an interesting and for this thesis noteworthy thought, but just one access to the embedment and treatment of the trickster figure. There is more to say about its productivity across genres and cultures in order to be able to pin down the similarities between the fool figure and the trickster figure in more detail.

From Greek mythology, Radin names Mercurius as a possible prototype for European trickster figures, similarly showing "a fondness of sly jokes and malicious pranks, his power as a shape-lifter, his dual nature, half animal, half divine, his exposure to all kinds of tortures, and—last but not least—his approximation to the figure of a savior".[350] In literature, Miller proposes Ulysses as the "archepic" figure of tricking and wiliness, who avails himself of

---

345 Paul Radin, *The Trickster. A Study in American Indian Mythology,* with commentaries by Karl Kerényi and Carl G. Jung, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956, xxiii; and cf. Kern (1980), 118ff.
346 *Ibid.*, 260.
347 Cf. Peter Burke, 'Frontiers of the Comic in Early Modern Italy, *c.* 1350-1750', *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*, Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (eds.), Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997, 61-75, 66.
348 Cf. Miller (2000), 242.
349 Cf. Kern (1980), 39ff. and 117: "Tricksters therefore represent scapegoats of a special nature and deserve special consideration."
350 Radin (1956), 255-56. And cf. Miller (2000), 242-3.

deception by his eloquence and intellect, demarcating him from a purely honest man.[351] Other tricksters known from myths and folk tales involve

> the Greek god Hermes, a liar, a thief, and a master of disguise; St Peter, who appears in Italian folk tales as a shiftless opportunist whose quasi-criminal activities have to be continually remedied by patient and forgiving Jesus; the Norse god Loki, the companion of the thunder god Thor and personification of lightning; the Native American Coyote, a sacred progenitor, manic omnivore, and externalized taboo; and the Yoruba Esu-Elegabara from Nigeria, a figure who carries the desires of man to the gods.[352]

Varied forms are the magician in the Celtic tradition, the warrior in the German cult, or the clever schemer, the Vice, and the professional fool figure in comedy.[353] All these examples share striking features such as contradictoriness and ambivalence, repeated in the basic concept of the trickster. Such features make it easy for the figure, its framework of illusion, and the carnivalesque to supply comic moments. Laughter in its potentially anarchic and subversive quality sticks to the figure and its surroundings, contributing to a cathartic effect.[354]

Besides Mercurius, two other known figures from Greek mythology deserve the name 'Trickster': the already-mentioned Hermes and Prometheus, while their concepts differ in a certain respect. Both allow a partitioning in two elementary subtypes of the trickster figure as Kerényi suggests to acknowledge the difference between a self-seeking, rather egoistic type and a persona doing tricks not in his own interest. The latter can be found in Prometheus, who acts without being self-seeking, whereas Hermes, the little thief from his day of birth onwards, is not interested in mankind and prefers to engage in his cunnings not for their sake. Typically of such a myth, Hermes' behaviour triggers laughter and no indignation, whereas Prometheus performs his skills in an altruistic way as it can be detected in the clever slave managing lovers' union in the end.[355] Turning to Prometheus again, his figure offers another interesting insight into the trickster's ambivalent structure since he and his brother Epimetheus visualize the duality in two separate personae. Kerényi highlights the telling names by adding the names' translations, "Prometheus the Forethinker" and "Epimetheus the belated Afterthinker", who both represent "a single primitive being, sly and stupid at once".[356] The binary quality is performed by the combination of irrational playfulness and purposeful behaviour in scheming figures as the clever slave in comedy.

Whether the figure is called Hermes, Mercurius or Prometheus, a trickster appears to move between extremes and opposites, while spanning an ambiguous net, wherein tricks, lies, illusion, and reality are finely interwoven with each other. The instrument—how he sells his 'cruelties' to the audience so that they react rather with amusement than with calls for justice—can be identified in his playfulness as the response to Hermes' tricks is Zeus' laughter; he does not arrive at the decision to punish the little god. It is that playfulness that draws the trickster closest to the professional fool figure in drama. Besides their common tone and instrument, they share the aspect of ambivalence and inborn contradiction, which allows us

---

351 Miller (2000), 242 and cf. 240ff. The *Iliad* presents a common pair, the hero and the trickster, in Diomedes and Ulysses (cf. 244).
352 Andrew McConnell Stott, *Comedy*, New York et al.: Routledge, 2005, 51.
353 Cf. Miller (2000), 243.
354 Cf. Kern (1980), 121-22. "Laughter always accompanies the myth." (21).
355 Cf. Radin (1956), 181; and cf. Kern (1980), 122-129. Kern discusses Hermes in more detail.
356 *Ibid.*, 181; "[…], according to Kerényi, Prometheus must be seen as a being whose inseparable and complementing double is his brother Epimetheus." (Kern [1980], 122).

to speak of them as relatives. In fact, there is a diachronic catalogue of similar interpretations of that dual concept including the laughable as instanced in cunning gods, court jesters, clowns, jokers, wise fools, insane prophets. Radin's previously described universality draws on the figure's attraction based on his complex and versatile concept and his realisation of elementary human traits, social structures, and their dynamic processes. The prototype and the number of his variations throughout the nations and centuries embody kernel human traits such as cleverness, greed, selfishness, but link them with their complementary 'other'. A figure originates that can occur as a mastermind creating a plot and concomitantly, astounds by stupid, nonsense, clownish turns. He stands at the beginning of a process that starts with trouble and the reversal of order but can end in a solution and renewal. In taking such a figure as the protagonist of a tale, the writer gains a flexible and creative representative fabricating the development of the tale, while it is told. And the trickster is not restricted to a purely male persona but can (re)construct his identity—male or female—, which relates to the stage's quality of changing gender by cross-dressing.[357] The tale's prime mover intrigues by its inherent juxtaposition prompting tension and triggering affect such as laughter by dissolving it. In catching the audiences unexpectedly, his unpredictability founded on an ambivalent and contradictory concept provokes suspense.

Watching such activities based on the traits seems to be appealing in every society independent from century; the routines are weaved into various kinds of literature. The skeleton elements, universal and offering complexity, come about in his duality accompanied by his potential and power for change. In his universality, the figure can be used as an attribute, for instance, added to the orator, or occurs in various genres as fairy tales, drama or heroic epic. Briefly, it indicates a very flexible concept rooted in the figure's ambivalence, while it comes without a given face and tone.

The figure's attractiveness stems from his ambiguous nature theatre as a space of illusion embraces. Shakespeare's romantic comedy staging a female trickster like Rosalind or Viola treats doubleness as a rich source for suspense, erotic allusions, and comic moments. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Puck as a fairy compiles transformed roots of a "demonic spirit" and features of a "playful trickster".[358] They have the tendency to compete with other figures and support topsy-turvydom like the Plautine clever slave does. It is common in Plautus' comedy that the pairing of servant and master turns into adversaries, the schemer and the deceived.[359] Early new Latin plays and early English plays deal with that element, too such as Lyly's *Mother Bombie*, wherein all servants organize themselves and conspire against their masters as a group, or Gammer Gurton's *Needle* (c. 1559-60), wherein a Plautine slave machinates.[360]

In sum, the basic concept of the trickster occurs present in male and female, (disguised) noble and low-ranked, supernatural and human figures. The trickster can be masqueraded as

---

357 Cf. Margaret A. Mills, 'The Gender of the Trick, Female Tricksters and Male Narrators', *Asian Folklore Studies* 60 (2001): 237-258, 237. She highlights the prominence of female tricksters in Middle Eastern popular literature and folklore genres.

358 Stott (2005), 53.

359 Note Annalisa Rei, 'Villains, Wives, and Slaves in the Comedies of Plautus', *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture. Differential Equations*, Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan (eds.), London et al.: Routledge, 1998, 92-108, 93: "For example, the function of the trickster, male or female, is reserved for characters of the lower classes. The rogue's trickery is in fact, motivated by his or her lack of social and economic power. Typically, the trickster's ruse humiliates a powerful obstacle figure and thus reverses normal social hierarchies. The principal means by which this comic humiliation is achieved are role-play and disguise."

360 Cf. Duckworth (1952), 410 and 412.

the often synonymously-used comic drivers such as jesters, fools, Vices, and clowns or in other words,

> [t]ricksters are the instigators of carnivalesque activities, whether Lords of Misrule, jesters, clowns, devils, or saintly prophets of the nature of Nietzsche's Zarathustra. They usually display saint-sinner qualities not unlike those evident in Thomas Mann's Holy Sinner. The comic justice meted out to them conforms in its ambivalence to their entire fictional existence, so that they are heroes both triumphant and suffering—none less than the Falstaffs and Tartuffes, none more than the servants of commedia dell'arte origin, Rabelais' Panurge, or Chaucer's Nicolas, who gets the girl in the Miller's Tale but is also 'scalded in the toute.'[361]

Such a universal perspective sets the concept of the trickster parallel to that of the deliberate fool figure. Both represent the prime mover of error, turn the world upside-down or at least support that vision, come up with enigmas and challenges, change themselves and their surroundings by the act of becoming, play and create at the peripheries of a system.[362] Consequently, they can both be thought as interchangeable macro-concepts differing in their emphasize on certain features as the deliberate fool figure stresses folly as the ultimate source of error, whereas the trickster sets deception and wiliness at the centre, which closeness and combinability gave rise to figurative blends between those two—a perspective that has already been applied for the former subtypes.

The Vice

Vice is "the familiar theatrical label for the stock role of the homiletic artist who, as protagonist of the forces of evil, created and sustained the intrigue of almost every morality play".[363] His role thereby unites didactic and entertaining aspects, while he represents evil with a show of intrigue and comic spice.[364] The protagonist standing in opposition to Virtue takes a central and usually undoubled position in the structural composition of such plays.[365] It is typical of the deliberate fool to move at the peripheries of the stage and to communicate with the audience.

> Through soliloquy, he would make the audience his confidants as he announced his evil nature and briskly devised a scheme to lead some innocent dupe to moral catastrophe; and with great relish he would keep them posted through later soliloquies and asides. He skilfully managed the scenes effecting the dupe's downfall, and his goal

---

361 Kern (1980), 117.

362 Cf. Robin Mookerjee, *Transgressive Fiction. The New Satiric Tradition*, Basingstoke et al.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, 57. And cf. Miller (2000), 242-3 and 249.

363 Bernard Spivack, *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. The History of A Metaphor in Relation to his Major Villains*, New York/London: Columbia University Press, ³1968, 135. The Vice was active in the morality play proper as well as in later pieces of literal drama. And on morality play in general, cf. *Ibid.*, 96-129.

364 Cf. David N. DeVries, 'The Vice Figure in Middle English Morality Plays', *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History*, Vicki K. Janik (ed.), Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998, 471-493, 482. And cf. Elam (2008), 315, ft. 123. The figure and his comic value is referred to by a wise fool at *TN* 4.2.122-23, when Feste sings "I'll be with you again, / In a trice, like to the old Vice".

365 Cf. Robert Weimann, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre. Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*, Robert Schwartz (ed.), Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978, 156.

was the overthrow of those religious (and, in later plays, social and political) values to which playwright and audience subscribed.[366]

The direct contact with the audience, his use of order, inversion, subversion, and the preparation of challenges and traps remind us of the package of actions a deliberate fool figure usually shows. He recognizes his own functionality, moving around on the stage powerfully and neglecting restrictions. His character expresses a carnivalesque nature, which is explicitly palpable in his careless treatment of topics evolving from the lower bodily stratum as he is fond of scatology. He contributes to *ridiculum* by familiar techniques such as disguises, puns, false use of language, and other forms of manipulation and violations.[367]

Its occurrence in the medieval theatre as an example *ex negativo* imaging "nihilism, ambition, pride, sedition and many other such attributes"[368] echoes the prominence of morality and moral education in those day's society and the dominance of Christian belief that "temptation gradually breaks down the soul's defences".[369] The entertaining dramatic figure with such a doctrinal background came to its climax as a popular device in the second half of the 16th century.[370] It indicates a vicious kind of a deliberate fool figure not only in functional terms but also in the medieval mind set. "The foolishness of vice, or the foolishness into which vice leads, plays on a standard interpretation of the intellectual nature of the battle between the forces of good and evil."[371] Indeed, the fool's scale of qualities covers being bad, tempting, disgusting, and showing an evil nature up to being benevolent in the heart, sympathetic, harmless, and good. Both can inhabit comic grounds, which sets them in a flexible environment of laughter and illusion, a possible port to vanity but it differs how they make use out of it.[372] The Vice does not express folly as a divine nature; nor is he the dual paragon of wisdom and folly.[373] In short, the Vice embodies the evil on stage and represents the anti-idol to be despised against a religious backdrop.

The audience expects him not to break out of this concept and identifies him as fixed in his functions, which seems to diminish the flexibility the deliberate fool figure inherits typically.[374] The figure's actor performs "the allegorical aggressor, the homiletic preacher, and the humorist".[375] In terms of the dramatic functions, the Vice fulfils a given range Weimann divides up into three major parts: "the Vice as protagonist and opponent of the figures of Virtue; the Vice as intriguer and manipulator of the representatives of humanity; and the Vice as producer, manager, and commentator."[376] This tripartite division and particularly, the last-

---

366 John Reibetanz, *The Lear World. A Study of King Lear in its Dramatic Context*, Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977, 58.

367 Cf. DeVries (1998), 472 and 480; and cf. Elam (2008), 315, ft. 123. And see Richard in *R3*, "Thus like the formal Vice, Iniquity, / I moralize two meanings in one word" (*R3* 3.1.82-3).

368 George Oppitz-Trotman, 'Staging Vice and Acting Evil: Theatre and Anti-Theatre in Early Modern England', *The Church and Literature*, Peter Clarke and Charlotte Methuen (eds.), Woodbridge et al.: Boydell Press, 2012, 156-169, 156.

369 Reibetanz (1977), 58.

370 Cf. Oppitz-Trotman (2012), 156; and cf. Peter Happé, 'The Vice: A Checklist and An Annotated Bibliography', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 22 (1979): 17-35, 17. He suggests the period 1547-79.

371 DeVries (1998), 489. He adds that this is "an interpretation of some importance for a study of the medieval English Vice and the Fool".

372 Cf. Figueroa-Dorrego/ Larkin-Galiñanes (2009), 149, citing the Old Testament, *Ecclesiastes*, ch. 7: "It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise, than for a man to hear the song of fools."

373 Cf. Stott (2005), 47.

374 Cf. Prentki (2012), 36.

375 Spivack (³1968), 135.

376 Weimann (1978), 156.

mentioned part also fits Plautus' clever slave and similar protagonists in comedy and confirms these functions as productive and continuing in the concept of the macro-type, the deliberate fool figure, since the description of the Vice's activities and his position on stage seem to delineate the preceding Roman knave in the comic universe. Therefore, vague statements excluding the past beyond medieval ages such as "the Vice was in some ways the forerunner of the clown/fool"[377] or "[t]he clown's ancestry in the Tudor 'Vice' is a generally accepted fact of theatre history"[378] should be valued with caution and rephrased as the Vice represents the medieval interpretation in the history of buffoonish, roguish, tricking fool figures, to which the Elizabethan professional fool belongs.

The Vice appears to be the result of medieval dynamics affecting the stages, which includes morality tradition and the depiction of Christian values. Simultaneously, the figure can be understood as continuing antiquity's comic discourse of error, the popular plot of intrigue, and takes the functionary position of mediating between audience and comic action with the common devices of soliloquies, direct address, and asides. The Vice definitely belongs to the category of deliberate fool figures, while functioning didactically and for the coherence of the morality play. But in contrast to the clever slave and the wise fools, he is limited in his identity of the evil and tempter, investing mostly in the laughable for the process of correction, while presenting his victim's ruin to the audience. The Vice's comic agency should be perceived in this context of spiritual misleading.[379]

The professional fool figure in Shakespeare resembles the Vice in some characteristics. The Elizabethan figure does not show the same strong dependence on a religious framework. With the knowledge of Plautus' comedies, the type of the clever slave, and his revival on European private and public stages, the Vice's supposed dominance over the later Shakespearean fool figures diminishes against the parallels that can be drawn between the *servus callidus* and the sum of Shakespeare's intriguers, deceivers, and professional fools. Of course, it is not a question if the Vice figure was available or prominent enough for Shakespeare as he was a fixed part in the Tudor Interludes but a question of why the Vice should be the only or one of the primary sources for Shakespeare's fool(ing) figures.[380] It is rather the repertoire of New Comedy and its Roman afterlife that is evoked across Shakespeare's works than only a medieval catalogue led by the Vice figure. Apart from the insertion of comic moments by abuse and intrigue, the Vice figure's allegorical origin recommends itself to be pursued in Shakespeare's drama as Peter Milward argues since he

---

377 Elam (2008), 315, ft. 123. Elam comments on the naming of the Vice by Feste at *TN* 4.2.122-23 ("I'll be with you again,/ In a trice, like to the old Vice"). All further citations will be given from this edition.
And note Spivack (³1968), 136. As Spivack warns, a similar conjecture misleads if it is argued that "the Vice is essentially a dramatic outgrowth of the medieval clown or jester, extraneous to the morality drama and brought into it merely to create its comedy."
For a recent, more differentiated view but still without clarifying the interdependence of antecedents inside and outside theatres, see Peter Thomson, 'Clowns, Fools and Knaves: Stages in the Evolution of Acting', *The Cambridge History of British Theatre*, Vol. I, Jane Milling and Peter Thomson (eds.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 407-23, esp. 410: "The clown was not created out of nothing, of course. The precedent of the Vice in morality plays and interludes has been generally recognised. There is, though, an essential distinction. Whereas the Vice, however temporarily disruptive, is contained within a moral, homiletic frame, the clown is socially free-ranging."
378 David Wiles, *Shakespeare's Clown, Actor and Text in the Elizabethan Playhouse*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 1.
379 Cf. Spivack (³1968), 136-7 and ff.
380 Cf. Prentki (2012), 36. Prentki refers to the prominence of the Vice in the Tudor Interludes.

sees the continuity between the morality plays to Shakespeare's works palpable in the history plays.

> The Morality plays, which originally represented the human soul drawn one way by virtue and another way by vice, had become less ethical and more political by the beginning of the 16th century. It is this political tendency which is apparent in Shakespeare's history plays, where the characters are all ostensibly historical personages, yet serve in many cases an allegorical function in the dramatic action.[381]

Another approach to the influence of the Vice figure focuses on the personification of evil and its ruining temptation that moves close to the tragic framework. The representative of evil suggests an impact on figures that range in the context of villainy and devilish agents as studies like that by Bernard Spivack propose.[382] Nevertheless, even in that regard, Wolfgang Riehle raises objections and emphasizes comic pre-forms in classical comedy in commenting on a paragon of viciousness poisoning his victims while he is mixed with bomolochian features, however with a derisive appetite:

> Iago is so like the trickster in Roman comedy or the implied stage director in Plautine comedy that the connections with the medieval Vice, which are usually commented on, appear by comparison to be of minor importance.[383]

Similarly and more relevant for this study, the deliberate fool figure "Feste is no mere mischief-making Vice, but a fool who sees the truth and is wiser than his betters."[384] Welsford's criticism on the stereotypical foundation of Feste, the wise fool, evokes more strongly the parallels to the features of the buffoon and eiron epitomized in the clever slave, a comic driver and protagonist in intrigue comedies of one of Renaissance's most popular Roman playwright, Plautus.

> Not to underestimate the Vice tradition in Shakespeare's drama, a grander perspective on morality plays helps to enlighten the overlapping set of comic businesses in the discussed figures. The Vice figure should not be reduced to a possible metamorphosis but seen in his context. On Renaissance stage, medieval drama including the Vice and its religious ideology continues in the presence of religious satire, the mockery of Puritanism, and ridiculous, puritanical figures, wherein the professional jesters definitely engage greatly.[385] Hornback goes on in that argumentation more intensely in criticizing Weimann's thesis that the Vice tradition becomes secularized in the (theatrically) popularized clowns.

> What is finally most certain, though, is how mistaken the dominant critical narrative has been in claiming that professional drama in the Renaissance rejected the religious concerns of the medieval drama or that the clown Tarlton had 'completely secularized the vice' tradition.[386]

The truth lies somewhere in between: on the one hand, complete secularization; on the other, rejection of the medieval religious apparatus handed down in morality plays. The critical

---

381 Peter Milward, *The Medieval Dimension in Shakespeare's Plays*, Lewiston, N.Y. et al.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990, 5.

382 On Iago cf. Spivack (³1968), 3-59.

383 Riehle (1990), 235, ft.85.

384 Welsford (1935), 251-2.

385 Cf. Hornback (2009), 132-36 and ff.

386 *Ibid.*, 142. Here, Hornback criticizes especially Weimann's findings in his *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre*. For Weimann's view, see esp. 187.

discourse should acknowledge the motivation of the artificial fool figure on the Elizabethan stage as complex and as a figure, who is aware of the comic traditions predating him. It is dangerous to consider the influence of the religious ideology on the fool in Renaissance's drama too strong and exclusive because it would completely ignore and repress not only New Comedic forms of comic license but also its roots in socio-cultural rituals.[387] The structure of opposition and figurative opponents in drama is exemplified but not based on the pairing of Vice and Virtue in the morality plays. If antiquity's catalogue is looked at, the audience's delight in the exposure of (too) strict morals and religious restrictions is satisfied by the stereotypes of the magistrate or simply the agelast, delivering targets for laughter; similar targets in Shakespeare's days are the Puritans.

In sum, the Vice figure manifests a medieval, religiously dominated element in drama that relies on typical techniques and features comedy used before: figures that are authorized to ignore conventional order and move in an upside-down world; comic 'freedom' is used by figures that are authorized to nourish *ridiculum* by their improvisation. The Medieval period determined the thematic scope of such dominant comic figures sustaining the carnivalesque and gave the utopian stage a framework. The agenda of teaching in the religious context and the primary factor of morality pins down the concept of the enemy in the devilish forces, which are humanized in a comic figure that ranges closer to the evil, the villain, and the vicious rogue in contrast to the altruistic, sympathetic clever slave and the harmless, sceptical wise fool.[388] Briefly, the Vice seems to be a religiously loaded clever slave figure; though there is not the slightest suggestion that the former is directly based on the Roman protagonist.[389] They each instantiate the productive concept of the deliberate fool figure synchronically, while they perpetuate the concept's universal features.

Commedia dell'arte's comic servants

Commedia dell'arte is based upon improvisation and depends on the know-how and talent of the actors how to breathe life into the given scenario, the outline for the plot. Around a dozen of stock characters takes part in the scenario, wherein the core of figures comprises two zanni and two vecchi or in English, two servants and two old men, represented by four traditional masks, Pantalone, Dottore, Arlecchino, and Scapino later Brighella. While names in the

---

387 Cf. Hornback (2009), 18-19. Hornback argues that "religious ideology authorized the fool/clown's license on the stage". Of course, it is an important factor and belongs to the socio-cultural scope of those days containing variants of the carnivalesque destabilizing and re-establishing religious order like the participation of Lords of Misrule in rituals.
At a grander perspective, as far as the English Renaissance is concerned, one main difference to the other European nations was the circumstance that the English Renaissance had to cope with the potential of conflict between "two rival value systems- the religious system of English state Protestantism and the aesthetic, epistemological and intellectual systems of Renaissance Italian culture." (Alistair Fox, *The English Renaissance: Identity and Representation in Elizabethan England,* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997, 6). The reader stood in between the damnation of the sinful and promiscuous Italian literature by the religion and the attraction to 'new' and visionary texts. See *Ibid.*, esp. 7f. and 181f.
388 The Vice figure should be understood as an agent of the devil and seen separated from the devil, who predated the Vice figure on stage. On the minor role of the Devil in morality plays and the dominance of the Vice figure "shoot[ing] his scurrilous jests" at the utmost evil but more and more functionless figure (Spivack [³1968], 131, and cf. 130ff.).
389 Cf. DeVries (1998), 472. He cites other incorporations of viciousness in Middle English Literature as it is the case in Geoffrey Chaucer's works.

complete cast can change, their features and relations adhere to their types.[390] In accordance to their inferiority and low status, the servants' repertoire contains acrobatic actions, songs of comic value, and mimicking involving obscenity, which immediately evokes associations to almost every other clownish figure in drama that works mostly deliberately for *ridiculum*.

> Zanni, from whose name the English word 'zany' derives, always speaks in a loud, coarse voice because his comic type is based on that of the Venetian market porter who had to make himself heard offering his service above the clamor of the piazza and the rest of the traders if he was not to go hungry. […] Zanni is at the bottom of the pecking order. He is regrettably eternal unfortunate, the dispossessed immigrant worker. With his baggy, white costume, originally made of flour sacks, Zanni suffers from the spasms of an ancestral hunger, which is his basic, everyday condition.[391]

The comic servants of the *commedia dell'arte* call to mind parasitical roots as much as they bear bomolochian features. Their routines of *ridiculum* consist of physical comedy to a great part and appear to be quite drastic, direct, and obvious in their inclination to sex, scatology, and violence in contrast to the wise fool's excess of enigmatic style.[392] Analogically, the zanni are embedded in a carnivalesque structure comedy draws upon as they are living at the bottom of society challenging the superior. Enquiring into the pair of servants more closely discloses similarities to former types in Greek and Roman Comedy and to the concept of the deliberate fool figure since the two servants were originally divided into the first zanni, *il furbo*, a cunning and sharp-witted man, and the second zanni, *il stupido*, a man of naivety and foolishness.[393]

The first zanni's detailed description by Angelica Forti-Lewis reads like a portfolio of the Plautine clever slave or of the scheming servant in comedy:

> The first one (Brighella) hesitates at nothing. He has no conscience, while his assistance is invaluable in executing such trivial commissions as the murder of a rival. If a love intrigue is to be planned and carried out, or some money is to be removed from the guarded possession of Pantalone or Dottore, Brighella is the inventive genius who will find a way. […] His full name is Brighella (from *briga*, trouble, and *cavillo*, pretext) because of his ability to find a solution for every difficulty. […] he is always the first zanni, the boss of all servants.[394]

Trouble (or *turbae*) represents the common trade of the clever servant, while he takes the position of the *architectus* commanding the other figures and assuring not only the audience of his inevitable success. Albeit this proximity, the first zanni differs from Plautus' type in his non-altruistic image since "[a]ll his relationships are exploitative, and he loves nobody".[395] A

---

390 Cf. Angelica Forti-Lewis, '*Commedia dell'Arte*', *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History. A bio-bibliographical Sourcebook*, Vicki K. Janik (ed.), Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998, 146-154, 146-147. She cites Riccoboni's list, namely "the four masked actors of our theater, the Venetian Pantalone, the Bolognese Dottore, and the two servants, now identified as Arlecchino the Bergamask and Scapino the Lombard" (Luigi Riccoboni, *Histoire, du theatre italien depuis la decadence de la comédie latine,* Paris: Delormel, 1728, 49-50). ; And cf. Nicoll Allardyce, *The World of Harlequin. A Critical Study of the Commedia dell'Arte*, Cambridge: University Press, 1963, 40. Allardyce refers to Goldoni's later list of Pantalone, Dottore, Arlecchino, and Brighella.
391 Forti-Lewis (1998), 148.
392 Cf. James Phillips, 'Zanni', *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History, A bio-biographical Sourcebook*, Vicki K. Janik (ed.), Westport, CT et al.: Greenwood Press, 1998, 508-512, 509-10.
393 Cf. Forti-Lewis (1998), 148.
394 *Ibid.*, 148.
395 *Ibid.*, 148.

Pseudolus, Chrysalus or Palaestrio does not appear as unsympathetic and insensitive as Brighella but their type seems to incorporate some features of the second zanni, Arlecchino. Due to Riccoboni and Goldoni, that servant figure conveys a more comic value than his complementary part, which evokes the activities of a *servus ludens*. The silly, clumsy part of the zanni is mostly responsible for the performance of acrobatics, slapstick and farce, which alludes to both fool types, natural and deliberate.[396] As a harmless comic driver, Arlecchino "exists in a mental world where concepts of morality have no being, and yet, despite such absence of morality, he displays no viciousness."[397] In Plautus' intrigue comedies, constant and intentional violation of convention belongs to the sympathetic trickster's behaviour, though he can still keep up his image of harmlessness. Far away from advancing to a prime instigator, Arlecchino is embedded in the scenario by becoming a desperate or fortunate lover of the servant girl—a male servant in love as well as a parallel, more or less happy love story among servants are elements that are already well-known in antiquity's comedy but are repeated in Renaissance theatre as it can be detected for Shakespeare's servants like Dromio or Touchstone.

Though the pair of Arlecchino and Brighella seems to be structured contradictorily, the separation between the characteristics in the pair of the zanni was not always clear-cut since the second zanni Arlecchino started his career as a silly target of ridiculing and a victim of trickery but later on, could free himself from his mere *stupidus* role and form a hybrid "between the parasite-*stupidus* and the rascal and between the witty/cunning and the stupid servant".[398] Thelma Niklaus also verifies both figures' use of scheming; yet he makes deeper distinctions between both ways. He argues that Brighella and Arlecchino's relation to trickery differs since the former is a classic mastermind fully aware of what he is doing, how he achieves his goals, and what consequences his plans bring, whereas Arlecchino's tricking often happens without a thought-through plan and misses the mischievous attitude Brighella brings with him.[399] Regarding both roles' differences and closeness, it appears as if Brighella and Arlecchino split the clever slave's composition, while emphasizing the constituents of cunning as well as playfulness and nonsensical behaviour in their specific persona.

At a grander perspective, Plautus and Terence's comedies continuing New Comedy and Atellan farce already staged single features, types, and mixed kinds as well as the basic structure for a scenario that later reoccurred in *commedia dell'arte* varied only in different constellations. In other words, "the zanni characters exemplify the developments in the stupid-tricky servant binary";[400] however, neither did improvised Italian comedy initiate that process nor was it the only available dramatic form doing so in Renaissance. The same is true for the two vecchi and their impeding function causing conflict. The old men are available as targets of tricking, deception, and ridiculing already a *senex (iratus)* had to face.[401]

Improvised Italian comedy offered both subtypes, the deliberate and non-deliberate fool figure, and put them in a pair contrasting the two old men who appeared as their hierarchically superior opponents showing gravity, seriousness, but also lust and lovers'

---

396 Cf. Phillips (1998), 509.
397 Forti-Lewis (1998), 149.
398 Tanase (2014), 218-19. And cf. Del Ivan Janik, 'The American Circus Clown', *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History, A bio-bibliographical sourcebook*, Vicki K. Janik (ed.), Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998, 136-145, 140.
399 Cf. Thelma Niklaus, *Harlequin or the Rise and Fall of a Bergamask Rogue*, New York: Braziller, 1956, 34.
400 Tanase (2014), 218.
401 Cf. Forti-Lewis (1998), 147-48.

folly.[402] Pairs offer the opportunity to set the members of each group parallel as twins or at the same time, as complementary parts showing two sides of one medal. The pairs thought as a whole can be structured as foils and contrast towards each other, which gives the playwright a complex and interesting playground for juxtapositions, overlapping, chiastic relations, implying distance and closeness at the same time. The deliberate and natural, the stupid and the wise, the boastful and the ironic, anti-laughter and laughter-producer—all those exemplify such binary configurations that resemble the oppositional and inverted structure in comedy.

Commedia dell' arte knew a third pair crystallized as a complementary part to the male pairs, "the innamorata or amorosa (the lover) and her pretty servant girl, the servetta birichina", who used to be an older maidservant at the beginnings of the *commedia dell'arte*. Later in the 17th and 18th century, the female servant then became a rejuvenated and more attractive version, who was first named Zania parallel to the zanni and later Colombina, a pretty girl for the naïve Arlecchino falling in love with her.[403] It is worth to note here that quite parallel to the alteration of the role, these centuries also saw a change on stage from the boy actors playing female parts to actual women entering the stage of the improvised comedy. Devices of cross-dressing and allusions to gender were now based on different conditions. Nevertheless, becoming another did not lose its place in the comic discourse—why should it? The zania does not lag behind concerning Brighella's wit and deceiving talent since the female trickster can persuade by various identities, getting costumed as a lawyer or a doctor, veiling her true gender. In that net of personae, she presents herself educated and self-confident, which qualities she makes use of in her contributions to comic complications, for example when she indulges in playing with Arlecchino and vitalizes the discourse of the lovers' pairs.[404]

The *commedia dell'arte* knows love as one of its key themes the action circles around, not very dissimilar from written romantic comedies. Similar to Greek and Roman comedy, a young master seeks the love of a mistress, to which amorous affair another pair of lovers, here Arlecchino, the servant to the master, and Colombina, the mistress' maid, is added.[405] In the carnivalesque upside-down universe, the low-status figures "consistently offer an amusing and sexually frank parody of their masters' sublime relationship."[406] In regard to that scenario and fundamental theme, it can be assessed that the improvised comedy can be subsumed among national dramatic variations as cultural entities of the natural drive 'love'. The *commedia erudita*, the *Palliata*, or the *Atellana*, all are rich in inverted, exaggerated or genuinely intimate perspectives on love, in obstacles of folly, madness and despair, as well as the struggle to a harmonious ending. Stereotypical elements such as the intentionally and non-intentionally parodying figures, the tricking lovers in disguise and their helpers, impeding figures and their hybrid forms accompany the realisations of the culturally specific comic discourses. Accordingly, the *commedia dell' arte*'s character structure draws a familiar picture of opposing pairs like those of the vecchi and zanni as well as doubled roles in female and male parts like zania/zanni as well as young master/mistress. Such a juxtaposition of hierarchical position, of comic characteristics, and a source for agonistic actions can already be identified in Old Comedy and in its dramatic successors, especially when the framework of these elements is regarded as changing and evolving a tendency from *Polis* to the more private realms. In this usual environment of family, neighbours, and the marketplace with the

---

402 Cf. Forti-Lewis (1998), 147-48.
403 *Ibid.*, 149. And cf. Phillips (1998), 511.
404 Cf. Forti-Lewis (1998), 149-150.
405 Cf. *Ibid.*, 150-151.
406 *Ibid.*, 151.

parasite, the prostitute, or the procurer,[407] Plautus or Terence's plot of a lovers' union resembles the one of Italian comedy because of a similar course of action, spiced-up by complications, misunderstandings, illusions, errors and staged by stereotypical opponents and pairs of upper-class lovers and their servants. In this structure, the deliberate fool usually in a position of service can take on the role of a supporter of love, a villainous preventer of happiness, and/or a commentator.

All in all, as the focus is on the manifestations of the deliberate fool figure, the binary zanni figures can be regarded as a model for Shakespeare's clownish and tricking figures but at the same time, *commedia dell'arte*'s scenario and types, both in their male and female versions, did not offer anything revolutionary new that the classical sources of Plautus and Terence did not already contain. As Michael Silk concludes

> [t]he very prominence of servants in the *commedia* recalls Plautus, and their formulaic nature does too. The Plautine slave, cunning but ultimately loyal, seems to underlie the familiar types of 'Columbine' and 'Harlequin' – Columbina (clever female servant) and Arlecchino (mischievous man-servant) – along with Pedrolino (loyal and trusty).[408]

Nevertheless, there is no denial of a potential influence of the *commedia dell'arte* on the conception of the fool and trickster figures in Shakespeare's plays.[409] Shakespeare could have been interested in the Italian popular dramatic form; similarly, the companies' actors and primarily, those playing the clowns could have shared their impressions from their travels and made use of them for their acting like Louis B. Wright argues for Will Kemp in his article 'Will Kemp and the *commedia dell'arte*'.[410]

Though in acknowledgement of close-to-life approaches, *Commedia dell'arte* was not the first to construct their zanni as intersections of figures of parasitical, buffoonish, foolish and tricking quality. In short, it is part of the available sources, where fool figures are employed for the comic effect.[411] The clever slave's concept shows cross-overs of the same features already existent in Atellan drama, the mime, and New Comedy; Plautus' slave finds a successor in the witty servants of Renaissance's theatre. At an intermediary place, *commedia dell'arte*'s Arlecchino and Brighella look back on their ancestry of mime, classical comedy, and Atellan drama; as far as the latter is concerned, the Italian improvised drama continues to wear masks and puts comic stereotypes on stage like the roles of the Maccus and Bucco performing slapstick.[412] There are even suggestions that the zanni is linked to the Vice of medieval

---

407 Cf. Zimmermann (2006), 57-63.
408 Silk et al. (2014), 128.
409 Cf. Richards and Richards (1990), 15ff.
410 Cf. Louis B. Wright, 'Will Kemp and the *commedia dell'arte*', *Modern Language Notes* 41.8 (1926): 516-20.
411 Cf. D. I. Janik, (1998), 140: "the interplay between the two types, fool and clown, trickster and simpleton, has long been characteristic of clowning." Here, Janik refers to John Towsen's *Clowns* (1976).
On *commedia dell'arte*'s reception (still) with a Plautine background, note Silk et al. (2014), 127-128: "From its stock characters, especially its comic servants (*Zanni*), the *commedia* generated other forms of popular entertainment. Punch and Judy puppet shows were first recorded in England by Samuel Pepys in 1662; by the nineteenth century, they had become a symbol of class defiance, with Mr Punch both a violent clown and an irreverent, subversive figure, who disrespects marriage and religion, and defies the policeman and the hangman. Punch (along with other European variants) derives directly, both in form and name, from one of the stock figures of the *commedia*, Pulcinella, who can be traced back, in turn, to the Plautine *servus callidus* (or its Atellan prototype), the trickster slave bent on serving his master, but also on manipulating events to his own advantage."
412 Cf. Phillips (1998), 508. And cf. Richards and Richards (1990), 21. And cf. Niklaus (1956), esp. 18-34 on Arlecchino's ancestry in Atellan and mime theatrical forms concerning his costume and configuration. But Niklaus overrates Arlecchino's relation to other fool figures when he sets him apart and crowns him as the ultimate clown "as he transcended all other clowns" (24). And for Arlecchino's several traces of origins, cf. Phillips (1998), 510.

drama—at least, they equate in their agenda of deception, mischief, and comic engagement.[413]

In connection with the conglomerate of bomolochos, parasite, and other subtypes, the zanni remains an interpretation and descendant from earlier comic drivers. It is the eiron, the comic ironist, that appears to be the closest archetypal relative on stage to the wise fool as the eiron epitomizes

> the clever figure who frequently shifts his functional identity, freely engaging in disguise and deception. He is the only type in Old Comedy who, to serve his purposes, performs all of the functions involved in the performance action: farcical celebrant, satirical mocker, participant in lyrical interludes and direct spokesperson for the playwright's political concerns. The eiron is the primary actor-figure of Old Comedy, the one who changes his role at will and, by doing so, openly ridicules other characters.[414]

Being outside and inside of performance's illusion at the same time classifies him a marginal character that stands closest to the audience.[415] For Shakespeare's wise fool, Plautus' *servus callidus* can be perceived as situated at the interface of antiquity's binary concept of fool figures hardly directly available for Shakespeare anymore and of native, contemporary entities that also echo the Plautine witty slave; the *servus callidus* is an available and popular source as a prototype and relative.

Elizabethan Court fool

An off-stage manifestation of wisdom intersected with folly is identified in the Elizabethan court fool, the last type to be discussed in that chapter. His names vary with the era, in which the entertainer was active, like the jester became an official label at the end of the 14th century, whereas earliest European sources denote him as *nebulo*, "a word expressive of clerical contempt but which nevertheless conveys an accurate assessment of his social standing; he was seen as a paltry, worthless fellow, a nobody."[416] In the late Middle Ages, such social 'outcasts' were usually persons with physical or mental defects designated as fools, who were stared at as fascinating but despised creatures and purely seen as contrasts to their mighty rulers at the European courts.[417] They served as mascots, who were said to keep bad luck away and to neutralize the hubris of their masters by their own railing.[418] Their service package then expanded into the present concept of the court fool adding entertainment by deliberate folly.

Phillips pays attention to the zanni's French roots as well as his Roman theatre's background including African slaves. "The lenones of the Roman theater were the portrayers of African slaves, and similarities exist between their black mask and the black half-mask of the early Arlecchino."

413 Cf. Phillips (1998), 508. Unconvincingly, Phillips does not give clear evidence for such an argument nor does he refer to any source that does so.

414 Soule (2000), 44.

415 Cf. *Ibid.*, 43-44.

416 John Southworth, *Fools and Jesters at the English Court*, Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998, 1. And cf. Beryl Hugill, *Bring on the Clowns*, Newton Abbot/London: David & Charles, 1980, 37.

417 Cf. Werner Metzger, 'Narr', *Lexikon des Mittelalters VI*, Norbert Angermann (ed.), München/Zürich: Artemis & Winkler Verlag, 1993, 1023-1026.

418 Cf. Ghose (2008), 95ff.

Their main business comprised the production of *ridiculum*, demanding the skills to react impromptu to their surroundings, to recognize the parodic value of situations and people, and to create hilarious verses, songs, and puns to amuse their masters. Concerning the demand of new and unexpected wit, it is not surprising that the jesters sought inspiration in jest books that were numerous at their time.[419] Besides the verbal dance, his audience expected extravagancies in his appearance, grimaces, and acrobatics, similar to the show clownish figures put up in the theatres.

A usual feature, being a 'nobody' at the bottom of society, seems to connect fool figures and their actors throughout the ages. The negation of identity is a chance to become someone else as it is compensated with his professional habit and that is to play the fool and construct manifestations of the comic, carnivalesque, and even grotesque. His outside status and freedom from decency allow him to behave as a chameleon, close to the trickster, taking on different roles. The performer can only exist if he has an audience. The court fool found his applause-giver and 'employer' in his patron, the king or queen, the most powerful man or woman in the country, to whom hierarchy set him farthest away; though his exclusive position enabled him to remain close to the master's ears. Besides diversion, the jester could be his confidant, advise him, spy for him, and be a source of truth. Frankness and honesty were qualities an emperor sought in vain among his staff of nobles and flatterers; the professional fool knew how to combine amusement with openness as he turned truth into hilarious pieces full of hidden messages.[420] England's court enjoyed their jesters as much as rulers in ancient times did: the Egyptian Empire had its foolish and licensed jesters.[421]

The fragile basis of such immunity was echoed in the jester's motto 'speak what you think' expressing the same license, on which the dramatic fool figure relies. It demarcates the person from society living within the conventional boundaries and therefore, adapting their speeches to those rules. The outsider position and the privilege of speaking plainly depend on each other, whose relation is often said to develop out of "the primitive belief that fools and madmen were touched by divinity and that any indiscretion was either caused by ignorance or inspired by God."[422] In Erasmus' treatise, Folly outlines her protection of the professional fools at court and explains the fools' license with their special status of "natural innocence". In contrast to the wise man spreading melancholic feelings to his auditorium, the masters, kings, and princes sought lightness and mirth. In addition, the innocence of fools granted them an unadulterated truth.[423] Erasmus acknowledges in his colloquy "The Well-to-Do Beggars" that the fools' wisdom can exceed that of those they entertain.[424] That was certainly true but not to be outspoken since the fool's freedom of speech was not inviolable as the praxis could look slightly different; a king or queen's reputation or his or her lifestyle were not appropriate objects of ridicule. Elizabeth I appreciated her court fools but not without restricting them.[425] In comparison to the other members at court, however, the jester's tongue was probably the most uncensored. The members of the elite and the fool did not differ in intellect but in

---

419 Cf. Hugill (1980), 57. For some extracts of a jestbook, see 58.
420 Cf. Southworth (1998), 7-8.
421 Cf. *Ibid.*, 2-3. He refers to Enid Welsford's study of the fool figure in history.
422 Hugill (1980), 37. Also note theology's account on folly, the danger of (too much) or the desire of knowledge because of the human failure in Eden, cf. Stott (2005), 47; and note Howard Jacobson, *Seriously Funny. From the Ridiculous to the Sublime*, Harmondsworth: Viking, 1997, esp. 167, Christ as "a mock-king".
423 Miller (1979), xviii and 55-56.
424 Cf. Erasmus, *Coll.* 212. And see Miller (1979), xviii.
425 Cf. Derek Brewer, 'Prose Jest-Books in England', *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*, Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (eds.), Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997, 90-111, 104.

appearance; when a witty man became a deliberate fool wearing a costume, often consisting of colourful patches, elucidated the aspect of acting and a certain veil of illusion, which also supported his license as his words and deeds were identified to happen in the sphere of non-seriousness.[426]

Up to the beginning of the 17th century, witty men turning on that sphere worked "in the palaces of monarchs, the homes of wealthy families and churchmen, and later, in brothels and taverns".[427] Being an artificial fool was a profession that could turn the former stereotypical lower-class membership into an social upgrade since it grants access to royal courts, to powerful classes, and their way of life. When a successful court jester was under the king's favour, his patron could make the formerly lower-class entertainer a landowner affording servants as well as luxurious goods.[428] Though, not every famous clown could look back at such a career like Richard Tarlton, jester at Elizabeth's court and comic actor of The Queen's Men, who died poor.[429]

The era of professional fools at court finally ended in England with Thomas Killigrew's son, appearing to the last court fool in England, whose father himself was a jester and a playwright. After 1694, records do not tell of any official jester to the king.[430] The decline of court jesters had started over one century earlier as in 1599 it was already an exception to employ a jester in one's household; they were only found at court and at few noblemen's homes.[431] At the time of Elizabeth I, official entertainers began to take their career from court to the stage. According to the record, Tarlton participated in both worlds successfully but stood at the turning point, when professional clowns like Kempe and Armin saw themselves also as players and favoured theatre as their working place, where the genre 'comedy' offered them many variations of the fool figure, natural and artificial.[432] Nevertheless, it would be highly misleading to conclude a proportional or even causal relationship between the decline of the court fool and the presence of the deliberate fool on Elizabethan stages since foolish figures are bound to performative arts, whether at court or in theatre, where they have always been an integrative part. Equally, it is false to take the professional fools' change of working place as the sole reason why Shakespeare put up figures like Touchstone and Feste.

In sum, the court fool, *nebulo*, jester, or professional fool accompany the theatrical forms of foolish figures in relying on the effective concept of folly. In his dependence on the master's favour, the performer comes close to the parasite and kolax; his habit of ridiculing without restriction sets him parallel to the bomolochos; his ironic world view resembles that of the eiron; creating mischief bears resemblances to the Vice; he is marked as a trickster by enclosing ambiguity and illusion. Southworth acknowledges the universality of the court fool with the following words:

> [t]he curious double-act of king and fool, master and servant, substance and shadow, may thus be seen as a universal, symbolic expression of the antithesis lying at the heart

---

426 Compare to Erasmus, *Coll.*, 212; and note Bente A. Videbæk, T*he Stage Clown in Shakespeare's Theatre*, Westport, Conn./London: Greenwood Press, 1996, 2: Videbæk argues that the court fool was transformed into the clowns on the stage "his free license of speech, his professionalism, and many articles of dress". While the latter can be true, the first two-mentioned qualities can already be found in former deliberate fool figures.
427 Hugill (1980), 37.
428 Cf. *Ibid.*, 37-9. Beryl Hugill mentions Archibald Armstrong, court jester to James I and Charles I, his great success and fortune as an example. On Archy Armstrong also see Southworth (1998), 140-151.
429 Cf. *Ibid.*, 46. And further on Tarlton and other probable jesters at Elizabeth's court like Lockwood and Thomas Staney, see Southworth (1998), 107-120.
430 Cf. Brewer (1997), 105.
431 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 99.
432 Cf. Southworth (1998), 138ff.

of the autocratic state between the forces of order and disorder, of structured authority and incipient anarchy, in which the conditional nature of the fool's license ('so far but no further') gives reassurance that ultimately order will always prevail.[433]

It follows that Shakespeare's wise fool is not a mere copy of the court fool but they both match in the concept of the deliberate fool figure that had seen so many manifestations throughout history lying out before Shakespeare. The court fool and his professional colleagues add another puzzle piece to the picture of Shakespeare's idiosyncratic deliberate fool figure. In other words, Shakespeare had at his hand an unbelievably rich catalogue of fool figures in literature, in ritual, in person, and in theatre. He faced their concepts in classical and native sources, Roman comedy as well as English interludes, and in other European theatrical interpretations of their own traditions and antiquity's heritage like Italian drama. It is not the question of either—or but the significant factor is the awareness that "these traditions are now better understood as part of a shared cultural heritage tapped by commercial theatres of both nations [, Italy and England,] to attract the paying public to their plays."[434] "For England, and perhaps for Europe, Shakespeare makes the most remarkable use of the fool/clown/jester, once again establishing himself in the general popular tradition, though with more humanity."[435] If one wants or does not want to agree with that praising does not matter but indeed, a rough tendency in the development of the fool figures in Shakespeare's plays can be detected and that is from rusticity, farcical elements, and coarseness to detachment, subtlety, philosophical quality, aesthetic use of wit taking its peak in the wise fool.[436]

All for Shakespeare

The chapter now turns to a rough sketch of the diversity of fool figures Shakespeare's plays offer as candidates for the metamorphosis of the prior introduced subtypes of the fool figure. Here, certainly, the predecessors to the wise fools like Speed and Launce, who are also often put in relation to Plautus, though they must be neglected in the later profound analysis of the play texts because of the here-taken focus. In Shakespeare's early play, the audience can watch a cast of foolish servants, low-rank figures that are producers of the laughable more or less intentionally: Speed and Launce of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* or the Dromios in *The Comedy of Errors*. Due to Edward Berry, Dromio of Syracuse even already comprises all the functionality the following deliberate fool figures show. He thus defines him a kind of archetype in Shakespeare's universe of fool figures:

> Dromio of Syracuse, probably Shakespeare's first clown, plays nearly all the roles that Shakespeare was to develop. Buffoon, servant, and jester, he is a 'trusty villain,' who 'lightens' his master's humor 'with his merry jests'.[437]

---

433 Southworth (1998), 3.

434 Frances K. Barasch, 'Harlequin/Harlotry in *Henry IV, Part One*', *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & his Contemporaries. Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*, Michele Marrapodi (ed.), Hampshire/Burlington: Ashgate, 2007, 27-37, 28. In his article, Frances K. Barasch focuses on the *commedia dell'arte*'s impact, while he discusses the brotherhood of Harlequin and Falstaff.

435 Brewer (1997), 104.

436 Cf. Hugill (1980), 99-108. He mainly focuses on Dogberry, Touchstone, Feste, and Lear's Fool.

437 Edward Berry, *Shakespeare's Comic Rites*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1984, 113. Berry himself cites some phrases taken from *The Comedy of Errors* (*Err*. 1.2.19-21).

Of course, there is a long way to go from Dromio to Lear's Fool; nevertheless, Berry has an interesting point in asking if the servant can be seen as the first attempt to create idiosyncratic fool figures based upon the writer's knowledge and experience of how folly was incorporated with the purpose of *ridiculum*. Consequently, the starting point, Dromio, is first of all not a question of reception and direct heritage but the figure is situated in the dynamics of aesthetic consciousness accessed by Shakespeare. The servant and his comic colleagues share features from the above mentioned forms.

Still, the closeness of *The Comedy of Errors* to Plautus' *Menaechmi* and *Amphitruo* does not automatically prove any direct relation of the two Dromios to Plautus' *servi callidi*. The Dromios like Sosia of *Amphitruo* or Messenio of *Menaechmi* are rather tokens of the comic and targets of abuse than the centre of machinations. The two Dromios are lost in the turmoil of *errores* like their masters when they accompany them, wandering around in the 'bewitched' city of Ephesus, whereas the clever slave is mostly in control of creating *turbae*. In his superior position, it is the *servus callidus* that bullies the master (indirectly), forcing him to repeat his orders. In contrast, the look-alike servants endure the sometimes bullying demands of their masters, reminding of how Menaechmus forces the parasite Peniculus to repeat his words.[438] If the serving figure resembles a clever slave is a question of position and function in the plot: is the slave or servant in a superior position guiding and taking control of the master or is the figure a sort of mirror image but low-rank addition to the master that is rather the victim of irritation than the conductor of *turbarum* like it is the case for the two Dromios.

Comparing the clever slaves of Plautus with Shakespeare's smarter servants entails comparing how their relations to other figures of authority, mainly the one to the *adulescens* and the *senex*, are constructed. The most prominent aspect here is that the *servus callidus* usually helps the young master by mostly replacing him in the machinations and by doing the dirty work for him. Chrysalus and Tranio go into one-sided partnership with their young master, helping the young generation and the young lovers, whereas he stands in opposition to the *senex*, lying at him and arguing with him. These agonal structures are the layout for scenes of carnivalesque arguments when the clever slaves play dumb or show their actual plans and superiority to the audience in asides. Chrysalus refuses to obey Nicobolus' instructions and Tranio laughs at Theopropides, sitting on the altar and making jokes at his master's expense. Tranio in *The Shrew* and Feste in *Twelfth Night*, for instance, show their cleverness off in scenes of similarly agonal opposition. In contrast, the two Dromios stand at their masters' side as a parallel constructed half of a sympathetic pair lacking such a clear-cut agonal figure as the *senex iratus* embedded in the agon of an intrigue. The later romance comedies like *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night* develop a kind of a female leading intriguer in the clever young lover with her strategic behaviour and manipulations, struggling in the comic turmoil of love and identity. The plot *of The Comedy of Errors* or *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* does not offer a similar opportunity for largely depicting a carnivalesque pair of a servant turning the world of his master or other authorities upside-down. The agonal image is limited to sequences of witty reposts between the servant and his master and can be identified primarily in the accidental fooling of the figures in the burlesque scenario of confusion with the 'addendum' of farcical and intentional jokes.

Fitting the zest for farcical entertainment, a parasitical attitude can be part of their nature as Launcelot Gobbo acts close to a parasite when he decides to take a new master, "who gives him better clothes, more food, and less work."[439] Tranio, Petrucchio, and others

---

438 Cf. Miola (1994), 22-23.
439 Berry (1984), 122.

show a great talent and fondness for trickery in their influential position when it comes to the course of action.[440] Characteristics of the parasite and trickster are bound to a carnivalesque structure and utopian nature, which also comes about in the practice of mocking. Juxtaposing the master, servants give comic speeches on the superiors' behaviour like Speed, the more witty one of the servants in *TGV*, "describes at length the familiar posings of the amorist, mocking his master's love."[441] His counterpart, Launce, plays with the concept of folly still being a source of wisdom when he reflects upon his master at 3.1.263-64: "I am but a fool and yet I have the wit to think my master is a kind of knave."[442] Speed and Launce present the low-class counterpart to the noble pair of their masters. Speed engages in the verbal agon to show off his wit, whereas Launce as his complementary displays a producer of comic skits with his dog, while he also funtions as an opposition to his master's ideas of loyalty.[443]

Apart from the different thematic configuration and varying plot structure, the servant and the slave are members of the lowest social class, sharing the themes of moaning about orders, showing parasitical features, fearing punishment, complaining about their lot as the 'beated butt', and seeking freedom – usually with an emphasis on *ridiculum*.[444] With an agenda of destabilizing truth and reality, they stabilize comedy's utopian nature, taking part in comedy's consistent sport of wits, for instance, as a comic agonist against authority, who explains the world, its rules, and its absurdities to the seemingly wise men.[445]

Their comic sport contains raucous and farcical elements and offers a flexible position in the carnivalesque universe. In their comic performance, the servants show a familiar repertoire of New Comedy's themes and techniques: wordplay as *equivoca* or a breathless Dromio of Syracuse resembling a *servus currens*.[446] Their central common function as the "willing or unwilling butt of laughter" is the production of comic moments: Antipholus of Syracuse calls his servant his fool that chats with him and lightens his serious hours with his sauciness (c.f. *Err*. 2.2.). As lower-class figures and comic drivers, they tend to abuse verbal standards and indulge in miscommunication. Speed and Launce's dialogues exemplifying Plautine-like sources of puns thus exhibit nugatory behaviour.[447]

Puck's tendency to similar clownish and foolish (verbal) escapades shows him close to the coarse humour of a clever slave. Both are servants but still free spirits loving spontaneity and capriciousness. Still, Puck's *turbae* are not the consequences of his own plans but of his mistakes getting out of hand. Oberon, the king of the fairies and the prime intriguer, makes him to his '*turbae* handler', who fails to put his masters plans into action successfully. While

---

440 Contriving is part of the plot of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* but is not given to one single servant figure. Suitors make use of the skill not for the sake of others but for their own sake, like Proteus, who "turns Machiavellian schemer" (Robert Ornstein, *Shakespeare's Comedies. From Roman Farce to Romantic Mystery*, Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986, 51). Intrigues prove unfaithfulness and the violation of friendship, instead of solving generational conflicts.
441 Berry (1984), 111.
442 For a brief note on the passage, see Weimann (1970), 98. He speaks of the awareness of the servant/actor in relation to his master/role of Proteus. And on Dromios, Speed and Lance, cf. Videbæk (1996), 53ff.
443 Ornstein (1986), 50: "The comedy of Launce and his dog is just one of the reoccurring motifs that lend an architectural unity to the episodic plot of *Two Gentlemen* […] Indeed, Launce's dog is one of the more vivid personalities in the play because we are privy to the intimate details of his canine existence, including his toilet habits." And cf. 50ff.
444 See *The Comedy of Errors* 2.1., Dromio of Ephesus is beaten and threatened with punishment by his master and Adriana.
445 Note Dromio of Ephesus' jesting about time, *Err*. 2.2..
446 Cf. Miola (1994), 22-23.
447 Cf. Riehle (1990), 216: He refers to *TGV* 2.1.56-61 and 1.1.110-124, showing "Paronomasia-like pun as the most common type in Plautus".

Oberon comes close to the clever slave's qualities of leading and architecting *errores*, Puck, the Hermetic helper of Oberon's sport with Titania, adds an anarchic component and shows an elusive quality, moving quickly on stage. The pair of master and servant complements each other in their control of the other figures' fate and the production of chaos. The figure Puck epitomizes comedy's manner of mixing up and irritating in the magic world of *A Midsummernight's Dream*, sharing his master's love for a good sport and fun.

Ariel in *The Tempest* takes over a similar secondary role of the serving spirit that engages in deceptive and manipulative activities, replacing Prospero in encounters with his master's enemies and satisfying Prospero's longing for revenge. Ariel, the enslaved spirit, is situated in hierarchical opposition to Prospero, who promises Ariel freedom. The common constellation of master and slave involves the known threat of punishment or imprisonment in terms of Ariel since Prospero threatens the servant to imprison it in an oak (*Temp*. 1.2.294-96). Unlike the Plautine clever slave, Ariel does not act out of an altruistic motivation, aiming at the well-being of a young master or in other words, the union of two young lovers but the spirit's activities are dependent on Prospero's Machiavellian desires.

Following his master's wishes, the spirit identified with the elements of air and fire excels in achieving the impossible when he causes the shipwreck, and goes beyond the mere shape-shifter by his transformation into fire.[448] Although Prospero, the learned magician, governs the island, it is Ariel that seems superior when it comes to "courage, [and] self-sacrifice".[449] In addition to the contrastive constellation with Prospero, Ariel's configuration as a polymorphous servant and a trickster is based on the oppositional scripts of visibility and invisibility as well as natural and supernatural. Shakespeare expands the forms of the shape-shifter to illusions manipulating the destiny of the others, affecting the senses and determining what the figures see and hear: Ariel splits the groups, leading them with music and providing visions; beyond illusions, the spirit stages the tempest by becoming and controlling the natural forces. The servant Ariel does not engage in sports nor does he show features of a deliberate fool, leaving sorts of the extreme, grotesque and rusticity to Caliban and his companions. Despite his illusionary power, Ariel is dependent on Prospero's instructions as a variation of the prototypical trickster in the figure of the loyal servant and helper. If Prospero is the *poeta* on the stage of the island, then April is his repertoire of props to direct the figures and shape the scene.

In Shakespeare's comedies, servant figures offer sources of *ridiculum*, violating standards and propriety. John Dover Wilson compares Touchstone's habit of verbal dance with Dull and Costard's readiness of violating language and assesses a close relationship between them.[450] Disruption of standards, not only of a verbal sort, clings to the fool figures all along as it is case for the early figure of the bomolochos. For Berry, Grumio, Dogberry, Costard, and Bottom fit in this buffoonish category, emphasizing their opposition to decency "usually with an air of rusticity, if not actually countrymen".[451]

---

448 Cf. Miola (1994), 155, 162-63.

449 Bernard Knox, '*The Tempest* and the Ancient Comic Tradition', *English Stage Comedy*, William K. Wimsatt (ed.), New York: Ams Print, 1965, 52-73, 69. Knox further argues that Ariel is more intelligent than Prospero. Their kind of intelligence is hardly comparable. The spirit is part of the supernatural world and is freed from human desires like the urge for revenge and usurping power, which dominate Prospero and his decisions.

450 Cf. John Dover Wilson, *Shakespeare's Happy Comedies*, London: Faber and Faber, 1962, 158: "What Dull and Costard supply in *Love's Labour's Lost*, Touchstone gives to *As You Like It*."

451 Berry (1984), 112 and cf. 126. And further on Bottom and Dogberry, see Videbæk (1996), 39ff. and on Grumio, see 53ff.

This rusticity and coarse nature of the former turns into a more subtle fool in Touchstone, who juggles with the concepts of the courtier and the countryman. Superseding the clownish figures, the wise fool of *As You Like It* offers "in the educational jargon of our time, a better background".[452] In short, Touchstone's comic endeavour is "more elaborate, deliberate and cultivated than that of Launcelot Gobbo."[453] As if sitting in the middle of the scale ranging from foolish figures to court jesters, Lavatch from *All's Well That Ends Well* is suggested to take such intermediary position in Bente A. Videbæk's study.[454] In this thesis, the metamorphosis is perceived as a flowing, steady process with its single peaks found in the adaptation to the relevant play, its tone, plot, atmosphere. The first peak of the concept of the wise fool is commonly acknowledged in Touchstone, who advances in contextual interference, satirical voice, and comic eloquence. His type exhausting the paradox pattern manages to construct a net of juxtapositions reflecting the play's inner structure. Besides comedy, there are tragic manifestations of the deliberate fool, proving the productiveness of its oppositional structure in a different environment. *Hamlet, Lear*, or *Troilus and Cressida* involve the fusion of high and low and popular and elite since the plays' deliberate fools exemplify a "'popular' figuration in a sophisticated context" or the combination of folly and seriousness.[455]

Unfortunately, not all of the above-mentioned instantiations can be discussed in depth regarding their fitting to the concept of the deliberate fool figure, their relation to the subtypes as well as their potential dependence on the Plautine clever prototype of the professional fool figure. The thesis concentrates on Tranio as a definite evidence of Shakespeare's use of Plautus' scheming protagonist and on the following generally-accepted figures of wise fools, Touchstone and Feste, in the romantic comedies. An excerpt of the tragic derivations, like Thersites and Lear's Fool, will briefly be considered at the end of the analysis. There cannot and will not be a detailed archaeology of origins for Shakespeare's fools but an examination of how they fulfil the concept of the deliberate fool figure Plautus' clever slave also draws upon. It follows that now it is time to designate what the concept of the deliberate fool figure is after the most prominent and distinct forms of fooling agents and their features in comedy have been discussed diachronically. Now, before the analysis of the play text can start, a synopsis is needed, of what the concept of the deliberate fool figure contains; to put it differently, how the previous single types overlap.

The deliberate fool figure is an expert of how to produce moments of *ridiculum* by perceiving the discourse analytically for the instalment of incongruous scripts. He is situated at the edges of rationality and irrationality as a sort of morosophos. In accord with comedy's utopian nature, "[t]he fool's mental universe, then, is a kind of no-man's land, a liminal landscape between sense and nonsense, where the boundaries are unstable and ill-defined."[456] He does not want to reorder boundaries and establish alternative truths but invests in ephemeral products of the Comic. Consequently, absolute truth cannot be part of his programme; nor does he represent a doctrine. He is interested in mockery and sometimes become a manager of thoughtful laughter, who knows that laughter can be a vehicle to recognition, which eases threat, criticism, and pain. Plainly spoken, if you are going to tell an unpleasant truth, better make the other laugh. The knowledge and physical talents around *ridiculum* help him to use his instrument 'laughter'. He invites the audience into a world of

---

452 Wilson (1962), 158. He compares Touchstone's knowledge with that of Launcelot Gobbo. And cf. 157.
453 *Ibid.*, 145.
454 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 77 and ff.
455 Silk et al. (2014), 123.
456 Berry (1984), 126.

confusion, where sense can meet nonsense and where the sound mind ends, but simultaneously, offers them somewhere an exit to recognition. His profession of ridiculing the other needs the skill how to depart from reality, invent, and tempt the audience to distort their faces to grimaces of laughing faces. He is good at inventing and deceiving and excellent at mocking and parodying.

Such programme assigns him to the ugly: he is bound to mischief, trouble, misrule, vice, error and stands in connection to the lower bodily stratum. His carnivalesque nature is confirmed by parasitical features of food, drink, and lust. His presence is paired with the absence and neglect of dignity and decency. Like a trickster and parasite, he concocts hidden and enigmatic stratagems to achieve what he wants, laughter and/or money. Often, he stylizes his participation in the discourse as an agon, a bet, a game, and not as a bitter strife. Architecting his actions goes hand in hand with adding more to his role than his actual low stratus. As a social outsider, he crafts identities for himself, wherein he seems almost unlimited as a nobody in a no-man's land. Utmost flexibility clings to the fool figure's position in a utopian environment and to the usual habit that fools range far away from the realistic tradition forming characters that appeal to be close to real-life persons and their psyche. The deliberate fool figure's concept is constructed to be fully functional for the schema of comedy. Therefore, the deliberate fool figure is granted an advantage in knowledge and some sort of overview over the plot. Gaining some distance allows him to enter a meta-level and persuade as self-conscious and aware of the comic universe he inhabits. As outsider he moves close to the audience and can be perceived as their guide through comments, announcements and prophecies. He grants them access to the workings of comedy's chance in addressing it, relying on it, ridiculing it. The deliberate fool figure's physical presence and the dominance of the stage as a utopian space "[do] not have sharp, well-defined boundaries between actors and an audience but is rather a form of participatory scenario that combines dance, comic improvisation and athletic endurance with an atmosphere of festive spontaneity and informal hospitality."[457] He wears the comic mask and imposes it on the other without causing pain. In other words, he is given a license. The combination of his all-license as well as his production of *ridiculum* identifies the figure as a seminal element of "audience management", taming them by laughter, guiding them and calling for attention.[458]

His most important instrument of his body, more as to any other actor, is his tongue and its licensed nature. As Ben Jonson puts it, "'[a] fool could never hold his peace.' For too much talking is ever the indice of a fool."[459] While the fool proper speaking discloses the sign of stupidity, the deliberate fool veils his intellect in incongruous constructs as soon as he begins to speak. Ben Jonson, Shakespeare, Plautus, and other great playwrights of comedy knew that "the treasure of a fool is always in his tongue".[460] For the comic poet, the fool figure is a great device as he knows that the fool's tongue can be seduced to speak the most hilarious things (with much plausibility) and to code and decode truth. The figure can cause *turbae* in form of quibbles and codes of sense and nonsense on the verbal level.

---

457 Michael D. Bristol, *Carnival and Theater. Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*, New York et al.: Methuen, 1985, 142.

458 Richard Preiss, *Clowning and Authorship in Early Modern Theatre*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2014, 226.

459 Jonson, *Discoveries*, 512, lines 264-5.

460 *Ibid.*, 513, lines 283-4. Ben Jonson here refers to Plautus, who phrased the line "*est thesaurus stultis in lingua suis*" (*Poen*. 625) = "a fool's resources are always in his tongue", which means that "his resources are always on the point of expenditure and loss." (Jonson, *Discoveries*, 513, ft. comment on line 283).

He draws upon his cleverness, intellect, fantasy, or simply wit, a term that reoccurs in articles on the artificial fool, which makes it a key word although it seems to evade a precise definition. As Conal Condren points out, "[s]ince wit was, and always has been, a decidedly variable and elusive notion ('*Comely* in a thousand shapes', 'we only can by *Negatives* define'), we are brought no closer to an effective definition".[461] John Locke proposes a nutshell-definition saying that wit "lying most in the assemblage of ideas, and putting those together with quickness and variety, wherein can be found any resemblance or congruity, thereby to make up pleasant pictures and agreeable visions in the fancy".[462] However, for the comic driver applying wit, congruity is not an obligatory and primary aspect. In detail, wit is here understood as an elementary capacity of cognitive agility that enables one to link ideas to complex constructs not simply based on facts but stretched to maximal fantasy.[463] Here, the fool figure differs from the scientist who is eager to discover the truth unemotionally as his search and disclosure are seen to be free of any affect; whereas the fool figure has no problem to veil truth and to play with it in order to arouse distinct emotional reactions. He uses his tongue wittily; the *OED* defines the quality to be witty as the ability "to [say or write] brilliant or sparkling things, esp. in an amusing way; smartly jocose or facetious."[464] More concretely, the fool's wit encloses the art of irony as well as the escapades of folly with its concomitants of surprise and unexpectedness.[465] By this quality, the professional fool tries to reach aesthetically effective excellence in the comic domain Shakespeare realizes in his programme of symmetric and asymmetric constructs of scripts and their clusters like he does through Touchstone, the rustic lover, courtier, creator of nugatory moments as well as Rosalind, the lover in disguise, strong magician, weak woman, and contributor to funny dialogues.

Finally, the possession of wit makes a decisive difference between the natural and the artificial fool, while that capacity is also set at the binary portrayal of comedy since it addresses once more the issues of vulgarity and refinement like "Sidney's *Defence of Poesie*, which condemned the tendency of the public playhouse to confuse the refined comedy of 'delight' with the vulgar comedy of 'laughter'".[466] The fool figure occurs at a mediatory place, where he mixes vulgarity, physical extravagancies in dance and acrobatics, status, themes and language with refined elements of eloquence, philosophical thoughts, and insight into the meta-level in his deliberate and omniscient manner.

> Far from introducing a note of discord, the [fool] refuted Sidney's castigation by being the active principle of drama's didactics: he was the play's moral made accessible, reduced from esoteric verse to the hard-headed vocabulary of prose, dumbshow, and

---

461 Conal Condren, 'Satire and Definition', *Humor* 25.4 (2012): 375-399, 384. Condren himself cites Cowley (see Abraham Cowley, 'Of wit, miscellanies' [1656], *The Norton anthology of English literature*, M.H. Abrams [ed.], New York: Norton, 1986, 1665). The italics are not mine.

462 John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), Vol. I based on the 2nd Edition (Books I. and II. of 4), release date: January 6, 2004 [EBook #10615] at Project Gutenberg, produced by Steve Harris and David Widger, URL= https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/10615/pg10615-images.html (accessed January 05, 2022), book II, chapter XI, 2; and for further considerations, John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding in Focus*, Gary Fuller et al. (eds.), London et al.: Routledge, 2000, for book II: of ideas, 67ff. and 120ff. (of the Association of ideas), for book IV: of knowledge and opinion, 139ff.

463 Cf. Schwind (2000), 348. "The definition is a free translation and mine of the following passage: "*Wit ist eine elementare geistige Beweglichkeit, eine hochkomplexe phantasievolle Verbindung von <ideas>, die sich allerdings mit Wahrheit und Vernunft nicht völlig deckt.*" (348).

464 *OED*, s.v. 'wit, n., II.7'.

465 *Ibid.*, s.v. 'wit, n., II.8.a'.: "That quality of speech or writing which consists in the apt association of thought and expression, calculated to surprise and delight by its unexpectedness".

466 Preiss (2014), 3.

common experience. He was not an anomaly to be dismissed or apologized: rather, like his classical antecedent in the *servus* type of Greek New Comedy and Roman drama, he was precisely what defined a nascent cultural institution trying to bridge diverse audiences, and what had enabled its greatest triumph – a unified vision of both art and nation.[467]

All in all, the deliberate fool's wit fitting the whole flexible and unpredictable concept is authorized to reveal the world and ourselves living in it as "an assemblage of heterogeneous [and ambivalent] components", steadily reminding us "to avoid taking our knowledge for truth" otherwise we just become "victims of our own folly" leading to dishonour, conflicts in the nucleus family, vice, evil, chaos and other forms of disruption and corruption. The key motto 'know thyself' and the main prop 'mirror' accompany the concept of the deliberate fool figure through all its minor and major manifestations at least in association.[468] Consequently, deliberate folly and the fusion of sense and nonsense operate in epistemic frameworks. The figure questions truth, making the audience rethink forms of knowledge and their epistemic limits.[469] In view of scepticism, Shakespeare seems to recognize the type's potential to enhance the epistemic value; he does so in his wise fools. It is insignificant whether it happens in a tragic or comic environment or a hybrid of it. The fool figure knows that man's common sense can vanish at love's first sight, hatred, and other causes for blindness, becoming the spring for errors, misunderstandings, incongruity, and chaos: comedy's nourishment for a suspensive course of action and moments of laughter. Briefly, the deliberate fool's concept can be described by the following terms bound to the paradoxical arrangement: a carnivalesque structure, the abuse of utopian nature, all-licensed flexibility, a master of *ridiculum* through miscommunication.

The concept of the deliberate fool figure reveals a structure based on a paradox; a powerful, all-licensed lower-class member or a witty, foolish figure, the type is an available cultural entity in the aesthetic consciousness, prevailing because of its effectiveness to respond to the natural drive 'laughter'. The (sub)types discussed above confirm the concept's productivity. In the world of comedy, the deliberate type based upon the paradox pattern can even be assessed as the *signum* of comedy by incorporating its principles, the laughable, the carnivalesque, and the utopian, supporting comedy's aesthetic coherence. The type fulfils the expectation and condition of being ugly, while the ugly is reflected on the audience. In other words, the pattern makes the type functional for comedy; the figure fits comedy's coherent concept built upon *ridiculum*, carnivalesque, and the utopian nature. While this analysis focuses on the use of the deliberate fool figure's concept and its specific embedment in Plautus and Shakespeare's comedies, the paradox pattern can also be useful to approach

---

467 Preiss (2014), 4. Preiss uses the term 'clown' in the same way as fool is applied here.
468 David Turnbull, *Masons, Tricksters and Cartographers. Comparative Studies in the Sociology of Scientific and Indigenous Knowledge*, Amsterdam et al.: Hardwood Academic Publishers, 2000, 91. Compare to Rupert D.V. Glasgow, *Madness, Masks, and Laughter. An Essay on Comedy*, Cranbury, NJ et al.: Associated University Presses, 1995, 209. He puts an approach forward that underlines folly, laughter, and the fool as "exorcizing" elements, while he rephrases and compiles the call to be cautious with our knowledge and the image of ourselves to a warning or even remedy against potential antisociability in us: "The sight of the anarchist wreaking his havoc may thus unmask *us*, reveal the anarchist in *us*. This is indeed an aspect latent in all folly, whether positively and festively presented or scornfully portrayed as sin, vice, and roguery. If we all contain the capacity for evil, anarchy, and chaos, even the most outrageous of fools may be interpreted as exorcizing the potential antisociability that we recognize (perhaps only subliminally) within ourselves."
469 Cf. Teuber (1989), 244.

other manifestations of deliberate fool figures left aside here because of the playwright's limited resources and the thesis' needed and chosen focus.

With the definition of the fool figure's subtypes, comedy's schema, its principles, and the diachronic discourses in the prior chapters, it is now the aim of the following chapter to expound Plautus' *servus callidus* as a prototypical deliberate fool figure, a professional in comic entertainment. He is expected to make use of the creative freedom of utopia, juggle with illusion in the utopian nature, occupy a liminal position, favour oppositional structures and foster the production of the species of the ugly, to which he himself belongs. The chapters drawing on the corpora of comic texts investigate how the specific deliberate fool figure installs, uses, and illuminates error in pragma and discourse and thus is active on the levels of words and deeds while he is part of and aware of the ugly. To emphasize the finding of the *paradox*, each subchapter on the *servus callidus* focuses upon one incongruous pair of constituents in the concept of the type, initiating with his identity as the heroic anti-hero.

III.i-v. Plautus' *servus callidus*: a prototypical fool?

Why and to which extent can the Plautine figure be understood as a 'fool'? Why can it be considered as similar to other later "professional fools"? Why do we appreciate this type in a comedy or what makes them functional and indispensable in their use for comedy? To answer these questions thoroughly, this approach will analyse how the type of the clever slave and the elements supporting it is constructed in Plautus' intrigue comedies. The investigation is understood as a cautious retrospect working with the analysis of Plautus' plays at hand and the scholarly constructed socio-cultural background at that time. The type will be defined in its representation and in its interaction on stage, which makes it necessary to clarify how it is constructed thematically, addressed, (self-) reflected, described on stage and perceived by the audience against the foil of social-cultural nexus.[470] The analysis will therefore look at linguistic, literary and dramatic techniques that shape the figure. Finally, this approach makes it possible to pin down its aesthetic value, functionality and effectiveness for the schema of comedy.

III.i. The heroic anti-hero

The heroic concept

Before describing the heroic anti-hero in Plautus' comedy, this subchapter identifies the concept of the hero in the Greco-Roman environment, embedding it in Plautus' socio-cultural background.[471] The Greek concept of the hero must be understood in its literary designation and in the religious tradition. Both do not exclude each other but go hand in hand as it will be outlined in the following. In Homer's epic, the word *hêrôs* was not used exclusively for certain figures which would fit our present definition of a hero but in the broad meaning of "any free man".[472] In the context of war, the *Iliad* employs the word for the fighters of both sides, which suggests to translate it with 'warrior' or 'lord' though the expression was not associated with any religious connotation or with any veneration.[473] The epic poem around Akhilleus still outlines a distinct concept of heroism that defines a "heroic" character as best among the others, as "physically perfect [and] young [...] dying for fame and escaping maturation that ends his physical history in combat".[474] Although the title 'hero' was not yet used in the

---

470 For the analysis, all citations of Plautus' comedies will be taken from the following corpus published in Loeb Classical Library (LCL): Titus Maccius Plautus, *Amphitryon, The Comedy of Asses, The Pot of Gold, The Two Bacchises, The Captives*, Vol. I, transl. by Paul Nixon, Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, repr. 1997; Titus Maccius Plautus, *Casina, The Casket Comedy, Curculio, Epidicus, The Two Menaechmuses*, Vol. II, transl. by Paul Nixon, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press et al., repr. 1988; Titus Maccius Plautus, *The Merchant, The Braggart Soldier, The Gost, The Persian*, Vol. III, ed. and transl. by Wolfgang de Melo, Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2011; Titus Maccius Plautus, *The Little Carthaginian, Pseudolus, The Rope*, Vol. IV, ed. and transl. by Wolfgang de Melo, Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2012. In order to ease reading and due to economic reasons, all citations of the text will be given in justified lines without indentation. The interchange of the letters 'v' and 'u' in the editions is neglected in favour of the reader.
471 This is not and does not want to be an attempt to develop or discuss the concept's history.
472 *LSJ*, s.v. 'ἥρως'.
473 Cf. Christopher P. Jones, *New Heroes in Antiquity. From Achilles to Antinoos*, Cambridge, Mass./ London: Harvard University Press, 2010, 3-4. The *Odyssey* uses 'hero' more broadly than the *Iliad* does.
474 Miller (2000), 4-5.

present understanding, the eighth century showing cult of even anonymous *'heros'*, the prevalence of the epic including the image of Akhilleus can be retrospectively seen as giving major impulses on the later Greek concept of a hero and consequently, also as one decisive source for the European concept; though what the idea of the hero entails depends on its context and the perspective: there is the idealized or 'Hollywoodized' protagonist in movies, saving the world, or the mythological subject of worship or the tragic figure on stage or a trickster or other cultural forms and accesses to the idea.[475] In regard to antiquity, *hero* can be discovered as a complex cultural concept implying death and immortality, changing from human to the divine. It remains a significant subject in Greek cult throughout antiquity.[476] In more detail, the tragic potential of the heroic image, dying young for fame, is generically picked up and developed when "the (literally) shift from older, epic hero to hero of Greek tragedy" becomes apparent.[477] In terms of cult and ritual, the graves and monuments of the particular hero were venerated. Some were just regionally specific while some were even panhellenic. Similar to the gods, the veneration was designed with sacrifice by slaughter, having dinner together, and even *agônes*.

In the 5th century, literature offers a variation of the concept found in Pindar's victory songs. Here, the competitive character of *agônes* is combined with the notion of battle and combat.[478] One link is given when Pindar presents war and its outcome, that of Herakles against Augeas, as the foundation for the Olympic games at *Olympian* 10.43-9.[479] In accordance to the battle scenery, the athletes' performances were 'watched' by the Olympic gods addressed as belonging to the audience as well (see *Olympian* 9.1-5).[480] Battle and competition share the moment of victory. In the songs this moment of victory guarantees the athlete immortality and glorification for himself and his *polis*. So, similar to the warrior, immortality means the advancement to a semi-divine level. Pindar shows the warrior and the athlete in their comparable status "as a semi-divine being, above men, below the gods."[481]

Not only did songs deal with the relation between men and the gods, but also drama was interested in the potential embodiment of something supernatural—for example, Old Comedy developed in dependence on cult and the performance of rituals. Some scholars assume that the plots are based "on an underlying ritual matrix or model".[482] Several examples from texts show that Old Comedy refers to instances of pluralistic cult practices in the form of sacrifices, festivals, oracles, and their experiences. The tone is not always close to a hymn or

---

475 Cf. James Whitley, 'Early States and Hero Cults: A Re-Appraisal', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988): 173-182, 173-5. Eighth century showed a "contemporary interest in the Heroic World" (173). And for a differentiated view on Achill and the critical perspective on his heroic concept, note Arbogast Schmitt, 'Achill-ein Held', *Merkur* 63.724 (2009): 860-70. The figure Achill, his behaviour, and his major characteristics like his rage do not equate the concept of the ideal man, the idealized hero, but were at the centre of many discussions throughout the centuries particularly concerning moral adequacy.

476 Cf. Jean-Pierre Vernant, 'La belle mort et le cadavre outrage', *La mort, les morts dans la societés anciennes*, Gherardo Gnoli (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1982, esp. 53ff.; cf. Dean A. Miller, 'Indo-European "Bad Death" and Trifunctional Revenants', *Incognita* 1.2 (1990): 143-82; see also *DNP* (*Der Neue Pauly*), 'Heroenkult', 476-479.

477 Miller (2000), 6-7.

478 For a detailed but rather narrative overview of the rituals, events and institutions inheriting the sense of *agôn,* see Helmut Berve, *Gestaltende Kräfte der Antike*, München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1966, 1-20.

479 Cf. Anne Pippin Burnett, *Pindar*, London: Cristol Classical Press, 2008, 18-20, esp. 19.

480 *Ibid*., 16-17.

481 Miller (2000), 3, and cf. 5.

482 Scott Scullion, 'Religion and the Gods in Greek Comedy', *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014, 340-355, 349. Here, Scullion relies on the studies of Bowie (1993 and 2000).

to nostalgia but can be disrespectful. It can resemble slapstick to create laughter, which allows the scholar to recognize a potential for ambiguity.[483] The 'critical' or sceptical perspective does not automatically state any evidence that belief in gods or cult practices decreased in seriousness or traditional piety drastically in those days. Comedy cannot be assumed to be a neutral source when it comes to the treatment of tradition and society's attitude towards it. Nevertheless, it must be noticed that religious worshipping faced a change and a phase of regression starting with the Peloponnesian War. Enlightenment split society more decisively into two groups of dealing with religious matter, the intellectuals and the "popular mind […] choos[ing] their own gods".[484] Rationalism disclosed religious practices as forms of superstition, granting its supporters freedom, but also caused reactions of insecurity of how to cope with traditions and their rejection.[485] The position of comedy in that situation of conflict is unique and somehow peculiar since the comic discourse offers a balance between moments of ridiculing and defending religion. Comic poets seemed to play the role of a guardian of religious traditions, who allowed the spectators a relief from religious conduct but assaulted every serious opponent.[486] How comedy addresses traditions should thus be taken cautiously as a (potentially) ambiguous image of society's attitude and treatment of those. The constitutive cultural material, here of cult, is productive in the specific literary space regardless its interpretation. That is also valid for New Comedy, which pursues the references to Greek cult and its traditions in accordance to the working of morals in the plays.[487] In other words, it depicts the religious concept in relevance to the synchronic socio-cultural environment and the changed, idiosyncratic structure of the genre.

In general, both, Old and New Comedy, prompt a witty and ironic space, upon which cultural material of rituals and myth from feasts and festivals can be projected.[488] The heroic cult is part of this "inherited conglomerate"[489] and present in the imagery, epithets given to figures, connotations, mythic allusions, and associated socio-cultural themes as *agônes*. Due to the programmatic closeness and the access to Greek culture, Roman culture became familiar with these uses and images.[490] For instance, the cult of Herakles was transferred from Greece to Rome.[491] The similarity of both religious 'systems' facilitated such imports for the Romans and the assimilation of both religious complexes over time.[492] Both complexes had pluralism as a decisive feature, which was also geographically and socially determined; it is,

---

483 Cf. Scullion (2014), 340, 341ff, esp. 343, 345. Scullion refers e.g. to Strepsiades' experiences at the festival Diasia in *The Clouds* and the story of a roasted haggis that then explodes (341), which uses means of exaggeration and the inappropriate, unexpected outcome of explosion; and he mentions the examples of two other festivals identified as "antiquated" in *The Clouds* (343-4). In contrast, *The Clouds* also show the "lovely hymn […] in praise of holy Athens" (345) at 299-313, although the progress of the play will turn it into an explosion of sophistry. The nostalgic atmosphere is only superficial.
484 Eric R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1951, 193.
485 Cf. *Ibid.*, 188-89.
486 Cf. Wilhelm Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Sokrates*, Stuttgart: Alfred Körner Verlag, ²1975, 456ff.
487 Kathleen McCarthy, *Slaves, Master, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000, 59, ft. 48. New Comedy showed a preference for superhuman, diffused power.
488 Scullion (2014), 353.
489 Gilbert Murray and Richard Winn Livingstone (eds.), *The Legacy of Greece*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947, 66-67.
490 Netta Zagagi, *Tradition and Originality in Plautus. Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980, 67.
491 Liv. 9.29.9 (*ad Aram Maximam Herculis*) an example for the presence of the cult in Rome around 300 BCE.
492 Manfred Fuhrmann, *Die Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 1999, 27-29.

however, hard to define the boundaries of Roman religion(s) in the Republican Age. It should be understood as internally pluralistic in the Mediterranean area.[493]

In conclusion, religion and epic designate a rich concept of a hero, a free man close to the Gods, central to rituals, showing a competitive notion and in general, representing one key concept aiming to describe humans within their religious, social and cultural structures. The understanding of this concept of the hero, its accompanying cultural context and the knowledge and interest of the ideal audience allow evaluating the following section. It describes the function and effect when Plautus' *servus callidus* participates in the conglomerate and is consumed as a heroic anti-hero. What the term *hero* relates to in antiquity has been outlined. So, the antithetic concept of the anti-hero is still missing and will be explained in regard to the Plautine type of *servus callidus*.

The slave, an anti-hero

The second part of the title, 'anti-hero', is quite prominent since the social class of the figure does not suggest itself for the epitome of being a hero, especially if the Homeric use of the word is taken into account. The figure is not a free man, but a slave. Homer denotes the slave as a "half a man" and Aristotle describes him as "a living tool".[494] In Roman society, the slave is not regarded an animate subject but more an object deprived of rights and listed among the *res mancipi*.[495] In the plays, the attitude towards slaves as socially inferior is regularly issued and affirmed in the address and reference to the type. Usual adjectives are e.g. *malus*, *stultus* or *maleficus*. Swear words or offensive words like *carnufex* (*Bacch*. 785), *mastigia* (*Most*. 1; *Rud*. 1022), *verbero* (*Most*. 1132), *verbeream statuam* (*Pseud*. 911), *verbereum caput* (*Pers*. 184), *scelerum caput* (*Bacch*. 829; *Pseud*. 446), *plagigera genera hominum* (*Pseud*. 153) and many more are not seldom.[496] The colloquial diction emphasizes the figure's low status.

Still, the type is a slave but marked as *callidus*, which he proves by his abilities to conduct plans, take significant decisions for the course of the plot, and to handle tricky situations. This characteristic of being wily enables the slave to design manipulations to trick the other characters, often the figure of *senex*. In that function, the figure resembles a trickster. Following that similarity, Chrysalus equals himself to Odysseus at *Bacch*. 940. Indeed, Odysseus himself can be thought as a trickster type of the first hour.[497] In fact, the *Iliad* knows

---

493 Cf. Jörg Rüpke, 'Roman Religion', *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Harriet I. Flower (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 179-196, 179.

494 Hom. *Od.* 17.322-323; Aristot. *pol.* 1.1253b29.

495 Cf. Segal (1968), 102ff.; cf. Peter P. Spranger, *Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1961, 65. In legal terms, the slave does not have a family tree; nor can he refer to a homeland. The approach towards slavery by legislation, however, differed from jurisdiction as well as philosophy, whose two parties mostly voted for perceiving slaves as human and equally capable in terms of intellect, morals, and other human characteristics (cf. William L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1955, esp. 116ff.). Also note the impacts of Stoicism on Roman jurisdiction and the question of equality, accompanied by voices in Latin literature arguing for mercy, humanity, and equity in the treatment of slaves like Seneca did, see Miriam T. Griffin, *Seneca. A Philosopher in Politics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976; in the Renaissance, Grotius pursued Seneca's considerations, cf. John W. Cairns, 'Stoicism, slavery, and law', *Grotiana* (*Grotius and the Stoa*) 22/23 (2001/2): 197-232, esp. 210ff.

496 Cf. Albert Müller, 'Die Schimpfwörter in der Römischen Komödie', *Philologus* 72 (1913): 492-502, esp. 492-4 for a list of how masters address slaves.

497 Cf. Miller (2000), 242; see Zagagi (1980), 63. For the Greeks, Odysseus served as a proverbial reference for craftiness.

two 'tricksters', the already mentioned Odysseus and a character whose name Dolon can be translated as meaning 'trickster'. At least, Odysseus can be considered to belong to the category of a trickster if trickster is defined in the broad and more presently-understood term of a figure deceiving someone.[498] But none of them can be considered as the prototype of the 'trickster' comparative religion studies and anthropology gave shape in the previous century.[499] It was concretized as a transcultural phenomenon active in myth and related narrative genres and that is "often in animal form or disguise but possessing (at the other contradictory extreme) divine or semi-divine powers, who 'plays' and yet creates - something."[500] Like the concept of the hero, the trickster is situated in the context of ritual and religious tradition. Here, it provides a link to the supernatural and allegorically denotes chaos and change. Due to these characteristics, it seems to perfectly fit in the comic space representing confusion and inversion.[501]

When the trickster is positioned in comedy, it offers itself as a contra-figure to the epic and tragic hero. The trickster hides in the shadow and plays a deceiving game while the hero openly outrages and faces the *agôn*.[502] Thus, the identification as playing with the other and destabilizing former order fits the figure of the *servus callidus* and reveals the figure of *servus callidus* as a foil to a hero or in other words, the 'anti-hero' full of *malitia*. The social rank of a slave supports this contradictory position and allows the figure a position that comes close to an outsider standing at some distance from the stage, which provides him with a helicopter perspective. The paradoxical structure of the heroic anti-hero becomes clear when a *servus callidus*, Chrysalus in *Bacchides*, does not accept to be an 'anti-hero': *Hunc hominem decet auro expendi, huic decet statuam statui ex auro* (*Bacch.* 640).

These two parallel structured sentences demand the honouring of a man who must have achieved such great things so that only the most worthy material, *aurum*, is sufficient to reward him. He should get as much gold as his body weighs and a statue that reminds people of his glorious deeds and him for all time.[503] Accordingly, the image of a hero comes to mind when such honours seem to be decent, since *decet* underlines social and moral adequateness, here those of the man's achievements.[504] The slave Chrysalus compares his deeds to those of a hero. In Plautus' day, building a statue for military honours was not something unusual but a golden one was absolutely not common and extremely farfetched for the Romans in this period.[505] Even in the context of *fabula palliata*, a slave who tricks his master was not

---

498 See Hom. *Il*. IX.313. Akhilleus' accusation of Odysseus' speech as Odysseus is said to hold something back and utter something else instead.

499 Cf. Miller (2000), 242-3. He relies on the overview by Robert P. Delton, *The Trickster in West Africa. A Study of Mythic Irony and Sacred Delight*, Berkeley: University California Press, 1980, 1-24.

500 *Ibid.*, 243. And see D. Bynum, *The Daemon in the Wood. A Study of Oral Narrative Patterns.* Center for Study of Oral Literature. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978, 162ff.

501 *Ibid.*, 255.

502 *Ibid.*, 241-242.

503 The second part of the honouring is highlighted by the *figura etymologica* of *statuam statui*.

504 *Decet* can be understood as the demand since it 'suits' or as a conditional one that is translated by it 'would suit'. But according to the following passages and open declarations of success and praise, the indicative should be more likely.

505 Cf. Titus Maccius Plautus, *Bacchides*, ed. with transl. and commentary by John Barsby, Warminster et al.: Aris & Philipps et al., 1986, 152. Since the self-glorification is linked to *spolia* (*Bacch.* 641) and clearly set in a military scenery (comp. *Bacch.* 925ff.), the statue is probably meant as a reward for achievements of a general. Livius tells us about giving statues to generals for the triumphs earlier than Plautus' working period (Liv. 9.43.22: *Marcius de Hernicis triumphans in urbem rediit statuaque equestris in foro decreta est*). Even less worthy material than gilt was not used for the statues until the end of the republic (Cic. *Phil.* 5.41); and see John Arthur Hanson, 'The Glorious Military', *Roman Drama*, Thomas A. Dorey and Donald R. Dudley (eds.), London: Routledge & Kegan

considered an adequate candidate for such honours. There is nobody in the play who is capable or willing to weigh him up in gold and building a statue. The emphasis and repetition of the material *aurum* add to the inappropriateness and hubris of the demand, as if just a statue was not enough. Besides, the mentioning of gold as an award might hint at the 200 *nummis* Nicobulus is driven to pay.

In contrast to his status as the *auctor* of the deceiving plan and the potential addressee of these honours, he does not use the first-person pronoun but he refers to himself in the form of the third person by using the demonstrative pronoun, *hunc* and *huic*, which is repeated in its syntactically appropriate form at the beginning of both sentences. It is not hard to imagine Chrysalus standing in the middle of the stage and pointing at himself with exaggerated gestures when he is emphasizing *hunc* and *huic*. He appears as the mediator of a demand for himself in the third person, which pretends to be a formal announcement without any official addressee. The *deixis* expected here is ignored and can be perceived as artificial and contradictory to the situation. He makes the suggestion in a public space, while he is totally ignoring the public concept of a hero. A picture of an unrealistic demand, its formal texture, but an informal context make Chrysalus' speech deliberately ridiculous. The clever slave stands in antithesis to the type of the impostor since he is not a genuine *miles gloriosus*, who can be classified as a natural fool since he believing in his exaggerations fails to recognize the taunting responses towards his persona and his resulting reputation among the others. The clever slave does not intend to brag mainly on the interpersonal level since he does not impress the others on stage by such soliloquies but addresses the mock-heroic to the audience as a thematic veil of the trickery.

The audience was probably not supposed to and certainly did not believe in his seriousness but received the ironic distance between the demand and its quality emphasized in its form. These verses exemplify a typical perspective on the witty slave categorized as a servant and inheriting a low status while he claims honours of high status.[506] Chrysalus deliberately creates a paradoxical tension between his social status and the artificial picture of himself drawn in these verses. This paradox is not objectionable but decodable for the audience recognizing the irony. Chrysalus miming the impostor offers scenes that are rich in inversion and dissimulation.[507] The slave is proud of his brilliant plans but he is clever enough to know about their triviality and their immorality. Crudely, he speaks differently from what he is and knows.[508]

The tension provides the potential for *ridiculum* since he offers himself as a target for the ridiculous and laughter. He works with the motif of mock heroic; this technique is common

---

Paul, 1965, 51-85, 56, esp. on the attitude towards gold statues and the practices of honouring in Rome in third century B.C.

506 Further examples: *Most*. 775-782 (military theme); *Pers*. 753-62 (military theme); *Pseud*. 574-92; *Curc*. 439-48 (military theme); *Epid*. 160-165, 675-7; *Mil*. 215-28, 1025 (*Ilium accedi*), 1160-61.

507 Cf. Wirth (2017), esp. 16-18. For Cicero, there are two modes of irony: inversion (*inversio*), the opposite of the actual, and dissimulation (*dissimulatio*), which affects the whole speech and acting. Besides Cicero (*de orat*. 2.269), note Quint. *Inst*. 9.2.44 (*contrarium ei quod dicitur intelligendum est*) as a generally accepted definition (found in dictionaries) of the term 'irony' as a rhetorical device. Also note Quint. *Inst*. 6.2.15, 8.6.54ff. (on allegory) and 9.2.44ff. (distinguishing between trope and figure).

508 "A crude definition of an ironic statement would define the meaning as *opposite to* what is said, but it is better to conceive of the meaning of an ironic statement as *different from* what is said, not exclusively or even necessarily its opposite." Ellen O'Gorman, *Irony and Misreading in the Annals of Tacitus*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 11.

for the type *servus callidus* if Plautine intrigue comedies are considered in average.[509] Plautus' heroic anti-hero develops his self-confidence and skills to triumph, at which Chrysalus seems to be best. The series of "heroic badness"—as Anderson terms it—starts with *Asinaria* containing a minor influential and pre-form of the protagonist *servus callidus*, whose triumphs occur rather as an episode than thematically continuously over the play; the series pursues with *Miles gloriosus*, whose *servus callidus* does not give a *laudatio* on himself right away, but is addressed and described by his allies with the rank of a senate and military dignity.[510] The increase of the thematic configuration, the heroic anti-hero, suggests that the audience reacted positively to the comic triumphing remarks and whole scenes and made the mock-heroic a fixed element in Plautus' concept of the *servus callidus*.

Regarding the sum of Plautus' intrigue comedies involving a *servus callidus*, the mock-heroic method is framed in a military,[511] divine,[512] political, and patriarchal scenery implicating high status and deriving from socio-cultural Roman institutions.[513] Here, the military theme has an exclusive position since only the slave figures make use of it to characterize themselves and their task in the scene.[514] For instance, after Pistoclerus assures his friend of some divine might that will come to their rescue, Chrysalus directly appears and seems to be this divine aid by the dramatic sequence. When Pistoclerus announces Chrysalus' coming on stage to Mnesichlochus by calling him *tuam copiam* (*Bacch*. 639), his description of Chrysalus accords to the image and the thematic configuration of a hero sent by divinity. Furthermore, *copia* referring to the plan and help by Chrysalus, designates a military force. In *Bacchides*, Chrysalus intensively expresses the mock heroic by installing military imagery and alluding to grand heroic narratives.

---

509 Cf. Zagagi (1980), 15ff. In regard to mock heroic in general, monologue openings in Plautus's comedies often set the actions of a mythological hero in ridiculing opposition to those of the comic figure. Eduard Fraenkel identified this form of deprecation as originally Plautine. See p. 124-5 for a critical discussion of Fraenkel's finding.

510 William S. Anderson, *Barbarian Play. Plautus' Roman Comedy*, Toronto et al.: University of Toronto Press, 1993, 98ff. Though, the upside-down status of master and slave is greatly demonstrated in *Asinaria* bearing some reminiscences to Chrysalus' inappropriate demands when Libanus wants a statue and an altar (cf. Laurence L. Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, London et al.: T & T Clark International, 2005, 173-74).

511 The theme of military can represent a sort of spirit of the age, the early Roman Republic, and beginning expansion and period of military conflict. Military performance and honouring was definitely a socially present issue. See Hanson (1956), 57ff.

512 See Chrysalus in *Bacch*. 892ff. swears on gods; in other comedies: *Pers*. 251ff. sacral diction, *Asin*. 545ff. he calls to *perfidia*. The slave makes use of the gods when swearing to them. This method of mocking is no taboo, but is part of the cultural perspective. The paradoxical tension is recognized but accepted as a common mechanism. Divine order and comic order are aligned. See McCarthy (2000), 58 ft. 47 and Duckworth (1952), 295ff. On the image of the slave as a god, see Erich Segal, *Scholarship on Plautus 1965-1976. The Classical World* 74.7, Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University, 1981, 132-36.

513 Other framing besides military: slave as a ruler e.g. when Tranio describes himself worthy of the position of a ruler (*Most*. 775-77) and simultaneously, introduces the image of *mulienos mulos clitellarios*, which collides with the heroic status of the former named ruler figures and makes Tranio's comparison apparently ridiculous and inapt; *Bacch*. 638-9; slave as linked to divinity: *Epid*. 675, *Asin*. 712f. (application to divinity; statue), *Bacch*. 652 (*multipotens*); slave's cognitive performance in planning the intrigue as the congregation of the senate: *Epid*. 159 (*senatum consiliarium*), *Most*. 688; *Bacch*. 1072-3: Chrysalus negates to triumph again, to glorify his deeds and success even more. He seems to break with the former motif now the plan has succeeded; it is a clear example for the unpredictability of the slave and that he tends to turn to his own stereotypical construction. See also Niall W. Slater, *Plautus in Performance. The Theatre of the Mind*, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, ²2000, 92-3. It is an example of "*paraprosdokeion* joke" (92).

514 Greek and Latin literature show an extensive use of the military metaphor applied to love and love affairs. See Alfons Spies, *Militat omnis amans: Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*, Diss. Tübingen, 1930.

After the above-mentioned hyperbolic demand for a statue, he goes on in his pride and reasons the rewards for himself: *nam duplex hodie facinus feci, duplicibus spoliis sum adfectus* (*Bacch.* 641). Again, the sentences are structured as parallels and have a somewhat anaphoric beginning. The structure as well as the equivalence of *duplex* and *duplicibus* can be interpreted to relate back to the twofold honouring.[515] But ironically, all his efforts have been useless since Mnesilochus gave his father all the money back because of some misunderstanding in love affairs between the mistress and his best friend. For the audience, Chrysalus' former self-praise must have been hilarious as they know at that point in the play that his plan does not bear any fruit. Consequently, two layers stand in contradiction to the heroic concept after all. Not only does the social status of Chrysalus negate the heroic picture, but also the dramatic irony of the presumable success and actual failure of Chrysalus. These two features work for the moment of *ridiculum*. Thus, the honouring of the 'self-announced' hero is completely eroded by these means and gives access to the ridiculous.

Nevertheless, the heroic scenery is extended when Chrysalus considers his next deception or *fabrica*. The exaggerating depiction of the endeavour, tricking the master, is set behind the thematic background of military:

De ducentis nummis primum intendam ballistam in senem;
ea ballista si pervortam turrim et propugnacula,
recta porta invadam extemplo in oppidum anticum et vetus:
si id capso, geritote amicis vostris aurum corbibus
(*Bacch.* 709-12)

Chrysalus uses the style of military impact and metaphorically expresses the discourse of trickery by a battlefield setting. He uses military vocabulary simulating an attack (*intendam ballistam*)[516] and aims at *senex,* who is replaced by a geographic place to be conquered, *oppidum anticum et vetus*. 'The old city' is meant to be Troy, which must be strategically captured as he explains Mnesilochus: first *turrim et propugnacula*, and secondly, *recta porta*. Goods will again be the expected sum of *aurum* (*ducentis nummis*) and even beyond in *corbibus*. Here, Chrysalus' original status as a slave, who usually receives orders, opposes the picture of a successful *imperator*. He represents army and leader in one person. Thus, he designs himself as the military hero, who manages even almost unthinkable and impossible missions like a kamikaze (*insanum magnum molior negotium*, *Bacch.* 761).

Pseudolus describes his intrigue pretty similar since he is prepared for the enemy (*hostibus* 580; *inimicum* 584) and his troops (*copias* 579; *meas legiones* 586; *meum exercitum* 587) will conquer (*capiatur* 585a) the old city (*oppidum hoc vetus* 587). This achievement is socially demanded and simultaneously secures him *memoria* since "*magna [eum] facinora decet efficere quae post [ei] clara et diu clueant*" (*Pseud.* 590-91).[517] The military metaphor of the slave's plan deploys and enriches the concept of the hero as it constructs the narrative background for heroic homage. Hence, Chrysalus pursues the foregrounding of the heroic concept and simultaneously, the nourishing of *ridiculum*.

---

515 Cf. Barsby (1986), 152. The passage might have stood later in the play as some argue that no double deception has happened so far, but only the first.
516 Milphio in *Poenulus* uses *ballista* and *ballistario* to describe his plan to 'destroy' Lycus (*Poen.* 201-02).
517 *Cluere* is used in Chrysalus' Trojan song, here in the form of *cluent*, to refer to the glory of the *Atridae*.

The Trojan song

In *Bacchides*, the heroic concept reaches a highlight in the mythological comparison of Chrysalus' witty planning to Troy's fall:[518]

> *Atridae duo fratres cluent fecisse facinus maxumum,*
> *quom Priami patriam Pergamum divina moenitum manu*
> *armis, equis, exercitu atque eximiis bellatoribus*
> *mille cum numero navium decumo anno post subegerunt.*
> *non pedibus termento fuit praeut ego erum expugnabo meum*
> *sine classe sineque exercitu et tanto numero militum.*
> *[cepi, expugnavi amanti erili filio aurum ab suo patre][519]*
> *nunc prius quam huc senex venit, libet lamentari dum exeat.*
> *o Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex,*
> *qui misere male mulcabere quadrigentis Philippis aureis.*
> *nam ego has tabellas obsignatas consignatas quas fero*
> *non sunt tabellae, sed equos quem misere Achivi ligneum.*
> *[Epiust Pistoclerus: ab eo haec sumptae; Mnesilochus Sino est*
> *relictus, ellum: non in busto Achilli, sed in lecto accubat;*
> *Bacchidem habet secum: ille olim habuit ignem qui signum*
> *daret,*
> *nunc ipsum exurit; ego sum Ulixes, cuius consilio haec gerunt.][520]*
> *tum quae hic sunt scriptae litterae, hoc in equo insunt milites*
> *armati atque animati probe. ita res successit mi usque adhuc.*
> *atque hic equos non in arcem, verum in arcam faciet impetum.*
> *exitium excidium exlecebra fiet hic equos hodie auro senis.*
> *nostro seni huic stolido, ei profecto nomen facio ego Ilio;*
> *miles Menelaust, ego Agamemno, idem Ulixes Lartius,*
> *Mnesilochust Alexander, qui erit exitio rei patriae suae;*
> *is Helenam avexit, cuia causa nunc facio obsidium Ilio.*
> *nam illi itidem Ulixem audivi, ut ego sum, fuisse et audacem et malum:*
> (*Bacch.* 925-49)

It introduces *Atridae*, the two sons of Atreus, using a patronym to refer to Agamemnon and Menelaus. That notion is typical of epic and tragic style. Their aim, Troy, is depicted in an alliterate triplet *Priami patriam Pergamum* that emphasizes Priamus as the leader, Pergamum as the 'heart' of the city referring to the citadel and the epithet of being home. The following list of military force, which conquered Troy, again displays a partly alliterate itemisation, *armis, **e**quis, **e**xercitu atque **e**ximiis bellatoribus* (927), and shows epic references since *mille*

---

518 Fraenkel's opinion that Chrysalus' 'downgrading' of the Trojan War stems from Plautus' feather in origin has been heavily discussed. Zagagi's detailed and convincing analysis shows it to be Plautus' application of a long-term motif. For instance, besides the *Nea*, the glorification by the depreciation of the Trojan War was also a common technique in Attic Oratory. See Zagagi (1980), 24, 61-64.

519 Paul Nixon giving a critical note on v. 931 departs from the version of Leo bracketing the verse. Note Titus Maccius Plautus, *Plauti Comoediae*, Friedrich Leo (ed.), Berlin. Weidmann, 1895.

520 Paul Nixon giving a critical note on v. 937-40 departs from the version of Leo bracketing the verses (Leo [1895]).

cum numero orientates itself at the poetic usual of 1000 ships for the quantity of the fleet.[521] The *canticum* here imitates epic style and alludes to a heroic atmosphere. The ideal audience could probably have recognized the narrative of the heroic destiny, related to tragedy's and epic depictions, whose original pathos now declines to the comic domain.[522] Already the first word of the verses makes the reference clear by introducing *Atridae*. But the *canticum* is set in the comedic space, transforming Chrysalus' heroic images into the motif of mock heroic.

According to Chrysalus, this long, mostly asyndetic and climactic enumeration of means Agamemnon and his brother Menelaus had at hand when they conquered Troy at last after ten years seems ridiculously handy in contrast to his enterprise and support. Ironically, he contrasts only his persona, who must deal with the situation practically *sine omnibus*, with the might of the Greek army at that time; this is highlighted by the repetition of *sine* and the list.[523] Troy's conquering seems simple and easy in comparison to his plan. The heroic atmosphere is intruded roughly by colloquial diction when *pedibus termento* reads itself like a proverb, which seems to connect the hard work over time to the physical act of walking a long distance.[524] Literally, the degree of injury and hardship is minimized to the little blister of the feet in comparison to Chrysalus' engagement and 'hard work'. This evaluation is absolutely contradictory and absurd concerning the former immense list of soldiers, material, and time.

His undermining is undeniable when Chrysalus announces the song to *lamentari*. An ironic and even sarcastic version of an elegiac song follows that foreshadows Chrysalus' planning as well as sums up his latest 'attack'.[525] That is the case when Chrysalus' parallel and repeated form of exclamation resembles tragic style like in Ennius' Andromache "*o pater, o patria, o Priami*" (*scaen*. 99).[526] It simulates grief that Priamus/Nicobulus will be driven into catastrophe. The lamenting seems to have an even sarcastic undertone since Chrysalus himself is responsible for the 'ruin'. In fact, he is full of joy and restless expectation about his soon triumph (*triumphent milites* [972]; *oppidum expugnavero* [977]). In comparison to the beginning of Chrysalus' *canticum*, the triplet of Troy, *Priamum, patria*, and *Pergamum* is repeated but is now subverted in the exclamation and supposed lamenting in v. 933. It can be 'translated' as the *senex* and the money needed and tricked. Consequently, it can be stated that the former arrangement and resemblance to an epic and tragic atmosphere is now dismantled again.

The same intruding or defect can be detected in the alliterative *tricolon*, destruction (*exitium*), death (*excidium*), and deticement (*exlecebra*) stemming from epic and tragic style.[527] But *exlecebra* destructs the pathetic announcement as it imitates the alliterate

---

521 Cf. Barsby (1986), 173. Homer writes of 1186 ships at *Il*. 2.494-759 and Thycydides mentions 1200 (1.10.4). 1000 ships are given by Aesch. *Ag*. 45 and become the "symbolic" number (see Verg. *Aen*. 2.198; Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* 1328).

522 See Gernhardt's term "*Fallhöhe*" as "*den Absturz des einst Ernsten, Erhabenen ins Komische*" (Balzter [2013], 52).

523 Cf. Zagagi (1980), 61: "the glorious victories of the Athenians during the Persian Wars" (Demosth. *Epit*. 10-11).

524 Cf. Barsby (1986), 173, ft. 929. There is not any other source known that shows this proverbial expression. Nevertheless, the effect of absurdity and ridiculing remains the same strengthened by the stylistic disruption.

525 Cf. Richard B. Rutherford, *Greek Tragic Style. Form, Language and Interpretation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

526 Barsby (1986), 173, ft. 933. cf. Cic. *Tusc*. 3.44; mythological comparison and parody as a two-voiced discourse.

527 Cf. *Ibid*., 175, ft. 944; and note the meaning of the prefix *ex-* here underlining a process of change and separation (out, away) in the compounds, which alludes to the removal of money, the temporary decrease of the master's authority, and a 'generational shift'. Cf. *OLD*, s.v. 'ex-'.

sequence of *ex-* and stands in analogy to *elecebra* and *elicere*. *Elecebra* involves the tricking of money and also hints at buying out both sisters.[528] *Elecebra* and the verb *elicere* both do not foster the image of the military battlefield but emphasize the battle of wit and the task of tricking the master. Plautus uses seemingly pathetic triplets, which reveal themselves in the last part as undoing that pathos and show themselves as the punchline in the comic sense. Similarly, the triplet and alliteration of **m**isere **m**ale **m**ulcabere is reminiscent of the sound of whimpering. But in contrast to pitying his *erum*, the last of the three words inserts the profane in a 'prosodic' word play since Nicobulus will be either beaten up or made to pay up.

The work with epic elements is present in the parallels of roles in the play with mythological figures. Mnesilochus is compared to Sinon while his surroundings are coloured by *luxuria* and that of sexual longing, replacing the elegiac atmosphere of Achilles' grave when *busto* is replaced by *lecto*. Furthermore, the burning *signum* is subverted in transferring it to the sexual inflammation of the young master. Simultaneously, Mnesilochus is Paris to foreshadow the fall of the old master or Ilion one more time. The echoic pun of *arcem* and *arcam* brings the two objects of interest prosodically as close together as they are apart from each other in regard to meaning and value. Another link on the prosodic level can be found between *stolido* and *Ilio*, which are also comparable by their parallel syntactical position. The rhyme merges an adjective and a noun in an absurd constellation. [529]

In sum, the Trojan song is rich in absurd and ridiculous comparisons between the Homeric epic poem and the slave's perspective on the plot and its characters. To achieve that, Chrysalus uses absurd metaphors, makes allusions to epic scenes and characters on the prosodic and verbal level, and inserts epic vocabulary in comic atmosphere.[530] The clever slave turns the plot of 'an unruly slave tricking his master' into scenes of boasting about great achievements. There is a striking contrast between the cluster of scripts like 'slave', 'unruly' or 'comedic' and the scripts 'hero', 'honour' or 'tragic'. The *servus callidus* dissimulates badness in a seemingly elegic song while constructing a second scenery playfully since his self-portrait and that of his surrounding are significantly different from his original role.[531] The eiron acting as a braggart reveals the tragic and epic material in the context of comedy as unstable on the semantic level. To the audience, the ironist 'performs' the "divergence in sense between utterance (*quae dicuntur*) and the unsaid (*quae sentias*)".[532] The names of Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses, the grandness of tragedy and the heroic epic collapse and are revealed as jocious hyperboles and comic triviality. The scenes of mock heroic therefore contain irony as self-irony and 'contextual' irony, wherein construction and deconstruction are steadily interchanged. Chrysalus makes use of the comic versatility of what is said and meant and simultaneously, of what is seen and created. The audience watches two personae: Chrysalus, a comic slave projecting unto himself an identity of a tragic hero, interconnects the

---

528 *Elecebra* (the woman that elicits money, a courtesan) as well at Plaut. *Men*. 377; moreover, it is related to *illecebra/illectus* (attraction, alluring) used in the form of a word play at *Bacch*. 55, the adjective *illecebrosus* (seductive) can be found at *Bacch*. 87.

529 The Trojan song is not only a potpourri of mock heroic and paradoxical monody but a dramaturgic summary of the so far happened course of action. The mythological comparison (*tria fata* 956) resumes the deceptive plan, Chrysalus' nearly punishment and foreshadows the tricking of the last 200 *nummi Philippi*. The witty slave displays himself in the superior position and in his advantage of knowledge to the audience, reporting and commenting on the prior action.

530 The metaphors move outside convention and solvability for the spectator's categories of knowledge.

531 Cf. Cic. *de orat*. 2.269, *severe ludas*. This is important as there is transparency to the audience. The context of comedy leaves no doubt about the slave's enthusiasm and playful seriousness.; and cf. O'Gorman (2000), 11.

532 *Ibid.*, 11.

style of the braggart with the talent of the eiron: a performance operating on different levels, which challenges the audience to (de)construct the illusion.[533]

The slave's method of mock heroic

The method of mock heroic seems to glorify the *servus callidus* and cast the slave in a heroic role. Eduard Fraenkel argues that this application of the motif is a Plautine idiosyncrasy.[534] But this analysis follows Netta Zagagi, who demanded that the whole Greek background must be

[533] Irony or applying irony was a controversial topic in antiquity: a useful rhetorical device or a source for errors. To name some negative qualities, irritation, pretense, and dangerously deluding tricks were ascribed to a Sophist's training in rhetorics. This study focuses on the use of irony as a rhetorical device as well as on the figure of the eiron and an ironic perspective as an effective means of contrast and duality. In theatre, the eiron or the trickster, who is not obliged to speak truthfully, can expose the other as well as his own mask and radically transform the perspective on the world by making the other recognize his or her own ignorance (this consequence is not unlike that of Socratic irony, but Socratic irony entails understatement and modesty). See Wirth (2017), 16. See ch. on the eiron and Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 1108a, the alazon and the eiron are opposed to truthfulness.

In poetological terms, irony represents an instrument to image the world in a constant change of creation and destruction (note Schlegel's terms of *Selbstschöpfung* and *Selbstvernichtung* in regard to existence). Irony is a grey area, which operates in the spectrum of joke and earnestness, where the self is constructed and moves within conventional frames, while it is negated and drops out of these frames. Irony shows an epistemic function that invites the reader and spectator to dissolve the disorder of frames, roles, narratives, styles, etc.; the dissolvement can be eased by the means of humour. For the recipient, detecting and trying to understand irony can offer a revealing perspective on the world. The act of detecting *inversio* and *dissimulatio* means a challenge to recognize the violation of rhetoric principles, which reveals irony as a "*Grenzphänomen des Verstehens*" (Uwe Wirth, *Diskursive Dummheit. Abduktion und Komik als Grenzphänomene des Verstehens*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1999, esp. 58ff. [a detailed analysis of how stupidity relates to comic, the joke, and irony]); see ch. Miscommunication.

For this study, irony in verbal and non-verbal discourse can be applied as a dual contrastive reference to the self that permanently challenges the interpretor to 'order' the entangled layers of frames or illusion or to realize that irony negates coherence and invites arbitrariness, incomprehensibility, and uncontrollability (linked to Schlegel's "*permanente Parekbase*" [Friedrich von Schlegel, *Philosophische Lehrjahre (1796-1806). Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, Ernst Behler (ed.), Vol. 18, München et al.: Schönigh, 1963, 85] and de Man's destructive power of irony). In theatre, generating and breaking frames confront the spectator or the observer with 'interleaved' fictive layers with reality or 'truth'. An ironic perspective on theatre's constant duality discovers its ephemeral nature, attacking the assumption of the 'reliable' self at the same time. See ch. Illuminating the illusion. Cf. Wirth (2017), esp. 16-18; on E.T.A. Hoffmann's application of humour and irony, see Johannes F. Lehmann, 'Humor/Ironie/Komik', *E.T.A. Hoffmann Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, Christina Lubkoll and Harald Neumeyer (eds.), Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2015, 379-383; cf. 'The Concept of Irony' in Paul de Man, *Aesthetic Ideology*, Andrzej Warminski (ed.), Minneapolis (et al.): University of Minnesota Press, ³2002, 163–184 and *Id.*, *The Paul de Man Notebooks*, Martin McQillan (ed.), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014, esp. 147-151; on 'romantic' irony and Friedrich Schlegel's view, see Kazuko Yamagushi, 'Das romantische Erhabene', *Ästhetische Subjektivität. Romantik & Moderne*, Lothar Knatz and Tanehisa Otabe (eds.), Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005, 124-136, esp. 134-35; on the influence of Schlegel's view on irony, its influence (discussed by de Man) and the permanent parabasis, cf. Marika Müller, *Die Ironie. Kulturgeschichte und Textgestalt*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1995, esp. 32ff., 53ff., 63-65 and cf. Miriam Haller, *Das Fest der Zeichen. Schreibweisen des Festes im modernen Drama*, Köln et al.: Böhlau, 2002, 168ff., 245ff.; exemplifying irony's functioning in art, see Linda Hutcheon, *Irony's Edge. The Theory and Politics of Irony*, London/New York: Routledge, 1995, esp. 135-152 ('The signs of the beast—in context'); for Goffman's social theory, see Erving Goffman, *The Gofman Reader*, Charles C. Lemert and Ann Branaman (eds.), Malden, Mass.: Blackwell et al., ²2001, esp. xlvff., 73ff. and 95ff.

[534] Cf. Eduard Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1922 and see *Id.*, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, transl. by F. Munari, Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1960, 178ff.; and cf. Zagagi (1980), 15-6.

examined and taken into account to give a reliable proposition whether this method is Plautine in its origins.[535] Prescott and Law were the first to seek Greek equivalents for that method outside Attic Comedy and questioned Fraenkel's argument. After a profound analysis of mythological hyperboles, Zagagi confirms Law's finding that the mythological hyperboles were not a Plautine 'invention' and he adds that this form of exaggeration can be found in the *Nea*. At least, the frequency of mythological hyperbole in Plautus' plays suggests that it was a motif known in New Comedy and already functional there and Plautus took it over from the Greek original. How much these mythological hyperboles stem from Plautus himself—for example, in their application to the *servus callidus*—are not of primary interest here since it does not make any difference to the effect they have on the characterization of the type as well as to the function they fulfil for the installation of *ridiculum* and the fostering of the fantastical.

Fraenkel assigns an effect of "*Skurrilität*" to the motif of the mythological hyperboles that means the intention of the passages was to make the characters grander, more valuable and more interesting.[536] The base character does not intend to draw itself closer to epic or tragic characters since it inhabits the comic space and supports its creation and perception. The comic character can be seen as a foil to the tragic and epic in regard to the generic frameworks. Probably, Plautus did not want to make the daily life grander by this method, but entertaining. He made use of the features of the grand genres like the hero achieving semi-divine status or the heroic hubris as a contradictory sketch to comedy and thereby enriched the comic world with the fantastic imagery of epic battles or brave leaders. The *servus callidus*' plotting or *turbae* become colourful, vivid and comic in their paradoxical incoherence to the anti-heroic dead of deceiving the master. It can thus be argued that the technique of mythologically-enriched self-celebration works with cultural material, traditional themes and images for the dramatic interpretation and presentation of the comic. The method and its underlying material are the decisive factors that make it entertaining. The following text analysis will take a closer look at how this entertainment is conveyed on the verbal level.

On this verbal level, the passages of mock heroic, like Chrysalus' monologues and especially the 'Trojan song', provide elaborate style that is given to a base character in a comic environment. On the one hand, the high style seems a misfit in that regard and is more and more revealed as this misfit when it is constantly undermined by the moments of the base and profane. The former directly announced intention to perform a *monody* (932) is destructed over and over by the intruding base. Plautus follows the agenda, the installation of paradox, and that is the intermingling of high and base, which are mutually exclusive. The mythos in its heroic and tragic character as well as the style used in the *canticum* appear foreign in the context of comedy. The contradictory positioning is perceived as a contradiction that even grows to absurdity. Comedy hence uses the generic other to support its function of *ridiculum* and carnivalesque. This function is guaranteed when the generic characteristics are opposed, e.g. on the verbal level, and their paradoxical relation denies any fusion. The heroic (epic) context falls victim to the laughable when the slave avails himself of the context for his trickery. The majority of the audience is assumed to recognize the epic material in a comic setting. Plautus achieves the *ridiculum* by the means of irony on the verbal and dramatic level. True (elegiac) pathos is alluded to but sought in vain. The audience is confronted with verses simulating the heroic in the context of comedy, reaching beyond boundaries so that the spectator can enjoy the laughable that exists in the farcical moment; epic and tragic fineness

---

535 Cf. Zagagi (1980), esp. 18, 19-67.
536 Fraenkel (1960), 389.

meets comic crudeness.[537] The sum of moments endures in the paradox pattern as the condensed form of the non-mergable: it is the quality of incongruity that nourishes laughter throughout the centuries.

From a poetological perspective, the comedy's protagonist casting himself as an epic hero combines two complementary parts: the superior format of the heroic epic poem that nourished tragedy and the inferior format of the iambic and comedy.[538] As mentioned above, it is not an arbitrary or accidental comparison. The use of mythological material—especially the epic of Troy—for comparison was a common practice in antiquity. The Trojan War can be seen as a standardized source for comparison or in Zagagi's words, "a frame of reference among the Greeks".[539] The mythological material of the Trojan War is linked to the treatment of this material for the construction of Roman identity as Troy was taken as the birth place of Rome around late fourth century BCE and the line of ancestry was drawn back to the archaic city,[540] which makes it more than likely that the ideal audience must have been quite familiar with the narrative; even giving just hints, like a name or symbol, was enough to remember the specific part of story.[541] The ideal audience must have had a vivid memory of the mythos, the style and the experience of the epic poem as well as of its tragic adaptations.[542]

How might the audience have perceived such a performance by a witty slave and how can the dramatic function of the Trojan song described? In literary terms, some might call it a parody.[543] If parody is thought as imitating an original in order to make it ridiculous, then Chrysalus' *canticum* cannot be called a parody since it does not fit this definition.[544] It must be considered on the level of intertextuality. The *canticum* does not primarily intend to imitate the epic original to mock it, but the comedic song displays a contradictory set of both forms

---

537 The mock-heroic can be taken as a farcical image of the tragic and epic, drawing an improbable constellation of a slave conquering his master with troops in the context of a legendary war.

538 Cf. Aristot. *poet.* 1448b 20ff. (Aristotle sets an analogy between *Margites* and comedy as well as Homer's epic poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and tragedies) and 1449aff. (opposing invective and lampooning against heroic verses and epic poems).

539 Zagagi (1980), 62.

540 Cf. Charles Brian Rose, 'Forging Identity in the Roman Republic: Trojan Ancestry and Veristic Portraiture', *Role Models in the Roman World. Identity and Assimilation*, Sinclair Bell (ed.), Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 2008, 97-131, 97.

541 Cf. William Beare, *The Roman Stage. A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic*, London: Methuen, ²1955, 63. The Trojan cycle can be concerned as omnipresent in culture since it was depicted in various forms of art, e.g. the stage; for the relation between Plautus and the Greek originals in the use and comparison of the Trojan cycle, see Otto Zwierlein, *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus III. Pseudolus*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1991, 39; Fraenkel (1960) 9, 61ff., 85-6, 90, 95ff.; adding Zagagi (1980), 67. This corresponds to the formerly given definition of the Plautine audience. The fact that Plautus refers to myth quite often suggests that the Roman audience must have been considered as having a solid background to understand the allusions and as being quite fond of such allusions. Zagagi mentions the Etruscan art as a medium for Greek legends as well as the Roman adaptions of Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius to provide the Romans with the necessary knowledge for such passages of mythological hyperboles.

542 Sophocles' *Laocoon* and *Sinon*, Aeschylus and Euripides' dramatic interpretations as well as Aristophanes and Menander allude to it. Cf. Zagagi (1980), 44, 62. For instance, Euripides displays two depreciations of the Trojan War, *Cycl.* 350-2 and *Andr.* 368-9; cf. Barsby (1986), 170-1. The inconsistencies, already mentioned above, within the monody do not prohibit this interpretation since the fact that a base character here works for *ridiculum* is decisive. The inconsistencies themselves even highlight the mock heroic. It was never meant as retelling the mythos or adapting *Bacchides*' plot parallel to it. It is rather the other way round that it is (ab)using the bits and pieces rather freely for the comic.

543 Parody can also be seen in correspondence to deprecation and the ridiculing opposition of the mythological hero to the comic figure. See the discussion referring to Fraenkel and Zagagi.

544 Hutcheon (1985), 32. "There is no transhistorical definition of parody."

of text to gain the ridiculous.[545] Comedy and comedic perspective is foregrounded and is built upon the contradictory background of the epic when Chrysalus retells the Greeks' victory from an ironic distance. If parody is understood in its juxtaposing nature via the strategy of irony,[546] then Plautus' *canticum* can be referred to as parody. Plautus' plays—especially *Amphitruo* as the *tragicomoedia*—speak of a sensibility for the cultural interrelations, the proximities, and differences of these two genres and a consciousness for them in the audience.[547]

It is therefore not surprising that this passage does not simply mock the epic or the equivalent tragic adaptations but generates a paradoxical tension between epic and comedy and its realisations. The tension is created out of the generically defined as well as culturally valued and experienced incongruity of both discourses distributed to two genres. The *Iliad* depicts the smart Odysseus and his talent in deception within the framework of pathos that is active in longing for *aristeia* and tragic moments like the slain of Patroclus. Pathos, *aristeia,* and tragic can begin when comedy ends. The *canticum* contains two voices: comedy (ab)uses epic. The listener must 'negotiate' between those two, decoding and making sense of it.[548] It is the paradoxical tension between the generic speaker and its object of reference, between the generic context of the common and that of the 'grand' and between the discourse of the *ridiculum* and the discourse of *pathos*. Hilarious pictures are triggered if a spectator imagines the comedy's slave as Odysseus, who is seen a counsellor for leaders and manages to deal with so many 'epic' challenges.

Plautus frames the depreciation of the Trojan War with the comic world of the *Palliata*. He puts it in the mouth of a *servus callidus*, who makes use of it in showing his witty eloquence during his performance, creating a fantastic realm, where epic and tragic matter can meet comedy and thereby offering comic entertainment. It can be assessed that the perspective and the description of the type *servus callidus* thematically configure the slave and make it aesthetically effective, relying on the *paradox*. The slave describes himself as a hero, while he is actually understood as an anti-hero. Variations of the configuration 'hero' can be found in the themes of military, politics, *patronus*, divine aid and in mythological comparison. In other words, these scripts add up the cluster *hero* standing in incongruity to the cluster *slave*. The scripts or fantastic constructs belonging to the first-mentioned can be interpreted as a failure in self-perception, a deficit, whose performance already Plato saw as a source for the laughable.[549] However, the clever slave does not display a usual braggart but a competent *poeta* creating amusing images and more glorious foils to his ignoble activities. If anything, he is bragging with his competence to spin exaggerated and contradictorily superior fantasies, but mostly, with a twinkling eye as he is aware of its artificiality. Reading his demands and mocking sequences as serious claims would only be misleading; they make him appear close to the *eiron* in regard to self-irony and knowledge of the self, which contrasts him to the blind *alazon*. He juggles with social concepts, the institution of slavery, and ideology self-confidently by transferring concepts of other genres in the comic realm. Plautus' figure feels himself at home on the meta-level. By Chrysalus and his other colleagues, the audience can enter the intertextual universe of the epic, tragic, and comic, whose use by the clever slave

---

545 Cic. *de orat.* 2.248ff. Here, Cicero speaks about the sameness of sources for either jokes or serious thoughts.
546 Hutcheon (1985), 31. "Irony participates in parodic discourse as a strategy." Here, Linda Hutcheon also refers to Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Forms. Studies in Symbolic Action,* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, ²1967, 1.
547 See the prologue of *Poen.* 1-2: *Achillem Aristarchi mihi commentari lubet: inde mihi principium capiam, ex ea tragoedia.*
548 See cognitive processing in ch. II.i.
549 Cf. Hubbard (1991), 2ff.; and see ch. II.i.

demonstrates its cohesiveness.[550] In brief, such behaviour allows a first glimpse at the clever slave's extradramatic knowledge and his status as an outsider.

This richly designed concept of the hero Plautus developed as a common theme for the *servus callidus* offers the comedic construction of the type.[551] That is the case whenever the clever slave deliberately uses the heroic themes to install moments of *ridiculum* and the heroic concept describes the anti-heroic plan of deception and its realisation in a reverse relation. The heroic themes design the trickery standing at the centre of the Plautine intrigue plot. The hero as an embodiment of the ideal and conformity contradicts the anti-heroic, supercilious slave behaving against social norms.[552] It is hence valid to say that the mock heroic element fits the fourth criterion, *mésalliance*, Bakhtin claims to be part of carnivalesque nature of comedy since the element mixes something sacred and superior with profanity.

Applying mésalliance elements affects the conventional framework valid for the play as it invalidates and inverts convention. Consequently, the mock heroic motif plays a significant role in the topsy-turvy nature of Plautus' comedy and outlines its carnivalesque structure. The audience experiences the contradiction in a fantastic realm with hyperbolic images, which eases the antithesis dissolving into the ridiculous. In fact, if the aesthetic schema of comedy is thought as coherent moments of *ridiculum* and the opposing structure of conventional und unconventional, then the paradoxical construction of *servus callidus* pursuing the discourse of deception fosters that very coherence.[553] Hence, the paradoxical pair of anti-hero and hero can be identified as the first constituents for the paradox pattern, abstractly forming the aesthetically effective entity, here the *servus callidus*, for comedy.

---

550 Plautus and the audience he wrote for were situated in the cultural and artistic context that was sensitive for Greek material: the central genres of epic and drama to be imitated, their (primary) motifs like the concept of the hero bound to religious practices and rituals, literary sceneries like the battlefield and the images as the semi-divine empowered warrior. The Roman audience watched his plays not only with their knowledge of Greek material, but also with the awareness of the Roman socio-political and cultural issues of these days like slaves rebelling against their masters or Rome's rise to become a major military force. Hence, "the inherited conglomerate" in the socio-cultural reality of Plautus' time can be comprehended as a part of the audience's *Erkenntnishorizont*, a setting for Plautus' writing and the performance of the play (Murray and Livingstone (1947), 66-67. Gilbert Murray terms the material the "inherited conglomerate".).

551 Chrysalus, the superlative among the heroic anti-heroes, ironically refers to the convention to triumph at the end of the play when he informs the audience not to wonder about why he does not give another triumphing speech (*pervulgatum est, nil moror, Bacch.* 1073). Before, he praises his success in four lines. Plautus could not have topped the Trojan song, which already was the climax of casting the slave as the hero. See Eduard Fraenkel, *Plautine Elements in Plautus*, transl. Tomas Drevikovsky and Frances Muecke, New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 2007, 162. Fraenkel interprets Chrysalus' lines to refer to the established theatrical convention ironically, and not to historic circumstances.

552 Here, compare to Roberta Stewart, *Plautus and Roman Slavery*, Malden, MA et al.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. She crystallizes Plautine comedy as an ambiguous and multipart forum for the master-slave relation on an interpersonal and institutional level involving the negotiation of identities.

553 Cf. Schmitt (2008), 304-5. *Tractatus Coislinianus* lists methods to gain ridiculous effects in his paragraphs V and VI, among whom the following actions are named: a) when somebody can be deceived, b) if somebody behaves as another person (that relates to crossdressing), c) if something deviates from the expected. This list again shows the prominence of deception in comedy in antiquity.

III.ii. The all-licensed *servus* or fool

Threats, sanctions, and slaves

The previously discussed self-glorification of the anti-hero draws upon pathos, the feeling of pride and the image of a victory. Fear does not match this catalogue, but the feeling seems to become prominent in scenes when the slave is caught by the limitations of his actual social status as he does not own the privileges of a free man but he must behave according to his master's orders. If he does not follow them, he must suffer from the consequences. In *Mostellaria*, Tranio, a *servus callidus*, informs Simo of the arrival of his master in despair and pleads with Simo not to give him and his audacious activities away, since that would inevitably lead to Tranio's severe punishment. Assuming bad consequences for Tranio, Simo names the punishment of Tranio, dissected in three parts building to a climax of brutality: *tunc <malum corio tuo> portenditur, ind' **ferriterium**, postea <**crux**>.* (*Most*. 742-43). Simo expects Tranio's beating, sufferring in the workhouse and crucifixion at last if the master finds out.

This short dialogue taken from *Mostellaria* exemplifies the threat of punishment, which is constantly issued throughout Plautus' plays. It elaborates on what unruly slaves must expect as a retribution for their offences. Erich Segal evaluates the prominence of torture and punishment within the plays even as "obsession".[554] Slaves are permanently reminded and remind themselves how unruly slaves including the figure of the clever slave like Tranio are treated.[555] Masters warn them in advance as Daemones does when he wants Trachalio to calm down otherwise he promises to discipline him. The master mentions the slave's body parts, *crura, talos, tergum* (*Rud*. 635), shins, ankles and the back, insinuating the correspondent physical punishments like breaking the shins or ankles and whipping the back.[556] In such scenes, masters and other figures confront the slaves with a variety of vocabulary denoting tools, places and performances of punishment: *ferriterium, ergastulum, ferratus, ferricrepinus, ferriterium*. The expressions Plautus uses are mainly taken from vulgar language describing sanctions in the form of expletives and invectives: *abire in malam pestem malumque cruciatum, furcifer, verbero, carnifex, carnarium*.[557]

A striking number of instances in Plautus' plays defines the slave as regularly punished or the "*capreaginum hominum*" or "*pantherinum genus*" denoting whip marks and colouring of the skin (*Epid*. 17). Various techniques of torture and different forms of sanctions are mentioned; physical violence against slaves is not only foreshadowed and verbally present, but also visualized and actually performed on stage.[558] In *Pseudolus*, Ballio intensively talks

---

554 Segal (1968), 140.

555 Theme of physical violence against slaves (just to name several examples): *Bacch*. 779-80 (*latera lacerentur*); *Rud*. 635-641; *Pseud*. 1240-1 (*stimulis aut flagris*); *Poen*. 358 (*ne tu oratorem pugnis pectas postea*), 369 (*iubeo quadrigis cursim ad carnuficiem rapi*), 731ff.; *Most*. 1114ff.

556 De Melo, *Rud*., 255, ft. 9. "Breaking the shins was a punishment for slaves who had run away."

557 Moreover, characters often use vulgar metaphors to refer to physical punishment as *alicui corium concidere*; *perdere corium*; *periit meum corium*; or metonymically, *corium* means the whip with which the slave is beaten at *Poen*. 139. And see *Poen*. 347; *Most*. 743; see Müller (1913), 492ff.

558 Physical violence and the claim for punishment is also found among slaves: *Rud*. 661, Trachalio, *servus* for the young master Plesidippus, encouraging Daemones, the *senex*, to punish the 'pimp' severely; *Rud*. 999ff.: these verses read like a threat duel of physical violence between Trachalio and Gripus, the fisherman: e.g. Trachalio: *fiet tibi puniceo corium, postea atrum deneo* (*Rud*. 1000); In *Mostellaria*, the typical opposition of land slave vs. urban slave, Grumio vs. Tranio, e.g. 1ff.: *ego pol te ruri, si vivam, ulciscar probe*; Grumio to Tranio: *cur me verberas?*; for a detailed discussion on the concept of slavery and freedom in regard to Plautus comedies, cf. Segal (1968), esp. 137ff and 140.

about the essential necessity to regulate slaves' behaviour by punishment while he is constantly whipping and beating his slaves.[559]

Such scenes within a play drastically emphasize the anti-heroic, low social status a slave owns in antiquity's reality and depict the slave's dependence on his master for his life.[560] Ironically, even the actor playing the master and imposing sanctions on slave figures is a slave himself owned by the theatre's director.[561] Both, the slaves' performance and the depiction of slavery, confront the audience with the image of hierarchical relations on and beyond stage referring to the common Roman household and the macrocosmic role of slavery for the Roman Empire since slavery was fundamental in the rising Roman Empire evaluating slaves as economic resources, selling products with a certain market value, and as a part of the commerce system. Since Plautus' audience primarily consisted of people belonging to the Roman elite, men were acquainted with what it was like to be the head of a household with a certain number of slaves.[562] Each time a scene involves the physical treatment of slaves, it relates to the socio-political and domestic reality of a Roman sitting in the audience. How the member of Roman elite presumably experiences such scenes depends not only on the theatrical presentation of the issue 'slavery', but also on his attitude towards the issue.

News that a free slave killed his former owner as well as a certain frequency of slave revolts must have caused distress and intensified the Romans' fear of rebellious slaves and their revenge.[563] If the slave revolts really had an impact on how slaves were treated cannot be confirmed, but at least, these events might have sensitized the Romans to the treatment of slaves by the *paterfamilias*. In general, a *paterfamilias* was presumably interested to stabilize his authority in his household and to deal with the property including slaves responsibly, which would normally exclude arbitrary cruelty and killing, otherwise he would impair his wealth unnecessarily. Accordingly, it was in his interest to keep the balance between those two concerns. Roman politics, on the other hand, was certainly eager to defuse a conflict potential coming from slaves' vexation and rising anger.

Consequently, the Roman spectator and especially the member of the elite going to the theatre bring with them their knowledge and daily experience how to behave towards and how to discipline slaves, while they have their concerns about current slave rebellions. In Plautus' intrigue comedies, the spectator watches a condensed account of his daily experience in a comedic environment, facing allusions to and illusions of punishing (unruly) slaves. The topicality of how slaves are treated and punished might address the issue of slave revolts as well as the treatment of slaves in Roman society; offence and retribution are the conventional ways to restore order. At least, the audience waits for the latter, when the master announces

---

559 Ballio beating his slaves at *Pseud.* 135-138 (*ita plagis costae callent*) and 145ff. (*ego vostra latera loris faciam*), 229 (*cras Phoenicium poeniceo corio invises pergulam*).

560 Cf. Peter P. Spranger, *Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1961, 64-65. The Roman judicial system defined the slave as an object belonging to the master's property. As part of the household, the slave lived under the dominance, but simultaneously, the protection of the master; and see Alan Watson, 'Roman Slave Law and Romanist Ideology', *Phoenix* 37.1 (1983): 53-65, 53-56. Ill-treatment of slaves by masters – unless another person sanctioned the slave without the master's allowance and diminished his 'market value' – was normally not prosecuted in legal praxis. Despite the fact that censors had the right to take legal proceedings against cruel masters, there is hardly any evidence and likeliness that this regulatory measure was really acted out, at least in Plautus' time and the Republican era.

561 Cf. Segal (1968), 211, ft. 11.

562 Cf. ch. II.i.

563 Cf. Holt Parker, 'Crucially Funny, or Tranio on the Couch: The *servus callidus* and Jokes about Torture', *Oxford Readings in Menander, Plautus and Terence*, Erich Segal (ed.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2001, 127-137, 127.

to do so.[564] Though Plautus' plays are rich in references to punishment and threats of the like, they are situated on a stage revealing a utopian and Saturnalian environment.

Besides the actual foregrounding of punishment, the spectator encounters a paragon of the unruly slave, who is actually never punished, and thus, violates the spectator's expectation based on social conventions. In *Miles gloriosus*, Palaestrio can rely on his uncommon position in contrast to his fellow slaves: *ita hic senex talos elidi iussit conservis meis./ Sed me excepit […]* (*Mil.* 167-68). This exception standing out to the formerly described collection of slaves' sanctions, threats, and physical brutality bears a comic potential for the audience.

Comic relevance

It is the *servus callidus* standing out from the other slave figures by his relation to the threat and realisation of punishment since the threat of being punished is called back to mind repeadetly in the course of his legal transgressions although he is never truly sanctioned. In accordance with Erich Segal, the frequency and inseparability the threat of punishment occurs in relation to the clever slave evince the threat of punishment as a motif bound to the *servus callidus*.[565] Exactly, the motif's high rate of occurrence contradicts the lack of its realisation when the slave remains immune, and highly opposes the common treatment of other slave figures on and off stage. Unsurprisingly, it is not the emotion of true fear dominating the comedy's scenes where the motif is active, but the exaggeration of convention, the recurrent catalogue of vulgar expressions, and the creative description of foreseen punishment deny any serious attitude towards the matter and represent a source for laughter.

For example, the clever slave figure or his master usually inflates the threat of punishment to such an extent that the relation between offence and retribution appears to be ridiculous. As Daemones menaces Trachalio to break his shins and even more because the slave's behaviour is simply too annoying for the master, the intensity of the punishment stands in an obvious imbalance to Trachalio's failure. Often, the number of sanctions stated by angry masters even contains capital punishment like crucifixion. In *Mostellaria*, Theopropides wants to impose this kind of torture on Tranio for playing tricks on him: *verberibus, lutum, caedere pendens* (*Most*. 1167-68).

In *Bacchides*, although the *servus callidus* himself is aware of such a threat hanging over him like the sword of Damocles, it does not hinder Chrysalus to pun with the method that could torture him to death:

credo hercle adveniens nomen mutabit mihi

---

564 Cf. Spranger (1961), 12-15. Some early literature (notably Chalandon [1875], Dunkin [1946], Korzinskij [1957]) saw the significance of the play's slave figures and belonging motifs in providing a social message and possibly criticising the living conditions of slaves and/or the socio-economic system at that time. I do not agree with interpreting Plautus' comedies as a mere form of social and political criticism. Mainly, how Plautus arranges slave figures, motifs and the intrigue plot for several comedies serves the formation of a Saturnalian stage with an entertaining and comic *architectus* and not a Marxist rhetoric. But certainly, we cannot deny him slight swipes at stereotypical behaviour and an awareness of social roles and their boundaries.

565 Cf. Parker (2001), 127; and cf. Elaine Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*, Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1972, 74 and 96. Plautus' plays heavily draw upon that motif, for which New Greek Comedy and Terence show little evidence. Aristophanes also forms verbal images of slave punishment. Plautus' clever slave figures, however, show an extreme imbalance between the frequency and intensity of threats and the lack of realisation. So, the motif is not uniquely Plautine, but carries his handwriting in regard to its use as well as effect for the *ridiculum*; it plays a major role in the slave's thematic construction.

> *facietque extemplo Crucisalum me ex Chrysalo.*
> (*Bacch.* 361-2)

The word play changing the slave's telling name *Chrysalus*, the golden boy, to *Crucisalus*, the crucified boy, calls attention to the capital punishment he would suffer when Nicobulus discovers the slave's fraud. In the end, both, Tranio and Chrysalus, are spared.

All three examples given above name the method of crucifixion as a probable retribution for the offences done in a domestic household.[566] Even so, the capital punishment almost exclusively relates to the socio-political issue of rebellious and vindictive slaves as crucifixion is restricted to punish conspirators in a slave rebellion or similar offenders. Thus, the brutal form exceeds the dimension of failures in a Roman household and seems ridiculously non-proportional.[567] A Roman spectator bearing the actual socio-political tensed situation in mind experiences a ridiculous, more or less subtle allusion to this matter. In order to explain the comic relevance for the audience, Holt Parker drawing upon Freud's *Wit and Its Relation to Unconsciousness* argues that the comedic perspective, which is active in such puns and exaggerations, makes the threat of rebellious slaves harmless—at least temporarily. That is the case when a most unruly slave like the *servus callidus* and the exaggeration of torture offers the chance to laugh at this fearful subject for a Roman member of the elite.[568] The audience can enjoy the theatrical illusion denying any threat of intrigue against them. Moreover, within the illusion and the comic atmosphere, serious issues as the catalogue of capital punishment and their application lose their intensity, when they are permanently addressed, inflated, and not realized in the end.

Both parties, the slave and the master, are instrumental for the comic effect. Firstly, the authoritative behaviour of the *senex* contributes to the contradictory and ridiculous presentation of the matter 'punishing unruly slaves' since the master is always sure to be ahead of the slave's trickery and believes in his authority, while the audience is shown the contrast. He often reaffirms his authority by threatening the clever slave, which usually builds up to a climax with the furious demand to make the clever slave pay for his intrigue at the final scene, when the victim becomes aware of the deception (see *Most.* 1030ff.; *Bacch.* 1087ff.). Comparing the infuriated master to the prior peremptory behaviour must have enhanced the ridiculing effect on the Roman spectator, who watches a master failing to have disentangled the web of deception and to enforce his authorial position. To restore his reputation, the only appropriate form of sanction seems to be crucifixion in the dramatic moment when the master realizes he has lost his face.[569] By constructing the motif 'threat of punishment' and neglecting its fulfilment, Plautus distorts the conventional relation between master who punishes and slave who is punished to a parody. The spectator can laugh at a railing *paterfamilias*—certainly

---

566 Also see *Bacch.* 1184; *Mil.* 842-3. The clever slave Palaestrio exaggerates his status by threatening his fellow slave Lurcio with crucifixion for lying at him.

567 The decision what kind of punishment was appropriate for the slave's domestic offence was normally exclusive to the master. His consideration to hurt or even kill the slave included an economic aspect since killing a slave would simultaneously mean to diminish the amount of wealth.; see Parker (2001), 130, the retribution for rebellious acts against Roman society was achieved by the capital punishment, *cruciatus*, a strictly Roman practice, but usually not used for offences of domestic slaves (see Tac. *Hist.* 4.11.).

568 Cf. *Ibid.*, 128-9. Parker's approach contributes to the understanding of the *servus callidus'* success as a comic figure in comedy in that time period and in regard to the Roman attitude towards the subject 'unruly slaves'.

569 The play *Pseudolus* lacks the presentation of a railing master since Pseudolus and his master bet on the outcome of the slave's deceptive plan (see *Pseud.* 1238ff.). Simo is rather impressed by the slave's success.

a not unknown image from real life—as if the master figure on stage could be the own neighbour sitting next to him.[570]

Secondly, the comic quality of the motif becomes even more clear, when the harsh and permanent threat of punishment is concerned in its paradoxical relation to the clever slave's behaviour and attitude to that theme. Whenever the prospect of punishment taken to the extreme contradicts the slave's playful attitude, his deceitfulness, and incredible anxiety about such brutality, the hyperbolic threat loses its force and turns into a comic instrument. Finally, the threat's teleological quality cannot be taken seriously anymore. The Roman spectator, although a master, can laugh at a fantastic image of the unruly, yet unpunished slave.

Plautus' intrigue plays provide imaginative and humorous scenes drawing on the incoherence between the clever slave's social status and the figure's exclusive immunity, between the recurrent motif 'threat of punishment' reassured by master and slave alike and the shortcomings of its realisation. This view suggests a Roman appreciation of dark humour, at least today humour involving threats to well-being, brutality, and capital punishment in a system of slavery is considered as morbid. But how dark humour is assessed changes with the addressee's horizon and values in the cultural system. In brief, antiquity's attitude towards slavery and the status of a slave differs from the modern view as

> Donatus says that serious statements are automatically made ridiculous when uttered by slaves, and that they are often put in the mouths of slaves for this very reason. Slaves were, legally speaking, mere chattels.[571]

The all-license as a Saturnalian factor

The hyperbolic theme of punishment involved in the production of comic moments still goes beyond providing the audience with humorous scenes and a feeling of temporary release. What else does the motif 'threat of punishment' contribute towards the construction of the *servus callidus* as a comedic figure? On the one hand, it is a decisive element making the slave figure apparent as a prototypical fool figure. The prominence and hyperbole of threatening sanctions stand in contradiction to the fact that they are never fulfilled although the clever slave's intrigue is always discovered at the end. In the plays of intrigue, the protagonist slave figure offends his master in multiple ways: lying at him and others, stealing his money, corrupting the younger master, ignoring his orders, claiming divine status and other kinds of offence.[572] Despite these violations of social conventions, the most unruly slave figure is

---

570 Cf. Kathleen McCarthy, *Slaves, Masters and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*, 2000, 27-28.

571 C. Stace, 'The Slaves of Plautus', *Greece & Rome* 15.1 (1968): 64-77, 74; and note Sandra R. Joshel also relating to Parker (1989) evaluates punishing slaves and their anxiety of it to be "a running joke in comedy; though that joke reminds the audience that legitimate violence is the province of the master." (Sandra R. Joshel, 'Slavery and Roman Literary Culture', in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery* [Online] Edited by Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 214-240. 218. Available from: Cambridge Histories Online <https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521840668> [accessed January 05, 2022] [citation style given by website]).

572 Even non-slaves are punished and beaten. Those who are beaten stand in opposition to the plan of the *servus callidus* and the happiness of the *adulescens* and are termed "blocking characters" by Northrop Frye or "agelasts" by Erich Segal. Frye (1957), 163-69; Segal (1968), 70 and Segal himself refers to George Meredith, 'An Essay on Comedy', *Comedy*, Wylie Sypher (ed.), New York, 1956, 4. In *Miles gloriosus*, 1413ff. the braggart soldier alias "*Venerium nepotulum*" (1413) is punished. In comparison to the braggart's behaviour, the *servus callidus*' hymns of mock heroic justify no sort of punishment as they serve the comic and should not be seen as mere hubris (cf. Erich Segal [1968], 134).

spared of sanction in contrast to his partly innocent fellow slave figures involved in scenes of visualized physical violence. In short, he is granted a license.

Concerning the Plautine plot, a license is given in the exposition, when the young master or another central figure needs the help of the clever slave. Either the slave is asked to help or he freely agrees to intervene in the unfortunate cause of events.[573] In *Pseudolus*, the desperate Calidorus comes to the eponymous anti-hero, who in turn takes the initiative, promises to solve the problem for the young master and acts as the agent for the happy ending (*Pseud*. 104ff.).[574] At the end of the play, the license is usually tested, when the father discovering his successful deception demands retribution, but the young master or a friend of him usually pleads with the father to spare the slave. In *Mostellaria*, Callidamates, the friend of the young master, asks to pardon Tranio several times (*gratiam* [*Most*. 1169]). The license is confirmed, for example, when the father accepts the request (*Bacch.* 1191ff.), or when the too witty slave flees to a statue or altar out of the old master's reach and consequently, rescues himself (*Most*. 1094ff.).[575] But repentance or pleas for forgiveness are not an option for the slave, which would also not conform to his triumphing attitude as a succeeding *imperator* and the Saturnalian quality.[576] At no time, a severe sanction against the clever slave is fulfilled notwithstanding how many rogueries he performs. In *Epidicus*, the master not only pardons the schemer, but also releases him from slavery (*Epid*. 722ff.).[577]

This contradictory immunity of the slave figure discovers the common conventions to be inoperative and thereby, turns the known hierarchical system upside-down in accordance with the comedy's typical manner of social inversion. The possibility to combine unruliness and immunity seems to derive from *Saturnalia*, the "festival of reversal",[578] which temporarily allowed social equality, merriment and 'holiday' from slavery. In Plautus' time, the festival, however, was celebrated with banquets, where slaves and masters were allowed to eat and drink side by side or slaves had their own banquet before the master's one. Social equality was admitted to the table, still with restrictions. Only later, in the 1st century CE, the holiday of reversal embraced the complete city.[579] Of course, the *servus callidus* shows an extreme form by assuming to surpass the social superiors in wit and cleverness.[580]

Accordingly, Plautus' comedy seems to extend the Saturnalian element since the *servus callidus* owns an all-license to outlive his witty plotting, without which Plautine intrigue comedy would lose its dramatic core. As a consequence, for the time of tricking, the slave figure can rule comedic ground without being stopped by sanctions or restrictions. In fact, he

---

573 Sometimes, the slave hesitates to consent to play the role of the schemer (see *Pseud*. 78; *Bacch.* 691ff. second attempt). This reaction only retards the inevitable acceptance and underlines the slave's courage and the initiation of an exciting upcoming discourse of tricky deception. For a record of Plautine intrigues and their elements, see Arnulf Dieterle, *Die Strukturelemente der Intrige in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*, Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner BV, 1980, 43ff.

574 Compare *Most*. 388ff., Tranio takes the initiative and orders a desperate and inundate Philolaches to stay at the house. He will take care of the troublesome situation.

575 One option of escape or entering 'neutral land' for the slave was to flee to a holy temple or a statue of the Emperor. Cf. Watson (1983), 60.

576 See *Epid*. 680ff. (*nec tibi supplico* [683]) and 712ff. (*Merui ut fierem [liber]*).

577 In *Poenulus*, Agorastocles admits that he owes his slave freedom for past services. But the slave recognizes the young master's flattery (see *Poen*. 129ff.).

578 Versnel (1993), 99-122.

579 Cf. Segal (1968), 32ff. and 163ff.; Sen. *epist.* 18, 1-5. Seneca's sentences on *Saturnalia* read like a huge fair of today.

580 *Ibid.*, 102-3.

is most unruly and ruling the comedy's discourse when he overtly changes roles with his master:[581]

> SIMO *fac sis vocivas, Pseudole, aedis aurium,*
> *mea ut migrare dicta possint quo volo.*
> PSEU. *age loquere quidvis, tam etsi tibi suscenseo.*
> SIMO *min domino servos tu suscenses?*
> PSEU. *tam tibi mirum id videtur?*
> SIMO *hercle qui, ut tu praedicas,*
> *cavendum est mi aps te irato, atque alio tu modo*
> *me verberare atque ego te soleo cogitas.* […]
> (*Pseud*. 469-75)

Simo's order expressing his status as a master faces Pseudolus' anger. The master reacts surprised to the unexpected interchange of roles and incredulously rephrases Pseudolus' statement into a question (472). Here, the two parties consisting of the personal pronouns, *mihi* and *tu*, and the social designation, *domino* and *servos*, stand opposed towards each other in the syntactical sequence, which underlines the clash and questioning of power. Moreover, the surprise of Simo refers to the object of the verb, and that is that the object of anger is really himself. Pseudolus does not react defensive, but keeps his offensive position by posing a counter-question. The distribution of power becomes imbalanced, while the distinct separation of social roles becomes blurry.

Tolerating Pseudolus' behaviour, Simo assesses the inversion of power by using the ambiguous meaning of *verberare*. On the one hand, *verberare* denotes beating, a usual punishment of slaves (*verberare te soleo*). On the other, *verberare* also means the trickery of the master by the slave (*alio modo*).[582] The slave's dominance replaces Simo's practice to be the master beating the slave. It is now the slave who exhibits characteristics of a master, intending to control the master's decisions. Physical dominance becomes interchanged with intellectual supremacy, while both display a sort of control: the ambiguity of *verberare* unites two thematic categories, deceit and retribution, in representing and confirming the comedy's intrigue plot and its protagonist by announcing trickery and excluding punishment. In contrast to their social status, the *servus callidus*' management of action substitutes the master's control. Hence, the threat of punishment remains an empty, exaggerated device for maintaining the social hierarchy, which is not valid in the comedy's Saturnalian framework. The theatrical illusion establishes its own stable system as an inverted version of the known social system: a utopia, something *mirum* (*Pseud*. 473), in comparison to the norm, but valid and stable in its own. The deviation from the social norm can also be found in the contract between Pseudolus and his master in the ongoing dialogue (*Pseud*. 496-515). If Pseudolus is successful but actually disobedient in his attempt of deception, the master rewards the slave and guarantees the slave immunity for the rest of his life, whereas if the slave does not succeed, he must suffer his punishment in the mill.

---

581 See ch. III.iii. The element of the all-licensed intersects with the agonistic setting.
582 Cf. *OLD*, s.v. 'cavere' and 'verberare'. The use of the verbs *cavere* (to be on the guard) and *verberare* (to beat with tricks) prepares the bet between Pseudolus and his master relating to Pseudolus' repeated warning to his master (*caveas, caveas, cave* [517-89). See also p. 146. Another example of making fun with the usual process of master punishing a slave is the dialogue between the slave Milphio and the young master Agorastocles in *Poen.* 135ff. They ironically refer to Agorastocles' true love for the slave as the actual reason for beating Milphio almost daily.

Overall, this scene in *Pseudolus* is characteristic for the unusual slave-master relationship in Plautus' intrigue comedies. Across Plautus' plays, the audience recognizes the antithetic and upside-down version of the conventionally defined master-slave relationship, which is expressed through various forms, for example as ironic comments and explicit or implicit change of roles. Segal acknowledges it as the part in common between farces like *Pseudolus* and 'higher comedies' like *Amphitruo*.[583] Plautus, however, is not the first playwright to arrange the known hierarchical system in an inversion, but Aristophanes' Xanthias already takes part in the exchange of social roles between master and slave in the *Frogs*.

Both, Old Comedy and Plautus' *Palliata*, profit from the topsy-turvy arrangement in a two-fold way. The theme of master-slave inversion contributes to the creation of comic moments as shown above. Turning order upside-down, which includes hierarchical inversion and the reversal of control, is rooted deeply in comedy's structural universe as Henri Bergson accounts the "*monde renversé*" the elementary *modus operandi* of comic entertaining.[584] The performance that slave rules over master prompts the Saturnalian quality of Plautus' comedy and confirms the utopian framework, wherein comedy is active and from where the all-license for the *servus callidus* derives. This license programmatically allows the clever slave to produce and perform double-dealing, humorous and cheeky comments as well as creative visions. The figure can fuse superior with profane contexts, invert conventional structure and thus, become a mediator of comedy's carnivalesque. The license even expands beyond the limits of the play into metatheatrical realms since it attaches to the figure's titles *architectus* and *poeta*.[585] The thematic constructions of the *servus callidus* support each other in their thematic coherence and credibility across Plautine comedies.

Conclusion: The all-license's commitment to comedy

The all-license generally secures the clever slave's capacity for concocting intrigues, but at the same time, demands that the slave exhausts his resources. The slave would otherwise have to undergo the same punishment procedure as his fellows. The license's contradictory part is present in visual and verbal violence against slaves linked to the motif, the threat of punishment, since it indicates the conventional and realistic component, for example, the retribution for an offence, serving the audience's *Erwartungshorizont* taken from real life. From the comic perspective, the audience does not outrage at perceiving an unpunished, highly unruly slave, but can still enjoy the exaggerated threat of punishment happening in comedy's utopia. This tripartite thematic combination—the 'threat of punishment', the all-license, and the role of the dominant trickster—makes the *servus callidus* supportive for the Roman comedy's inner-logic Saturnalian structure that enables the slave to neglect his status' bound constraints and fulfil his roles as a slave, an 'aspiring' master, and a mastermind of deception.[586] Across the comedies, the *servus callidus* significantly silences a master's question why the clever slave does what he does with his motto *lubet*.[587]

---

583 Cf. Segal (1968), 115-6.
584 Henri Bergson, *Le Rire: Essai sur la signification du comique*, Paris: Presses univérsitaires de France, 1940, 72.
585 See ch. III.iv. The thematic configuration of an *architectus* is given in *Miles gloriosus* (901-2). The analysis applies the term to describe the process of actively constructing the plot.
586 Cf. Segal (1968), 144-147 (audience's delight and wish to watch an unpunished slave). And cf. Parker (2001), 127-128.
587 *Bacch*. 751; *Pseud*. 1299ff.

Nevertheless, only the theatrical illusion and the temporary utopia of comedy grant immunity and can afford to create such a slave figure as the *servus callidus*. In *Mostellaria*, Tranio assumes that he will get punished for some unruly behaviour in the future: *[…] quasi non cras iam commeream aliam noxiam:/ ibi utrumque, et hoc et illud, poteris ulcisci probe.* (*Most*. 1178-79). Clever slaves even ensure the audience that they were punished before and they will be in the future.[588] The immunity is something limited and bound to the local and temporal frames of the stage. During this temporary utopia of harmlessness, comedic discourse heads towards a happy ending solving the disastrous situation of the younger master. Since the *servus callidus* makes this reconciliation possible, his trickery does not endanger comedy's harmonious ending, but restores it. The slave acts altruistically because he does not want the object of the trickery, normally a specific sum of money, for himself.[589] Deception is not ruthless or brutal but leads to reconciliation, which is done playfully to entertain the audience. At last, the low status of the slave recommends itself to play the trickster for the lover and spares the young master from any inappropriate deceiving of his father.[590] Accordingly, there is no need for a performance of punishment to restore a balance in the temporarily comedic framework. Instead, comedy lifts cruelty in something to be laughed about.

In sum, the *servus callidus* functions as a plotting and Saturnalian figure, who acts as a mediator between master and son and between audience and the ugly. The figure of the *servus callidus* can wear and make use of the ugly mask without any pain. So, his license supports the realisation of comedy's utopian nature, allows to open the Pandora of jests and trickery, and foregrounds the Saturnalian quality within Roman comedy. The all-license is another decisive element in the Plautine figure's aesthetically effective construction suggesting the figure to be the prototype for the all-licensed professional fool and in particular, the wise fool in Shakespeare.

---

588 *Most*. 1178 (Tranio); *Bacch.* 361-2 (Chrysalus); cf. Parker (2001), 128-9.

589 Probably, the slave's altruistic attitude towards money displays one of the most decisive factors that save the slave's life. For the Romans, money and profit took priority over *virtus*. The slave and the lovesick young master only desire the sum of money to secure the master's romance. Materialism is not the highest principle in Plautus' comedies. See Segal (1968), 56-7.

590 Cf. Parker (2001), 134-5. The slave becomes the agent of the needed trickery, which is not appropriate for the young master.

III.iii. Agon

Agon in Antiquity

The previous subchapter has shown that the all-license secures the *servus callidus* while he organizes and pursues the intrigue against his master or another free man. The license even allows him to exaggerate his position as the intriguer and to show off as a heroic manipulator, enriched by the images of the military leader and *usurpator* of the *oppidum 'senex'*. The military metaphor images the relationship between *servus* and *senex* or *leno* as two opponents facing each other in a war of trickery (*Epid.* 160, "*indicatur bellum*") declared by the slave.[591] Naturally, comedy's harmless and mocking depiction of the heroic element does not offer an actual battle on life and death, but colours the intrigue as a competition, in which the figures contend for victory, eager to triumph over the other by using their wit: *callidum senem callidis dolis* (*Bacch.* 643). Briefly, the slave makes his opponent take part in an *agon* juxtaposing their wit.

Plautus applies the agonistic setting by evolving it centrally around the figure of the clever slave, who elevates the intrigue to a sportive and potentially heroic endeavour. It is necessary to outline the cultural significance of agon first in order to understand its embedment as the core element in the plot of the chosen comedies, and how it crafts the type, *servus callidus*, in its functionality. Consequently, this analysis is in need of a short excursion to the concept of agon in Greek and Roman society.

The Greek word Αγών originally denoted 'assembly' or 'place of assembly' and was later specified as a form of assembly including games or contests. The instances of agon in Homer's epics already allude to the meaning of 'assembly in order to contest'.[592] The purpose to watch a contest goes hand in hand with an assembly at a specific locality and in a specific arrangement, which could be in a circle around the sportsfield. In the *Iliad*, for example, when the Greeks hold the burial rite for Patroclus comprising a contest of eight disciplines, Achilles arranges the spectators in a wide assembly, *agona*, for those coming contests (*Il.* 23, 257-8).[593]

From the archaic age to the classic, the meaning of the word then altered slightly and its focus shifted from 'assembly' and 'the place of the assembly (for contesting)' to the assembly's purpose 'contest'. Analogically, its use expanded from religious rituals and national feasts like the Olympic Games into all similar and associated activities of life: "fights, battles, debates, and judicial and political contests".[594] 'Agon' became an occasion, where the opponents could compete in physical and psychic strength, in sports skills, in intellect as well as eloquence. Also, artists were compared in their achievements at the different categories of

---

591 Concerning statistics, there are thirteen intrigue comedies by Plautus, from which six have the slave as the trickster pursuing the intrigue to help the young lover(s) and the *senex* as the victim's intrigue (*Bacchides, Epidicus, Mercator* (partly), *Mostellaria, Pseudolus* (partly), *Trinummus* (partly)). Four intrigue comedies content the deceiving slave against an alternative 'contestant' like *leno* (*Asinaria, Miles gloriosus*, *Persa, Poenulus*). Hence, ten out of thirteen show the slave as the trickster with the aim to help the young lover(s).

592 James Dennis Ellsworth, *Agôn. Studies in the Use of a Word*, University of California, Berkeley, 1972, 1-2.

593 Liddell-Scott does not provide any epic examples for agon directly meaning 'contest'. For a good overview of the epic use, see Siegfried Laser, *Sport und Spiel*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987, T 11ff.

594 Ellsworth (1972), 2; Isidoro de Sevilla, *Étymologies. XVIII. De bello et ludis*, ed. and transl. by Josefa Cantó Llorca, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007, 136. Isidore of Sevilla enumerates the disciplines in *de generibus agonum* as "*inmensitas virium, cursui celeritas, sagittandi peritia, standi patientia, ad citharam quoque vel tibias incedendi gestus, de moribus quoque, de forma, de cantandi modulatio, terrestris quoque belli et navalis proelii perpetiendorumque suppliciorum certamina*" (18.26).

music, literature, and dance, for example during stage competitions (*skenikoi agones*) or music contests, which were part of the Pythian Games besides horse races and athletics.[595]

Greek society experienced agon in many variations, applying it to myriad situations in life, which makes it a significant socio-cultural phenomenon. Agonistic thought was, succinctly speaking, ubiquitous in Greek society.[596] Unsurprisingly, the socio-cultural Greek concept of *agon* was definitely something familiar to the Romans. They also had their own cultural equivalent as Isidorus describes in the following sentence: *Quae Latine certamina, Graeci agones vocant, a frequentia qua celebrabantur* (*orig.* 18.25).[597] In the Roman Republic, public competitions were dedicated to the Gods in the celebrations of *ludi*. For example, during the eight days of the *ludi Apollinares* first held in 212 BCE, the Roman Republic commemorated Apollo's 'help' in warding off the Punics. These kinds of festivals combined a character of competition found in horse races with cult and religious celebrations, which is comparable to the Greek festivals.[598] The people came together to cheer at the competitors, to celebrate, and to enjoy agon or *certamina* as a part of the cult, which reveals it as a significant element of socio-cultural experience for the participants and the audience.

Theatrical agon entertaining the audience

Notwithstanding what kind of agon the Greeks and Romans were watching, people witnessing a competitive action certainly appreciated its quality of suspense and entertaining value, which has not changed until these days regarding the mass of sports events and TV-formats of gaming. The third party—as not bearing any consequence—can enjoy the performance of agon as a diversion from daily life. The historian Thucydides describes Athens' richness of architectural masterpieces and cultural events in the speech of Pericles since they offer

---

595 Cf. Horst-Dieter Blume, 'künstlerische Wettbewerbe (skenikoi agones)', *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. Band 11, Sam-Tal.* Hubert Cancik and Helmut Schneider (eds.), Stuttgart/Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 2001, 491-499 and Wolfgang Decker, 'Sportfeste', *DNP* XI (2001), 847-855. For an overview of the Greek calendar and the festivals, see Jean-Marie André, *Griechische Feste, römische Spiele. Die Freizeitkultur der Antike*, Stuttgart: Philip Reclam, 1994, 36ff. (classical period), 80ff. (Hellenistic period).

596 Cf. Laser (1987), T 4-5, T 8-9. Already, early Greek society showed an integration of agonistic thought in their socio-cultural activities and hierarchical system of Gods. Siegfried Laser mainly relies on examples from the early epics. In the *Odyssey*, for example, the spirit of agon is present, when Odysseus fights against the wooers of his wife Penelope in the 'wooers' agon' (*Od.* 21, 75-443); of course, it is not suggested that agonistic thinking was something exclusive to the Greek culture or the period of antiquity.

597 Llorca (2007), 136; in addition, see *OLD*, s.v. 'certamen 3'. *Certamen* could be taken in the form of *gymnicus* as physical exercise, or *equester* as horse races or horseback riding, or in the form of *musicus* as competition of art (the arts of the Muses).

598 Cf. Jean-Marie André, *Griechische Feste, römische Spiele. Die Freizeitkultur der Antike*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 1994, 137f.; cf. Freyburger, Gérard (Mulhouse), "Ludi", in: *Der Neue Pauly*, Herausgegeben von: Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider (Antike), Manfred Landfester (Rezeptions- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte). Consulted online on 05 January 2022 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_dnp_e711310 First published online: 2006. (citation style given by website). Romans drew distinctions between public and private *ludi*, like the *ludi funebres.*

Furthermore, on the connection between the character of playing and the agonistic spirit, see J. Huizinga's *Homo ludens* (1981). The Greek agon urged the character of playing into the background, whereas the Latin term *ludus* combines the semantic complex of contesting, games, and playing. This becomes relevant for the discussion of the clever slave's characteristic as *servus ludens*. See ch. III.v.

[…] the greatest number of relaxations from toil for the spirit, by holding contests and sacrifices throughout the year, and by tasteful private provisions, whose daily light drives away sorrow. (II.38)[599]

Besides the feature of diversion, agon appeals to the audience as it conveys the spectator with the sensation of suspense: who will win and how he will achieve his aim. The process of agon showing a sportive or artistic character means an entertaining performance embedded in culture. This contents the Greek concept of theatre representing two sources of competition and suspense since the spectator enjoys a contest beyond and on stage. On the former, the playwrights long to be victorious over their competitors by contesting their writing and directing talents. On the latter, the playwright's creations, protagonist and antagonist, counter each other from the exposition onwards. Plautus' intrigue comedy expresses intrigue as an agon. Plautus draws upon an appealing, popular *topos* widely spread in antiquity's socio-cultural reality and providing him with other related themes as the military battle. Thereby, the competitive figure *servus callidus* represents a source for comic depiction of relevant socio-cultural themes a Roman spectator can identify with and can enjoy.

The agonistic image offers enjoyment as providing suspense. Plautus makes use of agon as a dramatic technique generating the major source for suspense since the content of intrigue comedy relies on the attempt to disentangle the twisted exposition of comedy – mostly, the lover's devastation and financial shortage. It is not the final outcome that helps to enhance the degree of suspense since it is already roughly defined: the relief for the young master will be granted and comedy's topicality demands the unification of the young lovers. The prologue sometimes hints at the witty plans and presumably the success of the clever slave.[600] Although these details are obtainable for the audience, Plautus makes the accomplishment in an agonistic atmosphere introduced by the clever slave (even more) entertaining.

Indeed, the audience can marvel at how the *servus callidus* tricks his contestant(s). The agon usually starts when the slave agrees to help the young master and solve his problems. Thus, he takes the challenge, for example, to trick the old master off the money needed. Ironically, he often does that in a rush way without having a clue how to reach the goal like Tranio wonders about how he is going to accomplish such an impossible mission even the gods cannot achieve (*Most*. 348ff.). In *Pseudolus*, the slave directly addresses the audience to ensure them about his upcoming genius plan although he does not know what kind of plan that will be, but that he will make it happen.[601] Typically of the agon's exposition, Plautus invites the audience in a seemingly improvisatory world where the clever slave is contriving the manipulative plan spontaneously while he stands in front of them.[602] Such acting foregrounds the challenge lying ahead of the *servus callidus* and the truly genius ideas of how to overcome that tricky situation.

---

599 Translation taken from Thucydides, *History II*, ed. with translation and commentary by Peter J. Rhodes, Warminster: Aris & Philipps, 1988.

600 E.g. in *Mil.* 79ff.. The slave Palaestrio giving a summary of the plot announces *magnas machinas* (138).

601 *Pseud*. 566-568: *atque etiam certum, quod sciam,/ quo id sum facturus pacto nil etiam scio,/ nisi quia futurumst*; the spontaneous and improvisatory character is often underlined by the sudden pressure and devastation the slave experiences e.g. since he faces the detection of prior failures; *Most*. 550. Tranio is anxious that his plan might fail and refers to the pressure on himself to come up with a plan quickly.

602 The motif of spontaneity and improvisation can be found in *Bacchides, Epidicus, Mostellaria, Miles gloriosus, Pseudolus, Poenulus*. On a profound discussion of improvisation in Plautus, see Slater (²2000), esp. 9-12.

Plautus repeats this plot element in a variation in the storyline when he enhances the challenge by integrating obstacles or regress during the agon. In *Bacchides*, Chrysalus must reinvent his trickery against a highly suspicious opponent after the first plan failed. The 'trinity' of Chrysalus' attempts is even a distinctive feature of that play derived from Menander's *Dis exapaton*. The clever slave Epidicus faces a similar fate as he must recognize his successful trickery as superfluous after the young master has bought a second young woman for himself. Consequently, he is urged to come up with a new plan now enclosing two girls to take care of. Highlighting, doubling, and aggravating the challenge the clever slave faces increase suspense.

The attempt to foreground the challenge reaches its climax with the warning of trickery by the slave since he is directly impeding the course of manipulations. In *Pseudolus*, the protagonist seems to sabotage his plans by warning his master beforehand:[603]

PSEU.　*[…] tu mihi hercle argentum dabis,*
　　　　aps te equidem sumam.
　　　　[…] iam dico ut a me caveas.
SIMO　*[…] si apstuleris, mirum et magnum facinus feceris.*
(*Pseud*. 508-12)

Pseudolus assures Simo and the audience that Simo will give him the money willingly. The verbs *dabis* and *sumam* define both personae in the act of money transfer: the one who gives it willingly and the one who takes it without forcing the other. The slave does not stop at the open 'confession' when he even confronts his master and the audience with a direct warning. In the upside-down world, a trickster warns the victim of his trickery (*caveas*). Pseudolus repeats it three times in a row and ends it with an imperative (*cave*, 516). Pseudolus behaves paradoxically since the idea of tricking is normally not to be detected, but detection seems to be given freely beforehand. Thus, it endangers the solution of the already twisted situation.

The warning-of-the-trickery-element can be subsumed under the reoccurring technique underlining and supporting the concept of comic agon, intensifying the features of suspense, and drawing upon comedy's fantastic and marvellous course of events.[604] Plautus' *servus callidus* seems to follow the motto: the more impossible a mission is presented, the more brilliant its accomplishment must be and the more brilliant the accomplisher appears. Consequently, Plautus ensures suspense for the audience how the witty slave might fulfil his mission although they know he will somehow. Correspondingly, Simo calls Pseudolus' endeavour something miraculous (*mirum et magnum facinus*).[605] The slave as a magician can manage his trick even with his hands tied. In short, the comic 'hero', the clever slave, functions as the *architectus* of suspense, justifying his epithet *'callidus'*. The agon provides the *servus callidus* with a 'showroom' for his qualities, being clever, manipulative, rhetorically witty, and

---

[603] There are certain parallels between *Pseudolus* and *Bacchides* in regard to the figure *servus callidus* and the foreshadowing of a successful tricking. Both slaves make prophesies that the old master will give the money. Chrysalus goes beyond that as he foresees that the old master will even ask him to take the money (*Bacch.* 824-5). Compare Zwierlein (1991), 15; and for a detailed analysis of parallels, see W. Theiler, 'Zum Gefüge einiger Plautinischer Komödien', *Hermes* 73, 1938, 269-296, esp. 274-78. He argues that these corresponding parts rely on some similar Greek schema and are not a purely Plautine invention or copy.

[604] Scenes including bets and the warning-of-the-trickery-element also show the characteristic of *ludere*. The concept of agon is closely connected to playing. See ch. III.v.

[605] Similarly, Periphanes acknowledges the clever slave Epidicus' success as "*mirum hoc qui potuit fieri*" (*Epid*. 414).

nimble. The Roman audience is invited to a comic utopia of trickery, an agon of wit, constructed and performed by the *servus callidus.* [606]

The slave's agon

The clever slave realizes the construction of agon on different levels in comedy. The clever slave creates and visualizes the intrigue as the agon on the level of syntax. In *Baccides*, the agonal structure is underlined syntactically by opposing "*ego erum*" (929), "*callidum senem callidis dolis*" (643), "*ego illum*" (766), "*extexam ego illum*" (239), "*ego Ilio*" (945). On the verbal level, the slave usually expresses the agonistic activity as a physical attack by using phrases of movement as he would force the opponent into a certain direction (*senem oppugnare, Epid.* 163). Here, the slave's verbal choice mainly relies on the institutions of sports and most of all, military imaging the physic competition and dominance.[607] For instance, Epidicus hints at sports while he describes his hypothetical escape as a race between *senex* and himself: *ille haud obiciet mihi pedibus sese provocatum* (*Epid*. 664-65). By using military terms, Pseudolus approaches the enemy while he leads his legions (*hostibus congrediar; meas legiones adducam* [*Pseud.* 580, 586]). Chrysalus calls himself Agamemnon and recommends himself a commander-in-chief leading the army against the enemy.[608] The examples include a physical component imaging the deception of the adversary, only on the verbal level. The intrigue, actually a manipulation of the mind, consisting of lies and pretence, gains a physical dimension elucidating the agonistic quality. Plautus' comedy foregrounds a verbal 'battle' in the full sense of the word.

In regard to comedy's first plots, Old Comedy traditionally situated the main conflict, the epirrhematic agon, in the middle, broadening it from physical combat to a verbal argument. In the common structure, the protagonist, the comic hero, engages either the choir or other figures in an often heighted verbal debate in order to persuade them of his plan. The closing of the agon often entails the *sphragis* when the more persuasive contestant is praised.[609] This central part in the structure of Old Comedy exhibits the agonistic setting

---

606 Concerning the agonal idea, the noun 'wit' can be found in Dryden's translation of Juvenal's *Satires*. See *OED*, s.v. 'wit C_1. a. 'wit-battle' (n.)', "1693 Dryden, *Disc. conc. Satire* in tr. Juvenal *Satires* p. xliii, the Wit-battel of the Two Buffoons."

607 Besides the competitive programme of *ludi*, the Roman Republic's military reveals another public institution involving agonistic thought. Single combats or duels gave a soldier the occasion to fight for fame, proving themselves as brave and a hero's worth. Such duels were officially held to determine the winner of a battle: two opposing armies send one representative each to compete as a substitute. In addition, informal and 'spontaneous' fights among soldiers separated from a battle could also lead to a certain grade of honour. The military duel exemplifies agon's drastic battle on life and death. See Stephen P. Oakley, 'Single Combat in the Roman Republic', *The Classical Quarterly* 35.2 (1985): 392-410, esp. 392, 393. Oakley starts with a citation of Polybios (6.54.3-4), where the ambition of fame and heroic status urged the soldiers also to single combats. The paper lists all examples for single combat in the time span from prehistoric times to at least 45 B.C.

608 Further examples for military vocabulary, see ch. III.i. The strategy of dominating the contestant and making him do what the clever slave wants is expressed, for example, in "*machina*" (*Mil. 138*) relating to the military weapon. At Cicero and Plautus, *machina* can mean trick and cunning.

609 Cf. Zimmermann (2006), 41-42; and cf. Arthur W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*, rev. by Thomas Bertram Lonsdale Webster, Oxford et al.: Clarendon Press, ²1962, 148ff., 195, and 200ff.; and for a very detailed discussion of each part of the agon, cf. Thomas Gelzer, *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der Attischen Alten Komödie*, München: C.H. Beck, 1960, 3 and 73ff. The usual macro-structure of an epirrhematic agon is binary and symmetrical, containing spoken/ recited and lyrical parts. The common parts of the agon are the odes, the *katakeleusmoi*, the *epirrheme*, the *pnigoi*, *sphragis*. Their

belonging to Greek drama as a typical element, which determines the acting and construction of the personae as they must

> [...] convince an interlocutor in front of an audience (the chorus). Almost every major figure in Greek tragedy and comedy has such encounters. This configuration can be seen as archetypal.[610]

Following the Greek example, Plautus' clever slave figure is characterized by the means of how he realizes the agonistic idea and fulfils his role as an opponent. Concerning the repetitive imagery of physical attack, the slave drawing upon agon's theatrical roots engages in verbal debates by fusing manipulation, make-believes, and offensives throughout the play. Thereby, the slave defines himself in demarcation to the figure of the opponent as he demonstrates his domination and manipulation of the contestant to the audience during the agonistic process, which often remains concealed to the defeated until the end.

In *Bacchides* 979ff., the scene plays after Chrysalus' Trojan song confirming his future victory. The slave acts ahead of his master Nicobulus by using imperatives against him: *congredere*, *nosce*, *perlege*. Nicobulus follows these demands, which is signifying since the master is made to come to his slave instead of the expected sequence of order meaning that the master normally waits for the slave to come.[611] But the master is too worried about his son to reprehend his slave and recognize the ultimate danger of being tricked. Comedy's upside-down structure is depicted by a slave developing a competitive attitude towards the master, challenging his superiority and engaging in the verbal contest. Thus, besides the exchange of 'arguments', the contest subtly questions the participants' status and entails the challenge of identity.

Contesting belongs to the processes in social dynamics since agon offers a mechanism for social distinction.[612] A contest looks for the best in certain skills; excellence distinguishes someone from the rest in a social group or among groups.[613] Agon expresses and inflames the participants' desire for domination, excellence, and honour, generating motivation and feeding ambition of surpassing the others.[614] The process of agon and its outcome contribute to the shaping of identity within a group, whether the group consists of two or of a whole

---

sequence is: ode, *katakeleusmos*, *epirrhema*, *pnigos*, antode, *antikatakeleusmos*, *antepirrhema*, *antipnigos*, and *sphragis*. The choir introduces the scene of conflict by songs as ode, e.g. about the importance of the discussion, and antode, e.g. drawing conclusions or evaluating the arguments. Finally, the conflict can dissolve in the triumph of one participating group. The ending of the agon is then marked by the *sphragis* praising the winner and underlining the argument's result. For Thomas Gelzer, the sphragis can also be understood as the choir's judgement and thus, displaying the choir as the judge (cf. Gelzer [1960], 123).

Aristophanes' *Birds* and *Lysistrata* show a more monologic agon filled by the protagonist's arguments; for a more detailed and still valid outline on Old Comedy's structure although highly criticized by Arthur W. Pickard-Cambridge ([²1962], 195-6) but followed by Thomas Gelzer (1960), see Tadeusz Zieliński, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1885.

610 Richard P. Martin, 'Ancient theatre and performance culture', *Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, Marianne McDonald (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 36-54, 40.

611 And see *Bacch.* 881ff., Chrysalus leads the negotiations between the soldier Cleomachus and Nicobulus.

612 Again the social dynamic processes of distinction and comparison support an agonistic attitude, which can be detected in various situations of private and public life, where interests of at least two people intersect. Realizing one's interest denies the realisation of the other person's interest.

613 Evidence of mechanisms for social distinction, especially agonistic thought, were detected in other early societies than the Greek. Furthermore, an agonistic attitude is part of human behaviour as a natural element engaging in social dynamics. See Laser (1987), T 7.

614 See *LSJ*, s.v. 'ἀριστεύειν'. The Greek word 'ἀριστεύειν' (to be the best, the bravest; to be best at; to win) denotes the motif of the agonistic process; and for epic examples, see Laser (1987), T 8-T 11.

nation. The performance of competition conditioned practices in culture, religion, and in the socio-political domain for Greek and Roman society, implying processes of forming and challenging social identities by conveying a desired status as winner and degrading the other, or national identity by confirming the imperial status, and cultural identity by celebrating and participating at ritualized festivals.[615] Plautus' plot and the protagonist *servus callidus* centralize the agonal process, whose depiction Plautus' audience was most probably receptive to. The deceitful slave becomes a vivid, sympathetic, and enjoyable opponent, who is eager to win. The comic atmosphere loosens the agonistic harshness into the playful performance of a verbal battle suiting the call for *ridiculum.*

When the clever slave tries to dominate the master or a non-slave figure, he temporarily challenges and exposes the social identity of his opponent to become a target of ridiculing. The slave designs a battle of authority raising his social status to something superior in the spirit of Saturnalia but of course, limited to the fictional comic world. In *Bacchides* 987-994, the audience becomes a clear impression of Chrysalus' Saturnalian attitude since he does not stop at commanding his master, but he is also reluctant to follow the orders of Nicobulus. The slave refuses to stay and listen to Nicobulus, who is about to read out the letter:

CH.   *Quid me tibi adesse opus est?*
NI.   *volo [ut quod iubeo facias]*[616] *ut scias quae hic scripta sient.*
CH.   *Nil moror neque scire volo.*
NI.   *Tamen ades.*
CH.   *Quid opust?*
NI.   *Taceas: quod iubeo id facias.*
CH.   *Adero.*
NI.   *Euge litteras minutas.*
CH.   *Qui quidem videat parum; verum, qui satis videat, grandes satis sunt.*
NI.   *Animum advortito igitur.*
CH.   *Nolo inquam.*
NI.   *At volo inquam.*
CH.   *Quid opust?*
NI.   *At enim id quod te iubeo facias.*
CH.   *Iustumst ut tuos tibi servos tuo arbitratu serviat.*
(*Bacch.* 988ᵃ-994)

This scene evolves a verbal fight around authority expressed in the constant clash of *volo* and *nolo*. Chrysalus does not follow Nicobulus' demands, but delays Nicobulus' reading out the letter as he permanently questions the need of his presence and urges Nicobulus to reason his request. The master does not reason but refers to his status (*iubeo, volo*). The slave's answer *volo* stands in contrast to Nicobulus' will and is even enhanced by *nil* and *neque.* The master is urged to repeat his command *quod iubeo facias* Chrysalus seems to adjust to. However, he cannot surpress to make fun of Nicobulus' exclamation *litteras minutas.* The assumed poor eyesight hints at the age of his master and the sharp remark can also allude to the deception and to the fact that he sees too little of what is going on around him.

The verbal fight enters into its second round: Chrysalus stays but now refuses to pay attention. *Nolo* and *volo* clash again against each other while the sharpness of *at* underlines

---

615 Separating these identities in strict categories is necessary to be able to describe them, but it is artificial as they overlap in reality.
616 Verse in brackets given by Leo, cf. Nixon (repr. 1997), 428.

the agonistic scene. A red-headed Nicobulus comes to mind, when he is provoked by Chrysalus' last and superfluous question why that is necessary. Finally, Chrysalus gives in by ironically stating the obvious social convention he disregarded the whole prior conversation as if he acknowledges Nicobulus' right and status as a master. The figura ethymologica *servus servire* and the quasi tricolon of the 2nd personal pronoun (*tuos, tibi, tuo*) exaggeratingly confirm Nicobulus' authority the slave actually undermines and ridicules. Chrysalus should have complied with Nicobulus' demands at once and should have shown 'activity' in the form of staying and listening rather than an evaluation and confirmation of something obvious and known.

In the whole conversation, the clever slave is not interested in being cooperative; he does not satisfy the master's needs and does not support a balanced communication between the addresser and the addressee. He pursues his own plan that replaces cooperation in communication with a more or less secret competition and thus deliberately transgresses the Cooperative Principle (CP) formulated by Herbert Paul Grice: "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged."[617] His definition of the CP, the four categories, Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner, and their maxims describes the foundation for a successful communication process as "a maximally effective exchange of information".[618] Grice's categories and subsumed maxims, which were already introduced in the chapter comedy, will help to clarify the slave's tactics in conversation: how he influences and challenges his dialogue partner closed from him by dominating the course of conversation and thereby, presents himself as the stronger opponent in the agon of mind.[619] When the clever slave flexibly follows and violates the categories' maxims, he shows a destructive attitude towards a balanced communication in a competition to surpass his dialogue partner and prove himself in control of the conversation.

If Chrysalus' last utterance is looked at with Grice's apparatus, the audience can understand the slave's conclusion as ironic since it violates Grice's specific maxim under the category of Quality: "Do not say what you believe is false".[620] Saying that it is the duty of a slave to serve his master is perfectly correct in Roman society of that century but his ongoing plan of trickery and the fact that Chrysalus places it after his prior open resistance to follow the master's instructions alert the audience. The utterance is true in itself but not in the context out of the mouth of the trickster, who temporarily neglects the formulated duty. The slave thus chooses a statement that is incongruous with the frame of tricking probably tickling laughter among the audience as they can perceive the irony in the utterance, whereas Nicobulus only gets what he wanted all along. In other words, while stating Nicobulus' right that his slave serves him in accordance to his will, the slave deliberately tricks him and watches Nicobulus going in his trap. The master's right that is outspoken and affirmed by a slave, who even resisted following the instructions at first, proves Chrysalus' prior behaviour as well as the present statement to be a challenge and domination of the master.

The clever slave is clearly more interested in illuminating his participation in the dialogue as a dominant role determining the course of conversation and his dialogue partner than in reaching a consensus. This attitude is also apparent in neglecting other maxims, which

---

617 Grice (⁴2002), 78.
618 *Ibid.*, 79.
619 Cf. *Ibid.*, 76-88. Grice's definition of the Cooperative Principle, the four categories and the subsumed maxims are seen as a useful tool to analyse the clever slave's method to insert an agonistic tone into the dialogue. For a more detailed introduction of Grice's theory and its relation to the analysis, see ch. II.i.
620 *Ibid.*, 78.

is the case when his reply violates a maxim of the first category Quantity since the piece of information Chrysalus gives is not required and Nicobulus already knows what the slave's duty is. The fact that Chrysalus' remark is a clearly exaggerated and abundant form of 'I do' or 'Yes, of course' as an answer to Nicobulus' demand also flouts the maxim of manner as it should have been briefer. The length and the chosen style of the utterance simulate a degree of formality that is inadequate for the situation and the speaker.[621] The surface of relevance and the exaggeration of style underline the irony, the inversion of Chrysalus' actual tricking and prior answers, and only pretend that social convention is fulfilled as the dialogue happens on a particularly Saturnalian stage, where none is valid and the clever slave can promote his advantage and superiority over his master.

The progress of the scene and especially the final statement of the clever slave embody the agonistically constructed relation between master and slave. The slave leads the process of agon as the slave overrules the master and introduces the audience to the inversion of hierarchy by ripostes, asides, images, and other devices. The Saturnalian atmosphere and the control over the agon allow the slave to expose the master or opponent to ridiculing. Conclusively, agon creates and stabilizes the Saturnalian environment since the fooling of Nicobulus by Chrysalus questions and influences the social identities of the two contestants. The slave in charge of the agonistic discourse levels himself with his social superior. The temporary limit of the agon ending with the accomplishment of the slave's plan guarantees the Saturnalian limitation. Within these boundaries, the slave can deviate from his traditional, expected status regarding reality to something fantastic and unpredictable within the framework of comedy. The slave's most effective weapons in the agon are his twists and his deliberate violation of the Cooperative Principle and the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner, revealing dialogue as his battleground and key to domination. The defects manifest the clever slave's double-dealing; the slave pretends to serve his master, but deceives him. His trickery and sudden turns accumulate to an opacity of his agenda often not only for the enemy but also for the audience, which assigns him the characteristic of unpredictability.

It is the slave's ambiguous acting in dialogues including dissimulation, deliberate misunderstanding and in sum, the misuse of conversational maxims that make the clever slave unpredictable and unfold his talent of tricking on the level of the verbal debate. The agonistic course fits the figure's profession, fooling the other and proving that the contestant is not as cunning as the clever slave.[622] It starts with the juxtaposition of *callidum senem callidis dolis compuli* (*Bacch.* 643) and ends in the admission that *quot illic homo hodie me exemplis ludificatust* (*Epid.* 671).[623] Throughout the play, the agonistic process can be perceived on two levels. The step stones of the plot—for example, the fact that Nicobulus reads the letter written by Mnesilochus but dictated by Chrysalus—are part of the organic action, the succession of the plot aiming at the success of the intrigue, while the microstructure of agonistic scenes shows the aim of *ridiculum* in undermining the conventional and presenting the verbal contest of wit. It is now essential to analyse that microstructure and understand how the *servus callidus* performs the agonistic process and how it displays the clever slave's functionality for the schema of comedy.

---

621 Cf. Barsby (1986), 179, n. 988-96.
622 Deliberate misunderstanding is also a specific feature in the clever slave's playful manner (see ch. III.v.).
623 Cf. *Bacch.* 813-4, 1095 (*dolis doctis indoctum*); *Most.* 1148.

The agonistic setting imaging the intrigue offers the slave a scope for his talents, whose sum enables him to construct the comic discourse. The figure's ability to do so is already advertised in his epithet *callidus* denoting "wise from experience, practised, expert" and "crafty, cunning, wily".[624] The slave remarkably knows how to perform the agon hidden from his opponent and make him wear the ugly mask. The formerly mentioned scene, where Chrysalus refuses to follow his masters' commands at first, continues with a sequence of Chrysalus' comments on Nicobulus' reading the letter. The audience can witness how the clever slave applies three different categories of comments a) hidden truth, b) ironic questions and c) contradictory turn (*Bacch.* 999-1027):[625]

> *Inde a principio iam inpudens epistula est.*
> *Nihil est illorum quin ego illi dixerim.*
> *Eadem istaec verba dudum illi dixi omnia.*
> *Non prius salutem scripsit?*
> *Estne istuc istic scriptum?*
> *Non dabis, si sapies.*
> *Ne unum quidem hercle, si sapis.*

Distributing the slave's comments to these three categories does not attempt to define the clever slave's speech in competitive dialogues with his opponent in general but should help to understand how the clever slave figure achieves a competitive tone in that scene and most of all, how he puts the species of the ugly on stage for the audience; the analysis intends to narrow down the former results given on the basis of Grice's maxims.

As the clever slave has dictated the false letter, a Trojan horse, the sentences under a) speak the truth while they allude to two situations: one that is false and only believed by Nicobulus and one that is true but too hidden for Nicobulus to recognize though disclosed enough for the audience to laugh at. The master perceives and is made to perceive falsely that Chrysalus has rebuked the young master with all these words, whereas the true situation contains the clever slave saying these words to Mnesilochus as part of the dictation. The supermaxim of Quality ("Try to make your contribution one that is true") is not actually flouted here but there is a form of violation since Nicobulus, the addressee, interprets the contribution falsely but in accordance to his knowledge. Chrysalus formulates ambiguous sentences on purpose, to create the allusion for Nicobulus that he reads the letter to the clever slave as news. Chrysalus acts as innocent, providing Nicobulus with an illusion and reminding the audience of the truth, namely that the master is fooled.[626] Chrysalus' comments are not required for any understanding but operate as confirmations of the slave, who successfully beats his master in the competition of wit and shows his victory off to the audience.

In b, the clever slave keeps up the pretence by asking for the content he knows best. The audience can only understand these remarks as ironic questions, which stand in contradiction to the clever slave's knowledge and again hint at Chrysalus' secret authorship. Similarly to a, these utterances are superfluous, foreground the fooling of Nicobulus, bear the potential for laughter, and even negate the master's intellect to puzzle out the deception.

---

624 *OLD,* s.v. 'callidus'.
625 It is important to note that Grice's term category does not equate with the here-applied notion; nor is it meant to replace it.
626 On the construction of illusionary frames, see ch. III.iv.

While the categories of hidden truth and ironic questions fit the slave's trickery, the clever slave seems to undermine his own plan by the sentences under point c with a contradictory manoeuvre. The clever slave has actually reached his aim, getting the money, but he prefers to prolong the competition. By the protasis, if Nicobulus is clever, the clever slave makes the master's decision dependent on his sharp mind, which means that if he gives the money, he is not clever. Chrysalus underlines Nicobulus' blindness towards the trickery and his inferiority as the slave is more clever. The contradictory turn puzzles the master and probably even the audience, but skilfully inserts a subtle variation of fooling Nicobulus and a gambit in order to manage his manipulation spectacularly and excitingly.

All three categories are based upon Chrysalus' advantage in knowledge of the letter as a deceptive tool. The master does not recognize the comments' ambiguity the slave shares with the audience. The process of agon describes a slave that pursues his agenda of tricking the master, while he is also interested in the agon of cleverness and its performance. For the slave, it does not suffice to achieve the aim of the intrigue, the object needed—usually a specific sum of money—, but to outwit the opponent bombastically and enriched by laughter. Fighting the adversary entails fooling him and more particularly, fooling him in front of the audience as Chrysalus abuses Nicobulus' lack of knowledge and makes him participate in his deception game involuntarily. On a subtle level, using the three categories hidden truth, ironic questions and contradictory turn shows the slave as juggling with incongruous constructs in a scene generating moments of *ridiculum*. Incongruity can be found between truth and illusion, when the slave's comments simulate a truth the master believes in, whereas he originally alludes to his trickery while tricking. Ironic comments seem to fit the master's knowledge but violate the real conditions. The third category contradicts the slave's formulated aim, getting the money, actively. Since the audience has witnessed the previous scenes including Chrysalus' dictation of the letter, they have access to the ambiguity of Chrysalus' comments. One meaning can be found in the locutionary act that is the utterance's ostensible meaning, the illusion. The second reading of the sentence includes the implication, addressed to the audience and determined in relation to the context of the scene enclosing all previous scenes. Opposing these two meanings discloses their incongruity, which is opaque to Nicobulus but highlighted by the slave and prominent for the audience. The image of the agon in the conversation is established by a number of defects, where incongruity can occur and the laughable relies upon.

The sum of the three categories containing some form of incongruity operates efficiently for the moments of *ridiculum* and shows the slave as being in charge of the scene. All along the clever slave makes Nicobulus' deficiency visible in his agon and promotes himself as the superior by ignoring the CP and excluding Nicobulus from the original course of the dialogue, his double game. Here, especially the third category 'contradictory turn' stands out from the first two as it connotes the slave's art of circumventing, whose sudden changes, spontaneous reactions and thus violation of expectation belong to the major characteristics of the clever slave since they guarantee suspense, excitement, and laughter.[627] When Chrysalus advises the master not to give any money, he paradoxically intervenes in the course of intrigue. The spectator might expect that he forces the master to give the money; but his negation seems to prevent the favourable outcome of the deception. In reality, he tricks the master in taking the decision on his own and giving the money freely.[628] At first glance, his

---

627 On the feature *para prosdokian*, see ch. III.v.
628 See *Bacch.* 1036-43. Chrysalus minimizes his former strong advice to a 'non-advice' at all as he does not want to be responsible for any false decision and consequences.

advice might thus seem foolish but reveals itself as a brilliant deviation from the expected during the scene.[629]

The final part of the letter scene in *Bacchides* continues with the slave's strategy enclosing contradictory turns. The scene could end with Chrysalus' victory when Nicobulus decides to help his son and to give the money to Chrysalus. The mission seems accomplished; however, Chrysalus refuses to take the money and pursues the agonistic course in order to make Nicobulus insist that he is the courier of the money. The following lines are Chrysalus' answers:

> *Non equidem accipiam. proin tu quaeras qui ferat*
> *nolo ego mihi credi.*
> *Non equidem capiam.*
> *Nolo, inquam, aurum concredi mihi.*
> *vel da aliquem qui servet me.*
> (*Bacch.* 1061-1065)

*Equidem, nol**o ego**, **mihi**, **me***—the presence of the first person in the sentences underlines Chrysalus' emphatic negation when he rejects to follow Nicobulus' instruction although it is exactly what he wanted to achieve. This unexpected strategy again triggers a back and forth quarrel between master and slave until Chrysalus agrees with simulated reluctance: *cedo si necesse est*. At first, the clever slave's reaction surprises since it seems to endanger his plan. But given the course of events in *Bacchides*, Chrysalus' reaction could be regarded the peak of his genius manoeuvre, which is supposed to distract Nicobulus and prevent the master from thinking the slave as the trickster from the beginning of the 'letter scene'. If Chrysalus had been too eager to follow Nicobulus' wishes, the master would probably have become suspicious. Besides, the clever slave would have fallen out of his Saturnalian role and paused in his agonistic performance.[630] In fact, the slave gives his contestant the feeling to be in control every time the master can 'assert' himself although his slave remains the leading figure in both senses at all times.

Chrysalus proves himself worthy in comparison to Greek masters of trickery as he likes to design himself in the mythological hyperbole.[631] Such twists and turns might even surprise and puzzle the audience, who is normally ahead to the master in knowledge of the strategic course of the clever slave. As a dramatic technique, it could be seen as sustaining the audience's attention and increasing suspense. As a characteristic of the slave, it defines the functional construction of this comic type, who wants to dominate the plot until the very end and prefers the unusual, more exciting path to an easier and straight fulfilment of his task. To achieve that, he abuses conventions as well as agreements such as the CP in order to perform a trickery as an agon and to present himself more as the Saturnalian player and finally, winner than a deceiver. The example taken from *Bacchides* can be compared to the clever slave Epidicus' unpredictable and contradictory behaviour within the framework of the play.

---

629 For more on foolishness and the thematic configuration of the *servus ludens*, see ch. III.v.

630 The paradoxical strategy already starts at the second deception. The clever slave manages to dissipate Nicobulus' suspicion by encountering the angry master and directing the anger into worries about his son: *salvus sum, iratus est senex* (772). Paradoxically, the slave's salvation lies in the anger of his master (cf. *Bacch.* 763-72). For some considerations see Niall W. Slater, 'A Note on Plautus' "*Bacchides*" 772', *The Classical World* 77.1 (1983): 20-21.

631 See ch.III.i.

After getting busted, Epidicus shocks the fooled and angry duo of Periphanes and Apoecides by turning himself in. Here, Plautus amuses the audience with a change from the desperate and threatened Epidicus to the superior and confident challenger again:

> *Quid me quaeris? quid laboras? quid hunc sollicitas?*
> *ecce me.*
> *num te fugi, num ab domo apsum, num oculis concessi tuis?*
> *nec tibi supplico. vincire vis? em ostendo manus;*
> *tu habes lora, ego te emere vidi. quid nunc cessas? colliga.*
> (*Epid*. 680-84)

The *servus callidus* confidently throws a bunch of rhetorical questions at the pursuers and corners them by leaving them no point to attack. He structures his short speech by the anapher of *num*, opposes *tu*, *te* and *ego*, and rounds it off with the imperative to be bound. The absurdity comes to a climax when a slave orders his angry master to bind him.[632]

What follows is a stichomythic sequence consisting of outrageous exclamations by Periphanes and Apoedices and the slave's continuation of his demanding and confident attitude. Epidicus finally perplexes Periphanes completely by inverting the actual purport of arrest: *Meo hercle vero atque hau tuo colligandae haec sunt tibi hodie* (*Epid*. 688-89).[633] Here, the slave pinpoints the agonistic idea present in the comic discourse since even when he seems to have lost and got caught, he manages to keep the upper hand at least in conducting the dialogue. Epidicus like Chrysalus clearly trusts his advanced status as an all-licensed *architectus*, who takes his confidence from his advantage in knowledge. Finally, Epidicus' plan succeeds and his immunity is affirmed since Periphanes awards him with freedom. Although the clever slave tricked and challenged his master, he is not punished but even rewarded. Not only does such contradictory behaviour of the slave in the agonal process surprises and realizes *ridiculum*, but it also fosters the carnivalesque structure, which exhibits slaves ruling their masters.

From the spectator's perspective, the intersection of truth and illusion, dramatic irony and contradictory turn indicate three personae the slave incorporates in the scene: Nicobulus' loyal slave who has fulfilled his mission; the deceitful slave who lies at his master to achieve the sum of money; and the opponent who does not stop at the former but wants to outwit the master.[634] The personae stand in juxtaposition to each other as the *servus callidus* plays the loyal slave to his master although he competes with him, defies and fools him. In other words, the agon conveys the paradox pattern, mostly apparent in the idea of a slave ruling, competing, and fooling the master; therefore, it represents an aesthetically effective part in the clever slave's construction. Not only is the Plautine *servus callidus* significant for the aesthetic value and experience of Plautus' comedy, but also essential for the schema's coherence of *fabula palliata*. The clever slave's characteristics are complementary to other stock characters and support their integration into *fabula palliata* as in order to display an agon and its process, two contestants are needed in the mood to fight. The construction of

---

632 On the closeness between an agonistic attitude and nonsense in behaviour, see ch. III.v. The element of contradictory behaviour sets them parallel to each other.

633 Epidicus in leading position of the conversation inverts expected social behaviour at the end of the scene again. At the beginning, he demands to be bound when Periphanes is actually planning to arrest him and finally, when the master has forgiven him and even sets him free, Epidicus does not allow him to untie his hands (*Epid*. 722ff.). Thus, the paradoxical intervention is doubled in the final scene of the play.

634 To be distinguished from the clever slave's *dramatis personae*, which include all personae or roles he plays within one play.

the *servus callidus* depends on and interacts with the *senex iratus*, whose rage conditions and co-determines the clever slave's provocative and competitive actions.

In conclusion, the analysis argues that the slave's complex of personae and his ability to create incongruity contribute to the functionality of the figure based on paradoxical pairs, which are here identified as the loyal slave and the trickster bound to his flexibility to move between them. Across the intrigue comedies, the clever slave displays himself as a chameleon rhetorically showing his different 'masks' in a paradoxical structure and applying them functionally in his pursuit of *ridiculum*. This is only possible when he is understood as a strategic thinker trying to keep the upper hand in the agon, the verbal debate. Constructing such stratagems implies the ability to predict the behaviour of other figures. In short, the *servus callidus* in his agonistic performance observes, influences the others, and stands at the outside and inside, communicating his dominant status to the audience.

Even if being in- and outside at the same time exclude each other at first, the clever slave's play reveals his exclusiveness compared to other figures. The observer collects all the information he can get to use them against his enemy, which also includes eavesdropping (*Pseud*. 134ff.), an activity demanding an outside perspective. Influencing the other relates back to the examples of Chrysalus and Epidicus dominating their masters in a conversation, using his bird's eye view, and determining the plot he is also part of. At last, the clever slave stands outside as he deviates from the other slave figures in his characteristics as he constructs and inhabits a Saturnalian environment, where he competes with his opponent in the agon and is exclusively protected by an all-license. Recognizing the slave as an outsider, observer, all-licensed and not to mention, utmost clever, divulge his talent of flexibility, which allows him to play an unpredictable double dealer. In *Epidicus*, Chaeribulus is impressed by Epidicus' quick adaptation to the new challenge: *Vorsutior es quam rota figularis* (371).

He has the ability to change roles quickly, to invent tricky manipulations, and to pinpoint the agonistic atmosphere in his ironic remarks. The superior intriguer simulates to be a loyal and inferior slave. The opponent pretends to be an ally. The expected reaction turns out to be the opposite. A paradoxical complex is created, in which the slave moves and mutually uses masks. His figure slips in different roles: the loyal slave, the innocent, the inferior, but also the challenger, the *architectus*, and the playful wit, which all belong to his professional repertoire. In sum, hopping between expected, familiar (re)action and unexpected, paradoxical and puzzling turns classifies the *servus callidus* as a "protean skin-changer" like he recommends himself to the audience (cf. Chrysalus as *vorsipellem*, *Bacch.* 658).[635]

Since the slave can adapt to the relevant situation wittily, moving through the complex of personae, incongruity derives from the paradoxical opposition and the unpredictable changes, especially when the slave's acting does not follow conventions and expectations. The paradox pattern is realized in every moment, when the slave gives orders to his master, while he serves his master, while the slave competes with his master and while he is actually a slave. By building up the dramatic action in these layers, the slave automatically creates a source for ambiguity and defect the audience has access to. Realizing the pattern can be identified as providing potential material for *ridiculum*.

The incongruity between the invented roles in the play and the socially bound ones as well as the quick change between them guarantee moments of laughter. For instance, if the

---

635 Slater (²2002), 93; Chrysalus' soliloquy on how a servant should be describes the characteristics of the clever slave (*Bacch.* 643ff.): being spontaneous, inventory, and utmost clever (see ch. III.iv.), which shows the slave as being conscious of the role and its functionality.

audience advances in knowledge to the slave's opponent, who is left in the dark about the ongoing pretence, the difference in knowledge provides moments of dramatic irony and a source for hilarious scenes. Furthermore, surprising twists performed by the slave urge the other figures to make a fool of themselves. Such scenes contain extreme and sudden reactions appearing incongruous with former behaviour, knowledge, expectation like Epidicus surprises with unconformity to his detection. If unexpectedness and surprise are seen as qualities of slave's dramatic action, then his playing operates as *paraprosdokeion* joking.[636]

While the clever slave pursues his 'profession' of a trickster with an agonistic tone, he fosters comedy's principle *ridiculum*. The slave's ability to shift between his masks, the loyal slave and the deceiving trickster, quickly and suddenly provides the type with a foundation of opposition and incongruity to install moments of *ridiculum*. This repertoire of masks transcribes the carnivalesque structure since being flexible and in control of the agonal comic discourse offers the *servus callidus* a creative space for his thematic configurations, for example, when the clever slave invents himself as an *imperator*. Thus, the process of agon confronts the audience with a carnivalesque complex of inverting hierarchical structure and intermingling the profane with the superior in the *servus callidus*, who incorporates various appearances like the heroic anti-hero, the all-licensed slave and the Saturnalian promoter.

Beyond that function, the clever slave's flexibility adds a metatheatrical perspective to the agon and underlines the actors' performance, especially when it comes to the clever slave's use of the contradictory turn.[637] The complex of personae and the acting of deceit foregrounds the fact of playing roles within a play and doubles theatre's *modi operandi* by creating a box within a box. Challenging the master or a non-slave figure and entering a Saturnalian environment are both bound to a fantastic construction the slave outlives since it does not affect convention and its boundaries beyond the intrigue. Comedy's agon with all its 'rules' and escapades remains in its utopian frame theatre grants. The agon thus displays the intrigue not as an immoral affront but as an entertaining, farcical but painless game, which is played by the architect of the plot to the audience, who does not come to watch the outcome that the master or leno is deceived but to get to see and hear how cleverly it is done. The type *servus callidus* serves comedy's principles and its schema by its aesthetically effective construction based upon the paradox pattern. The paradoxical structure discloses the *servus callidus*' quality of flexibility with the attribute of unexpectedness in order to serve the *ridiculum*, realize and visualize the carnivalesque and to mediate the utopian world of comedy.

---

636 Fontaine (2010), 7: "[…] comedy is the natural enemy of the perceptual set. Comedians love to set up patterns that seemingly build toward a logical end, only to reverse and disappoint our expectations at the final moment. Ancient theorists call this facetious and sudden reversal of expectations a para prosdokian (Latin *praeter exspectationem* 'contrary to expectation, surprise, turn, switcheroo')." Also see Cic. *de orat.* 2.70.284: *ex his omnibus nihil magis ridetur, quam quod est praeter exspectationem*. This basically means that jokes operating with *para prosdokian* can be best laughed at.
637 Compare to contradiction by acting as a *servus ludens*, see ch. III.v.

III.iv. Illuminating illusion

Being flexible and unexpected is present in the slave's change of roles producing layers of acting and characterization. Regarding this functionality on a metatheatrical level reveals the clever slave as constructing several, nested frames of play. Succinctly, the audience is drawn into 'the play within the play'. While the *servus callidus* guides the audience through the nested illusions, he illuminates these layers. The present chapter analyses the clever slave's bifold relation to illusion as he constructs and destructs illusions by different means and of variable intensity. Within the metatheatrical dimension, the audience's perspective shifts from the consummation of theatrical performance to the awareness and reflection of the product they consume.

Moments of metatheatre provide an insight into the theoretical machinery of drama as well as drama's culture beyond the audience's indulgence. Therefore, analysing the clever slave's relation to illusions helps to explain his functionality and aesthetic effectiveness in comedy, while it also offers a closer look at Plautus' design and understanding of theatre and comedy. Considering two sides of the same coin—constructing an illusion to indulge in and destroying it to illuminate the fiction and its poet—makes it necessary to start with outlining the anatomy of Greek and Roman Comedy's poetic production in order to disclose the dynamics of antiquity's theatre: the poet's perspective on his product and himself, the subtle prevalence of artists' agon, and the structure of illusion the Plautine figure is situated in.

The agonal idea still constitutes a significant element in this chapter since playwrights' agon affects the attitude towards their working environment, theatre, and how they fabricate it, which usually adapts to generic maxims, determines the experience for an audience, and influences their perspective and knowledge of theatre, its pieces of art, and its underlying conventions. The reciprocal relation between these factors affects concepts on stage, among which the figure *servus callidus* might be the richest figurative source in Plautus' comedies for reflecting upon theatre's operators as well as drama and dramatist's self-fashioning, whose records start in 486 BCE.

In 486 BCE, the Dionysian games see the first comedy play, connecting the comic poet's creation and dramatic performance with public competition.[638] Agonal idea becomes apparent in the fact that the geniuses in drama rival for the audience's favour, in the verbal contest, and in the *modus operandi* of the theatrical world, which creates a complex kaleidoscope of fictions, multiple voices, and images often opposing each other "in an atmosphere of developed agonistic competition and intense literary allusion, wherein the poets [seek] and [create] for themselves visible public identities."[639] The poet's voice rises, facing the challenge to invent something unique and new but also to follow a traditional and popular path, so to speak. The pressure of imitating something already existent and reinterpreting it with ingenuity puts the playwright in the dock. Not only due to those days primary rule of *imitatio*, a writer is always in need of demarcating and justifying his piece of art Old comedy realizes in the form of the parabasis, which New Comedy and Roman Comedy

---

638 Cf. Jeffrey Rusten (ed.), *The Birth of Greek Comedy. Texts, Documents, and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486 – 280*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2011, 16ff. and 38; cf. Zimmermann (2006), 14-26. Two festivals were central to the combination of agon, cult and dramatic performances: the major Dionysian games and the minor *Lenaea*, in honour of the god of vegetation and wine, Dionysus.
639 Hubbard (1991), 33.

substitutes by the prologues. In all of these means, the voice of the poet becomes almost palpable.

In Old Comedy, the poet makes his identity visible by defending himself against accusations of plagiarisms and addressing the audience, the jury and his adversaries in order to praise the own creation or compliment the audience. Aristophanes highlighted his authority as a comedy playwright of the first hour by insisting on having removed vulgar and farcical images from comedy (*Pax* 741-2; *Vesp*. 60). In general, parabatic discourse is determined by defensive, offensive, and self-reflective rhetoric. [640]

Such parabatic claims correspond to those in New Comedy's prologues, which also occur in Plautus and Terence's introductory sections dealing with issues of audience applause and attention, contamination, borrowing, and the poet's self-defence.[641] Each *topos* hints at the agon of verbal uniqueness and originality. Especially in *Poenulus'* prologue, the prologue speaker outlines the details of how a theatre visit and the atmosphere in antiquity look like, instructs the spectators and names them as judges (*vos iuratores estis*, *Poen*. 58).[642] The jury's judgement is measured in their attention and final appreciation. Audience applause in the end indicates an evaluation not only of the performance, but also of a new Roman version adapting Greek comedic forerunners, which attempts to seek its demarcation to the past achievements in drama: *Palliata* demarcating from New Comedy, and analogically, New Comedy demarcating from Middle and Old Comedy, and the genre comedy demarcating from tragedy.[643]

The key to do so lies in the poet's creativity, a poet's voice and the identity of his work, made palpable throughout the play besides the prologue. In antiquity, creativity for comic poets differed from their tragic colleagues in their initial situation and their production standards since

> Comedy did not generally draw its material from the sphere of traditional myth [in contrast to Tragedy]; it depended more on the poet's own inventiveness, and therefore the practice of poets imitating each other's ideas or reusing their own.[644]

The poet was thus depended on his creative mind seeking for answers to how something 'new' can be tied up with the already known and popular aesthetically and how traditional concepts of dramatic figures can be reinterpreted. The early comic poets looking for material and integration into the cultural consciousness relied on the stock of already established "generic rivals".[645] They attempted to construct a 'competitive' genre, whose stories were not indebted

---

640 Cf. Hubbard (1991), 32-33. The choral parabasis outlining the poet's identity presents the chorus and addresses the judges to gain their support and to persuade them of their advantages against the other choral presentations (see *Av*. 753-68, 785-800, 1102-17; *Eccl*. 1155-62; *Equ*. 565-80; *Nub*. 575-94, 1115-30; *Vesp*. 1071-90; *Thesm*. 830-45; fr. 112-13 PCG).

641 For examples on contamination and borrowing see Ter. *Andr*. 1-27; *Haut*. 1-34; *Eun*. 1-45; *Phorm*. 1-34; *Ad*. 1-25, and on criticizing and flattering the audience, see Plaut. *Amph*. 1-85; *Cas*. 1-33; *Poen*. 1-45 (esp. 36-39). For more examples, see Hubbard (1991), 1 ft.1, 2; contamination and *aemulatio* as leading criteria in the creational process for a Roman poet held up to the Greek *exemplum*.

642 Direct address, the determination of the audience's role, and the construction of a relationship between a speaker and a hearer belong to rhetoric means and usual theatrical practice.

643 There was a consciousness of comedy's and tragedy's generic interrelations and differences, e.g. *Poen*. 2: *Ind' mihi principium capiam, ex ea tragoedia*.

644 Hubbard (1991), 33-34.

645 Rusten (2014), 46. And on generic intersections, see Johanna Hanink, 'Crossing genres: Comedy, Tragedy, and Satyr Play', *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014, 258-277.

to any direct literary binding in contrast to myth-based tragedy. This independence and comedy's ridiculing habit coming close to iambic poetry admit comedy to use other genres and their content more freely, which might drastically be described as a form of parasitism in analogy to the agonistic thought.[646] In a comedy, intertextual references can act parasitic by conveying a parodic tone and exposing serious material to triviality. Aristophanes treated tragedy substantially parodic in *Acharnians*, *Women at the Thesmophoria*, and *Frogs*.[647] Besides content and style from other genres, the following generations of Greek and Roman poets like Menander or Plautus could deal with former or contemporary successful comedy plays. Plautus could not only rely on the plot repertoire of Middle and New Comedy, but he also applied epic and tragic content by lying mythological hyperboles in the mouth of the clever slave. Furthermore, he issued the generic features of tragedy and comedy in *Amphitruo's* prologue as the prototypical generic blend of both. In most intrigue comedies, he put the clever slave at the centre as a comic *deus ex machina* that is in charge of the intrigue and restores order, starting from a seemingly hopeless situation.[648] The genre of comedy exhibited a greater freedom for experiment and generic variations than tragedy, whose potential Plautus exhausted more extensively—to name the dominant type *servus callidus* and the *tragicomoedia Amphitruo* again—than Terence tending to adhere to Menander more firmly.[649]

For Plautus, writing comedy granted him with a license for creative 'freedom'; still, he was restricted by tradition and the challenge of *imitatio*. Plautus' comedy and Plautus as a playwright were in need of meeting these requests and communicating the poet's identity and that of his drama in demarcation to his sources since he participated with his creations and their content in a recently started national cultural movement relying on the Greek idol; the Roman poet wanted to emerge by the *fabula palliata*. Plautus employed the common device of parabatic-similar prologues to address the competitive attitude and communicate his image as a genuine poet to the Roman audience.[650]

In the discourse of the play, the process of demarcation and creative distinction continues in metatheatrical references, wherein the poet's concept of theatre and its cultural background can become palpable. Such passages develop an intertextual or intercultural dimension, which is especially the case, when Plautus appeals to native dramatic forms and gives the impression of improvisation à la mode of Atellan farce, probably slipping in his experience from his career as an actor.[651] Such seemingly improvisatory parts in Plautus'

---

646 Aristot. *poet*. 1448b1, 25ff. and esp. 1449a1 ff.; Rusten (2014), 37: "[…] comedy, which makes up its plots and uses any names it wishes (*katholou*), is the least 'fact-dependent' of all poetic genres." (cf. Aristot. *poet*. 1449b2-8, 1451b12).

647 *Ibid*., 46-47. On Aristophanes' relation to tragedy, note Silk (2000).

648 For the significance of the original tragic *deus ex machina* in Sophocles and Euripides' plays, see Andreas Spira, *Untersuchungen zum Deus ex machine bei Sophocles and Euripides*, Kallmünz: Verlag Michael Lassleben, 1960, esp. 156ff.; Plautus could draw upon a profound knowledge about Greek drama material and performances of Greek theatre as - most likely- he also sat in the audience watching performances of Greek plays. "[…] Imported Athenian comedies as well as tragedies were being performed in southern Italy as early as the first half of the fourth century BC." (Slater [²2000], xiv. Slater relates to the major works of J. R. Green, *Theater in Ancient Greek Society*, London 1994; and Oliver Taplin, *Comic Angels*, Oxford 1993).

649 As it has been discussed previously, Plautus did not invent the type *servus callidus*, but certainly transformed New Comedy's cunning and cheeky slaves to the concept of a *servus callidus* and its themes suiting his *palliata* (see ch. III.i.).

650 Cf. Hubbard (1991), 1 ff.

651 Cf. Slater (²2000), 5-6. Slater calls Plautus a theatre professional. Also see Duckworth (1952), 49-51. I follow Slater and Duckworth in the belief that "Plautus was an actor, presumably in Atellan farce or mime. He may have even acted in his own plays" (Slater [²2000], 6 ft. 14).

comedies, which will be of interest in the following analysis, foreground theatre's ambiguity: performing a fixed script remembering sentences as reactions in contrast to spontaneous inventions on stage. Improvisation is part of Plautus' complex of metatheatre, bringing the space of the stage and the Roman *Palliata* into focus.

Calling attention to theatricality indirectly or directly means that the poet guides the audience's experience of theatre and the interpretation of comedy; he illuminates the illusion. Plautus' theatricality varies in its form and explicitness across the plays. The strategy ranges from using ambiguous vocabulary hinting at the semantic field of theatre to addressing the audience, or commenting on the stage performance.[652] Thereby, Plautus fashions the cultural experience the audience makes and the creative process the poet and the actor pursue.

Its outcome, theatrical fiction, allows the audience to indulge in an illusion when actors play roles within the boundaries of stage, but metatheatrical references can also remind the audience of being these outsiders of illusionary action sitting in front of the stage. In detail, moments reminding the audience of their status can be intended to maintain the audience's attention, underline the fictive character, advertise for the genre's popularity and his poet's status, 'win them over', or make them reflect upon the aesthetic complex of themes and their cultural relations within the plays. Thus, the poet can create theatre as an agon, which opposes dramatic illusion and its rupture, making the audience perceive theatre from two perspectives as it alternates between illusion and front-of-house; it illuminates the poet's interpretation of theatre and the genre. Theatrical experience implies a dialectic of closeness and distance, wherein the artificiality of the genre is acknowledged, where the aesthetic experience is situated and the epistemic value is granted.[653]

In this chapter, the analysis examines how Plautus uses the *servus callidus* to constitute the identity of his comedies; how does the clever slave function in metatheatrical discourse? It concerns the paradoxical relation between being part of the illusion, being its constructor and destructor. Illusion is here understood in a primary and secondary form: primary means the mimetic element of theatre, the illusion of 'life'. Secondary describes the construction of illusionary spaces and frames on stage and can be subsumed under the primary one. Illusionary spaces divide the stage in separate spatial arrangements figures act in as it is the case for eavesdropping scenes. In contrast, illusionary frames are not visible but distinct layers of fictions and roles in the play as the clever slave tells lies to the master, who takes it as truth from a presumably obedient slave the audience recognizes as false. Consequently, rupture can happen on the primary level and on the secondary level. Theatre and its fascination grow from the construction, intersection, and disruption of the primary and secondary illusion Plautus mainly realizes in his intrigue comedies by the protagonist *servus callidus*.

Of course, Plautus' networking of illusion and disillusion is not exclusively depended on one specific figure. Nevertheless, as the prior analysis has shown, the figure of the *servus*

---

652 Cf. Gregory W. Dobrov, *Figures of Play. Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2001, 169 and here esp. ft. 3: "Strategies belonging to the categories of surface metatheatre could include familiar phenomena, e.g. 'ruptures of dramatic illusion': audience address, commentary on the circumstances of production, explicit mention and micro-manipulation of dramatic convention, reference to extradramatic phenomena, parody, quotation, etc." Dobrov also refers to G. A. H. Chapman, 'Some Notes on Aristophanes', *American Journal of Philology* 104.1 (1983): 1-23.; e.g. theatrical vocabulary: *agitur, statur, ludere, basilicum* (e.g. *Pseud.* 458).

653 Cf. Bernd Seidensticker's reasoning of delight in watching tragedy and sharing pain empathically, Bernd Seidensticker, *Über das Vergnügen an tragischen Gegenständen*, *Studien zum antiken Drama*, Jens Holzhausen (ed.), München/Leipzig: Saur, 2005, 217-45, and esp. 226-227 (the types of distance; the aesthetic, temporal, spatial distance of the observer) and 238-39 (three reasons stemming from the Aristotelian theory) and 239 ff. (emphasising the emotional, level of empathy).

callidus is mainly responsible for constructing illusionary spaces (e.g. during eavesdropping), contexts (e.g. deception as a military battle), and frames (e.g. during agonistic scenes). The process of construction grants the audience access to the kind of illusion they can also recognize as an artificial environment as the same constructor tends to rupture and visualize the framing. The degree of destruction varies from minor secondary forms as illuminating illusionary frames of the agonistic scenes to breaking the ultimate frame, the primary illusion, and thereby, illuminating the mimetic act, its symbol, the mask, and the theatrical stage with the actors and their props. The latter is of special interest in this chapter for two reasons since the *servus callidus'* metatheatrical function contributes to the coherence of his aesthetically effective construction and his functionality for comedy; the figure gives Plautus the opportunity to cast light on theatre's operations and fashion his (intrigue) comedy.

To understand how the *servus callidus* is responsible for changing the audience's perspective, it is important to take the figure's involvement in both processes, the construction and destruction of primary and secondary illusion, into account. The following analysis will prove that the *servus callidus* unites the paradox of playing in and architecting the plot, of the poet and the actor in a single figure in a non-improvisatory drama, and being inside and outside the illusion at the same time. Contriving the nesting of comic illusions defines him a *signum* of (intrigue) comedy, especially whenever he fosters the audience's recognition of comedy's utopia and installs moments full of *ridiculum*. Beyond that, the figure's passages of theatricality enlighten Plautus' dual conception of Roman *Palliata* and understanding of comedy.

Servus callidus' announcements and comments

The analysis of the prior chapter has shown the quality of the slave figure to arrange his trickery scenes as a play within the play, where he observes the dramatic action, participates within the scene, and stands at the outside of the illusionary frame. If the figure's quality is considered in regard to illusion and disillusion, these scenes make the type apparent as an illusionist of his opponent and illuminating the deceptive illusion to the audience. The stage becomes a manifold place containing different layers of secondary illusion, which the clever slave keeps up by deceiving ears and eyes of other figures like Palaestrio wants to make Sceledrus distrust his eyes and believe that he did not see what he actually saw ([…] *qui se hic vidit, verbis vincat ne is se viderit* [*Mil.* 187]).[654] The clever slave's main area of activity, contriving and leading the intrigue, draws close to theatre's working. Illusion or deception turns people into an audience or spectators; the etymological roots of these words, *audire* and *spectare*, openly appeal to the physical access to the cultural performance and the illusionary power over the senses. Succinctly, theatrical illusion comes close to deception; this parallel should always be kept in mind concerning the clever slave's relation to constructing and rupturing the illusion.

---

654 Also see *Mil.* Palaestrio's prologue, 149: *faciemus ut quod viderit ne viderit*. *Videre* and its negation remains a recurring antithesis and a source for *ridiculum* in the first scenes of the play, especially when Sceledrus is fooled. *Miles gloriosus'* Palaestrio concocts the story of the double young Philocomasium, creating a twin sister. The illusion of identity plays another key theme, especially in the second group of Plautus' comedies if they are divided into identity and intrigue comedies (both entail the construction of illusion within the theatrical form). In Shakespeare's plays, gender roles and related identities similarly turn into an upside-down tangle of the illusionary, especially by the mean of crossdressing.

The clever slave recurrently refers to his illusionary framing in the different phases of inventing a plan, laying the groundwork for it and realizing it. The audience is prepared for the framing and its phases throughout the play mainly by the clever slave's communication of his type and function within intrigue comedy, which can be divided into two categories: announcing future illusionary constructs and commenting on past and present illusionary constructs.[655] The analysis prioritizes announcements and comments in the form of soliloquies and asides since it gives an insight into the relation between the clever slave and the audience, which stands in contrast to the other figures' relation and ascribes the clever slave a significant position.[656]

Concerning the first category, the intrigue comedy shows the *servus callidus* regularly announcing his trickery to the audience in soliloquies and asides especially at the beginning by promising to come up with a plan: *curabo*, *turbas dabo*, *fabricam dabo*, *ludos faciam*, *aurum efficiam*, *machinabor*.[657] The detailed description and the single steps of his deception are not of primary interest here but the future forms and the eager tone assure the audience that the clever slave will and can invent a creative solution for the young master's situation, which probably stimulates the audience's attention and expectations towards enjoyable and entertaining illusions. The function of the figure lies in his impact on the plot, constructing future illusionary acts as telling tales and playing roles. Describing the deception as *machina*, *turbae*, and *ludos* emphasize the propitious and ornate complexity of the upcoming deception and the constructive process of layers superimposing lies and illusion on truth or stage's 'reality' as Palaestrio triumphs about his quantity of scheming in *quantas res turbo*, *quantas moveo machinas* (*Mil*. 813). The clever slave promises movement and progress in the comic discourse and underlines its quality as worth watching.

By such promises and succeeding in his task of deception, the *servus callidus* is designed and designs himself as cleverer than the others since he is the only one to see clearly through the confusing *turbae* within the plot and be in charge of the tricky machinery. Promising the play's outcome and his role in it proves a certain self-confidence, which is also evident, when the figure relies on his talents in scenes of bets with his enemy and oaths to his allies: all of them announcing some future act in the play's plot and about the outcome.[658]

He communicates his creative position to the audience in a frequency that foregrounds his active position in changing the play's exposition and acknowledges his central influence for the development of the play. In *Bacchides*, a sequence of twelve speaking verses contains three announcements made by Chrysalus. Although Chrysalus has asserted at the end of the dialogue between Pistoclerus and himself that he will take care of the money, Chrysalus

---

655 Of course, other figures besides the *servus callidus* use common devices like comments and announcements (e.g. in *Pseudolus*, Simo's soliloquy explaining the next steps and comments on Pseudolus' achievement with metatheatrical references, e.g. *Pseud*. 1238-1245), but they decisively differ in their status for the play and their degree of self-awareness. A main difference lies in the condition that the clever slave's skill to construct and illuminate the illusionary is not limited to the boundaries of the stage and his figure but the type also reflects on the concept of theatre as the following analysis will examine.

656 Announcements made in a dialogue with the young master or other allies and addressed to another figure are of minor interest as the analysis focuses on communication of the clever slave with the audience. Of course, every speech act done on stage is indirectly meant for the audience but that is the existential foundation of theatre, which perspective alone does not generate relevant results.

657 See *Bacch*. 232-33, 241-2, 357, 366, 761-9, 792-3, 929, 946, 975-7; *Epid*. 159ff., 184-88, 314-19, 661ff.; *Mil*. 260ff., 334, 814; *Most*. 416-8 , 427-8, 529, 566, 687-9, 813-16, 931-2; *Pseud*. 412-4, 566-572, 574ff., 600-03, 637, 674, 690-3, 761-66.

658 For example, Pseudolus promises his young master to help him, *tanta facinora promittere* (*Pseud*. 563), and agrees in a bet with the *senex*. Also see ch.III.iii.

repeats his promise, his responsibility in this matter and his future triumph twice within ten speaking verses of him. First, he assures the audience in a soliloquy about his firm intention:

> *Negotium hoc ad me adtinet aurarium.*
> *[...]*
> *inde ego hodie aliquam machinabor machinam,*
> *unde aurum efficiam amanti erili filio.*
> (*Bacch.* 229-33)

In the following scene, Chrysalus again proclaims his successful scheme right before he starts it and addresses Nicobulus: *extexam ego illum pulchre [...]: opus est chryso Chrysalo* (*Bacch.* 239-40).[659] The last two passages of announcement are not addressed to another figure but are only meant for the audience to colour the deception metaphorically. They set the clever slave apart from the other figures because of his knowledge as well as his influence on the play's progress. The clever slave stereotypically contributes to illusion by his cunning scheme.

These moments of announcement confirm the physical core in Plautus' intrigue comedies, the conventional protagonist, the clever slave and the content of the play as Tranio like Chrysalus promises the audience **ludos** *ego hodie vivo praesenti hic seni faciam* (*Most.* 427-28) although only one scene earlier he was the desperate messenger of the father's arrival proclaiming Philolaches and his own death. Still, Tranio promotes his improvisatory and influential quality for the plot after he left everyone else locked inside the house (*Most.* 425-6). The audience can unambiguously identify the stereotypical characteristics of the clever slave and its function in intrigue comedy as his type is confirmed repeatedly and becomes familiar. The audience can compare him to similar types of cheeky and cunning slave figures in New Comedy and see him in the tradition of former Plautine *servi callidi* as Chrysalus, a late *servus callidus*, can be typologically related to Epidicus and Pseudolus, who already managed to construct illusionary frames around the masters and dominate comedy's plot. The formation of a stereotype and the recognition of its characteristics are confirmed and progressed.

Since the stock type asserts himself, his announcements often show a portion of self-awareness of the own concept and convention. In the self-reference, *chryso Chrysalo*, Chrysalus relates to the figure's traditional function itself by doubling the telling feature of his name as he is the only one to achieve the money needed. He thus refers to the envisioned aim of the intrigue and knowingly foreshadows the success in tricking the gold from the master. By such parts, the stock character, the clever slave, illuminates his type and characteristic to trick the master often aligned with metatheatrical remarks to the own figure's concept, which enhances his position as the constructor of illusion and his reflective perspective. The frequent act of announcing future illusions and assuring the audience of upcoming exciting scenes means communication with the audience.

In these soliloquies and asides, the clever slave pursues a silent dialogue with the audience, himself, and his convention. His address is sometimes underlined by calls for attention; the *servus callidus* ambiguously wraps this call in phrases of motivation for himself like Chrysalus interdicts sleepiness, addressing the single spectator and himself (*haud dormitandumst* [*Bacch.* 240]); Palaestrio demands utmost attentiveness from himself and the

---

659 In the soliloquy, *Bacch.* 229-34, Chrysalus promises to help the young master and foreshadows the tricking. His monologue, *Bacch.* 239-242, is situated right before the first deception scene with Nicobulus.

audience (*vigila inquam, expergiscere inquam* [*Mil*. 218]) and Pseudolus wants attention when he explains his single steps (*date operam modo* [*Pseud*. 585]).[660]

In the communication process, he makes the audience co-confidants in his function as the deceiver or constructor of illusions, and illuminates the construction of secondary illusions. Thus, he prepares the audience for how to understand coming dialogues between the *senex* or *leno* and the clever slave and defines himself as the trustworthy guide for the audience through the nested illusions. The audience cannot but perceive the illuminated illusionary frame and the creative process the clever slave introduces and continues in the announcements set especially before, but also in between or within deception scenes. The audience is assured of the clever slave's 'fooling-the-other' leaving no doubt about the incongruity between truth and lie or in other words, between the installed frames deluding other figures and the primary illusion. The perception of this incongruity can result in moments of laughter as shown in the agon approach. Therefore, announcements promise deception paired with *ridiculum.*

The clever slave casts himself as the troublemaker and as the creator of the comic (*ludi*). The style of his announcements contributes to the comic tone as it can show a carnivalesque mixture of base and superior: roasting the master like a roasted pea (*tam frictum* […] *quam frictum est cicer* [*Bacch*. 767]); I'll certainly make a Phrixus' ram here to-day, and by the same token shear off his gold right down to the quick! ([…] *ego hodie faciam hic arietem/ Phrixi, itaque tondebo auro usque ad vivam cutem* [*Bacch*. 241-42]).[661] The master becomes an animal that ranks below the slave or even becomes food for the slave and is probably meant to be devoured by the slave. When Nicobulus transforms his identity to an animal in that moment of speech, the *paterfamilias* adopts the dominated status of the animal as it can be shorn, its feature of non-rational, unhuman, and undignified being set free for ridiculing. The clever slave's pursuit of *ridiculum* remains mostly concealed from or coded for the ridiculed, the master, but is communicated to the audience by an indirect address speaking in an aside or even directly addressing them.[662] The construction and concealment of the illusionary negate open malice and prevent confrontation with the ridiculed at least until the final discovery; it enables only the outsider outside the illusionary frame to recognize the moment of *ridiculum*. In sum, the audience can perceive the deceptive illusion as parallel to a comic masquerade, wherein these exaggerated images follow the comic ridiculing habit and foreshadow the atmosphere of the deceptive scenes.

---

660 Also see *Epid*. 162. Probably, as the prologue of Poenulus exemplifies best, antiquity's audience was not as silent and attentive as modern theatre visitors. Prologue contains a guideline how they should behave during the performance. Calling for silence and attention was a familiar feature in those days in regard to the noisy environment especially the actors of comedy had to break through since "spectators of comedy laugh, cheer, applaud, jeer, gasp, groan, and, in short, make a great deal of noise, whereas tragedy is performed before a relatively silent audience." Cf. G. A. H. Chapman, 'Some Notes in Dramatic Illusion in Aristophanes', *American Journal of Philology* 104.1 (1983): 1-23, 1. Repetition and the address of the audience should be also seen under that aspect.

661 Other examples can be *Bacch*. 766, 792-3; *Epid*. 184-88; *Mil*. 334; *Pseud*. 613; cf. James Thomas Svendsen, *Goats and Monkeys. A Study of the Animal Imagery in Plautus*, Diss., Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, 1971, 192-3. Could the illusion of the man becoming a ram even be enhanced by wearing a white beard and white garments? Plautus might have supported the process of changing from superior to base by guiding the audience's perspective as they could have looked at the visual appearance differently after the metaphor applied by Chrysalus.

662 Ironically, after Chrysalus announced "*accipitrina haec nunc erit*" during the scene, Nicobulus' reply "*deceptus sum*" puns with the fact of deception unwillingly (see *Bacch*. 274-75).

A device functioning similarly belongs to the second category 'comments' the *servus callidus* deploys to emphasize the deception and to assure its comic and farcical tone.[663] The clever slave's comments are commonly situated in the dialogues of trickery and shortly interrupt the illusionary frame in the form of an aside; they can also appear after an element of the plan has been realized to evaluate the scheme's progress. The comments thus happen outside the illusionary frame; either the slave talks to himself, addressing the audience indirectly, or he addresses them directly; both cases illuminate the constructed secondary illusion and can even rupture the primary illusion.

These often short interruptions introduce and continue the clever slave's body of images and show the figure beyond its role as a slave. That is the case when the clever slave creates contexts for his manipulations and thematic configurations for himself since he adds a heroic quality to his anti-heroic *turbae* like Tranio refers to his deeds as *facinora immortalia* (*Most*. 777) while he fools Simo and Theopropides.[664] As it is valid for the mock heroic, *ridiculum* is often realized by mixing base with superior. Tranio continues his ridiculing by the following metaphor:

> *nam muliones mulos clitellarios*
> *habent, at ego habeo homines clitellarios.*
> *magni sunt oneris: quicquid imponas vehunt.*
> (*Most*. 780-82)

Tranio's metaphor characteristically shows how the clever slave tends to describe and evaluate his type as well as operations to the audience in a thematic richness relying on the carnivalesque principle, which means the upgrading of his own figure as well as performance and degrading his opponent and behaviour in the intrigue scenes. The clever slave evaluates the action as fitting comedy's upside-down world and thereby, sticks to his prior announcements. Both instances, announcements and comments, communicate a comic atmosphere to the audience and support the clever slave's combination of *ridiculum* and illusionary construct.

In analogy to the announcements, comments also continue the stock figure's fate of deceiving, his superiority and foreground the clever slave's perspective from the outside on the illusionary frame, wherein he repeats the Saturnalian order highlighted in mock-heroic images and supports the agonistic attitude towards the *senex* or opponent as the one that is fooled. The constructor of illusion underlines the comic style of the deception, and thus, offers a source for moments of *ridiculum*. The audience can laugh along with the clever slave before, during, and after the agon. He announces his illusionary constructs and comments on their success triumphantly.

The categories—announcement and comment—move the clever slave to the stage's limits and in reach of the audience: the *servus callidus* communicates the atmosphere of the dramatic scene and the identity of his mask to the audience, who can be expected to know the category of the *servus callidus* and his similarity to former concepts. The clever slave acts as a focalizer taking an internal and external position and displaying the conscious centre of

---

663 For more, see *Bacch*. 349ff., 649ff., 795ff., 945ff., 987-8, 1053; *Epid*. 124-26, before Epidicus ends his eavesdropping; *Mil*. 275, 386, 464ff., 596ff., 867-73, 991ff. (Palaestrio and Milphidippa engage in an exchange of asides, an illusionary frame, prompting Pyrgopolynices' arrogance and ridiculous self-glorification), 1130-6; *Most*. 407ff., 438-9, 442-3, 530ff., 655ff., 700-1, 711-6, 775-83, 1041-63 (Tranio eavesdrops his master later), 1072-3; *Poen*. 427 (ironic), 817ff., 839ff., 917ff., 1108-10; *Pseud*. 423-26, 454, 574ff., 614, 667-677, 759-63, 905, 969-70, 1078ff.
664 See ch. III.i. (the heroic anti-hero).

performance on stage, directing the attention of the audience to the mechanisms, means, and effects of the trickery and guiding the audience through the illusions concerning his quality as a double dealer.[665] In contrast to the other figures, he permanently assures his outside position, from where the figure fashions and presents himself as the decisive, integrative and self-aware element for the intrigue comedy to the audience.

Mastering performance

In the intrigue comedies, the clever slave allows the audience to have glimpses behind masks by inserting metatheatrical moments in his plan of deception. He manages the balancing act between being part of the dramatic illusion and being aware of it; he is conscious of playing a role and being a stock character. Not only does he describe his type's characteristics and is aware of them, but separates the type or mask from the actor, which foregrounds the illusion of role playing. The audience perceives a figure moving within and out of his conventional frame. For example, the *servus callidus* Epidicus temporarily becomes the stock type *servus currens*:

> *age nunciam orna te, Epidice, et palliolum in collum conice*
> *itaque adsimulato quasi per urbem totam hominem quaesiveris.*
> *age, si quid agis.*
> (*Epid*. 194-96)

The vocabulary of *ornare*, *adsimulare quasi* and *agere* describes the preparation and process of performance since Epidicus costumes and instructs himself how to play the following scene. The clever slave also achieves to highlight the theatrical fact of performing when he uses a vocative to address himself whereby the *servus callidus* alienates the figure and its mask from the actor and introduces the audience to the second identity the *servus callidus* is about to take. Again, the clever slave announces and prepares the construction of an illusionary frame the two old men are not able to see, but the audience is aware of. The clever slave thus creates a utopian spot on stage where he acts as an actor putting on a costume to play the *servus currens*.

Epidicus' example belongs to a sum of scenes and passages, wherein the clever slave shows a variation of allusions to role playing: playing another figure temporarily, talking to oneself and using vocative cases, or punning with the telling name.[666] Plautus makes the audience recognize the repertoire of comedy's means the clever slave is aware of. Disclosing the devices and their illusionary quality calls attention to the convention, the audience's expectation, and the artificiality of roles and stock types.

Plautus varies usual practises of the theatrical device 'soliloquy' by questioning their structure and introducing a metatheatrical perspective. In *Pseudolus*, the clever slave starts soliloquizing by addressing himself by his name (*tu astas solus, Pseudole* [*Pseud*. 395]) and goes on with evaluating his situation as if being his own dialogue partner. After several lines, he returns to the deictic zero point of the first person and to the conventional dramatic perspective of the soliloquy. For a short time, the audience is confronted with a rupture of the

---

665 Gérard Genette's term of focalization is used here more freely than he defines it in his theoretical approach to narrative discourse. It is applied to the status of clever slave as a director of perspective in the play for the audience.
666 See also *Bacch*. 240, 704 (telling name Chrysalus); *Epid*. 161, 194 (*Epidice*); *Mil*. 215ff.; *Most*. 1068 (Tranio).

primary illusion, looking at the common device but absurd moment of a soliloquy when a figure standing alone on stage talks to himself in an audible volume. Plautus comically addresses the fictional character by inserting an antithetical element, a dialogue, into a soliloquy, whereby the figure appears more clearly as the theatrical construction.

In *Epidicus*, the dualism of acting, the role and the actor, is taken to the extreme when Epidicus sticks to the separation of the figure and the actor throughout a schizophrenic soliloquy:

> *Nam ubi senex senserit*
> *sibi data esse verba, virgis dorsum despoliet meum.*
> *at enim tu praecave.²*
> *at enim –*
> *bat enim, nihil est istuc. Plane hoc corruptumst caput.²*
> *nequam homo es, Epidice.²*
> *qui lubidost male loqui?*
> *quia tu tete deseris.²*
> *quid faciam?*
> *men rogas?²*
> *tu quidem antehac aliis solebas dare consilia mutua.²*
> (*Epid*. 92-99)[667]

As Pseudolus, he introduces the fake dialogue by confirming the obvious fact that he is alone on stage now (*solus nunc es*, *Epid*. 81), but he then engages in a back and forth sequence of a listener and speaker. Paul Nixon's translation wonderfully underlines the dialogue by adding stage directions in brackets indicating pauses in speech and the change of tone as if the speaking persona alters.[668] The schizophrenic talk becomes especially prominent when the turn taking sequence is highlighted by the anaphoric *at enim* that is finally disrupted with *bat enim* as if the dialogue partner interrupts the other's attempt to explain himself.

Finally, Epidicus and his dialogue partner argue with each other most apparently when the grammatical categories of I and you are contrasted in the sequence of questions: "*quid faciam?- men rogas?*" (*Epid*. 98). The grammatical category *tu* describes the complementary persona in a dialogue, but here the listener and potential future speaker are the same.[669] They are, however, separated and opposed in *me* and *rogas*, which simulates one asking and one that is asked and expected to answer. The audience listens to a dialogue but just sees one figure, who seems to have gone mad temporarily. Niall W. Slater argues persuasively that the actor could have performed the soliloquy as an actual dialogue to his mask, putting it off beforehand.[670] But even if the actor does not take off his mask, the audience is more likely to look behind it and disassociate the role from the actor than perceiving the fusion of mask and actor.

The mimetic act and its illusion are similarly undermined when Pseudolus shortly underlines the mad quality of a soliloquy on stage in "**sum**ne **ego** homo insipiens,/ qui haec **me**cum **egomet** loqua**r** **solus**?" (*Pseud*. 908-08ᵃ) as talking to oneself is usually considered to

667 The sentences marked with the exponent '2', a device to read the schizophrenic dialogue, belong to Epidicus' dialogue partner, who could be identified as the actor.
668 Cf. Nixon (repr. 1988), 287.
669 Cf. Gabriele Diewald, 'Dialogrollen-Person-Identität', *Constructing Identity in Interpersonal Communication*, Minna Palander-Collin et al. (eds.), Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2010, 15-36, 23. "Ich und du enkodieren die kommunikative Grundsituation[…]".
670 Cf. Slater (²2000), 16-19.

be rather a sign of insane people. The prominence of forms of the first person throughout the question completely negates the presence of any potential listener and affirms the mad image of Pseudolus on stage talking just to himself; however, the clever slave continues to speak to himself, which makes his former question quite obsolete and appears to be a comic side kick for the sake of *ridiculum*. In both cases, Epidicus and Pseudolus, the figure/actor deliberately acts in an absurd and ridiculous manner while they reflect upon theatre conventions.

By such comments and scenes, the clever slave ruptures the dramatic illusion and causes reflection on theatrical action, its devices and operators, the actors and masks. The comic tone does not stop at the plot's content and its figures but also involves comedy's own mechanisms for the audience's illusion. The clever slave wields power by an ironic perspective on the self and its environment, which demands self-awareness of the type and its surroundings. This perspective designates the clever slave's relation to the *ridiculum* as deliberate and professional since his acting constructs the ridiculous in full awareness and without sparing himself from the ugly. The *servus callidus* does not lose control in a foolish and absurd behaviour, which an audience would expect from a mad man, but keeps his creative power in the performance of such foolishness and absurdity. This type's transparency of his self and context even strives for epistemic value of what the stage is and how it works.

The discussed scenes exemplify direct and indirect allusions to theatricality, signifying the clever slave as self-conscious not only about his configuration, but also of his dualism of actor/figure and his context.[671] The audience can recognize the figure's self-consciousness when the figure directs their attention to the character and conventions of theatrical performance. Pseudolus does so by engaging in an artificial and silent dialogue with the audience and confronting them with their expectations deriving from his stock character:

> *suspicio est mi nunc vos suspicarier,*
> *me idcirco haec tanta facinora promittere,*
> *quo vos oblectem, hanc fabulam dum transigam,*
> *nec sim facturus quod facturum dixeram.*
> *non demutabo. atque etiam certum, quod sciam,*
> *quo id sim facturus pacto nil etiam scio,*
> *nisi quia futurum est. nam qui in scaenam provenit*
> *novo modo novom aliquid inventum afferre addecet.*
> *si id facere nequeat, det locum illi qui queat.*
> *concedere aliquantisper hinc mi intro lubet,*
> *dum concenturio in corde sycophantias.*
> (*Pseud*. 562-72)

Pseudolus puns with *suspicere* by building a sequence of suspicion and equating the usual suspicious character, the *senex*, with the audience. He directly addresses the spectators and interferes with the dramatic illusion in order to colour the coming *fabula* as improvisatory work. The clever slave mixes the fabric of theatrical performance based on a script with the dimension of improvisation. The clever slave's stereotypical *tanta facinora* and his raison d'être, *fabulam agere*, are certain for himself and the future experience of the audience although the knowledge of the figure does not exceed this mere fact since he lacks a plan how to deal with the situation. Knowing his convention (*scire*) foreshadows the progress and the

---

671 The clever slave uses direct address and a vocabulary of theatricality and narration (*fabula*) in addition to hidden allusions to his binary concept of figure/actor (addressing himself in the second persona).

outcome of the comic discourse (*futurum*) even though he must still create the content of the discourse (*pacto facturus*).

In Pseudolus' direct address to the audience, he dissociates mask and its convention from the actor and the individual performance. The verbal sequence of *scire, nihil scire*, and *futurum* includes the collision of the figure's and the actor's horizon since the figure's knowledge of his lines and his future action derives from the playwright's text he is speaking whereas these lines construct the illusion of improvisation the actor could pursue and follow his own unwritten text. The improvising actor stands in traditional relation to *Atellana* involving not-written, traditional step stones and stock characters of *Atellana* and its plot.[672] Ironically, it is Roman *Palliata's* text that alludes to a non-written quality. Metatheatrically, the figure-actor compound discusses his necessity to create *fabula*, the comic discourse, containing prescripted performance and free improvisation. This becomes especially apparent when Pseudolus changes the perspective to the third person and speaks in a proverbial tone in order to explain what is expected by the audience when an actor enters the stage (see v. 568-9). The improvisator and the playwright's voice can be heard in this self-referential passage since interpreting something 'old' newly to produce something new is valid for both comedy types, the written drama by Plautus and the improvisatory Atellan farce. The proverbial sentence intricately interlaces the challenging condition for the actor as an improviser as well as a visible presenter and that for the poet as an invisible inventor in the tautology of *novus* and *invenire* and in the infinitive *afferre*. Plautus' text presupposes the quality of 'new' for a person that enters the stage.[673]

On the one hand, an actor is defined as improvising in accordance with already known Atellan traditions when he enters the phase of interpretation and contributes to the creation of something 'new' by his performance and his choice of words and phrases. On the other hand, the poet displays a person interpreting something known in new words providing the actor with new material. Hence, both, the poet behind a text and the actor behind a mask, suffice the presupposition Plautus displays in the ambiguous relation to his contemporary cultural environment, and thereby, he fashions his play and its performance with the epithet of 'new'. The hidden voice of the poet assures the audience of material that is worth to be watched, appealing to curiosity. Beyond that relation, the central term 'new' spans a semantic net around the poet, his product, and the consumer since it introduces a literary-historic perspective as well as the attitude towards creation of literature or more generally of art. It describes an essential feature in the concept of Roman literature, *aemulatio*, Plautus shares with his colleagues. Plautus combines the talent of improvisation going back on Italic tradition and *Atellana's* model with a poet's aspirations lying it in the mouth of the *servus callidus* since the deceiver claims to realize the given outcome of the plot (*quia futurum est*) by inventing and thereby, secures his existence on stage supported by his characteristic *callidus*.

---

672 Cf. Mark Griffith, ''Telling the tale': a performing tradition from Homer to pantomime', *Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, Marianne McDonald (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 13-35, 27. "Form of improvised farce (*fabulae Atellanae*, 'Atellan stories/plays'), employing masks, stock characters and conventional plots, which also allowed room for some audience involvement too. These stock figures (Pappus the father/old geezer, Bucco the braggart, Dossen(n)us the trickster, Maccus the clown and Manducus the ogre) show up in more or less recognized form in many Plautine comedies, and an ancient (and not incredible) biographical tradition asserted that T. Maccius Plautus was so named because of his early success as a professional Atellan 'clown' before he came to Rome."; referring to performance based on script, see *Poen.* 550-554 (the witnesses coming with Agorastocles).

673 *Pseudolus'* text is especially rich of the theme 'invention' and creating something 'new' since the *servus callidus'* scheme is in need to adapt to the changes steadily during the discourse (*novo consilio, nova res*, 601-1ª).

In such passages, the *servus callidus* steps out of a figure's boundaries and ruptures the primary dramatic illusion by directly addressing the audience, foregrounding the artifice of the mask, reflecting upon the conventional means of the plot and the dualism of Roman drama's development containing the *Atellana* and the *Palliata*. The clever slave's knowledge extends beyond his stock type to the recognition of generic principles and their cultural roots. Plautus manages to reflect upon the relation and dependence among actors and playwrights with a humorous perspective, lying the words in the mouth of the clever ignoble constructor of illusion and intrigue. Improvisation is illuminated as a theatrical device—whether it is fictive or real.[674] An improvising actor can extend or shorten a scene, add something unexpected, makes every performance of the play different and unique, and appears as a minor poet on stage, whereas the fictive performance of improvisation discloses the poet persona on stage.

Improvising or the process of invention belongs to the core elements of trickery the clever slave usually reports briefly or discusses theoretically, inviting a metatheatrical dimension, which could be seen as a rather mature thematic compound Plautus developed to outline the cultural environment of his theatrical production. In his early intrigue comedy, *Miles gloriosus*, Plautus does not already stage a self-reflective Pseudolus but takes a different perspective on the moment of inventing since his early clever slave figure, Palaestrio, does not compare his process of scheming to the theatrical operations of an actor or playwright but performs it.[675] Plautus creates an illusionary space for Palaestrio and chooses a scene, where Periplectomenus observes and comments on the clever slave's efforts to come up with a plan (see *Mil*. 200ff.).[676] The old man tries to visualize the invisible invention process, which happens in Palaestrio's mind. Plautus' intrigue comedies show that the theme of improvisation paralleling scheming play an important part for the *servus callidus*; in later intrigue comedies, the figure focuses rather on the themes and the ambiguity of invention than the actual performance. The clever slave thus performs it off stage as Pseudolus exits the stage to think his plan through and promises the audience an interlude by the flute player: *<sed mox> exibo, non ero vobis morae;/ tibicen vos interibi hic delectaverit* (*Pseud*. 573-73ᵃ).

The off-stage performance takes place at the same moment as the interlude is played. Improvisation always depends on a temporal component, the moment of spontaneity, and the denial of any prior preparation, which makes the *servus callidus* seem independent in the construction of illusion. The allusion to the element 'improvisation' can thus also be found in the moment when the clever slave announces his trickery and his reactions to some difficulties that just arose. He often adds the temporal adverb *hodie* emphasizing the unity of time and the impression of a spontaneous adaptation to the problematic circumstances in a certain time.[677] The actor's challenge to improvise theatrical illusion right now and right where he stands parallels the figure's challenge to scheme and deceive in the temporal and local frame, wherein he announces. Comparing the *Atellana's* mode with the deceiver's task, Tranio evaluates spontaneous invention to be the best: *calidum hercle esse audivi optumum*

---

674 See also *Pseud*. 394ff., 423, 454.
675 In Palaestrio's 'prologue', he already informs the audience that *ei nos facetis fabricis et doctis dolis/ glaucumam ob oculos obiciemus eumque ita* (*Mil*. 147-48). Palaestrio's announcement introduces him as a clever slave, who is expected to scheme.
676 In *Miles gloriosus*, Palaestrio does not cast himself as self-confidently as Chrysalus but Periplectomenus and mainly the deceitful women like Acroteleutium assume some thematic configuration of the *servus callidus* including moments of praise.
677 See *Bacch*. 232-33, 761-9, 925; *Most*. 686ff., 813-16, ; *Mil*. 334; *Pseud*. 414; 574ff.; 600-03, 637, 690-3, 702, 764-66, 910.

mendacium (*Most*. 665).[678] Lying at the master extemporaneously equates the construction of illusion for the audience and the corresponding power over senses.

In *Mostellaria*, this verse initiates a series of asides by Tranio as Theopropides demands explanations and forces Tranio to tell him outright lies. The clever slave recognizes that improvisation and the satisfactory creation of something 'new' is a craft that is not easily realized. Tranio comments on his present deficiency of ideas and words (*Most*. 660-679) and designs his mind by *nescio* and *non reperio* as a blank sheet without any words. In this dialogue, Tranio's insecurity how to react to his master's pressure becomes fear, which emotion is present in his desperate question: *quid ego nunc agam [...]*? (*Most*. 662). *Mostellaria's servus callidus* is one of the most prominent sources for passages of fear where the figure is confronted with impediments to his plan and is frightened of detection in the progress of the play.

In the intrigue comedies, the theme of fear goes hand in hand with the demand and the realisation of scheming. Although the clever slaves share a particular self-awareness and confidence in their skills, they sometimes seem to fall from it when fear overwhelms them. Whenever fear occurs, it usually lasts only for the instant it takes to confirm it: *metuoque ut hodie possiem emolirier* (*Bacch.* 762). In *Bacchides*, Chrysalus has his doubts once in the play, ending in an oath on his life that he will eventually deceive his master. Interruptiv momfents of fear can be seen as a thematic variation of the scheming process and particularly, underline the impossible trickery, the spontaneous adaptation to the situation, and the improvisatory act.[679]

In consideration to the thematic coherence of the clever slave, the anxiety about detection relates to the motif, threat of punishment, and the low status of the clever slave; this belongs to the intact illusion of a coherent slave figure. The illusion of a slave constructing illusionary frames can only function if the concept's elements, the improviser and the slave, show thematic intersections and coherence, which allows the audience to recognize a slave fearing his master and simultaneously, a Saturnalian deceiver controlling the illusionary. Plautus equips the lowest rank with the most powerful position within the illusionary frames and here, frees the clever slave with independent creativity.

Plautus allows his *servi callidi* self-awareness about their stock characteristic, traditional body of topics, and their integration into the schema of comedy. The clever slaves seem to be free from a figure's restraints and gain a certain degree of authenticity when they appear to improvise their intrigue even if they actually act out a script—if we can speak of authenticity in a stock character. They move freely on stage and closest to the limit of the fourth wall when they establish illusionary frames and illuminate them. No other figure has such an insight into theatre's and essentially, comedy's parameters and how to use them to be as flexible and unexpected as a professional deceiver or illusionist needs to be. The *servus callidus* can take different roles, shifts in tone and exploit his chameleon characteristic. For the metatheatrical level, his self-defining habit and creative skill recommend him as a medium to a poet's identity and his play since the separation of the mask from the actor as well as the complex of text-based acting and improvisation illuminates the figure's concept and grants the audience access to the functional cosmos of theatre and the extradramatic world involving actors, texts, and poets.

Plautus endues his clever slave figures with perspicacity about the extradramatic world not only by integrating implicit but also explicit references as the clever slave can relate to

---

678 Compare to *Epid*. 284. "*Tum tu igitur calide quidquid acturu's age*."
679 See ch.III.iii. agon.

Plautus' other intrigue plays and actors playing in it. Chrysalus differentiates between the specific actor and the role when he admires Epidicus as much as himself but hates the performance when the actor Pellio is one of the cast (*Bacch.* 213-15).[680] Here, the clever slave, but actually the actor knowing Pellio, shares some criticism of performance with the audience, which leaves the impression of a competitive tone and might be a side kick among theatre professionals. The audience can look behind the scenes, when Plautus refers to contemporary production processes, the popularity of actors, and thematic relations between his plays.

Such strategies of rupture belong to Plautus' style of theatricality supplying his figures with self-awareness and knowledge of their part in the theatrical world, whereby impulses are given to reflect upon drama, the genre of Roman *Palliata*, the cultural embedment, generic relatives, and its operative structure.[681] As a consequence, the audience can receive a sharper image of the poet's voice, the genre's devices and content. The type *servus callidus* helps to shape that image by reflecting upon his figure's conventions and the conventions of comic performance, which foregrounds comedy's schematic production and the audience's expectations. He shows a certain consciousness of the dramatic process as well as his function of a creative improviser relating to Roman dramatic tradition. In brief, Plautus' *servus callidus* invites the audience to perceive theatre and the play also with the eyes of a theatre professional. Therefore, the poet constructs the clever slave close to the role of himself, who can deal with the clockwork of Roman comedy effectively.

The clever slave has the chance to be a deliberate force in the temporal and local limits of the utopian nature, wherein he ridicules the other only for the eyes and ears of the audience. He creates the illusion of spontaneously spinning the *fabula* and being anxious of negative consequences, but at the same time, undermines the figure's shell and illuminates its dualism of a professional actor having learned the text and the figure originating from theatre tradition, which finally displays the theatrical compound of text and performance. His power lies in constructing secondary illusion and rupturing primary and secondary illusion, casting light on the stage to appear as an artificial and utopian space, where his type's chance can realize the announcement just made.

The Plautine type's conception includes the comic opposition of the improvisator inserting new lines and varying a scene as well as the figure set by a script, which makes the actor free and independent within the frame of the play but at the same time, he is guided when he remembers the words the poet wrote for him. Plautus aims at the transparency of this opposition, designing the clever slave the illusionist and disenchanter. His habit of hopping between the illusionary frames as well as mask(s) and transgressing boundaries fits his core inclination to playing and fooling around with codes and conventions deliberately in order to provide the audience with images, such as a ridiculed *senex* or the actor playing and improvising. The clever slave's playing characteristic highly draws upon his knowledge of the polyvalence of matters, on which he can cast light as it has been shown for the theatrical constellation of actor, figure, and performance in this subchapter.

---

680 Compare *Most.* 1149-51. Tranio addresses the theatrical value of his plot and recommends his story for reception though ridiculously reversing the course of reception as Plautus used comedies from Diphilus and Philemon, two Greek playwrights: *si amicus Diphilo aut Philemoni es,/ dicito is quo pacto tuos te servos ludificaverit:/ optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis*.

681 On strategies of rupture and the component of metatheatre in New Comedy, note Kathryn Gutzwiller, 'The Tragic Mask of Comedy: Metatheatricality in Menander', *Classical Antiquity* 19.1 (2000): 102-137; and for Aristophanes, see Niall W. Slater, *Spectator Politics. Metatheatre and Performance in Aristophanes*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

The Plautine *architectus* shows his dominance as the creator of illusion Mnesilochus describes as a craftsman who knows how to *comparare*, *fabricari*, *fingere*, and *conglutinare* (*Bacch.* 693). He illuminates his illusionary complex and its working elements as tales and role playing. Both characterize the functional construction of the figure, *servus callidus*, who contributes to the audience's knowledge of what is happening on stage, as the audience is more informed than the one to be tricked. The slave's transparency that a network of tricks will come allows the audience to enjoy the plotting since they are not deceived as participants in the theatrical world by the clever slave. They are conveyed with as much information as needed to develop sympathy towards the plot architect and ally of the young master and as little as to create a feeling of suspense.

Thus, Plautus provides spectators with a sympathetic protagonist excelling in knowledge and influence in comparison to the other figures and recommending himself to lead the audience's foci and attention within the network of trickery. Especially his ability to announce future action and perform the invention on stage mark him as an improvisatory plot architect moving between the boxes of illusionary frames. Commenting on the scene and imposing his idea of the scene supplies the audience with a mostly self-confident figure participating in the dialogue and looking at it from the outside at the same time. The superiority over illusions moves the figure semantically close to the playwright. Indeed, the clever slave plays a major role in rendering the dramatic illusion transparent by displaying a trinity of personae in the theatrical performance: figure, actor, and poet. The former two and their detachment have already been discussed in regard to the *servus callidus*' self-awareness while the latter was only marginally discussed and must still be considered more closely. The third *persona* is usually situated off stage and hidden from the view of the audience. Nonetheless, the clever slave simulates the poet's *persona* on stage when he designs himself as the *architectus* of the intrigue and as the poet arranging the stage action. If the figure and his quality are looked at under the premise of plotting as a theatrical plot, the type gains a theatrical dimension reaching beyond his mask and the improvisor.

The *servus callidus* shows the playwright's remit when he commands other figures, slaves and non-slave figures, in their movement on stage. In *Mostellaria*, Tranio commands the slaves to clear the stage off all (suspicious) things including the drunk Callidamates and all to stay away while he takes care of the *senex*: *vos modo hinc abite intro atque haec hinc propere amolimini* (*Most.* 391); *clavim cedo atque abi intro atque occlude ostium* (*Most.* 425).[682] Figures enter and exit on command of the clever slave, while actors enter and exit the stage on command of the playwright. When he has directed them off stage, he often replaces them on stage, pursuing their interests for them as it is often particularly the case for the young master in *Bacchides*, *Epidicus*, *Mostellaria*, and *Pseudolus*. Replacing correlates with silencing the figures as the clever slave takes over the argument with the *leno* or *senex*: *taceas* (*Epid.* 651; *Most.* 388); *tacete et habete animum bonum* (*Epid.* 181); *tace* (*Epid.* 653; *Mil.* 196, 233, 810; *Poen.* 167); *ne interturba* (*Bacch.* 733). In *Bacchides*, the whole dictation scene, where Chrysalus dictates Mnesilochus the words for the fake letter, is intended to create the text Nicobulus reads out as Mnesilochus' thoughts later. The *servus callidus* fakes a script determining the young master's verbal presence in two scenes. In sum, the defining features of a performing figure—moving and speaking—are governed by the persistent imperative

---

682 Also see *Bacch.* 227 (Chrysalus: *abi intro, ego hic curabo*), 714; *Epid.* 655; *Mil.* 596, 610, 808, 857, 864, 929-930, 1128, 1175, 1194-8, 1353; *Poen.* 205, 426; *Pseud.* 393, 560-1, 567, 758, 959.

mood, which means that the physical presence of many figures is shaped by the clever slave's 'power' mostly reiterated in the verbal trio of *volo, iubeo, impero*.[683] Usually, the imperative accumulations take place in whole scenes when the clever slave, appropriately for a playwright, coordinates the movement and action of figures and instructs them in their way of playing. Plautus' intrigue comedies involve such scenes informing the clever slave's 'staff' about the next steps in the intrigue and simultaneously, the audience of the following action.[684] The instruction scenes are accompanied by ambivalent vocabulary designing the clever slave as a poet/director as the slaves commonly initiate their instructions by an "*animum advortite/ advorte*" since it calls attention on stage and in the auditorium alike (e.g. *Bacch.* 753; *Mil.* 766; *Most.* 399; *Poen.* 591).[685]

In analogy to a director rehearsing a scene, the clever slave is additionally ascribed the position of a *magister* (*Epid.* 592; *Pseud.* 933) telling his 'pupils' how they should act in the play by giving his orders (*praecepta*). Especially in *Miles gloriosus*, where Palaestrio, the clever slave, can rely on a group of conspirators, they repeatedly sum up the instructions as *praecepta* (see e.g. *Mil.* 354, 903-05, 1173 [*satin praeceptum est*]). Accordingly, the *servus callidus'* followers obey, confirming his superior status like Periplectomenus in *Miles gloriosus* does: *nos tibi oboedientes* (611).[686] The choice of words expresses the relationship between a leader and his followers, which is linked to the military theme. As it is valid for the mock heroic, the epithets, *magister, architectus* and *imperator,* must not be mistaken as serious titles as they finely display comedy's Saturnalian hierarchy allowing a slave figure to be in charge and manage a main part of the action. The scenes thus always incorporate the comic upside-down essence and fit to the figure's playful design nourishing the *ridiculum* since the exaggeration of true obedience simulated by the literary content of the utterance stands in incongruity with social conventions and the limited position of the clever slave.

Instruction scenes functionally help to form the illusion of improvisatory plans and most importantly, foster the image of a superior slave dominating physical presence of other figures. Plautus deploys a mastermind, the *servus callidus*, who can realize an illusionary frame of spontaneous action, directing future scenes. The instruction scenes do not differ in the thematic design of the *servus callidus* but they can vary in their structure, length, addressees and importance for the plot. In *Bacchides*, *Epidicus*, and *Mostellaria*, the clever slave directs the other figures to stay passively in the manipulation and remain rather minor roles and off-stage instruments during the deception when he mainly pursues the agonistic path on his own. In *Miles gloriosus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Poenulus*, the *servus callidus* manages the plot of instruction and manipulation scenes by partly substituting himself. He dresses figures—Pseudolus wants a costumed Simia (*Pseud.* 751 and 757)—and provides them with their own active roles in the deception.[687]

Pseudolus seems to double himself, intending to gain an instrument on stage: "[…] *onerabo meis praeceptis Simiam,/ quid agat, ne quid titubet, docte ut hanc ferat fallaciam.*"

683 See *Bacch.* 228, 702ff.; *Epid*. 185; *Mil*. 185, 771, 908, 1159, 1161, 1170; *Most*. 383ff.,632ff., 898; *Pseud*. 384, 585a., 559, 713, 919, 921. The degree of power is of course limited temporarily and bound to the matter of the clever slave's mission.

684 See *Bacch.* 709ff.; *Epid*. 364ff., 651ff.; *Mil*. 182ff., 237, esp. 255, 765ff., 897ff., 1025ff., 1158ff.; *Most*. 392ff., 419-26; *Poen*. 173ff., 424ff., 578ff., 1086ff.; *Pseud*. 384ff., 724ff., (914ff. Pseudolus' attempt to instruct Simia, who competitively argues with Pseudolus).

685 They function similarly to the ambiguous demand for attention in announcements.

686 See *Mil*. 765ff, 1094ff. (the soldier asks Palaestrio for some advice, which funnily turns into a clever slave ordering the obedient soldier: PYR. *Tibi sum oboediens* [1129]).

687 *Pseudolus* also offers a short scheming scene without the clever slave Pseudolus as Ballio and Simo conspire together to trick him. They also make some references to role-playing in 1063ff., esp. 1081-83.

(*Pseud*. 764-65).[688] While Simia is active, Pseudolus remains passively as the protagonist *servus callidus* observing the illusionary space, from where he comments on the action as annotations to his plot (*Pseud*. 969-70; 974; 984). Similarly, Palaestrio achieves a secondary *serva callida*, when he has Periplectomenus deliver his orders to Milphidippa, his female counterpart, and her mistress Acroteleutium off stage.[689] Here, Plautus varies the form of instruction by the clever slave as a rehearsal scene, where Palaestrio asks them to commemorate the single major steps in their *fabula*. In the deception of the *miles gloriosus*, the clever slave then guides and advises Milphidippa to take his words as a guideline (*Mil*. 1025-29).[690] In the final instruction scene in *Miles gloriosus*, the clever slave even dictates the dress code of Pleusicles as a captain in every detail, describing his clothing items, their colour and how to wear it. (*Mil*. 1176ff.)

Poenulus' Milphio acts not as powerful and self-confident as a Chrysalus throughout the play; however, his instructive dominance peaks in the rehearsal scene with Agorastocles' witnesses Collybiscus praises as:

COLL.   […] *eu edepol mortalis malos*!
AGO.   *ego enim docui.*
MIL.   *quis te porro?*
(*Poen*. 603-04)

Agorastocles tries to receive the praise for himself as he taught the witnesses but he is only the currier since it was Milphio, who taught him. The rhetorical question substitutes Agorastocles' emphatic *ego* and thereby, reminds the audience of the clever slave's inventory skill and primary position, which was unmistakably introduced at the beginning of the scene, when Milphio starts rehearsing with Collybiscus:

MIL.   *iam tenes praecepta in corde?*
COLL.   *pulchre.*
MIL.   *vide sis calleas. […]*
        fac modo ut condocta tibi sint dicta ad hanc fallaciam.
COLL.   *quin edepol condoctior sum quam tragoedi aut comici.*
(*Poen*. 578-81)

The act of memorizing the words Milphio gave to Collybiscus and the expectation that the instructed persona knows them by heart are set parallel to the mnemonic task of actors regardless of the genre. Conspiracy and its preparation are fashioned with the tone of a *poet* and director, the *servus callidus*.

In all the cases, the clever slave shows his ability and characteristic to determine the future course of the play and other figures' roles in it as how they move, behave and are costumed. Dominating word, movement, and dress normally lies in the competence of the

---

688 Pseudolus describes Simia with the same attributes, *doctus* and *astutus*, as they are used for *servi callidi* (*Pseud*. 907). Unsurprisingly, two *servi callidi* show the same thematic configurations and compete for the supremacy as military leader and commandant pursuing their mood of *volo* (911ff.).

689 In *Miles gloriosus*, Palaestrio is mainly supported by women in his cunning. Thematic parallels are drawn between the clever slave and women, going back on the prejudicial attitude towards women in those days. Their low social status and their stereotype's characteristics makes them candidates to be the perfect complementary artistry deceiver as Philocomasium and Acroteleutium do (see *Mil*. 185ff., […] *de ingenio degradiatur muliebri/ earumque artem et disciplinam obtineat colere* [185ᵃ-86] and 782ff., […]*forma lepida mulierem/ quoi facetiarum cor pectusque sit plenum et doli?* [782-83]; 887ff. and 942-43, *nostrarum malitiarum; perfidia*).

690 The dialogue is about the dualism of theatrical form in Rome. The act of memorizing correlates to script-based drama, whereas the emphasized invention on stage assumes improvisation.

playwright and director of the performance, which is here alienated and given to a performing figure. Parallels become visible between the construction of deception and the construction of dramatic illusion, which grants the clever slave the epithet *poeta*.

The most significant and open use of the playwright metaphor can be found throughout *Pseudolus* and especially in one of the *servus callidus'* soliloquies:

> quid nunc acturu's, postquam erili filio
> largitu's dictis dapsilis? ubi sunt ea?
> quoi nec parata est gutta certi consili,
> *[…]*
> neque exordiri primum unde occipias habes
> neque ad detexundam telam certos terminos.
> sed quasi poeta, tabulas quom cepit sibi,
> quaerit quod nusquam est gentium, reperit tamen,
> facit illud veri simile quod mendacium est,
> nunc ego poeta fiam: viginti minas,
> quae nusquam nunc sunt gentium, inveniam tamen.
> (*Pseud*. 395-405)

Under the pressure of coming up with a plan, Pseudolus puns with the art of invention: to find something that does not exist. The deceiver and liar resemble the poet's craft to create an illusion in a certain style since both must construct a plausible fiction to be believed (*veri simile*): one by the opponent and one by the audience or reader. But both are not restricted by limitations since the power of imagination can lead them to any utopia, which also supports the all-licensed quality of the schemer.

This power of mind even achieves to construct something out of nowhere, which exaggerates the challenge of invention and ironically addresses the aspect of 'new' again— Pseudolus already spoke of that in *novo modo novom aliquid inventum afferre addecet* (see p. 166). Pseudolus, the schemer, and the invisible poet follow the principle of imitation but simultaneously, must prove their results to be 'new' and genuine. The parallelism of the verses 402 and 405 (*nusquam gentium esse*) connects the categories of words and fantasy with the category of material—the twenty coins Pseudolus is in need to 'find'. Poets look for poetic material to invent a *fabula* as the clever slave seeks gold and therefore, yarn to spin a manipulative story for his opponent.[691]

The audience encounters the poet of the coming plot, which could be referred to as the interior *poeta* seemingly working with improvisation in *Pseudolus*, and the exterior *poeta* arranging fiction by a script (*tabulas*). The clever secondary poet illuminates the illusion of his actual performance and an invisible poet persona. The ambiguously used vocabulary, *agere* and *parare*, enhances the intrusion of the creative process in the theatrical illusion: *agere* refers to playing a figure, whereas its future form alludes to the figure's fictive decision how to act; *parare* refers to memorizing the text and rehearsing, whereas the negated perfect form denies any preparation of the coming performance.

The poet as well as the figure starts from a blank *tabula* seeking ideas, finding words, and creating fiction, which imitates truth or life most closely in a (deceiving) illusion. Plautus

---

691 Similarly, the dictation scene in *Bacchides*, where Chrysalus invents the words determining the further course of the play, designs the clever slave as the playwright resembling to "ancient poets [who] usually dictated. Chrysalus is dictating the play here: directly, by writing a speech for Mnesilochus, and indirectly, as the subsequent course if the play is shaped by the letter." (Niall W. Slater, *Plautus in Performance. The Theatre of the Mind*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985, 108).

comically outlines the challenge of a poet by placing these words in the mouth of the *servus callidus*. The soliloquy, where Pseudolus designs himself a *poeta*, is the climax of the slave's description of his creative position and influence, which comes close to a playwright's abilities and duties. The audience meets a figure belonging to two worlds: the centre of theatrical illusion and the border of it. The *servus callidus'* concept gains an ambivalence arising from his *poeta*-like image and the limitations of a figure. Hence, his exclusivity comparing to his fellow figures is not only apparent in the instruction scenes, but also in the clever slave's knowledge of the kind of play he performs in, the generic specifics, and the consumer, the audience and their expectations. Every time he seems to be a playwright, he disrupts the theatrical illusion, adverts his function to construct the illusionary, and supports his fiction of being more than the figure, a *poeta*.

Like a playwright is concerned with the effective arrangement of scenes, the clever slave restricts the number of speech acts and ends dialogues as if calculating the length of the play and diminishing redundant parts as the comedy's performance is meant for the audience: [...] *nam huc si ante aedes evocem,/ quae audivistis modo, nunc si eadem hic iterum iterem, inscitia est*. (*Poen*. 920-21); *nolo bis iterari, sat sic longae fiunt fabulae* (*Pseud*. 388); *horum causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula:/ hi sciunt qui hic affuerunt; vobis post narravero*. (*Pseud*. 720-21).

The comic poet knowingly avails himself of the principles of comedy, which also includes the utopian quality of comedy's stage the *servus callidus* can rely on:

> *nunc ad me ut veniat usust Acroteleutium aut*
> *ancillula eius aut Pleusicles. pro Iuppiter,*
> *satine ut Commoditas usquequaque me adiuvat!*
> *nam quos videre exoptabam me maxume,*
> *una exeuntis video hinc e proxumo.*
> (*Mil*. 1132-36)

Palaestrio's wish that his allies appear on stage becomes a mere announcement of their appearance for the audience. The personified *commoditas* signifies comedy's world of improbabilities and miracles working for the *servus callidus,* who directly refers to his lucky position not bound to temporal or local restrictions, shedding a parodic light on his concept of the exaggerated lucky and successful deceiver. The clever slave shows that comedy's convention is as exposed to *ridiculum* as human vices are.

Similarly, Pseudolus praises *opportunitas* for the plot's wonderful development supporting his mission: *namque ipsa Opportunitas non potuit mi opportunius/ advenire quam haec allata est mi opportune epistula* (*Pseud*. 669-70)*.* Pseudolus' polyptoton of *opportunitas* emphatically makes fun of the generic convention and his position in it as he will creatively spin his ranks from the letter luckily containing everything he needs; he will provide the audience with what is expected in a *fabula palliata* intrigue (*ubi inest quicquid volo* [*Pseud*. 671]). The indefinite pronoun *quicquid* underlines the object's arbritrariness *volo* aims at and expresses the clever slave's magical fulfilment of wishes.

The *servus callidus'* concept, in particularly the ability to construct the illusionary, relies on the comedy's law of chance, realizing a utopia; that can be the illusion that the clever slave, a member of the lowest social strata, can burn such a fantastic deceptive firework against the paterfamilias. The clever slave's impact on the plot is dependent on the interaction between luck and active influence since,

> whether in drama or narrative, a plot always takes shape as a result of negotiations
> between luck and contingency, between happenings by "hap" or chance and those

determined by a plan of events causally linked. Since its Greek beginnings, New Comedy especially depended on the tension between chance and human ingenuity. In Plautus and his many descendants ingenuity is embodied in the well-known type of the clever slave.[692]

The clever slave's identifying feature can be found in his wits, which exhaust the full potential of comedy's chance. The figure's self-awareness about its convention and functionality in the illusion reflects upon the comedy's utopian nature, its role in it, and on a macro-level, even the demarcation to tragedy in the matter of chance.

According to Schlegel, the principle of ancient tragedy is substituted by chance in comedy as

> the place of Destiny is supplied by Chance, for the latter is the empirical conception of the former, as being that which lies beyond our power or control. And accordingly we actually find among the fragments of the Comic writers as many expressions about Chance, as we do in the tragedies about Destiny. To unconditional necessity, moral liberty could alone be opposed; as for Chance, every one must use his wits, and turn it to his own profit as best he can.[693]

The clever slave is aware of comedy's inner machinery of chance or *Fortuna* he seems to control with his creative force of *velle.* Plautus conceptualizes an inner *poeta* standing outside the utopian mechanisms, or in other words, a comic *deus ex machina*, which addresses the issue of probability and the magical solution; the *servus callidus* is marked as a supporter of the utopian quality. The magician's design ranges from Palaestrio's theme as an *architectus* to Pseudolus' *poeta*. From the early intrigue comedy, the figure of the *servus callidus* increases in confidence and self-fashioning about his dominant position, while he can reflect upon his status for Plautus' intrigue comedy. He semantically intersects deceit and illusion as well as deceiving and acting, whereby the stock characteristics of the mask are compared to the use and effect of a mask itself.

The figure illuminates his functional concept within the schema of comedy and puns with the audience's position in a theatrical performance as they are addressees of an illusion. He communicates the ambiguity of illusion to the audience and relativizes deeds, words, and the relation of *actio* and *reactio* as parts of the harmless nature of comedy. Violating social norms, the cheeky slave still remains unpunished. Analogically, his fooling and ridiculing are aggressive but are not considered to be hostile or painful.

The clever slave sets himself apart from the other figures and can be comprehended as moving at the outside or on the margins of theatrical illusion. The local superiority of a *deus ex machina* describes his perspective on stage and the figure's advantage to take the position of an outsider and observer to the secondary and even primary illusion. The clever slave makes the audience recognize the illusionary and harmless quality of his stock character. The *servus callidus* affirms the audience that he is about to create an improvisatory masterpiece; he will achieve the improbable, whereby he simulates control like a *poeta*. Plautus displays a figure ranging in between two contradictory extremes: a) wearing the mask and staying within the figure's limits; b) making the mask and its generic condition transparent. The former displays

---

692 Richard F. Hardin, 'The Renaissance of Plautine Comedy and the Varieties of Luck in Shakespeare and Other Plotters', *Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2007): 143-156, 143.
693 Augustus William Schlegel, *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, transl. by John Black, London: Bohn, 1846, 192.

the slave who moves on stage unaware of its artificial limits and the own functionality within the genre. In contrast, the latter breaks through the invisible boundaries of theatrical utopia, recognizing the artificial potential of a comic stage, and knowingly exhausting utopia's source of the improbable and irrational fully. The *servus callidus'* entertaining quality derives from this combination of both extremes.

Conclusion

Single features the *servus callidus* shows can be detected in other figures. Using imperatives, addressing the audience, commenting on stage action and referring to the metatheatrical level are not exclusively bound to the *servus callidus*. Nevertheless, it is the sum and frequency of how the *servus callidus* communicates with the audience directly and indirectly, guides and instructs the other figures, arranges illusions for them, controls plot action and most importantly, reflects upon his theatrical environment. His roles and acting assess him as the primary manager of his own identities or thematic configurations. The Plautine figure displays himself as an *architectus* of the plot and even designs him as the *poeta* in charge of the dialectic of illusion and disillusion. The clever slave stands in the middle of entangled fictional ideas and roles bound to dramatic and non-dramatic (con)texts, which makes him seem to pull the strings.

 The clever slave manages to take on different roles, crafting and visualizing illusionary frames and stage-manages himself. He changes his identities and the inherent frames as the member of the lowest social rank, facing all its restrictions. The type of a deceiver and illusionist acts as a Saturnalian wit. The actor wearing a mask foregrounds the means of theatricality; the architect of the plot and the *poeta* reflect upon theatre's production. Perceiving the sum and the incorporation of these identities in one figure, the audience becomes aware of a figure that inhabits the centre of comedy's discourse and simultaneously, the peripheries of the theatrical space.[694]

 He seems to move at the play's surface ready to rupture primary illusion, whereby he acts in comedy's manner as

> this mode is the stock-in-trade of comedy that commonly foregrounds a basic duality in this connection: actor/role, theatron/dramatis *locus*, object/prop, face/mask, one's own speech/'borrowed'.[695]

The dual mode highly recommends itself to establish incongruous moments as they bear potential for *ridiculum*. When the *servus callidus* applies this mode, he shows himself to be mainly in control of creating incongruity. In fact, the ironic self-awareness of the figure *servus callidus* displays him as comic in his essence since generally one core deviation from tragedy to comedy is that "theatrical self-consciousness is an integral part of the comic performance

---

694 In this regard, the type *servus callidus* stands close to the trickster figure. "[Tricksters] are figures on the margin, belonging to the periphery, not to the center." (Leah D. Schade, *Creation-Crisis Preaching. Ecology, Theology, and the Pulpit,* St. Louis: Charlice Press, 2015, 143). And cf. Lewis Hyde, *Trickster Makes this World. Mischief, Myth & Art*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010, esp. 203ff.. The trickster can change from the peripheries to the center, whereby he reshapes the center in transgressing boundaries, while he can belong to two worlds.
695 Dobrov (2001), 14.

despite its absence from tragedy."[696] The clever slave constructing and rupturing illusion with a self-referential habit reveals himself to be comedy's *signum* as he shifts between the incongruous frames deliberately and knowingly, which allows ridiculing moments aiming at him, his theatrical environment and the others. In short, he is a deliberate fool and *poeta* of *ridiculum*.

The consciousness and awareness of the theatre's operations and parameters link him to the professional playwright behind the scenes. Plautus shows his deep knowledge and craft as "a theatre professional" in the construction of the clever slave.[697] The clever slave as *poeta* is a powerful image giving the comic poet's persona an audible voice to reflect upon his understanding of theatre, (national) drama and generic body of means, which foregrounds theatrical production processes during performance. The clever slave's appearance as a poet fits Plautus' former status as a slave and actor and moreover, slaves' role in the theatrical world as actors. Still, Plautus' voice must not be mistaken with that of the clever slave or with any autobiographical reference to the characteristics of the figure using it. Plautus might pun with the poet's voice as a cunning and deceiving type amusing the audience by drawing associations between the semantic pairs of lies and deception and fiction and dramatic performance. Briefly, the poet's language is fiction, whereas the deceiver tells fictive stories.

Besides a potentially ironic description of theatrical illusion, the incorporate dual mode in the *servus callidus* and his image of a *poeta* are achieved by Plautus' self-reflective poetics, which influences the audience's perception of comic theatre and its belonging processes. Plautine theatre's self-fashioning makes use of the associations between role playing, theatrical illusion and deception, visualizing connections between comedy's theme of intrigue, theatre's parameters, and a poet's work. The thematic equation of improvisation with scheming classifies the *servus callidus* not only as the deceiving creator of comic discourse, but also as the spontaneous inventor. The moment where the clever slave acts as if improvising identifies the stage as looking back to *Atellana's* mechanisms and thereby, recalling Italic forms of drama.

Plautus addresses cultural heritage in front of the Roman audience, intersecting New Comedy's plot, types and devices with native Italic pattern, while he finally represents a figure aspiring to be the creator crafting something 'new' for the audience. In *Atellana's* performance or improvisation in general, the actor relies on his creativity and innovation as analogically, the poet attempts to imitate the former material in an appealing, culturally integrative, and genuine way. The central aspect of theatrical production found in both is the performance of something 'new' regardless if it is the medium of text or acting. The Roman audience watches a poet's product that deals with its development—a topic that is rooted in New Comedy and in the agonal feature of *imitatio.*

Consequently, identifying the figure with an improvisatory poet reaches beyond Plautus' attempt to present his theatre by an ironic metaphor, but Plautus' intrigue comedies

---

696 Chapman (1983), 2; on Old Comedy's rupture of illusion as installation of incongruity, see Frances Muecke, 'Playing with the Play: Theatrical Self-Consciousness in Aristophanes', *Antichthon* 11 (1977): 52-67. And see John L. Styan, *Drama, Stage and Audience*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1975, 180-81: "In an Introduction to Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search for an Author*, Lionell Trilling: 'The word illusion comes from the Latin word meaning, 'to mock' (*illudere*), which in turn comes from the word meaning 'to play' (*ludere*), and a favourite activity of the theatre is to play with the idea of illusion itself, to mock the very thing it most tries to create- and the audience that accepts it.'"

697 Slater (²2000), 5-6; for an overview on Plautus' work as a playwright, see Adrian S. Gratwick, 'Drama', *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. II. Latin Literature*, Edward J. Kenney (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1982, 77-137, esp. 80-82.

communicate his idiosyncratic contribution to Roman ambition for a national dramatic form and offer the Roman audience an identity through his work and comic theatre. The Roman audience does not simply watch intrigue comedies in adaptation to former plays, but gains access to a transparent and comic fashioning of their cultural experience consisting of a poet's production, theatre's traditions, and performance on stage. Plautus' figure, the *servus callidus*, stimulates reflections on Roman comedy, its background, and its demarcation to the other dramatic products, which enables the audience to recognize a distinct Roman and Plautine play.[698]

As the clever slave, the *poeta*, stands at the centre of Plautus' self-fashioning, he unites a complex of identities transformed from New Comedy and adapted to Roman culture. His trademark is the paradox between being a fictive figure and its poet, the constructor and the raptor of illusion, and standing at the centre and the outside. The theatrical space represents a utopia, where magical things can happen as the lucky incidents support the protagonist in his mission, conventional dogma is suspended, and a slave can rule his master. The *servus callidus* superiorily signs comedy's stage with the signature of utopia confirming its harmlessness and identifies himself as an outsider commenting on the stage action and prophetically announcing the plot's progress.

The clever slave pursues a metatheatrical strategy like no other figure, illuminating the basis of every art: imagination. Niall W. Slater pinpoints Plautus' metatheatre as "the celebration of the power of imagination", whose triumph is led by the "plot-manipulating poet role".[699] Plautus presents the audience with a comic magician, who supports and communicates theatre's and comedy's nature. The type's flexibility arising from the creative freedom and the mobility between the inner dramatic frame and its peripheries recommends the figure *servus callidus* to realize myriads of themes regardless if they belong to the world of comedy itself and operate self-reflectively or if they relate to socio-cultural issues.

Consequently, his simultaneous inhabitancy of the utopian stage and its surface underlines the two most important feature of the clever slave recommending himself to be a prototypical professional fool figure: his self-awareness and his flexibility, which shines in his skill to invent, imagine, and play roles. He can deliberately construct identities, which can exist in incongruities as between illusionary frames or between theatrical illusion and reality in order to illuminate the stage in the light of comedy: the audience receives moments of *ridiculum*, perceives its utopian nature and is confronted with the carnivalesque depiction of reality.

---

698 Plautus' self-fashioning cannot be approached further in this work as the focus lies on the clever slave type's functionality, which means the support and realisation of comedy's principles.

699 Slater (²2000), 146 and 161. And discussing different approaches to Plautus' metatheatre, note Christopher Bungard, 'Metatheater and Improvisation in Plautus', *A Companion to Plautus*, George Fredric Franko and Dorota Dutsch (eds.), Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020, 237-249, esp. 238-39; cf. Ferdinand Stürner, 'The *Servus Callidus* in Charge', *A Companion to Plautus*, George Fredric Franko and Dorota Dutsch (eds.), Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020, 135-149, 145 (the clever slave as the strongest metatheatrical figure in Plautine drama).

III.v. *Servus ludens*

The fool, an inorganic figure

The thematic configurations of the clever slave that have been discussed so far always contain the comedy's addiction to *ridiculum* a key element the *servus callidus* shares with the concept of the stereotypical fool figure including both types, the natural and deliberate fool. Still, one essential quality an audience would commonly expect from a fool figure in comedy has not been considered closely; and that is, roughly speaking, to amuse with nonsense. Acting like a fool, a simpleton, someone that astounds by the greatness of his stupidity is a mode to create moments of *ridiculum*, making whimsical and foolish behaviour a key characteristic to be expected from a stereotypical natural fool figure, who invests heavily in comic moments and whose dramatic function can thus be recognized as a driver of the comic. To narrow down the term 'comic driver', the type should be looked at more closely by Barthélémy A. Taladoire's categorization of Plautus' figures. Taladoire formulates one main category "*les personnage inorganique*" divided into two groups on the basis of how they are involved in the main action and contribute to comic passages:

> *Dans le nœud de l'action, se présentent, en gros, deux catégories de personnages inorganiques: ceux que l'on réserve pour les intermèdes ou les effets comiques, ceux qui aident peu ou prou à la marche de l'intrigue.*[700]

The first group consists of those that just serve to create a comic effect and whose existence and stereotypical construction are adjusted to that purpose as it is true for Gelasimus, a parasite in *Stichus*, the cooks in *Aulularia*, or the fishers in *Rudens*. Thus, their dramatic existence is justified in establishing and driving the comic in one or more scenes. They usually enter the stage as members of the lower classes, cooks, parasites, and slaves, offering targets for laughter willingly or unwillingly.

The second category subsumed under Taladoire's main category of "*personnages inorganiques*" (though the term 'inorganic' originally stems from Henry Prescott's terminology) contains figures that serve the comic but whose roles also have a secondary function, for example, to present something, and that can be to characterize another figure like Grumio supports Tranio's introduction and characterization but does not interfere in the process of the main action.[701] With reference to a stereotypical figure, a *servus currens* fulfils the features for Taladoire's category of an inorganic persona since the running slave functions as a mere messenger, a dramatic device for supplying information, and does not take on an influential role in the main action; his short performance and especially his delaying tactics do not material for the plot, but he supplies the audience with *ridiculum* and therefore, with

---

700 Barthélémy A. Taladoire, *Essai sur le Comique de Plaute*, Monaco: L'Imprimerie Nationale de Monaco, 1956, 162. Differentiating inorganic from organic becomes most palpable in the moment of the (seemingly) irresolvable and most twisted strands of action, when the audience longs for scenes of organic essence.
It must be noticed that the quality of inorganic is not automatically equated with the category of nonsense.
701 *Ibid.*, 162, for the examples of the second group, Taladoire names Ergasilus in *Captivi*, Charinus in *Pseudolus*, Lydus in *Bacchides*, and Anterastilis in *Poenulus;* note 161-164, a strong categorization of figures is applicable due to the fact that Plautus' comedies do not pursue the individualisation of figures, especially not in a psychological dimension, which tendency can already be observed for Shakespeare's characters. In antiquity's drama, types rely on a certain apparatus of techniques, means, motifs, and action, but it is the variation and constellation of these, whereby Plautus earns himself the title "'*Ingénieur' au double sens*" (164); and cf. Henry W. Prescott, 'Inorganic Rôles in Roman Comedy', *Classical Philology* 15.3 (1920): 245-281.

entertainment. The first group could be identified as pure comic drivers, while the second displays a combination of a comic driver and a secondary function that contributes to the main action partly. If the stereotypical fool figure is seen as primarily functioning for the establishment of comic passages and does not promote the main action, the fool figure is "*inorganique*". It is, however, dangerous to conclude that every non-protagonist comic driver is a fool figure as some figures like a *servus currens* and Grumio foster moments of *ridiculum* but their methods of how to drive the comic and how they present themselves distinguishes them from a fool.[702]

Prescott categorizes figures as "inorganic" when they are "loosely or mechanically attached to the main action" whereas they are organic when they "are closely interwoven in the web of the plot".[703] Due to that definition, the *servus callidus* is organic since the protagonist and the performance of his intrigue plans are deeply needed for the plot and its development. Concerning his dramatic function and involvement in the plot, the clever slave differs from Taladoire's *personnage inorganique* and does not fulfil the exclusive or primary purpose to serve the comic, which would suggest that he is not a comic driver per se. Still, he constantly advances the instalment of comic moments throughout the play, which could determine him a secondary comic driver compared to Taladoire's inorganic personae with a secondary function for the plot. The clever slave's *raison d'être* and functionality for the play cannot exclusively be defined by driving the comic; in that sense, he does not fulfil the primary function of a stereotypical natural fool figure and does not satisfy the expectation an audience has when they hear the word 'fool'. Prescott's and Taladoire's categories are helpful to discriminate between figures roughly but do not take their whole concepts and their variable manifestations into account, which demands a more differentiated approach.

If figures can be defined by how much they contribute to the main action, scenes could also be evaluated due to their contribution to the plot. To widen Prescott's terminology, organic scenes, where mainly organic figures thus play and produce the main action, form the coherent web of the plot whereas inorganic scenes are not part of that web, which makes the comic discourse a sequence of inorganic and organic scenes or a causal-logic net of organic scenes suffused by the inorganic parts regardless how long or short they might be.[704] In analogy, the comic discourse consists of the constellation of organic figures initiating, participating in, and driving inorganic scenes. Plautus' clever type as the manager of his identities does not completely act as the deceiver and *architectus*, the purely organic figure, but also inserts inorganic passages in organic scenes or whole inorganic scenes in the discourse, which offer him space to perform a temporary comic driver. This chapter is interested in inorganic passages and scenes, where the clever slave exhibits the mode of a fool figure by engaging in the game of sense and nonsense, wherein he is not interested in the progress of the intrigue but exposes himself and others to absurdity in order to serve comedy's nourishment of *ridiculum*.[705] The analysis intends to trace the deliberately 'foolish' component in the *servus callidus* and to detect the clever slave's effectiveness and recognition as a deliberate fool in the paradoxical pair of sense and nonsense. Both categories, sense and

---

702 For the definition of the fool figure see ch. II.ii.

703 Prescott (1920), 246.

704 Prescott's and Taladoire's categorization helps to approach and describe figures' functionality on the general macrostructure of drama and the differences therein, but the categories should not be considered as operable for an approach on the microstructure nor for modern drama.

705 Absurdity does not automatically cause laughter as it is the case for nonsense but the reaction can be pity, dislike, or incomprehension. For other terms related to the laughable but not to be subsumed, see Kindt (2011), 154.

nonsense, are not understood as absolute but their content offers a scope for the figure's performance.

The category 'sense' denotes "the intuitive knowledge or appreciation of what action or judgement is appropriate to a given situation or sphere of activity", a "natural understanding, intelligence, […] and practical soundness of judgement", which can be summed up in "what is wise or reasonable", implying the presence of meaning.[706] 'Nonsense' is understood as "absence of rationality or meaning", which can be "absurd or meaningless words or ideas", "foolish or extravagant conducts", "misbehaviour", and the failure of sound judgement and of an appropriate reaction to a situation.[707] The definitions of humour seem to sound vague in order to include its myriad phenomena; this is also valid for the notion of nonsense in regard to theoretical accounts on humorous texts and activities.

Passages of nonsense contain an anomaly to the normal and expected, which sometimes seduces the scholar to take nonsense as a synonym for comic if no further distinction is made. Indeed, many humorous techniques rely on misbehaviour, inappropriateness, and the absence of rationality; seriousness is the natural enemy to humour, but sense or meaning does not behave in the same way as it cannot be bypassed when it comes to a joke's world since jokes—whether verbal or not—always exist in a logic on their own, whose frame is entered by processing its meaning. Nonsense only occurs as an activity attempting to exclude any sense, which is objectively not possible,[708] since nonsense is always a subjective matter as it depends on a form of judgement. It is not absolute as it is not to be decided where sense or meaning ends and nonsense starts for the individual. Neologisms heard for the first time can be thought as nonsense by the addressee but make perfect sense for the speaker and inventor. Therefore, 'comic' is hardly replaceable by nonsense since the negation or concealing of sense is only a humorous technique or category of techniques, which does not automatically produce a humorous entity when applied but draws upon the effectiveness of opposition and depends on the context and intention.[709]

The category's scope chosen here is not meant to be as wide as in common language but also not as restrictive as in verbal humour theory or in nonsense literature, which concerns the violation of grammatical and phonological rules with the result of seemingly accidental formation of words and sentences like in famous examples as Lewis Carroll's *Jabberwocky*.[710] Nonsense here means a strong or climactic disturbance of sense-making for the addressee and a deviation from the normal and expected from the former discourse and the present situation, which describes all scenes where the clever slave turns into a figure of foolish behaviour, who carries out extravagant conduct, juggles with expectations bound to the dramatic frame and subverts reasoning and logic, while his action is dominated by playfulness. He even seems to knock on the door of a mad man temporarily, but despite all his irrational actions, his behaviour still exhibits method as Polonius significantly acknowledges that "this be madness, yet there is method in't" (*Ham.* 2.2.204-05). In short, Plautus' type can be added

---

706 *OED*, s.v. 'sense'. "The mental faculties in their normal condition of sanity; […] in one's right mind; to be in one's right senses […] to cure of his folly (one who is behaving 'madly')." (s.v. 'sense, 10.a.').
707 *OED*, s.v. 'nonsense'.
708 Cf. Stephen E. Kidd, *Nonsense and Meaning in Ancient Greek Comedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, 8-11.
709 It should be noted, there is not the slightest attempt to replace humour with nonsense or to present an own theory of humour.
710 Lewis Carroll's poem from *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There* (1872); a recent book on nonsense in Ancient Greek Comedy by Stephen E. Kidd defines the category of nonsense partly differently to the here-applied understanding as he starts from an ancient point of view and discusses passages of nonsense as bearing "no serious sense" and as "language perceived as being unworthy of interpretation" (Kidd [2014], 8).

another identity, the *servus ludens*, who chooses to play with sense and become the comic driver by nonsense temporarily.

The epithet *ludens* was chosen to denote a key semantic complex the *servus callidus* is situated in while he is aware of it and knows how to use it. Although *ludens* is mainly restricted to denote playfulness and the game of sense and nonsense in the analysis, outlining the complexity of the term is important to understand the interdependence and coherence of the motives and identities that are integrated into the concept of the *servus callidus* in Plautus' plays. The verb *ludere* and the corresponding noun *ludus* are used throughout Plautus' plays,[711] spanning a wide net of inner- and extradramatic meanings, the first of which is *ludus* as a game serving for leisure and referring to the institutional framework for Roman drama since Roman public games often contained *ludi scaenici* like the *ludi Romani* did while celebrating Jupiter. If *ludere* is seen in relation to theatre, the verb, to play, addresses a figure's essence to be played by an actor and to exist in the act of performance, which the clever slave is conscious about. Here, *ludus* and *ludere* belong to a socio-cultural category, providing performance for a collective experience, which was at the centre of the last chapter *illuminating illusion*. The third component of the semantic spectrum relates *ludus* ambiguously to the intrigue comedy's content and comic nature since the phrase *ludos facere* or *reddere alicui* (to play a trick on sb.) names the central motif of deceit in many Roman comedies, while the phrase *ludos praebere* meaning 'to provide sth. to laugh at' or "to be a figure of fun" calls attention to the entertaining factor and comedy's desire for laughter encouraging the establishment of inorganic figures.[712] Analogically, the verb *ludere* denotes tricking, ridiculing, and speaking as well as acting playfully, which stands for the intrigue, mockery and jests synonymously. In other words, *ludere* depicts plot, Saturnalia, and *ridiculum* founding the essence of Plautus' intrigue comedy and its structure the protagonist internalizes throughout the play since he incorporates the closest connection between the aspects of *ludus-ludere.*

As it has been argued in the previous chapters, Plautus' type, *servus callidus*, thematically outlines its position of an intriguer and primarily pursues the combination of deceiving, teasing, and providing moments for laughter, which is evident in the inversive methods of imaging intrigue as agon and himself as a hero, when he draws upon his rhetoric repertoire of exaggerations, mixing of registers, and high and low metaphors. His playful use of language and conventions deprives any seriousness and severity even from violent themes like the recurring 'threat of punishment'. The clever slave presents himself as a dominant figure visualizing the theatrical show and the act of miming especially when the clever slave adapts the role of the contriver to the world of theatre and its vocabulary so that he occurs as the poet and illusionist spinning *fabula*. After all, every action and remark he undertakes seem to follow a complex agenda for comedy's upside-down utopia following the complex of *ludus-ludere* and presenting a hilarious intrigue plot, an enjoyable tricking of a superior, while he reflects upon the performing act of the ugly.[713]

The polyvalence of *ludus* and *ludere* expresses the clever slave's comic kaleidoscope as these terms exhibit the ambiguous interrelation between performance, intrigue, and comic pursuit, which is realized in the web of organic and inorganic parts. *Ludus-ludere* provides a space of becoming, wherein the clever slave can change the perspective and foreground each part: the figure separately from the actor, who amuses the audience by scheming, playful talk,

---

711 Cf. Gonzales Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, Vol. I, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1963, 911-12 (s.v. '*ludus*' and '*ludere*').

712 *OLD*, s.v. '*ludus*, 4.c', also note 4.a-b; in Plautus' plays, Lodge (1963), s.v. '*ludus* II.3'. Some examples are given: *Amph.* 571; *Bacch.* 1090; *Epid.* 706, *ludos facere* synonymously set to *ludificari.*

713 On the complex of *ludus-ludere* also see ch. III.iii. and iv.

and the absence of rationality. Calidorus' wish of *lubido est ludos tuos spectare* (*Pseud*. 552) connotes the ambiguous position of Pseudolus, who is about to perform rankings, and Calidorus, who will then become the spectator of this performance, confirming the illusionary frame the intrigue will create.[714] Moreover, Pseudolus' *ludi* imply that the clever slave will give an amusing show, while the slave constantly boosts material for laughter by mocking and jesting, a characteristic that is inseparable from his figure and the thematic configurations.

Significantly, Calidorus complains about Pseudolus' ridiculing behaviour in *ludis iam ludo tuo?* (*Pseud*. 24) (You are playing with your tricks), whose figura etymologica designates the *servus callidus*' habit and ability to make fun of everything, even of his own game since he does not stop at the despair of the lover, at the dignity of masters or at his own but garbs every matter with comic garments. Thus, if the clever slave's relation to comedy and its tone is considered, the semantic complex of *ludus-ludere*, on the one hand, sums up the type's employment of his identities since he flexibly moves between his roles, playing with social and theatrical conventions and the inner logic of the specific play. Here, the type's 'playfulness' happens on a macrolevel and pervasively over the discourse realized in the distinct thematic configurations of the heroic anti-hero, the threatened, but all-licensed slave, the participant in an agon, and the *poeta.* On the other, Calidorus' complaint stresses exactly the comic prevalence and the profession of the slave to be not only an intriguer but foremost, a producer of *ridiculum*. This characteristic becomes most prominent in scenes and passages of inorganic quality, where the young master's need and the slave's promise do not prevent the *servus callidus* from suspending his intrigue; now, he is simply a comic driver and fool. Becoming a *servus ludens,* he then concentrates on the construction of *ridiculum* under one aspect of *ludus-ludere* and that is speaking and acting playfully pinpointed as playing with sense, which can occur as irrational behaviour, a defect of logic, subversion of meaning, and even the subversion of the own identity since, analogically to comedy's characteristic of self-irony, the clever slave is capable of applying the playful mode on himself and his own conception.

This chapter will analyse the *servus callidus* becoming a *servus ludens* in phases of nonsense that are present in two forms on the micro-level in inorganic passages and scenes: behaviour and the use of certain verbal structures, negotiating the categories of sense and nonsense. The content of both categories delivers the *servus callidus* with something flexible that follows convention and logic or negates logic, rational thinking and violates meaning. He interferes with the present situation and its rules to produce a paradoxical constellation of sense and nonsense. In the coming subchapter, the first and major object of the analysis will be behaviour consisting of the clever slave's decisions, the relation and attitude to other figures. To disclose the whole range of the clever slave's play with sense, the subsequent subchapter needs to cover his behaviour in communication and focuses on how the slave avails himself of forms of sense in language by making use of its flexible system in order to achieve an unpredictable compound of meaning. The findings of both subchapters overlap in the clever slave's habit of miscommunication and his tendency to dominate the dialogue partner abusively. This is eased by the other's will to seek sense, meaning, validity, intelligibility, or even seriousness in his actions. The clever slave as a true prototypical professional fool figure deliberately controls sense in discourse in an atmosphere of nonsense with his full senses since the combination of *ludus-ludere* represents the slave's capacity to invent and perform games of intrigue and joking.

---

714 This quality of rupturing the illusion and found in *ludos spectare* confirms the *servus callidus*' dominance in the progress of the plot and the construction of illusion, which was thematised in the previous chapter (III.iv.).

Playing with sense or behaving 'foolishly'

The clever slave functions for the progress of the plot mainly in terms of resolution. Still, his ridiculing activity never stops and clings to his intrigue in all his performance as it can be found in his announcements, comments and in general, his form of communication. In *Pseudolus*, the clever slave communicates the intrigue to his master beforehand and provocatively, suggests a bet on its success, which belongs to those parts assuring that the *servus callidus* realizes his agon as a humorous game and not as a harmful contest and enhances the suspense of how the expected intrigue might succeed. In *Epidicus*, the final scene shows two puzzled masters wondering about Epidicus' challenging but most of all illogical behaviour since a slave demands to be bound by his master. Such scenes reveal the *servus callidus* to be a *para prosdokian* in itself, who is not afraid to cross the lines of convention, and even reason frequently.[715] Herein, he plays with parts of the plot and the expectations deriving from it and neglects coherence temporarily, which means that his behaviour opposes the expected, convention, and logic. Bets and extreme reactions as commanding masters are perceived as mad or silly by the other figures and sometimes come unexpected for the audience. In contrast to the irrationality perceived at first, the clever slave aims at some advantage following a hidden *ratio* as when Epidicus seeks freedom and Pseudolus guarantees himself immunity.[716]

For the comedy's schema and motifs, such passages serve the depiction of an agonistic relation as well as the creation of suspense and *ridiculum*, whose device can be identified in the *para prosdokian* nonsense dissolving in ingenious audacity at the end of the passage. Here, irrational behaviour is exploited to display a Saturnalian relation between slave and master and an agonistic tone along with the comic perspective. The scenes do not exist primarily for the sake of a comic effect provided by the unexpected and irrational behaviour and are not inorganic but constitute a specific *actio-reactio*-sequence that is important for the discourse; if Epidicus had not manipulated the two old men by his attack, they would not have been stopped in punishing him and it would have altered the end of the play significantly, which makes Epidicus' seemingly irrational behaviour part of an organic scene.[717]

The question remains if the clever slave also fosters insertions of comic scenes in the plot, wherein the intriguer does not hint at a specific outcome and some advantage for him, but where the characteristic of *ludens* preponderates over the agonistic challenge and primarily happens for the inorganic comic effect. These are the particular escapades this analysis is interested in, where the fool figure's intention of *ludos praebere* stands at the centre. Such a scene is found at the end of *Poenulus*, when Milphio pretends to be able to speak Punic and more or less helps his young master as Agorastocles cannot understand Punic. Thus, Milphio offers to interpret for him since (only) today no other figure is more Carthaginian than the clever slave is (*nullus me est hodie Poenus Poenior* [*Poen.* 991]). From verse 991 onwards, Milphio fakes his identity as a true translator when he generates absurd translations by guessing the meaning of Punic words from Latin homophones or Latin words that are phonemically similar: *donni* becomes *doni*; *bocca* becomes *buccam*; *assam* mistaken for a form of the adjective *assus* related to *arvinam*; *palu* becomes *palas*; and *umer gad etha*

---

715 When the term *para prosdokian* is used, it is not understood as the realisation of the rhetorical figure but refers to the surprising turn, a common term already used in the discussion about verbal humour by Bergson.
716 With such behaviour, Epidicus moves inside and outside of the play; for a detailed analysis of the scene, see ch. III.iii.
717 On the relations between agon and *servus ludens*, see p. 191ff.

is turned into *mergas datas*.[718] Milphio's translation creates an incoherent and absurd dialogue part for Hanno, who becomes a potential patient suffering from his jaw, offers gifts for the aediles in the form of African mice as well as sale products including spoons, funnels, nuts, spades and reaping boards, and who even makes a morbid request for assisted suicide. The quick turns of topic, their incoherence, and the absurd impressions of mice walking at a parade—which would have been nearly invisible to the spectators at the games of the aediles—do not disturb Milphio in continuing his meaningless translation until Plautus probably exhausted the joke.

Finally, even Milphio capitulates against such nonsense in verse 1028, admits not to understand anything anymore, thereby withdraws his former exaggeration to be most Punic today and ends the comic escapade. It is not Agorastocles or Hanno, who are the first to address Milphio's disastrous job as a translator openly. Hanno offends him after the clever slave's giving in. Agorastocles' encounter with Hanno is delayed without any progress for the plot by Milphio's senseless translations. In despite of the previous scene when the clever slave gave instructions and was ahead, he now acts foolishly, only committed to *ridiculum*. The audience could identify his translation as overestimation of his knowledge of the Punic language or even as the active careless domination of a dialogue because Milphio does not care that he cannot manage to translate Punic but like a typical *servus callidus* he takes the role of an interpreter for his master, only functioning as the temporarily foolish entertainer at the beginning of the dialogue. Although he offers to serve as a mediator between Hanno and Agorastocles, he does not foster their communication but impedes any intelligible discourse between those two by turning Hanno's speech into an absurd story about his identity and intention.[719]

Agorastocles' permanent and insistent questions of what Hanno says (*quid ait?*, *quid venit?*) emphasize his dependence on Milphio, while the clever slave asks him whether he cannot hear what Hanno says. Milphio's *non audis?* ambiguously relates to the comprehension but also to the physical act of hearing the words, the only possible activity for Agorastocles, whereas the young master's questions show him as the impatient victim of Milphio's false translations, comprehending nothing, which sharpens the interpretation process as a ridiculous absence of competence and meaning. Milphio's trip to nonsense comes closest to the stupid and incompetent character of a natural fool, who does not know that he ridicules himself or is ridiculed. Indeed, the beginning of the scene can be differently interpreted and performed by a director, staging a clever slave, who pronounces the revelation of nonsense not as if he was surprised and defeated by his own incompetence, but foregrounds his willing misleading as a hoax.

Plautus varied Milphio in comparison to the other clever slaves in his self-confidence and dominance over the play as he does not act as the primary *architectus*, replacing the master. In some scenes, Agorastocles shows some allusions to a clever slave's habits when he mocks his slave. He could also be varied in his performance of deliberate nonsense, setting him closer to a simpleton, who does not realize his own imbecility. But Plautus' text offers both interpretations and as Milphio can be subsumed under the group of *servi callidi*, even if he is not as strong as a Pseudolus or Chrysalus, his performance is here regarded as appropriate for a clever and self-confident slave. As his typological colleagues, Milphio is not interested in pursuing anything else in earnest than his plans, which are spiced up by the

---

718 This analysis follows De Melo's translation (2012); for a discussion of Hanno's true words, see Gregor Maurach, *Der Poenulus des Plautus*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1988, 146-9.
719 There is no basis for cooperation between the two dialogue partners.

deliberate creation of *ridiculum*. The clever slave shapes major parts of the play, motifs, and atmosphere merely how he likes it. The frequently used (*me*) *lubet* fits his capricious behaviour and deliberate and sudden changes when the clever slave can even skip reasoning and prefers to indulge in playfulness fully.[720]

Accordingly, Tranio in *Mostellaria* deliberately inserts a comic part for his and the spectator's fun when he mocks his master Theopropides and the neighbour Simo during the walk-through:

TR.   *viden pictum, ubi **ludificat** una cornix volturios duos?*

TH.   *non epepol video.*

TR.   ***at** ego video. nam inter volturios duos*
      cornix astat, ea volturios duo vicissim vellicat.
      *quaeso huc **ad me** specta, cornicem ut conspicere possies.*
      iam vides?

TH.   *profecto nullam equidem illic cornicem intuor.*

TR.   ***at** tu isto **ad vos** optuere, quoniam cornicem nequis*
      conspicari, si volturios forte possis contui.

TH.   *omnino, ut te apsolvam, nullam pictam conspicio hic avem.*

TR.   *age, iam mitto, ignosco: aetate non quis optuerier.*

(*Most.* 832-840; bold letters are mine)

By inventing a picture showing a crow that pecks at two vultures alternatingly Tranio images his treatment of Theopropides and Simo.[721] Simulating to see such a picture is of no use for Tranio's plan; on the contrary, Tranio risks that his intrigue blows up but he still undertakes the absurd mission to persuade his master of the existence of a non-existent picture, on the one hand, for the sake of *ridiculum* and on the other, in order to reassert the agonistic tone to the audience. The mere inspection of Simo's house, actually a balancing act for Tranio, becomes a nearly open triumph for the clever slave probably gaining many laughs for that short practical joke from the audience, which moves outside the logical sequence of Tranio's behaviour until this point in the play since the clever slave is dominated by fear of being detected and faces many perils to his plan in the preceding part. Therefore, Tranio's outward image of his deceit is at odds with the former display of Tranio's anxiety and turns his behaviour to something irrational.

The depiction of how the crow plays with the vultures (*ludificat*) simulates the exact action in which Tranio engages when he attempts to make the fictive picture visible for Theopropides: the crow Tranio keeps playing with the vultures in his illusionary frame. The question of visibility ambiguously alludes to the perception and the recognition of material, which includes the act of seeing and the act of seeing through. Both relate to the old master, who cannot see the fresco or grasp his fooling, and to the audience, who watches the whole performance and can see through the deceit, like Palaestrio's (*non*) *videre* implies both processes in *Miles gloriosus*. In detail, Tranio's fictive construction of a fresco simulates the becoming of an object, which cannot be seen, and aims at the recognition of an illusionary space, where the presumable picture could exist, by determining it deictically. Theopropides' *anagnorisis* of being a vulture fails because he is part of the illusionary space and does not

---

720 See esp. *Bacch.* 751; *Epid.* 698; for the frequency of *libet/lubet* and forms in Plautus' plays, see Lodge (1963), s.v. '*libet*'.

721 Titus Maccius Plautus*, Mostellaria*, Edward A. Sonnenschein (ed.), Clarendon Press: Oxford, ²1966, on verse 832: "The picture is supposed to be a fresco, like those found on the walls of houses at Pompeii."; De Melo also translates *pictum* with fresco (De Melo [2011]).

manage to look from outside on himself, while the illusionary space is embedded in Theopropides' false assumption that the house he walks through is his own.

Furthermore, Tranio's choice of animals fits the mini-narrative of the image, that of deceiver and deceived, because the birds stand for distinct human characteristics: *cornix* is seen as a type of sagacity and *vulturius* typically denotes rapacity.[722] As greedy and happy about the good deal of his son Theopropides is as less sagaciously he errs. His sagacious slave can even point his finger to the deceit but the two old men still stay focused on what they can see and believe to get although they are blind. The clever slave's insistent and repetitive *at* opposes Theopropides' decisive negation *non edepol* and *profecto nullam.* Additionally, he obviously hints at himself (*ad me specta*) as the crow and at the two old men as the vultures (*ad vos*). The slave's actions contradict every logic of an *architectus* but fit the epithet *ludens* as they prolong the viewing scene by playing with the senses, in particular with visual perception. Tranio's conduct is clever but he acts crazily during a risky situation. Two men believe in two fake stories: Simo, the owner of the house, thinks that he does his neighbour a favour and Theopropides believes to look at his new home. Tranio plays with both men, their assumptions, and the situation during the viewing; it seems that his sound judgement is absent, which can be expected of a *servus ludens*, who wants to persuade them into seeing non-existent constructs; the utopian stage here turns visibility and comprehension upside down.

Both, Tranio and Milphio, show misbehaviour: the latter prohibits a meaningful communication between Agorastocles and Hanno and introduces nonsense in his meaningless translation; the former conducts extravagantly by envisioning a non-existent picture, risking his deceit instead of pursuing it. These two examples can be defined as deliberate miscommunication,[723] which contradicts the demands for intelligibility and satisfactory meaning. Here, it is closed and cannot be detected by the involving figures at the moment of communication as the relevant dialogue partner(s), who is Agorastocles in *Poenulus* and who are Theopropides and Simo in *Mostellaria*.

Miscommunication can either be closed from the dialogue partner(s) or also disclosed and open so that the listener perceives the speaker's deficient communication. At the beginning of *Pseudolus*, Calidorus faces his confidant, who is joking despite Calidorus' desperate situation and request for help:

PSEU*. Ut opinor, quaerunt litterae hae sibi liberos:*
     Alia aliam scandit.
CAL*. Ludis iam ludo tuo?*
(*Pseud*. 23-24)

The verb *quaerunt* simulating an own will of its subject personifies *litterae*, but the object *liberos* surprises since being letters normally exclude the possibility to get children, which impedes the listener's ability to make sense of this sequence at first. The second sentence, *alia aliam scandit*, clarifies the former and helps the listener to understand since mounting one another metaphorically depicts the handwriting as the letters must be written so untidily and narrowly that they are almost written into each other, which the assonance of *alia* and

aliam underlines as a prosodic unity.[724] The actual message Pseudolus gets across is that the girl's handwriting is not at all neat; in fact, he can hardly read the letter. Of course, Pseudolus could have said 'this is a very untidy handwriting' or skipped the comment completely; however, this would not have served the generic request for *ridiculum* and does not suit comedy's mode.

Pseudolus moves in the realms of bawdiness by comparing untidy handwriting with sexual intercourse. These lusty allusions differ from the melancholic and longing feelings of Calidorus, looked at from an anti-pathetic perspective. They depict the comic version of the desperate lover. In his devotion to the girl, the young master starts another attempt to defend the writing emphatically by repeating the attribute *lepidus* and attaching it to every object in the sentence, relating to his mistress: *quor inclementer dicis lepidis litteris/ lepidis tabellis lepida conscriptis manu?* (*Pseud*. 27-28).

Such hyperbole leaves Pseudolus unimpressed as he goes on in his manner and replies with a question in return: *an, opsecro hercle, habent quas gallinae manus?/ nam has quidem gallina scripsit* (*Pseud*. 29-30).[725] Pseudolus does not justify his mocking of the handwriting but dominates the conversation as he springs a rhetorical question on Calidorus. The introduction of the matter 'hens do not have hands' seems not to stand in a direct relation to the former question of Calidorus apart from the anaphoric reference to *manus*. Only the second sentence carrying the punchline clearly reveals Pseudolus' line of argumentation since *nam* installs a logical reasoning why Pseudolus introduced the matter of *gallinae (non) habent manus* and links it to the matter of writing (*scripsit*). The conclusion is that a hen has written the letter, which is illogical, since, as it has been acknowledged, hens have no hands and therefore, cannot write. Pseudolus here draws the course of argumentation back to Calidorus' statement that his girl has lovely hands as well as a lovely handwriting and leads that *ad absurdum* since she cannot have hands as a hen. The argument of course fails in itself as the lover of Calidorus is not a hen and Pseudolus' argumentation discovers itself as a pure alternation between sense and nonsense.[726] He takes Calidorus on a tour of mockery, explaining the simple fact of a hard-to-read handwriting deliberately laboriously but wonderfully fitting for establishing his joke.

The slave does not take his young master's downhearted disposition and the reason for it seriously but transfers the topic of a lover's desire and its elegic, melancholic potential to the grounds of comedy:

PSEU. *advortito animum.*
CAL.   *non adest.*
PSEU. *at tu cita.*
CAL.   *immo ego tacebo, tu istinc ex cera cita.*
(*Pseud*. 32-33)

---

724 Fraenkel subsumes this joke under a Plautine method to generate jokes: "a suggested change of identity" (term translated by Malcolm M. Willcock in Titus Maccius Plautus, *Pseudolus*, Malcolm M. Willcock [ed.], Bristol et al: Bristol Classical Press, 1987, 97). Indeed, the letter and particularly, the handwriting changes in how the audience perceives the object, now imagining them as not readable and putting the matter in an association to another context, here sexual intercourse. But this identified method is only a puzzle piece in the larger unit of the clever slave's joking habit and does not explain the complete construction of his jests.
725 In contrast to Otto Zwierlein's opinion, these verses do not stand in concurrence to v. 22f. but are a development of Plautus' joke motifs about the handwriting and an answer to Calidorus' blind and excessive worship (compare Zwierlein [1991], 75-76).
726 The dialogue continues in the same tone (see esp. *Pseud*. 47-48, 75-77, 78ff.).

The clever slave replaces the wits of the young master, who is deprived of his own because of his lovesickness, confesses their absence and his need of Pseudolus' skills honestly. After the audience could observe the lover's condition, the passage alludes to *advortito* ambiguously since it first refers to the idiomatic combination with *animum* (to pay attention) so often used in Plautus' plays, which then shifts to a literal interpretation as the lover's mind is not there to be turned towards Pseudolus and his words. The clever slave continues the joke by accepting *aninum* as an object to be fetched, without which Calidorus' reason remains absent and needs to be replaced by Pseudolus. In contrast to the lover, the clever slave can decide whether he applies reason or let it loose since comedy's utopian grounds are a spring for facetiousness as long as it does not prohibit the logic of the plot constantly. Pseudolus is able to engage in nonsense talk and revert his young master's depressed spirits and his performance into a comic show. In Slater's discussion of the scene, he foregrounds that "the numerous gags that interrupt the exposition are more than comic relief; they function as Pseudolus' assertion that the play is to be a comedy, not a tragedy."[727]

In all the formerly analysed scenes, when the clever slave's characteristic of *ludens* intrudes into the discourse and takes a comic perspective on a figure and his conduct or the situation: when Tranio deals playfully with the viewing and his deceit, he crucially creates and supports the comic atmosphere; Milphio turns Agorastocles and Hanno's dialogue into a sequence of misunderstandings; Pseudolus plays with the letter, its form, and its relation to the foolish lover. The *servus callidus* is not interested in forwarding the issue the conversation circles around in earnest, but promotes a preposterous account towards the issue without any sensitivities towards his dialogue partners. *Ludere* can occur as an open or closed form of miscommunication, which violates the silent and general agreement of cooperation needed for a successful conversation since a speaker and a listener are dependent on each other, concerning their roles defining each other.[728] To exchange information effectively, a dialogue builds upon trust in behaving in cooperation and at best, complying with the four categories and their maxims Grice formulated as Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner.[729] As it is valid for the analysis of agon in the clever slave's communication, Grice's theory is not applied in depth; nor is the dramatic dialogue object to a mere pragmatic analysis since it would not generate valid results to rely only on the pragmatic perspective because of the difference between communication in fiction and reality but Grice's maxims serve as one useful approach to identify the clever slave's playful participation and miscommunication in dramatic dialogues.

Pseudolus does not care about the letter's content, changes, even inverts the subject formerly agreed upon, and disregards the maxims of quality since he supposes unreal and absurd constructs, which he does not believe to be true. He violates that of quantity as he excessively expresses his evaluation of an untidy handwriting, that of relation as his assessment does not fit the subject of Calidorus' misery and its remedy; nor is his excessive description relevant. He violates the maxim of manner since Pseudolus uses unclear, obscure references that must be explained by him. The characteristic of *ludens* rejects a serious conversation respecting the dependence of listener and speaker and denies cooperation since Pseudolus deviates not only from the mandate to read the letter but even from his former

---

727 Slater (1985), 120, and on the value of the whole scene, Slater continues persuasively that "the letter, though often interrupted, functions as an internal dialogue, providing us all the background details of the impending sale of Calidorus' *amica* to a Macedonian soldier of fortune."
728 Grice (⁴2002), 78: "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." And see ch. II.i.
729 Cf. *Ibid.*, 78ff.; and for analysed scenes, see ch. III.iii.

request to know what Calidorus is depressed about. After the clever slave initiated the dialogue, he shifts to an unreasonable approach to the present matter and does not fulfil his prior promise of helping Calidorus with good counsel and everything else needed (*aut re iuvabo aut opera aut consilio bono* [*Pseud*. 19]). By his misbehaviour in communication, the clever slave surprises Calidorus, abuses Calidorus' trust in him to follow the maxims as the young master does, and can thus control the conversation in his superior position, deciding when, if and how many moments of *ridiculum* he likes to add.

This control and status of superiority remind us of one theme of the former chapters, the agon and the clever slave's competitive attitude outlived in dialogues with the master. There are some similar aspects about *servus ludens* and the clever slave participating in an agon as both make use of the unexpected as well as the contradiction to prior behaviour, show forms of miscommunication, flout the conversational maxims, foster *ridiculum*, and take a superior role through their unpredictability and flexibility. The scope is thin between these thematic configurations; both know of the valence of the laughable and strategically use it besides other mechanisms to trump everybody.[730] However, there is a crucial difference between them: agon means a battle of authority, which uses miscommunication among other devices to support Saturnalian structure and is not interested in folly, whereas *ludere* does not focus on hierarchical inversion primarily but the creation of a comic foil by playful acting. The passages of agon can inherit an organic necessity for the plot and are thematically bound to the intrigue while a *servus ludens* is not interested in the development of the plot but tends to prolong the discourse.

Although agon and *ludere* overlap in the method of miscommunication and control, their distinct parts complement each other and help to constitute the concept of the *servus callidus* and make it functional. Even though Tranio's invisible fresco could be seen as a visualization of his agonistic attitude, the scene should be read under the premise of a *servus ludens* as the behaviour of the clever slave's spontaneous inference with the so-far successful housewalk does not oppose authorities (if only in the picture itself) primarily, but jeopardizes his plan and puts his control in the scene at stake. The clever slave Tranio changes his mask of an *architectus* with that of a playful and extravagant risker. Terming the clever slave's action as risky to the plan underlines the element of the unpredictability and unexpectedness the type's functionality derives from. *Ludere* always implies these two elements when the clever slave suddenly inserts absurd constructs and thereby, offers a comic access to the matter like Milphio, Tranio and Pseudolus tamper with the scene's content openly or closed from the other dialogue partner. The advantage of deliberate miscommunication enables the clever slave to exhaust his skills of imagination and the comic potential of the scene. His miscommunication solely follows his own maxims that make sure that a coherent joke text is established.

Tranio falls again into the mode of a *servus ludens* in the final scene of *Mostellaria* after Theopropides learnt about his deception. The clever slave does not plead for mercy but flees to the altar, starting to engage in a verbal dance with his master and to mock him by turning every sentence and even threats the master throws at him in a ludicrous phrase:

TH. *surgedum huc igitur. consulere quiddam est quod tecum volo.*

---

730 On the role of adversarial humour and its specific strategic use in competition as well as disputes, see Tony Veale, Kurt Feyaerts, and Geert Brône, 'The cognitive mechanisms of adversarial humor', *Humor* 19.3 (2006): 305-359. "[T]he kind of adversarial humor […] has as its logical core the idea that one speaker may, linguistically speaking, snatch victory from the jaws of defeat by turning the tables on an opponent. The effect of this reversal is to elicit not just a sense of victory in the agent itself, but a form of admiration from any observers, while perhaps earning the grudging respect of the opponent." (307).

TR.	*sic tamen hinc consilium dedero. nimio plus sapio sedens.*
	tum consilia firmiora sunt de divinis locis.
TH.	*surge, ne nugare. aspicedum contra me.*
TR.	*aspexi.*
	[...]
TR.	*quid tibi est?*
TH.	*dedisti verba.*
TR.	*qui tandem.*
TH.	*probe med emunxti.*
TR.	*vide sis, satine recte: num mucci fluont?*
	[...]
TH.	*surges. nam tibi iam iubebo ignem et sarmenta, carnufex, circumdari.*
TR.	*ne faxis, nam elixus esse quam assus soleo suavior.*
TH.	*exempla edepol faciam ego in te.*
TR.	*quia placeo, exemplum expetis?*
TH.	*loquere: quoius modi reliqui, quom hinc abibam, filium?*
TR.	*cum pedibus, manibus, cum digitis, auribus, oculis, labris.*
TH.	**aliud** *te rogo.*
TR.	**aliud** *ergo nunc tibi respondeo.*

(*Most*. 1102-19)

Tranio occupies the altar, where Theopropides cannot reach the slave, which guarantees the clever slave an all-license space, as long as he keeps his seat there.[731] He could use his secure space to calm the angry Theopropides down but he chooses unwisely to inflame the rage of his master as he does not allow of any appropriate conversation since he flouts the four maxims in his answers.

Tranio evades Theopropides' request to come to him by reasoning his stay at the altar by an absurd logic that sitting enhances his intelligence and his ability to give some good advice, which is underlined by the alliteration **sapio** and **sedens**. Theopropides correctly judges this behaviour as nonsense (*nugare*). The head-to-head game continues when Tranio pretending not to know of the tricking still picks up Theopropides' *emunxti*, a metaphor for tricking. He spins it cheekily and refers to the result of *emunxti* in its literal meaning as if the clever slave's successful manipulation was a medical treatment to make the master's nose run.[732] The final stichomythia contains four inversions of the master's threats and demands since Tranio deliberately misinterprets his master's words as he transfers them to another context that actually excludes itself logically. First, Tranio contextualizes burning him to death newly by using vocabulary of cooking as if he was a dish in a kitchen, which undermines and ridicules the master's announcement. Secondly, the threat to punish and to terrify the clever slave does not restore Theopropides' authority but becomes a potential compliment for Tranio, connoting *exemplum* euphemistically as he changes the meaning from a warning to an example for imitation.[733] Thirdly, Tranio responds to Theopropides' question about his son's condition with an exaggerated and superfluous list of body parts the father expects his son to have otherwise such news would be quite devastating. Tranio simulates to have overheard

---

731 De Melo (2012), 431, on verse 1094, "An altar is in effect also an asylum from which nobody may be dragged away."

732 *OLD*, s.v. '*emungere* 1a. and 2.' In its literal meaning, the verb means "to wipe the mucus from the nose, to wipe one's nose". For another use of the metaphor, see *Epid*. 494.

733 Cf. *OLD*, s.v. '*exemplum*'.

the master's implicature and reduces the question to a simply physical reference the old master cannot accept as a sufficient answer. Finally, *aliud* refers back to the master's implicature, underlining that there is still an open question left, but Tranio again puts his master's clear demand aside by repeating *aliud* as his final response.

The indefinite pronoun describes the clever slave's behaviour in contrast to the master's expectations and conventional principles since Tranio subverts Theopropides' contribution to the dialogue and misleads it, to a different direction. *Aliud* is repeated and simply remains empty while it summarizes the prior tone of the dialogue. Tranio's programme of *aliud* does not fit Theopropides' interest at all since the clever slave abuses his safe place at the altar and opposes Theoprodides' anger in the conversation by making the dialogue a sequence of *ridiculum*, while enjoying playing with language and disregarding the maxims. He does not apologizes or pleads for mercy. He has nothing to lose and continues his playful attitude now openly by plunging into folly and the habit of *nugare*.

In the whole, the *servus callidus'* communication can be described as defective since he violates cooperation, jumps between literary and figurative use, and contextualizes matter differently, namely in opposition to the dialogue's atmosphere and in an illogical relation to the context intended by his dialogue partner. He abuses the general principle of communication (that the participants in conversation are inclined to reach a consensus) and misleads the presupposed course of the conversation, ignoring the desire whereas his dialogue partner still sticks to it and tries to retain the conventional proceeding.[734] Persisting in his manner of violation, the clever slave strategically deploys the principle of implicature, the scope and difference between what is said and meant. He chooses what to understand and prefers the literal meaning to reading between the lines in order to add more comic moments as Tranio's fooling shows or as Pseudolus continues his deliberate misunderstanding of Calidorus' miserable situation after having read the letter:

> PSEU. *quid faciam tibi?*
> CAL. *eheu!*
> PSEU. *'eheu'? id quidem hercle ne parsis: dabo.*
> (*Pseud*. 78-79)

The young master makes the mistake not to answer his slave's question but he just revels in his misery by his lamenting injection, *eheu*, which the clever slave picks up and promises to give him as much (useless) support as he can.[735] The clever slave keeps his commitment since Calidorus receives three more *eheu* for an answer until the lover stops him (see *Pseud*. 80-84). Miscommunication in the form of meaningless repetition stands in contradiction to the cooperative principle, the demand for help and the expectation of spinning a plan, which defect is initiated by the literal understanding. Briefly, Pseudolus' use of *eheu* tellingly belongs to the category of nonsense.

---

734 Cf. Jürgen Habermas, *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1983, 34ff., 172 and "*rational motivierte[r] Konsensus*" (34). Habermas' considerations do not refer to a comic context or to Plautus' plays but to a general context.

735 The injection evokes pain and suffering fitting a tragic context and here, contrasting generic characteristics. Thinking about merging comic and tragic, ecstasy and horror makes one consider Nietzsche's presentation of the Dionysian concept leading to self-abandonment. See Friedrich Nietzsche, *Die Geburt der Tragödie*, Manfred Landfester (ed.), Frankfurt a.M./Leipzig: Insel Verlag, 1994, 69ff.; and cf. the commentary by Jochen Schmidt, *Nietzsche-Kommentar. Die Geburt der Tragödie*, Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012, 113; and cf. James I. Porter, *The Invention of Dionysus. An Essay on The Birth of Tragedy*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 112-13.

So far, it has been shown that the clever slave does not purely serve the plot and its content 'intrigue' but focuses on comedy's generic mode when his creation of *ridiculum* extends scenes, enriches them, and adds (more) entertainment completely on behalf of inorganic parts. Beyond these factors, the *servus ludens* applies a comic perspective on the present matter on stage, past material, and on figures, which is the case when folly responds to the lover's sickness or the master's rage; it provokes and ridicules the stereotypes. The clever slave makes use of unexpected reactions turning away from conventional behaviour, interpretation, and from what intelligible communication constitutes, particularly reason. The figure welcomes a fool's logic and his addiction to absurdity.

Drunk personae show a similar tendency to misinterpret and take figurative phrases literally; however, they cannot choose to do otherwise. They naturally follow their own logic and are impeded in comprehending the seriousness of a situation as the drunk Callidamates does when he wants to fight the father (see *Most*. 373-384) or as Pseudolus talks to his feet as a separate, independent part of his body (see *Pseud*. 1246-1249). In sharp and decisive contrast to the unwillingness and uncontrollableness of a drunk character, the *servus callidus* dominates his miscommunication with his full senses and can decide if he acts it out openly or hidden from his dialogue partner(s), while he knows how to design his playful performances by varying the methods of miscommunication: applying a different and incoherent context, deliberate misunderstanding in the form of comprehending something literally, giving irrelevant information, making illogical association and composing an absurd construct or a hypothetic, unreal situation.

Indeed, behind the play with reason and meaning, there is method; the method can be reproduced and learnt as Agorastocles mocks Milphio in the same way the clever slave uses so often:

MIL. *assum apud te eccum.*
AGO. *at ego elixus sis volo.*
MIL. *enim vero, ere, facis delicias.*
AGO. *de tequidem haec didici omnia.*
(*Poen*. 279-80)

The short excerpt of the eavesdropping in *Poenulus* resembles the inversion of the stereotypical roles since the young master deliberately misunderstands Milphio's remark and willingly intrudes into the course of conversation for the sake of *ridiculum*, which habit he learnt from the master skilled in all follies (*delicias*) as is the *servus ludens*.[736] Paradoxically, nonsense is applied with intelligence and practical soundness for comedy's nature.

In following comedy's inversion, the *servus ludens* and his deliberate miscommunication do not stop even at tragic subjects like committing suicide but erase their tragic potential and make them look hilarious, which fits the Romans' appreciation of dark humour already observed in the comic depiction of threats and punishment. When a despondent Calidorus announces his decision to hang himself, a spectator might expect a confidant that is worried and tries to persuade him not to do it. Pseudolus worries only about money—about one drachma Calidorus asked for to buy the rope needed for his suicide—even though the slave does not have this drachma and thus, cannot lend his master any money (see *Pseud*. 91-93).[737] Pseudolus reasons queerly and seemingly egocentrically that the young

---

736 See also *Bacch*. 200-03; *Poen*. 296 (*enim vero, ere, meo me lacessis ludo et delicias facis*).
737 PSEU. *quis mi igitur drachumam reddet, si dedero tibi?/ an tu te ea causa vis sciens suspendere/ ut me defraudes, drachumam si dederim tibi?* A similar example for such illogic can be found in *Mostallaria,* where the

master intends to defraud him, which suggests that tricking one drachma off Pseudolus seems to be worth dying. The accusation in the apodosis is the result of a hypothetical cause-effect relation that can be subsumed under the occurrence of nonsense when the clever slave establishes a 'second reality' that displays a non-validity in comparison to the real:[738] false translations create a weird and false identity for Hanno in *Poenulus*; in *Mostellaria*, Tranio designs an invisible fresco; Pseudolus speaks of a non-existent entity, a hen with hands. In short, his creations are unreal and illogical in most of the cases. The clever slave abides by the modus *ludens* and continues to violate the principles of conversation, especially quality, nearly constantly.

A special instance of flouting occurs if dialogue partners merge and are originally one person, which is the case for Epidicus' soliloquy and fake dialogue, where the clever slave seems to knock on the door of the mad man temporarily, while talking schizophrenically, which represents irrationality in a pathological form. The split and the performance of Epidicus' personae could be read under the epithet of *ludens*, which makes the thought processes of contriving visible with a comic effect. This interpretation does not collide with the analysis of the soliloquy presenting a source for the clever slave's disillusionary engagement in the former chapter since *ludens* here is rather a mode, the irrational and extreme sort of playing that can move close to the tragic sphere the figure of the mad man also inhabits as there is a certain similarity between Epidicus talking to his mask and Hamlet changing his masks and questioning himself and the world around him.[739] By the special arrangement, Plautus varies the common moment when the slave must come up with a plan spontaneously, and exaggerates the theatrical dimension of performance as he transforms a soliloquy to a dialogue, underlining the urgent demand for spontaneity and fear of detection.[740] Subsuming the passage under the thematic configuration of a *servus ludens* does not pay justice to the complexity of the passage. This passage exemplifies very well how manifold and overlapping the clever slave's thematic configurations and his modes are and that the concept of the *servus callidus* and its fascinating, amusing realisation is interlaced with the complex of *ludus-ludere*, which suffuses comedy's discourse. The thematic configurations are instrumental terms to clarify how the *servus callidus* shifts between his roles and indulges in the mode of *ludens* by his skills in deceit and illusion and thus, to explain his complexity but are not strict categories that can chop comedy's part into single pieces only belonging to one category. Solely the combination and overlapping of configurations as well as modes make the clever slave functional for comedy and its principles since they support each other and cling together in the abstract paradox pattern.

---

dark joke including 'a dead person cannot pay' becomes 'a dead person needn't be paid' when Tranio offers a deal to the audience: if one is willing to replace him and be crucified, he pays the volunteer one talent but only after the job, the crucifixion, has been done (see *Most*. 354-361). Tranio deliberately constructs an absurd balance between one talent and crucifixion, communicating a failure of the deal implicitly as it is closed between a half-dead creditor and a clever slave, who is famous for tricking money. As soon as the offer is made, it is already abolished as it stems from a *servus callidus* just fooling around, whereby Tranio draws a comic perspective on his own fear and the threat of punishment, whose validity is diminished and adjusted to the absurd suggestion Tranio makes. Irony replaces seriousness and certainly, truth cannot be expected.

738 The method could be compared to creation of the illusionary nesting or the mock heroic phantasies.

739 Note Gabriel Josipovici, *Hamlet. Fold on Fold,* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016, 262: "[…] Hamlet, who feels himself outside every play on offer, who so often comes downstage to comment on what is going on behind him or to talk to himself in the hearing of the audience, occupies exactly the position of the Clown."

740 See the analysis and the value of Epidicus' soliloquy for the clever slave's disillusionary quality in ch. III.iv.

Concerning the sum of findings on nonsense behaviour, *servus ludens* designs his communication freely and unconventionally without caring about his dialogue partner but with the ambition to perceive the scene's framework and/or its core subject from a comic perspective. Such behaviour can be termed deliberate miscommunication or *non-bona-fide* communication fitting his status of a deceiver, an illusionist and a shaper of discourse only that the type here does not focus on an intrigue but comic moments without any contribution to the plot, any attentiveness to his own dignity or status, and most of all any limitations of sense, which allows him the changeability and distortion of words' meaning and context, standing in association to the poet playing with the full repertoire of language.[741] In contrast to communication in real life, social interaction, and the structural principle of reason, the clever slave as a fool figure is not interested in any consensus or in the constitution of rationality but invites nonsense that is valid as a playful logic within the framework of the joke text but dissolves outside.[742] The professional fool acts for the constitution of Comic and replies to the questions of what is funny about a miserable lover, how rage can be ridiculed, and how dignity and superiority are powerless and become debased. His verbal caprices support him in this agenda and supply moments of *ridiculum*, the backbone for the effectiveness of the fool figure. The length of such parts, wherein he turns the present matter into a source for laughter by stretching reason and logic, can range from a short comment to a dozen of verses; similarly, the addressee can vary from one or more dialogue partners to the whole audience. They all share the type's tendency not to spare the occasion for a joke and to make fun of nearly everything for the sake of *ridiculum* and comedy's *ludos praebere*.[743]

Nevertheless, the category of nonsense does not exclude 'sense' as shown above and the comedy's mode embodied by the *servus ludens* can illuminate human folly as Calidorus' excessive decision to commit suicide and indulgence in passive lamenting or Theopropides' gullibility in a profitable deal. The paradox of the subconcept *servus ludens* opposes and unites sense with nonsense, control with looseness, and folly with method. The audience is invited to laugh during these accumulations of *ridiculum*; the traditional theory of incongruity explains their construction and processing.[744] The analysis of Plautus' comedy scenes and the clever slave's participation in it recognized the juxtaposition of complex units, scripts according to one of the latest and widely accepted approaches, *General Theory of Verbal Humour* by Victor Raskin and Salvatore Attardo.[745] A script is defined as "an organized complex of information about some entity" that collides with a second script the recipient cannot bring in any

---

741 Cf. Raskin (1985), 103; see ch. II.i.

742 The fool figure neglects codes of practice concerning language and communication for his own sake and that of *ridiculum*. Compare to Habermas' consideration: "Der Sprachgebrauch ist nicht nur rational rekonstruierbar, sondern bringt Rationalität und Vernunft selbst hervor." Jürgen Habermas, 'Universalpragmatische Grundlagen der Kommunikation', *Sprache, Sprechakt, Kommunikation. Sprachtheoretische Positionen des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Sybille Krämer (ed.), Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2001, 74-93, 74.

743 For more examples, see *Bacch.* 200-3 (associating one bacchis sister with the fragility of Samos' porcelain; Pistoclerus subsumes the clever slave's remark under his habit as if Chrysalus could not help it to insert another gag into the dialogue); *Epid.* 224; *Most.* 770; *Poen.* 325, 392-99 (despite Agorastocles' rage, Milphio ridicules his master's instruction by opposing the pairs of characteristics divided into *huius* and *meus* and signifying the young master's love and the slave's pain, which again highlights the excessive reaction of the young lover.) and note the following analysis.

744 See ch.II.i., on *ridiculum*. As it was the case for the chapter on comedy, there is no attempt to define an own theory of verbal humour but the need to see to the theoretical foundation of the analysis and adapt it to the object of analysis briefly.

745 The first theory was the SSTH, Semantic Theory of Humour (Raskin, 1985), which was later revised to GTVH, the General Theory of Verbal Humour; for an extension of the GTVH, see Attardo (2001), esp. 22-29. And note the theory's introduction in ch. II.i.

meaningful connection to the former when he resorts to his horizons and follows conventionally-coined interpretation since the scripts' complexes of information oppose at decisive points and evade congruent matching of cognitive categories invoked by the scripts.[746] The opposition finds dissolution in the processing and recognition of humorous value. A defect in pronunciation could cause such an opposition as the slip of a tongue sets an accidentally created word and its meaning in contrast to the intended meaning that is guessable via context. The two scripts, and that is of what is said and what is meant, are not congruent. If the situation, when the slip of the tongue takes place, and the participants in it allow of a humorous interpretation of the oppositional scripts instead of a pitiful reaction or ignorance, the defect in pronunciation can result in laughter.

For a dramatic text, humorous incidents do not happen accidentally, of course, but are thoroughly organized. A deliberately created opposition of scripts in a dialogue can be found in the formerly-cited passage of Agorastocles teasing his clever slave by the slave's own manner where Milphio's *assum* offers a pun based on a homonym since *assum* can be read either as an assimilated form of *adsum* or the adjective *assus* Agorastocles chooses to have understood.[747] The young master willingly changes Milphio's statement and its meaning to another entity, another lexeme that is semantically not connectable to the original and introduces another context. The script of *assum* in the context of the scene states Milphio's presence and support, whereas Agorastocles' script of *assus* does not answer the first complex of information and deviates from it by imaging Milphio as a dish whose preparation should preferably be rather boiling than roasting. The spectator can still dissolve the incongruity of both scripts as the first is valid, fits reality, and remains the point of reference as still pursuing the conversation logically and comprehensibly, while the second inhabits a second reality, which is at odds with the former, and evades validity by an absurd idea. Raskin denotes the processing of the two utterances, which causes the humorous effect, 'script switching' as the script of *adsum* is replaced by that of *assum*.[748] The spectator can laugh at Agorastocles' creative deformation of Milphio's statement, whose meaning stays separated in the second reality, the context of the kitchen and becomes obsolete in its success, laughter. The second reality vanishes after having fulfilled its purpose.

The quality of being obsolete and the action of vanishing complement the earlier accounts of humour and the discussed features regarding the violation of expectation. Kant's considerations on laughter deal with upsetting expectation but also stress the fact of dissolution and significantly call attention to the ending of a moment of *ridiculum*, 'nothing'. Laughter is "*Affect aus der plötzlichen Verwandlung einer gespannten Erwartung in nichts*". Kant's words hint at two important issues. First, it is tension that is raised by incongruity and opposition; secondly, this tension dissolves into 'nothing' when laughter rises.[749] Laughter states the recognition of incongruity and the acceptance of this kind of distortion as not affecting reality. The opposition is active in the joke's frame of reference but cannot leave it intact. Laughter affirms the failure of coalescing the given pieces into a 'seriously' meaningful combination that lasts beyond laughter. In praxis, the clever slave's escapades as a *servus*

---

746 Attardo (2001), 2.
747 Cf. Maurach (1988), 88. He compares this pun to *Most*. 1115.
748 Cf. Raskin (1985), 100.
749 Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der Urteilskraft. Schriften zur Ästhetik und Naturphilosophie*, Manfred Frank (ed.), Frankfurt a.M.: Deutscher Klassiker-Verlag, 2009, 689 (§54). This sentence is preceded with the thesis that "*es muß in allem, was ein lebhaftes, erschütterndes Lachen erregen soll, etwas Widersinniges sein (woran also der Verstand an sich kein Wohlgefallen finden kann).*"

ludens apply incongruity that ends successfully in laughter and gives an opportunity for further ludicrous turns on various levels.

The structure of opposition is applicable to the verbal level and easily recognizable in the example of Milphio and his master's two lexemes. The analysis of the passages has shown that the incongruence can also evolve on the dramatic level of behaviour and situation and displays a complexity as it is the case of Tranio's *cornix.* The situation of a walk-through Theopropides thinks to be real is disrupted by Tranio's irrational behaviour: the persuasion of a picture that does not exist, which belongs to the abstract bi-polar complex of scripts of visibility vs. invisibility. Tranio's image is not arbitrary like his irrationality seems to be but it is linked to the motif of deceit, agon, and illusion. In addition to these formulated scripts, the clever slave's risky behaviour contradicts his moments of fear and panic, while the tour secures the continuation of Tranio's plan jeopardized by fooling his master.

The characteristics of Tranio and his former behaviour in the play are an organized complex of information for the spectator, on which he relies to interpret the slave's future activities in the play. A cluster of scripts, Tranio, originates and is nourished by the dramatic text for the reader and by its enactment for the spectator; and some or all of these scripts can develop a contradiction to other scripts like those given by a dramatic scene and the figure's behaviour in it. Opposition on the dramatic level spans between clusters of scripts that embrace a web of associations and include incongruities, turning the text into a joke text and Tranio into the comedian delivering the joke text. Thus, oppositional structure can appear between scripts of verbal and dramatic entities. Single scripts coalesce into major structures, clusters, which unfold the full humorous potential as shown for the discussed scenes.

The collision of scripts and their clusters is provoked by the mode of *ludens* manifesting itself in irrational, illogical reactions or absurd responses. Evaluating something to be of irrational or absurd quality needs an organized composition of information found in vocabulary, style, mode, narrative, and physical aspects, which is then comparable to an expected, formerly and/or conventionally designed cluster. Consequently, inserted nonsense is not totally detached from the play, which means that the content of the script (cluster) governed by the mode of *ludens* cannot be arbitrary since it underlies two conditions: the complexes of information must oppose each other and cannot be seen in a congruent and valid relation in the same frame of reference but must still be of such an incompatibility that excludes a complete incomprehension of the audience because the purpose of opposition is not to trigger perplexity, but amusement and laughter. In some cases, the occurrence of the second script arouses the oppositional relation, which breaks with the expectation the first one has created, even if the spectator or reader does not articulate an expectation consciously in advance. The tension between the scripts partly including the violation of expectation must be of such a kind that it can only be solved by the perception of it as comic and finally, by the reaction, laughter. In praxis, elements of script clusters in the specific dramatic instance link to the play's material, the figure's concepts, and the play's frames of references in order to secure perception of the comic and to experience the stage, the scene and the figures as still congruent and intelligible.

Consequently, the clever slave's behaviour established by vocabulary, style, mode, narrative, and appearance—although that last device cannot be analysed in detail—validates comedy's world and manner, while it can oppose and stand in a 'nonsense' relation to the past discourse, his characteristics shown in the past discourse and given by knowledge of the stereotype, and/or the present situation set up by the other figures' characteristics, the discourse, and the use of language. Above all, the choice of scripts, clusters, and their opposition must not act destructive to the spectator's acceptance of the comic quality but

must foster the approval that what he perceives belongs to the species of the ugly otherwise laughter could not be the ambitioned effect.

The *servus callidus* does not lose himself in nonsense but remains in control of his folly and establishes these instances deliberately as he knows how to play with the figures' and the audience's expectations, to vary his own behaviour, and to hop from meaningful wit to clever deceit and to the intentional use of the absurd and folly. Keeping control and applying nonsense intentionally make him functional for the laughable. His mode of *ludens* allows him to compose oppositional scripts. Succinctly and saliently, the *servus callidus* exploits the comic potential of the scene and delivers a comic foil to the main action by inserting the subversive element of humour into the scene; he undermines sense in the form of expectation, convention, and reason with nonsense. Being a trickster and a *poeta* grants him a superior status to the other figures, which enables him to leap between expectation and reason and surprise and folly flexibly; he remains in control. Stretching the limits and wallowing in his creativity affirm the type's all-license and the utopian harmless nature a Saturnalian stage constitutes.

Between sense and nonsense or a witty fool's language

Under the protection of the all-license and in the utopian frame, Plautus' type usually has everything under control or wondrously manages to regain control right after any complication when he demonstrates his power of mind, staying focused in his intrigue operations to get the other figures to do what he wants as a genuine *architectus* and trickster figure. He proves his skills in rhetoric while he shines at manipulative communication as well as repartee, and is perfectly aware of how to use language effectively. Simultaneously, he seems never to spare an occasion to place a joke, to combine humorous moments with his responses or comments or to appear as the comic driver following the path of nonsense within a scene. The sum of findings on the type's mode termed *servus ludens* reveals the clever slave's concept as the realisation and opposition of nonsense and sense: a *servus ludens* meets an *architectus* and a *poeta*. His already-examined quality of the latter and his insights into the dramatic machinery allow the audience to reflect upon their socio-cultural experience as well as the medium of comedy in the conglomerate of Greek tradition and Roman challenge. Spectators perceive a slave figure that outlines his superiority to his master, control over *fabula*, and perspicacity in theatre's wheel. Still, the *servus callidus* demonstrates his intellect not only as an architect of a complicated net of lies and pretension or as a playwright arranging a thrilling storyline but also as a source for wit and wisdom. Matching the poet-like function and contradicting the element of folly, the *servus callidus* presents wise conclusions and counsels when he is and when he is not asked for help as a source for clever solutions.

Pseudolus advises the young master to look more on his advantage and get a grip instead of following just his emotions (see *Pseud*. 236). The act of counselling the young master fits the slave's habit of instructing other figures since he inhabits a superior position, simulating to know and understand more about the figures' constellation as well as their typical weaknesses. In *Miles gloriosus*, Palaestrio attempts to persuade Sceledrus into staying silent by a truism that a slave should know more than he says (see *Mil*. 477), which mirrors the clever slave's principle, too, and ironically, advises Sceledrus to behave in the exact manner that forsakes him since Palaestrio truly knows more than he tells his fellow slave and

holds the advantage in knowledge.[750] Both pieces of advice foreground the clever slave's intuition and his judgement on the situation, his knowledge of the figures' disposition, and his reasoning what consequences might evolve out of it. Here, the clever slave seems to offer some advice in one comprised sentence, underlining his superiority. On other occasions in the plays, the slave casts himself as a nearly-philosophical juggler with words, when he performs his talent of reasoning and abstracting in soliloquies, where he proves his bird's eye view, reflects upon the action, dramatic devices, and characteristics of stereotypes like the young lover, himself or the old master; he often does so in a proverbial style.[751] A *servus ludens* showing an indulgence in nonsense and folly can turn into an observant figure that even develops a bias for clear wise words.

In *Bacchides*, Chrysalus expounds his self-reflective theory about what the competence of a slave is:

> *nequius nil est quam egens consili servos, nisi*
> *habet multipotens pectus:*
> *ubicumque usus siet, pectore expromat suo.*
> *nullus frugi esse potest homo,*
> *nisi qui et bene et male facere tenet.*
> *improbis cum improbus sit, harpaget furibus,*
> *furetur quod queat,*
> *vorsipellem frugi convenit esse hominem,*
> *pectus quoi sapit: bonus sit bonis, malus sit malis;*
> *utcumque res sit, ita animum habeat.*
> (*Bacch.* 651-60)

The dual structure of the soliloquy divides 'good' and 'bad' repetitively in parallelism but unites it in the multi-competent chameleon, the clever slave, who demands such a characteristic for himself indirectly. Black and white become mingled in the slave figure as he should change and react in accordance with the situation, which phrases a general rule for the future play and for the clever slave's type underlined by the conjunctions of indefinite quality, *ubicumque* and *utcumque*, as well as the absolute negation of *nullus* and *nihil*, whereby he justifies his Saturnalian activity and confirms his license to trick especially antagonists like procurers. The slave's sentences sound as stemming from a piece of folk wisdom and link a stereotype's concept on stage with maxims for life. The slave's demand might even be read as a hidden short handbook for politicians and military leaders, alluding to their need of a flexible strategy, especially if the audience is aware of Chrysalus' strong mock heroic theme. The short remarks discarding ethical considerations might even insinuate some criticism. Unfortunately, this assumption cannot be elaborated further in the analysis but is worth being looked at more closely in a different project. In sum, Chrysalus develops a generally applicable rule about how life and people you meet urge you to adapt your behaviour.[752] The clever slave does not try to teach ethics but his generalization indicates some truth about life.

---

750 Epidicus states the exact same truism in a dialogue with Thesprio as a kind of self-advice in verse 60.
751 Also note *Mil.* 598-606 (on strategy and planning); *Most.* 1041 (introductory); *Poen.* 820 (about the lover); *Pseud.* 202-6 (aside), 576-8, 1256-64 (even a drunk Pseudolus attempts to explain the happiness of life).
752 If his claim for adaptation in a comedy can be interpreted as you should treat the other like he treats you, it relates to retaliation, especially with respect to a legal interpretation. The bible saying demands "eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth". Martin Luther Bible, AT, *Exodus* 21:24. *Lex talionis* or the law of retaliation. It is not at all suggested that Plautus' text stands in any relation to the bible text, but it is stressed that though Chrysalus' words

In a soliloquy in *Mostellaria*, Tranio talks similarly prescriptively about the clever slave and provides an additional generalized maxim about the harmless quality of a clever deceiver as he is obliged to carry out his intrigue and trick without any damage (see *Most*. 407-15). The clever slave alerts the audience how to perceive his figure and his activities. While both slaves reflect upon their own functions and characterize their integration into the plot, they derive conclusions coming close to *sententiae* and referring to the extra-dramatic space. Despite the fact that comedy and its generic relatives represent a source for *sententiae,* the clever slave phrasing proverbs does not teach moral lessons; nor does he use a hortative voice towards the audience but his phrases image the play's central issues and could possibly be applied to the extra-dramatic space. The presentation of such sentiments in both soliloquies displays the *servus callidus* not as a genuine moralizer but as a self-reflective commentator philosophizing about the dualism of stage and life, which stands in close relation to the dualism of illusion and disillusion as well as the title of a poet. Far apart from acting playfully and spreading absurd ideas, the clever slave here remains within the limits of reason, applying common sense, and concentrates on judging soundly as he advises and guides the audience through the labyrinth of stage and life often meandering in parallel by agreeing on stereotypical images. Validating Plautine farce, he does not give any guarantee of true ethical standards.

Pseudolus freely evaluates the production of his soliloquy as the action of *philosophari* (*satis est philosophatum* [*Pseud*. 687]), differentiating his usual treatment of matter in the comic context from that of the philosopher though philosophical approaches remain situated in the comic realm and thus obtainable for the laughable.[753] The clever slave contemplates fortune in life and the human error to prefer uncertainty to security or in other words, to want something we do not have or cannot have instead of being satisfied with what we actually have:[754]

> *bene ubi quoi scimus consilium accidisse, hominem catum*
> *eum esse declaramus, stultum autem illum quoi vortit male.*
> *stulti hau scimus frustra ut simus, quom quid cupienter dari*
> *petimus nobis, quasi quid in rem sit possimus noscere.*
> *certa mittimus dum incerta petimus; atque hoc eveni*
> *in labore atque in dolore, ut mors obrepat interim.*
> (*Pseud*. 681-86)

The clever slave addressing the audience proselytizes his ideas about human 'folly': chasing after hopes until death puts an end to the fruitless and laborious course of life. Pseudolus reveals a second human error as men depend on fortune but fail to assess the factors of someone's success or failure correctly as they do not differentiate the lot from their own skills, talent, and commitment. His conclusions bridge stage and life since he derives the demand for spontaneous adaptation based on fortune's domination in life from the need of adaptation to the changes in his intrigue plan, which adds to Chrysalus' call to adjust to the specific situation. Pseudolus modifies Chrysalus' guideline to a more sophisticated derivation of how

---

are spoken in a boisterous event and an occasion for laughter, the content of them hide more sophisticated quality as the quick reader or the rather inattentive spectator acknowledges.

753 Cf. Dorota Dutsch, 'The Beginnings: Philosophy in Roman Literature before 155 B.C.', *The Philosophizing Muse. The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry*, Myrto Garani and David Konstan (eds.), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014, 1-25, 11-13, and on the Roman fashion of keeping slave-philosophers in the household, esp. 12.

754 Pseudolus also describes Simia's witty truism in the dialogue between him and Ballio as a good start since he already philosophizes (*salvus sum, iam philosophatur* [*Pseud*. 974]).

dependent men are on their erroneous ambitions and how blind they are to their own inferiority, believing to be superior.

These soliloquies can deduce maxims for life from stage, present the clever slave as a commentator on the play, its structure, and types, underlining comedy's primary source and its depiction of failures and vices. In such passages, he illustrates himself rather as a thoughtful philosopher than an intriguer, who can recognize the abstract level of dramatic course and transform it in a proverbial structure. Thereby, he offers the audience a distanced perspective; they can reflect upon the performance and its imitated material. A figure that just entertained by miscommunication now gives insights into life, formulating *sententiae* that indirectly and directly address the spectators and show the commentator standing close to the world of the audience and that of the other figures. The figure's epithet *callidus* does not simply define how smartly he acts in his net of intrigues and manipulations but how wisely he perceives and describes the world and men living in it, which also entails his configuration of a poet, although the terms of wise and poet are limited by the context of comedy.

The inclination to witty conclusions and wise elaborations on stereotypical behaviour and self-definition is not separately found in soliloquies but also in a repartee or dialogue, where the clever slave argues in a proverbial structure and changes from a solitary philosopher of folk wisdoms addressing the audience to a figure in a dialogue spreading his wit and influence in short sparkles of wise words. Within the limits of the dialogue, the intention can be to give some advice to other figures like Palaestrio warns Sceledrus not to be too talkative, whereas the former general conclusions function as annotations to the plot for the audience since they highlight themes, characteristics, and implicatures, embarking on processes of interpretation as to look behind the mere sequence of actions. Such units of wise words belong to the category of sense and persuade the audience of his intellect. He applies his skills to set up a firework of folly in scenes that fulfil the conditions of nonsense, wherein the creation of *ridiculum* and the extreme of comic depiction ranks highest.

Conclusively, the *servus callidus* presents himself as a skinchanger relying on his cleverness for being a popular wise commentator and foolish creator of gags, which should not suggest him to be a black-and-white figure that is not coherent in its concept but as a figure with an unbelievably huge scope of becoming. He stands for a flexible figure investing in the categories of sense and nonsense when he appears in his different thematic configurations, whereby he gives access to comedy's full repertoire: a temporarily unreal, upside-down world rich in potential laughter and theatre in its deep and illuminating connection to life. In particular, Pseudolus combines the themes of a trickster, a poet, a philosophizing commentator and a *servus ludens*. He does so by the contradictory dualism of providing absurd, excessive, comic responses to the main action and *sententiae* and conclusions drawing on the mimetic relation of theatre and life. Plautus' figure serves comedy's perception as an entertaining genre aiming at laughter and organized as an exaggerated, distorted image of human nature by his persuasive wit, his outside, superior position, and the playful method of twisting meaning.

The abilities to give true or pretentious advice and to reflect upon life as well as theatre's concepts prove the clever slave's knowledge and intellect, his most useful instrument to realize both categories. The combination of that tool and his tendency to deviate from the expected makes him that unpredictable intriguer or entertainer, who takes his talent in verbal acrobacy to argue, instruct, and comment, which is bound to his mandate to trigger laughter, when the *servus callidus* draws witty generalized, often proverbial reflections on society or other figure's characteristics in order to excel in a repartee and to

stylize his lines to a comic and witty variation.[755] But these are sources of *ridiculum* that do not fulfil the conditions of the category of nonsense sufficiently although they can be recognized to contain a sort of miscommunication. Nevertheless, they are not contradictory to former behaviour. They do not intend to prevent comprehension or show a defect in reasoning or contain absurd constructs. The analysis is exclusively concerned with humorous parts in dialogues that realize the dualism of sense and nonsense, which is not the case for every joke text given by the *servus callidus* if joke text is defined as supplying a moment of *ridiculum*.

That is why the further discussion is concerned with particular shorter units of joke texts types, whose structures are based on a bi-polarity of sense and nonsense. The play *Pseudolus* presenting a very polished and intense type of the *servus callidus* bears two examples of verbal experiment that clarifies how the clever slave abuses structures of sense formerly used in his soliloquies and other passages now in order to jest. His fondness for contriving and his tendency to instruct and compete with other figures intermingle in the construction of generalized conclusions often in a proverbial structure supplying his source for another deliberate polarity of sense and nonsense. In *Pseudolus*, the following examples, though small in number, will concretize a varied use of both categories further and illuminate the *servus callidus* as a verbal acrobat also in order to prepare the analysis of the professional fool in Shakespeare's plays.

In *Pseudolus*, the clever slave Simia attempts to control the dialogue (see *Pseud*. 912-955) since the second *servus callidus* feels himself equal to Pseudolus in his skills as a manipulator and deceiver. He does not want to listen to Pseudolus' instructions and comments and tries to silence him by a pseudo-aphorism: *memorem immemorem facit qui monet quod memor meminit* (*Pseud*. 940). The style of the sentence loaden with the polyptoton and the figura etymologica, of *memor*, its personification, and the antithesis represent a very skilful but extremely exaggerated way to repeat Simia's one-word demand of *taceas*. His verbal boost of a simple imperative emerges as an illogical sequence since the act of reminding someone is assumed to cause losing the memory of the object; but the sense of reminding is the opposite—as if reminding someone too often endangers memory. Ridiculous content is presented in a structured and sophisticated version of sense, appearing to be an aphorism.[756]

Pseudolus himself varies the texture of an idiomatic expression in verse 123 as the clever slave here suggests to sleep rather on the eye than on the ear: *in oculum utrumvis conquiescito*. Calidorus unsurprisingly wonders about such a false combination since the original saying is "to sleep on whichever ear one likes" standing for "having no worries", which would perfectly fit the young master's wish and his expectation of Pseudolus.[757] The young master assumes that it was a mistake and corrects it, but the clever slave prefers his own version as he argues it to be less overused and dull. Ironically, his originality promotes itself to be more 'correct' than the phrase established in the daily use of language. Normally, people sleep with their eyes closed, which assigns rather an eye to sleeping than an ear. The clever slave seems to correct the saying in accordance with reality and the situation of sleeping and thereby, foregrounds the idiomatic expression diverting from an obvious physical condition, which actually attributes a defect to the saying. The clever slave plays with the discrepancy

---

755 For more examples, see *Mil.* 186-94 (esp. the conclusion in 194), 784-6; *Pseud.* 296-8, 612, 971-3 (Simia), 1005-6 (Simia, the second *servus callidus*).

756 Koestler (1964), 79: "nonsense humour […] is only effective if it pretends to make sense". This technique comes closest to the humor studies' understanding of nonsense humour.

757 De Melo (2012), 254.

between metaphors and reality by his alteration. Not only can the audience be amused about the defect in Pseudolus' version of the saying, but also at Pseudolus' nonchalance about his failure and his humorous thinking outside the box, which leaves Calidorus unsatisfied with a wide range for interpretation as the clever slave's 'metaphor' does not exist. When Pseudolus turns a structure of 'sense' into something non-idiomatic to make it a more formal expression, he exposes artificiality and illogic in idiomatic expressions, making a saying to his plaything.[758]

Working with idiomatic expressions, sentences claiming formality, general validity, and accessibility seem to contain a witty or even wise message and reach beyond the stage, intertwining life's truth and comedy's use of it; however, they do not intend to enlighten in comparison to the more distinct philosophical excursions in the given soliloquies but extend the wise commentator to the popular witty speaker, who combines proverbial material with his ambition to create *ridiculum* and his comic art that often directs the audience's attention to human fallibility by playing with conventionally-structured entities and infusing sense with nonsense. Simia's form sounds like an aphorism but its content discloses it to be a ridiculous sequence of *actio-reactio*, while Pseudolus turns an idiom slightly into an absurd image of its original even if it fits daily practice. In deviation to the soliloquies, the form of conventional repertoire, like proverbs, and the simulation of wise words become undermined by the principle of *ridiculum*; they can also function to carry innuendoes or subtle insinuations about another figure or simply human nature.

Proverbs and *sententiae* are of special interest here, since they constitute one of the most condensed, conventional, syntactical units in language that demand universal applicability to the situation or relation which it describes. Many grammars, rhetorical scripts, and commentaries in Antiquity and the Middle Ages do not clearly differ between proverb and *sententia* but use them interchangeably while they usually function as an ornament or an authorial device in argumentation.[759] These short formulas present logical conclusions— words of wisdom about human nature as well as social dynamics—and epitomize universal truth. Their character of generalization can be found in reoccurring vocabulary as *nihil* or *nemo*, impersonal constructions, and structures of comparison like *nihil* [adj. comp.] *quam* or *tam [adj.] quam*.[760] They can be clear-cut, excite ambiguous reading, bear some hidden authority because of their generalization, and describe life and its rules in their nutshells, whose termini jungle seems to be quite opaque, which is why *sententia* and proverb will be treated as synonyms, standing for a unit of universal truth regardless whether it is true or not and it contains some moral lesson.[761]

In the realms of comedy, these forms are items of convention that are open to a carnivalesque treatment when they become objects of deformation and carriers of comic value. Their non-prototypical use belongs to a common strategy in verbal humour.[762] On the

---

758 "Pseudolus has no patience with cliché, as his reworking of proverbs and play with language shows." Slater (1985), 120.

759 Cf. Sibylle Hallik, *Sententia und Proverbium. Begriffsgeschichte und Texttheorie in Antike und Mittelalter. Band 9. Studien zur Literatur und Gesellschaft des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*, Ulrich Ernst, Christel Meier and Klaus Ridder (eds.), Köln et al.: Böhlau Verlag, 2007, 13-14, 295, and 72ff. Throughout the centuries, there have been the attempt to classify different genres of *sententiae*; some did it quite precisely, amongst whom Quintilian can be found. See Quint. *inst.* esp. VIII, 5,4ff.

760 Cf. *Ibid.*, 74.

761 Cf. *Ibid.*, 17. And for a discussion of *sententia's* semantic scope and its development, see Marcelle Altieri, *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes. Leur perspective proverbiale et gnomique*, Paris 1976, 40f.

762 "[M]any cases of (verbal) humor revolve around the non-prototypical use of very common organizational principles like metaphor and metonymy". Veale et al. (2006), 334. Already noted by Brône Geert and Kurt

one hand, the *servus callidus*'s sayings contain advice, instructions, justifications, and philosophies, simulating authority. On the other hand, he plays with them by abusing their attention, while he wittily constructs even non-valid and intentionally comic versions of verbal standards, a common procedure for humorous effects.

The type stresses his duality in witty pieces of wisdom and jesting and in mockery, simulating conventional verbal units. The thoughtful commentator or part-time philosopher embodying the category of sense turns into a clever persona playing with structure and meaning; he deliberately deforms that category's material to insert the potential for *ridiculum* into the scene. The ability to construct and use proverbial structures and definitions about his surrounding world displays the clever slave as an observer of society and types of human behaviour. He allows the audience access to folk wisdom, playing with it and subverting it with a comic tone. In all formerly discussed examples, the figure of the clever slave thus connects folly with method, namely to distort and reflect human nature in comedy's manner of presenting the ugly. Plautus' clever figure advances to an expert in how to read, manipulate, and what is most, exhibit figures' characteristics in comedy and their stereotypical equivalents in the extra-dramatic world, whereby the clever slave dominates conversation. His behaviour in a dialogue fits his agonistic tone and confirms the Saturnalian feature.

In sum, extra-dramatic excursions, short philosophical elaborations, and vivid indulgence in nonsense are temporary, enrich comedy's discourse, and display the *servus callidus* as this unpredictable entity. All these passages unify one characteristic saliently: his versatility since he fully exploits the scope of style, rules, structure and meaning. The professional use of language—Simo refers to the Greek philosopher Socrates (*Pseud*. 464-65) and Chrysalus foregrounds his talent in his self-praising (*optumus sum orator* [*Bacch.* 981])— is the second approach to describe the opposition of nonsense and sense in the concept of the clever slave. It has been found in the distorting, inventive application of conventional and formal units. Of course, the clever slave does not fulfil the conditions of a Ciceronian orator but he focuses on the creation of *ridiculum* by applying language's conventional repertoire of metaphors, similes, proverbs, and other devices freely and playfully, which includes deformation of conventions. Similarly to an orator, he inserts these tools to present his arguments and remarks effectively in his agonistic passages; he also deploys them to illuminate illusions. But he deviates from an orator in his intertwinement of sense and nonsense, particularly when he temporarily seems to discard reason and logical construction, challenging and undermining the creation of sense and intelligibility.[763]

So far, the use of language and here of proverbial structures has shown that nonsense can appear in the disguise of sense as Simia and Pseudolus' creation does not keep the worthy value of its content that it promises by its outer appearance. Can this method be applied the other way around? Sense enters in the disguise of nonsense. If nonsense is understood as the comic veil of sense, then presenting sense by nonsense impedes the addressee to understand at first and leaves him in the dark as his comprehension is limited by the absurd and illogic or in other words, by the expected derived from convention and bound to the context.

In analogy to the abusive construction of proverbs and the veil of nonsense by sense, there are several passages in Plautus, exceeding the small number of verbal experiments in *Pseudolus*. Most importantly, they bring the characteristic of wise and foolishness together, adding the final parts for the analysis and therefore, the last input to the functionality of the

---

Feyaerts, 'Assessing the SSTH and GTVH: A view from cognitive linguistics', *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 17.4 (2004): 361–372.

763 For instance, compare to the earlier discussed scene of Milphio's failing mediation and false translation.

clever slave's realisation of sense and nonsense.[764] In *Bacchides*, Chrysalus pinpoints Mnesilochus' miserous situation in two verses defining the lover's dilemma of wealth and love: *animast amica amanti: si abest, nullus est;/ si adest, res nullast: ipsus est – nequam et miser* (*Bacch.* 193-4). The pithy style is enhanced by alliterations tying the tripartite sentence to one physical unit imaging the semantic level, which displays the pair of lovers, and by the parallel construction of the two conditional sentences as well as their antithetical relation towards each other creating two situations that have negative consequences for the lover either way. The clever slave's precise summary, however, cannot be equated to the earlier soliloquies and their separate pursuit of wise conclusion but it is embedded in a dialogue between Pistoclerus and him, where Chrysalus also exhibits his habit of miscommunication and playfully designs the conversation. By his proverbial verses, Chrysalus indirectly sums up the exposition of the play, alluding to the requirement of a plan.

This pithy definition is preceded by Chrysalus' encounter and welcome of Pistoclerus, whose course the clever slave determines as usual. In this short sequence, however, Chrysalus prolongs the discourse by his peculiar behaviour since he asked Pistoclerus whether Mnesilochus is fine, which is illogical, as the young master's friend has not seen him in contrast to Chrysalus, who was sent by Mnesilochus:

PIST.   *Nempe recte valet?*
CH.   *Istuc volebam ego ex te percontarier.*
PIST.   *Qui scire possum?*
CH.   *Nullus plus.*
PIST.   *Quemnam ad modum*?
(*Bacch.* 188-190)

Pistoclerus and probably the audience react understandably puzzled towards such an inversion since Chrysalus asks for some information he already knows but his dialogue partner he asks does not. The clever slave explains his weird action, a temporary, seeming trace of nonsense, by his depiction of the miserable lover and his fate, making Pistoclerus' news the condition for Mnesilochus' well-being. The short excursion to extravagant behaviour twisting logic relation and puzzling the dialogue partner ends in the witty proverbial definition of the lover's problem by a clever slave, who actually makes fun of Mnesilochus' situation in the drastic caricature of his dilemma by *nullus* and *nulla res*.

Again, a *servus ludens* dominates the conversation by confronting Pistoclerus with a weird, actually cryptic question as well as response (*nullus plus*) and by changing the simple transfer of information, whether Pistoclerus found Bacchis to a stylized, inefficient, and surprising turn in the conversation. Within this scene, the categories of sense and nonsense clash together in Chrysalus' design of the conversation when he controls Pistoclerus' contributions by altering the course and delaying intelligibility. The simple exchange of information if Bacchis is found transforms to an alternation of seeking sense and impeding it up to the point when Chrysalus poses his definition and thus, inserts the feature of *ridiculum* in the caricatural version of the lover and his despair. The clever slave suppresses his dialogue partner's process of comprehension and decides when he clarifies his extravagant and preposterous verbal mix. In contrast to the former analysed passages and applied techniques,

---

764 In addition to the analysed passages, see *Pseud*. 23-24 (as part of a larger scene where the *servus ludens* is active), 75-77 (*pumiceos*), 952-4. Malcolm M. Willcock subsumes v. 23-24 and v. 75-77 under his joke category of "suggested change of identity" (Willcock [1987], 18).

the clever slave here changes a dialogue to a tactical sequence of unintelligible, puzzling remarks unfolding their comic potential.

Not only does Pistoclerus face Chrysalus' challenge of illogic, but Chrysalus also attacks his old master when he answers Nicobolus' question (who sells me?) with mysterious verses reminding the audience of an oracle's wisdom:

> *Quem di diligent*
> *adulescens moritur, dum valet sentit sapit.*
> *hunc si ullus deus amaret, plus annis decem,*
> *plus iam viginti mortuom esse oportuit:*
> *terrai odium ambulat, iam nil sapit*
> *nec sentit, tantist quantist fungus putidus.*
> (*Bacch.* 816-21)

The clever slave does not respond to Nicobulus' question but offers a saying outlining the condition of death at a young age with the tricolon of a young person's desirable qualities and the love of the Gods. These three physical characteristics are then denied for a third person, *hunc*, relating to Nicobulus since they vanished twenty years earlier. The climax from ten to twenty years enhances the change of Nicobulus from a young and strong man to an old and senile senior who is not loved any more. Chrysalus drastically concludes from the saying as he opposes the love and the value of a young man to hatred towards the old master and his decline in value to the dark mocking image of a rotten mushroom totally negating any wit and knowledge. Matching his agonistic tone, Chrysalus challenges Nicobulus with astuteness, speaking of him in the third person, and attacks him more openly than usual since it is not only recognizable for the audience but for the old master himself when he slightly disguises his attack as an indirect description of his master contrasting him to his young son.

The saying in verses 816 and 817 sound like a riddle, which is subsequently solved by the gradual concretization and explanation of the further verses revealing the relevance of the proverb and constructing the opposition between young and old until the crescendo of metamorphosing the old man in a foul vegetable. The clever slave surprises with his response not matching the prior course of conversation not only in reference but also in style because of the proverbial and metaphorical expression as well as the change to the third person. Similarly to Simia's abuse of a proverbial structure and falling back on his dominant, inefficient, but comic mode of the conversation between himself and Pistoclerus, Chrysalus veils sense and delays the recognition of meaning and partly, intention; in other words, what is said blocks complete understanding at the beginning but is then accessed by the interpretation of the following verses and assessed as comic while *ridiculum* enters more and more by the distortion of form and the decline of tone, which changes a proverb to an indirect offence.

Here, the clever slave takes a *sententia* as material and makes it productive for his creation of *ridiculum*; it is only later that he elucidates his irrelevant sentiments. Chrysalus supplies the audience with the potential aesthetic experience of a moment of *ridiculum* but also with a certain tension and challenge since his two verses at the beginning are to be deciphered since they do not stand in any logic to the other part of the conversation but interrupt the course. Nicobulus and the audience move within the same frame, waiting for an explanation. Chrysalus then captivates the audience not only by supplying material for laughter when he elucidates the proverbial statement in an indirect invective, but also by constructing a mixture of style and Saturnalian moments. The audience can enjoy their

achievement of recognition, simply getting the joke, but also the clever slave's witty course of thoughts, whose effect partly derives from its unpredictability.[765]

Milphio in *Poenulus* introduces a verse similarly dangling in mid-air as he puzzles Agorastocles by a sentence that is semantically incoherent to his master's remark:

AGO. *at vide sis, cum illac numquam limavi caput.*
MIL. *curram igitur aliquo ad piscinam aut ad lacum, limum petam.*
AGO. *quid eo opust?*
MIL. *ego dicam: ut illi et tibi limem caput.*
(*Poen.* 292-94)

While Agorastocles is revelling in his admiration for his lover, Milphio interferes with his young master's kitschy tone by turning his oaths into a ridiculing play on words. De Melo's translation of the young master's first verse wonderfully underlines Agorastocles' exaggerated adoration and understands *caput limare* as a metaphorical expression for kissing.[766] The clever slave interrupts the course of conversation by violating the principle of relevance as his sudden decision to run to a small pond or lake in order to get some mud does not logically refer back to Agorastocles' lovesickness and confirmation that he has never kissed his mistress. Consequently, in his blindness, the young master is in need to ask for further explanation, which gives the clever slave the opportunity to deliver his punchline (*ego dicam*). The seemingly illogical remark of Milphio is attached to the former sentence by the prosodic repetition of *lim-* as it picks up Agorastocles' verb. *Limavi* inspires him to *limum* turning away from a lover's activity to ugly mud. Milphio's change of topic is actually his preparation for a punchline that then solves and justifies his first-occurring nonsense. The clever slave needs mud to rub their heads with, which metaphorically stands for waking them up out of their lovers' silliness, most of all Agorastocles. For attentive spectators, Agorastocles' sugary *limavi caput* metamorphoses to Milphio's dry and ridiculing *limum caput*, providing them with a good laugh.

Tranio also shows the activity of abruptly misleading the course of conversation and comments on the dialogue partner and the dramatic situation absurdly, which demands an explanation:

TR. *video. huc si quis intercedat tertius, pereat fame.*
TH. *quidum?*
TR. *quia nil <illi> quaesti sit. mali hercle ambo sumus.*
(*Most.* 1106-07)

Tranio's comment is situated in the previously-discussed final scene of *Mostellaria*, where the old master verbally fights with Tranio to get him to leave the altar. During his programme of nonsense, the clever slave applies a similar construction as Chrysalus or Milphio in the examples mentioned above when he inserts a cryptic conditional sentence not showing any relevance to their former conversation and conducting the talk further on his comic tour. He outlines a hypothetical situation by introducing a third persona in their argument and putting a conditional sentence, whose reference to their former course of dialogue he must explain in the second step. To understand the main clause and the consequence of death for the third

persona, Tranio goes on and starts his punchline with *quia* disclosing the causal relation between death by hunger and their argument. His twofold jesting offers a moment of *ridiculum* and implicitly foresees that they will never find an agreement on their own.

Within such parts of the dialogue, a typical component of the cryptic and uncommon quality of the clever slave's speech is the listener's need to ask what the slave figure intends with his weird comment and what sense they can make out of it. The other figures and the spectator listen to and watch a clever slave, who determines the dialogue knowingly when he digresses from the organic progress of the scene and ornaments the dialogue by taking the role of the *servus ludens* as he knows how to shift between two categories; one implying reason, logic, and knowledge and the other including absurdity, illogic, and the absence of 'useful' meaning. He pursues his agenda of a comic driver, who simultaneously manages to slip in clever observations often in a caricatural version. Consequently, the clever slave here acts as the *servus ludens* wittily combining the two categories of sense and nonsense in his verbal structures and use of language in order to incorporate ingenious punchlines and moments of *ridiculum*. In *Epidicus*, the clever slave embellishes the contriving and manipulation of Periphanes about the young master's wench with a short excursion to how women, money, and fashion dictate the streets, which finally exemplifies the mixture of both categories shown in behaviour and language.

After praising the wench's appearance, Epidicus deviates from his story and decides to answer Periphanes' question of what kind of dress the wench wore by inserting an architectural term in a new kind of relation as he creates an absurd image of a non-wearable dress inspired by the *impluvium*:

> EPI.   *Inpluviatam, ut istaec faciunt vestimentis nomina.*
> PER.   *Utin inpluvium induta fuerit?*
> EPI.   *Quid istuc tam mirabile est?*
> (*Epid*. 224-25)

Epidicus originates a dress shaped like an *impluvium* and striking with its four sides and a square border. Unsurprisingly, Periphanes can hardly imagine a woman wearing such a garment and reacts to the clever slave's miscommunication with the incredulous question of how that is possible. Fitting comedy's utopia and the *servus callidus*' excessive imagination, the image of a wench with "a quadrangular basin-dress" is not at all extraordinary or incredible when it comes to prostitutes' fashion but something totally normal for Epidicus and his performance as a *servus ludens*.

For such a figure, the absence of plausibility does not cause wonder at all but his absurdity is explained by a combination of witty observations on fashion's useless variety and the luxurious and superfluous style financed by lustful men:

> EPI.   *quasi non fundis exornatae multae incedant per vias.*
>   *at tributus quom imperatus est, negant pendi potis;*
>   *illis quibus tributus maior penditur, pendi potest.*
>   *quid istae, quae vesti quotannis nomina inveniunt nova?*
>   *tunicam rallam, tunicam spissam, linteolum caesicium,*
>   *[…]–gerrae maxumae.*
> (*Epid*. 226-33)

The ridiculous dress converts to a metaphoric and creative depiction of how much men spend on their mistresses as if the worth of particular dresses equates even whole country estates, or namely a part of a Roman house, an *impluvium*. In addition to addressing the object's value,

a basin displays a specific container for storage, where water could be poured in, or in Epidicus' interpretation, money in a probably endless process since the owner consumes continuingly, especially fashion and accessories. The clever slave now turns to those consumers and their lavish investment in garments for which the prostitutes do not stop to invent new names. In his question posing to Periphanes, Epidicus implies that wasting money is bound to the invention of objects to be bought. The clever slave exaggerates the senseless variation of dress names by a long list of weird pairs of garments, whose names do not tell anything concrete about the object and which is nothing but nonsense in essence. After his ludicrous image of a dress, he illuminates his play with words and meaning by explaining the circular process of men spending enormous sums of money on their lovers' style enmeshing men again.

After Epidicus talked about superfluous fashion at length and in excess, he ends his excursion into telling playfulness with a climactic conclusion Periphanes cannot decrypt:

EPI.   […] *cani quoque etiam ademptumst nomen*.
PER.   *Qui?*
EPI.   *Vocant Laconicum. haec vocabula auctiones subigunt ut faciant viros.*
(*Epid*. 234-35)

The assumption of stealing the dog's name is based on the ambiguous word *Laconicum* denoting a breed of dog and a kind of tunic. Epidicus following the method of his fellow clever slaves first begins his joke by the cryptic statement Periphanes does not comprehend and typically asks for an explanation. The comic veil of sense prepares the significant final line, which lifts the covering and resolves that the listener can understand the humorous quality of the former sentence. In the last crucial verses, Epidicus thus completes his jest while he also relates back to his former arguments about fashion, women, and ruin, inserting a final conclusion that all these names simulating a personified armada of dresses bankrupt men, namely husbands.[767] Thereby, he explains the implicit meaning of his question in verse 229 and discloses his obsession with dress' names as a tactic in order to demonstrate the expensive female threat for Periphanes' fortune.

Apoecides recognizes Epidicus' *quasi* monologue on clever manipulation of men only as a deviation because earlier on, the clever slave told about the troops' homecoming and the young master's enchantment by a harlot. In the inorganic passage, the clever slave can outlive his joking habit Apoecides wants him to quit and replace with the actual topic again. After Epidicus played the role of the *servus currens*, he now takes the role of a *servus ludens*, continuing to drive the comic by temporarily suspending intelligibility and indulging in extreme, ludicrous forms of images and style. Besides the insertions of *ridiculum*, the clever slave manages to part some witty thoughts that can be interpreted inner-dramatically since by exhibiting the prostitutes' taste and addiction to luxury, Epidicus illustrates huge sums of money Periphanes might lose if he does not prevent his son from buying his lover free. Hence, the clever slave puts the father in the right fearful mood for his plan. Additionally, he presents another caricature of blind, foolish men in love and the human tendency to fall for luxury. Concerning Epidicus' passage in an extra-dramatic reference, the audience listens to conclusions about stereotypical behaviour and human failure to fall for the outer appearance and be led by sexual longings.

Simultaneously, this idea underlines figures' appearance transformed by masks or costumes and their related illusionary, even deceptive quality, which sets Epidicus' issue

---

767 Note Nixon's translation, Nixon (1988), 303.

parallel to his own deceit when he is dressed up as a *servus currens*. In sum, Epidicus' performance as a *servus ludens* spices up the dialogue and presents the manipulation of the old men comically to men and husbands in the audience who have mistresses with a costly wardrobe. In short, Epidicus unites his loud and exaggerated presentation with observations from daily life. The clever slave does not simply perform foolery but the kernel feature of a deliberate fool figure is to wrap sense like interesting insights in an entertaining package, while he puts on and exemplifies the ugly mask of comedy.

Conclusion

Within dialogues, the *servus callidus* sometimes turns into a *servus ludens* placing moments of *ridiculum* which attract attention by a dualism of sense and nonsense. All the discussed passages show some kind of defect mainly in conversation since the clever slave discards the cooperative principle and freely interprets the maxim of relevance as any other maxim, which specifies his participation in these dialogues as miscommunication. The cases of miscommunication include occurrences of nonsense, for instance, when *ridiculum* becomes his major incentive encouraging him to behave in contradiction to prior scenes and to his characteristics of a clever and manipulative architect, while he inserts absurd and illogical images, storylines, or weird conclusions. He then neglects his deceiving function. He turns to a player in a harmless game, where logic and reason are mostly banned, but the control over the dialogue is kept and the beginning as well as the ending of the comic escapade are willingly set. Briefly, sense opposes nonsense.

The opposition can occur when thematic configurations such as the poet and a provider of wise words become contradicted by a juggler with foolish constructs, or between the agenda of intrigue and risking detection, which means a deliberate engagement in folly. His miscommunication has incongruity enter the dialogue when he suddenly changes the course, outlines the scene's and figure's features concealed in preposterous constructs and cleverly switches between what is said and meant, for example when he takes the literal meaning for granted without questioning it. His gradual failure of competence surprises and is disparate to his cleverness in the play but belongs to his plan of fooling around since the clever slave still maintains control over sense although he seems to lose his sound judgement. As he would put it, he simply likes (*me lubet*) to joke about the situation and those, who are around him.

This deliberate domination of nonsense is also highlighted by his use of verbal structures, whose analysis looked at the clever slave's habit of miscommunication and the short sequences of *ridiculum* and the recurring composition of joke texts. The categories' dualism demonstrates functionality by realizing the categories in the formation of short verbal entities and reoccurring types of joke texts and thus, by opposing clusters of scripts in the text. The use of verbal structures identifies the *servus callidus'* typical strategy of constructing moments of *ridiculum*, which the audience appreciates as 'witty'.

The short sequences are spread across the play and can either occur separately or can be parts of larger scenes of a *servus ludens* when he pursues his extravagant behaviour. They often only consisting of one sentence bear either an illusory appearance of sense or an illusory appearance of nonsense, which he both uses to play with expectations and stupefy his dialogue partners. Regardless if the sequence extends over ten or one verse, the clever slave analogically leads the conversation by his interruptions and continues his habit of miscommunication since he ruptures the logic and expected course of the conversation,

violates relevance and reference, relishes the absence of meaning for his dialogue partner, delays intelligibility, and ignores any desire of consensus but prefers to pursue *ridiculum*.

There are two possible procedures to do so. Here, sense is present in the texture of proverbs and aphorisms; the clever slave knows how to apply them in a comic style. First, the clever slave abuses a known structure of sense as well as its devices and fills it with an illogical content, which appears as sense at first but devours its promising vessel to merely inflated blather. Simia and Pseudolus are equipped with the knowledge how to (de)form authoritative, proverbial material in order to produce a comic effect. The clever slave thus simulates genuine conventional forms and their acknowledgement as pieces of wisdom undermining their conventional power by the absence of meaning and reducing their quality to absurd messages. In his verbal play, he veils nonsense as sense.

In the second procedure that is found more often, the clever slave creates seeming nonsense by suddenly throwing irrelevant and/or illogical constructs at his partner and delays the process of making sense of it as Epidicus does by inventing his quadrangular basin-dress or as Tranio places a third man between himself and his master. The clever separates the key for understanding from the foolish lines that disrupt the dialogue, whereby he gives an inferior position to his dialogue partner abruptly lost in the course of conversation and waiting for the other's clarification. Usually, he does not go on immediately but urges the other figure to admit not to have understood and highlight the insertion of nonsense, whereby the clever slave achieves a pause increasing suspense about how he will manage to make sense of that absurd verbal deadlock. Thus, the other figure needs to ask what purpose or what sense lies beneath the clever slave's puzzling words, which then provides the professional fool with the opportunity to place his comically brilliant solution superiorly, granting access to *ridiculum* for the audience. By deciphering the nonsense construct, the clever slave allows his dialogue partner to get back on track since he presents the relevance and hidden message in it: the sense in nonsense.

To the audience and the figure, the clever slave reveals himself to be a verbal conjuror as he manages to turn a far-fetched and absurd matter into something that stands in relevant association to the context. The second clarifying component sometimes contains proverbial structures, which directly appeal to familiar structures. Thereby, he shows his finesse in toying with formality and cultural knowledge. He provides the audience with wondrous achievements in artistry of comic 'logic'. While the clever slave turns something irrelevant, non-referential, and mostly unintelligible into something to be laughed at, he simultaneously generates an elucidating comment on the present scene, the play's development or the behaviour of the other figures as Chrysalus diagnoses the desperate lover Mnesilochus parodically or Epidicus illustrates on how fashion affects monetary business. Here, the *servus ludens* adds *ridiculum* to a comment, whereby he shows his skills in verbal dance and his abilities of observing sharply and concluding wittily.

Both procedures veil the actual, either completely or partly as by a sort of disguise since sense either veils nonsense or sense is veiled by nonsense, whereby two different kinds of joke text types can be identified. How the *servus callidus* composes his joke texts in both procedures can be summed up in a strategy that describes his playful verbal arrangement of the two categories as coding fitting his engagement in miscommunication. The activity coding focuses on the obscure or misleading presentation of meaning, which usually entails some observation about the scene's content often bound to the surprising insertion. On the abstract level, the strategy of coding participates in the formation of the clever slave's joke texts. The first smaller group of examples, the first procedure of coding, is concerned with the relation between presentation and content as it displays a form that promotes a general truth, a

promise it cannot keep, and is negated by its nugatory and insubstantial meaning that reassesses the form and unmasks it as being a false imitation.

The second larger group consists of at least two separable components. The initial component impedes processing and supplies the addressee with dissatisfying construct of sense not standing in relevance to the former discourse. Only the second component evolves its point in the ongoing joke text rejudging the first component's lack of full comprehensibility. The second group's shift from nonsense to sense does mainly function on the semantic level in contrast to the first group. Nevertheless, the second component and its revelation of sense can be enhanced by the use of proverbial structures to underline the process of conclusion and extend the joke text's function of carrying *ridiculum* to elucidating its context. The findings have shown that the joke text including style, vocabulary, and object can vary but both joke text types differ only in two different procedures of coding that strategically share a moment of surprise and reassessment.

A strategy of coding produces a code that naturally needs a process of decoding to be understood. Here, a code is limited to the result of *servus callidus*' coding in his joke texts.[768] The spectator needs to decipher the codes that are a sort of tangle of nonsense and sense and manage to get through to the relevance and the humorous value of the text, which means to recognize the oppositional scripts as the spectator can only assess the humorous potential if he has access to it. For the second joke text type, the punchline of a joke that is structurally separate and visible can be interpreted as an obvious final key to the code and a demanded element provoked by the strategy of coding like the response to a conundrum or the solution to a riddle. The clever slave's short sequences consisting of two components, the first that seems to be incongruent with the former dialogue but turns out to be the preparation of a joke and the second that picks up the preparation and makes the humorous value obvious and accessible. The *servus callidus,* who first seems to speak in cryptic words by coding, proves his wit in revealing their relation to the situation by a decoding element, the punchline supplying the trigger for laughter and making the joke text complete. In addition, the clever slave's punchline reflects upon the context already prepared in the formerly evaluated nonsense, the code. Coding or in that particular case, veiling sense by nonsense creates a part of the joke text, which is completed by the successive element to secure the process of decoding.

The clever slave's joke texts of the second group contain at least two separate parts, which makes it easier to recognize the punchline and the element for decoding; the structure of the first group does not show a distinct punchline, which makes it difficult to identify a separate structural element that is responsible for decoding. The order of the latter leaves decoding not imaged in the structure. For both, it is only valid to state that decoding happens along with the course of cognitive processing. The listener or reader attempts to sort out information, presuppositions, and inferences. Consequently, the complete joke text of both types ties coding to a process of decoding otherwise the humorous moment gets lost and declines only to some verbal construction evaluated as rather stupid, weird or inadequate than funny. The strategy of coding, its result, the code, and the necessity of decoding are all geared to the audience's comprehension and recognition of the comic value, whose sum enables the spectator to get the joke and ideally, laugh. This reaction can only happen if both types of joke texts depending on the intelligible construction of the opposing scripts allow their dissolution. The effect of a joke text therefore also pivots on the socio-cultural

---

768 The term 'code' does not stand in any relation to Volker Schulz' term in his theory of verbal humour and does not interfere with Attardo's 'script' but refers to the result of the strategy 'coding' and that is the intermingling of sense and nonsense.

knowledge of the addressee, who needs to recognize the proverbial structure, the specific saying, a concept of a stereotype or other culturally-specific entities involved in the generation of a joke.[769] However, an investigation regarding the cognitive processing of joke texts cannot be pursued any further but passed on to cognitive psychology. Most saliently, the focus is on the production and the *servus callidus'* activity as a *servus ludens*.

The clever slave's strategy takes part in how he produces a short joke text as one block in a dialogue, where the dialogue partner can be left out without damaging the joke text and its effect severely, whereas the *servus ludens'* longer episodes of extravagant conduct are joke texts that rely on the dramatic performance in a dialogue. What would be the translator without two persons, who are not able to talk to each other or what would be Tranio and his imagined fresco without someone to look at? In sum, the joke text types and its strategy add up to the *servus ludens'* repertoire to create moments of *ridiculum*, which completes the other thematic configurations and their contribution to *ridiculum* in the concept of *servus callidus*, showing overlapping in functionality.

In analogy to his agonistic tone, he completely acts and speaks freely when he realizes nonsense, flouts sense and opposes them in communication, which concretizes the clever slave's core characteristics of flexibility, unpredictability, and in sum, being all-licensed. The clever slave's discard of the pragmatic principles summed up in miscommunication frees him from the common restriction a speaker faces in generating his speech in dependence on the hearer, the dialogue partner. In essence, the only constraints the clever slave has to pay attention to at large are those of the genre and consequently, those of performance in front of the only valid 'hearer', the audience whose processing is of chief importance to the other figures—at least sooner or later in the play.[770]

Within this framework, the clever slave can take part in verbal violation, when conventions cease to be powerful on the level of language and can easily be altered and played with to establish the Saturnalian and utopian stage, which comedy needs to depict human nature and society as acceptably funny and painlessly ugly as the genre does. Especially the utopian quality takes a significant role in the programme of the *servus ludens* since the clever slave applies absurd and illogical constructions, which display something hypothetical or unreal that exists as a 'second reality' within its validity and frame of reference but that is only created for the joke and vanishes after its comic solution. His jesting introduces images, objects and situations; it is some entity that does not possess any influence on the plot or any sustainability as it is an unreal construction but is fleeting since Milphio announces to get some mud. He never intended to get any mud; nor does the mono-locality of the stage allow him to head towards a lake. Similarly, there is no third person that could die between Theopropides and Tranio and Epidicus' quadrangular basin-dress is probably not the new fashion. His mock-heroic passages implore something unreal and fantastic as his nonsense passages give the clever slave the opportunity to revel in imagination and almost unlimited association as well as unconventional reasoning, which depends on the all-license.

His playful arrangement of words in relation to context happens in a utopian construct, which remains stable within and for the joke but disappears after the moment of laughter. His treatment of sense realized by the free and unconventional use of language determines his procedures when he turns into the *servus ludens*, shifting from folly to sense or from sense to

---

769 Accordingly, the exclusive access to the codes and the retrospective analysis of a comedy text from antiquity makes it likely that not every single reworking of a proverb or similar device is detected and known in its original sense, which negates any completeness of cases to be discussed in an analysis.

770 Cf. Attardo (1994), 16. "[…] pragmatic principles such as the maxim of relevance constrain the generative power of the speaker and direct the search heuristics of the hearer."

folly. Such passages can be classified as inorganic in analogy to the inorganic scenes, satisfying by comic qualities reminding us of the bomolochian habit.[771] They represent the flesh to the bones if inorganic parts, the moments of *ridiculum*, and organic parts, the main action, are metaphorically seen as flesh and bone of comedy, while Plautus' figure is inseparably bound to and essentially responsible for both parts of comedy's skeleton as the architect, the intriguer, and the *servus ludens*.

Due to the overlapping of thematic configurations, the strategy and the activity of coding correlate with the body of Plautus' intrigue comedy and signify the type of the *servus callidus* since a code is thematically linked to deception and the act of deluding the truth. The ability of coding becomes a necessity for the comic intriguer since the clever slave knows how to apply language in order to allude to the intrigue while he talks to the deceived, and to provide comic moments for the audience sometimes without giving away himself or his mocking to the other figure. When the comic deceiver codes his mocking, distortion, and the presentation of the ugly, his mode rather satisfies the demand of witty moments of *ridiculum* than contributing to malicious, open invective.

The strategy of coding is apparent when the clever slave establishes a tension between the prior denial of comprehension and the subsequent access to it, displaying an effective device and fitting his epithet *ludens* since he plays with sense and his assumed inferiority. When the clever slave confronts his opponent or dialogue partner with codes, such as comments appearing as foolish words, the clever slave seems to be the foolish one at first, whereas the end of decoding rehabilitates the clever slave as a witty constructor, which transfers the epithet 'foolish' rather to those who are blind to the clever slave's intention and reference or are even the target of mocking themselves.[772] In the final scene at the altar, Tranio makes Theopropides look like a fool since the course of the argument between Theopropides and Tranio becomes the plaything for the clever slave, who urges his master in a passive position to ask for the sense of Tranio's conditional sentence. Thereby, he mocks his inability to rule his slave in the verbal dance and get him to leave the altar. In the upside-down world of comedy, it is a slave that perceives open or closed repartee as his drawing board, on which he can work as a comic artist; here, he arranges language artfully, reminding us of a poet, who creates the ugly by the instrument of language and plays with the absence and presence of congruity and incongruity, comprehension, and unintelligibility in his comic timing.

All in all, the activity of coding as well as the complex of *ludus*/*ludere* stand in association with the whole concept of the *servus callidus*. Plautus' figure encourages the image of agon and Saturnalian inversion by challenging and surpassing the superior in his exuberant depiction of sense. Coding implicates the act of hiding and presenting something in another disguise, which links the strategy to the *servus callidus*' profession of a deceiver and illusionist, who conceals witty comic attacks from the attacked in the verbal agon, infringes authority, achieves ambivalent remarks in his net of illusionary frames, and stylizes mere, simple statements and observations about stereotypical behaviour in a fascinating humorous verbal dance. In essence, the effectiveness of coding and miscommunication relies on the tripartite combinations of his understanding of the Comic, his wit, and the discard of principles. They supply comments, reflections or assessments on the performance with a

---

771 See ch. II.ii on the bomolochos.
772 See *Most*. 778-82 and *Bacch*. 814-15. Here, the clever slave highlights the difference between himself, the superior, and the figures falling for his cheating. For a discussion of these scenes and the value of deception, see Anderson (1993), 113-15.

humorous bonus. Asides, soliloquies, and his parts in a dialogue are mostly polyvalent, offering the audience more than information, but laughter and various allusions to all the processes, themes, and objects that belong to, reach into and out of the scene. The audience perceives the evaluation of the characteristics of other figures, the stage and theatre, pieces of the plot, popular matter as literary themes, or social institutions like the military. Still, he is not a moralist or a provider of encyclopaedic knowledge, but describes every entity from a comic perspective.

The attractiveness of the figure is nourished by his status of being inferior, who surpasses all the others in acuity and presents his excellence of mind and sense sympathetically and pleasantly in comedy's exaggerated, deformed, and ridiculous mirror of life. His cleverness conveys the audience with a performance of "extra cognitive work".[773] Concerning the realisation of all thematic configurations, the fool figure perceives language as a flexible tool and makes use of the power of imagination. The flexibility in language is perfectly seen in the witty slave's eloquence when he constructs and deconstructs style and forms, veiling his intention by coding.

In theatre's dimension and its heart, the dialogue, language means communication, whose purpose lies in successfully sharing ideas, thoughts, and other pieces of information between two parties. The success or understanding in communication, however, is nothing absolute since language unfolds a wide open range for variety, interpretation, and allusions. In fact, communication's concomitant is misunderstanding. Baudelaire diagnoses the benefit of human error in communication as the following: "It is by universal misunderstanding that all agree. For if, by ill luck, people understood each other, they would never agree."[774] Baudelaire's design of a dialogue suits comedy's world of error and failure perfectly, presenting a dialogue as consisting of non-overlapping contexts each dialogue partner moves in. The *servus callidus* can view both frames and hop between both. He "is quick to see this weakness present in human language", which advantages him to "consciously manipulate those who believe naively in the transparency of verbal expression."[775] It is precisely the awareness of constant misunderstanding and dysfunction in human communication that makes the prototypical professional fool superior to the other and from which he draws his functionality for comedy. He relies on his dominance not for any self-purpose but supports the plot of the intrigue and realizes dialogues of deceit by promoting a carnivalesque structure, nurturing *ridiculum*, reflecting human vices and weaknesses, and foregrounding utopian nature.

He exists within and outside the dramatic frame and can act unpredictably and flexibly so that he can be recognized as engaging in folly deliberately, which can be described as the

---

773 Attardo (1994), 322. Attardo identifies eight different interpersonal functions of jokes. One of them he calls cleverness bears extra-cognitive work. Here, on stage, Attardo's list only fits partly and should be adapted to the dramatic space, where the cleverness of the *servus callidus*' humour is not for the personal benefit of the figure but should be reinterpreted in its function for the delight of the audience, who performs extra-cognitive work to be able to enjoy the humorous moment but also the effort of achieving sense.

774 Charles Baudelaire, 'My heart laid bare', *Intimate Journals*, transl. by Christopher Isherwood, San Francisco: City Lights, 1983, 89. And note the preface to *œuvres complètes*, Marcel A. Ruff (ed.), Paris: Seuil, 1968, *Mon cœur mis à nu,* fragment 57.

775 Dominique Garand, 'Misunderstanding. A Typology as Performance', *Common Knowledge* 15.3 (2009): 472-500, 473. It is not Plautus' slave figure Garand writes about but the French libertine: "The French libertines were quick to see this weakness present in human language. Language can mislead by reducing, approximating, leaving room for interpretation. The libertine, well aware that language is inadequate to represent the real, consciously manipulates those who believe naively in the transparency of verbal expression." This description suggests the figure to be a morph of the deliberate type of fool.

realisation and opposition of sense and nonsense. In short, he applies nonsense with a good sense for *ridiculum*. The *servus ludens* plays all-licensed with the dramatic material, plot, figures, themes, ideas, lying in front of him, which draws upon the great influence of imagination to create absurd, incongruous ideas.[776] Foolish behaviour and the chameleon-like ability achieve variety, tension, delight, and can probably meet the taste of nearly every spectator as one might enjoy an agonistic challenge more, while the other is perfectly amused by a *servus ludens'* joking.[777] Composing a comedy's discourse demands to vary comic experience and offer a wide spectrum of taste, which Plautus offers in the *servus callidus*, his deliberate fool figure.

No matter how intensely he indulges in absurdity, he can still immediately change to the manipulative deceiver as he takes roles over how he likes (*me lubet*). He can also be a philosophical commentator impressing the spectator with his insights and knowledge of mankind and its imperfection. The *servus callidus'* concept relies on the paradoxical composition of deliberate and controlled absurdity or 'folly with method', which allows the clever slave to be a temporary *servus ludens*. In his role as a *servus ludens*, Plautus' figure juggles with predictability and surprise, obscurity and revelation, completion and incompleteness, riddle and solution, and continuity and disruption. The mask of the foolish figure offers revelation as Epidicus exposes the weakness and financial ruin of men.

Visualizing human inferiority and failure is the result of a fool figure's activity regardless if it is the natural or the professional type. The striking difference appears in their domination and determination of how they become a fool figure since full control of the situation make the professional type distinct whereas the genuinely foolish figure acts without intention and is an unwilling target of laughter. The *servus ludens'* concept, which includes the strategy of coding, playing the fool, and playfully revealing the foolish nature in others, supports comedy's schema, its aim, laughter, and its feature of being a mirror of life.[778] (Plautus') comedy is "far from reproducing the miscellaneous sequence of real life" but sheds a comic light on common, stereotypical aspects of human nature, which the clever slave helps to make visible when he wears the ugly mask but achieves to impose it on the other through the back-door of laughter and his playful attitude.[779]

The element of play—regardless if play is related to drama, actors, rules, or commonly, toys and games—enables the player and spectator to plunge in new worlds offering impulses for their senses as playing means worldmaking. While the player can actively influence and perceive the emerging realm, the spectator passively takes part in the experience. Worlds of play, realms of utopia, allure the active and passive participants by light-heartedness and a distance from reality, while they image the real world. They are coherent in themselves but of course, restricted by the apparatus of the game's rules and physical limits in addition to specific socio-cultural conventions and morals that are sacrosanct. A policy of violating and

---

776 Cf. Fraenkel (1922), 23-58, esp. 36. "Der für plautinische Phantasie so bezeichende Verwandlungsgedanke" (36); and cf. Willcock (1987), 18 and 97. Willcock categorizes jokes in Pseudolus in four different groups. One of them is named "suggested change of identity" (18) containing Pseudolus' ridiculing verses 23-4 towards Calidorus, bringing the letters to life.

777 Cf. Maurach (1988), 88. Maurach judges the value of this pun as undemanding. I do not share the distinction of 'stupid laughter' ("*dümmsten Lacher*") and 'witty laughter' but agree that people do not all laugh at one and the same joke together, but show different tastes when it comes to jests.

778 It is not suggested, as it was believed centuries ago, that the genre has the mandate to correct the manners of the audience, which was used to justify comedy's negative example. Therefore, Plautus' comedies and the *servi callidi* as a major part in it do not simply fulfil a pedagogical mandate.

779 Salingar (1974), 2.

eliminating this part of social contract would not be accepted. Within these limitations, the game's world exists as a system within reality.

Playing is revealed as a human drive, which surpasses necessity and logic. It unfolds the full potential of imagination and creativity, encouraging cultural development, and stimulating the genesis of something 'new' as a poet plays with the stock of motifs, metaphors, and sounds; or as a clever slave understands *ludus/ludere* in its kernel: the player plays (with) a play for the sake of playing.[780] The characteristics of play and playing is noticeable on all levels, macro, micro, extra- and innerdramatic. It is linked to ease, heading towards the absence of catastrophe, which deviates comedy's world from reality as a utopia, where a paragon of play(ing) can act all-licensed.[781]

Conclusively, the *servus callidus* fulfils the requirement of a professional fool since he shows the ability to amuse with nonsense when he becomes a *servus ludens* but as in contrast to the natural fool, he cannot be reduced to accidental folly or to genuine silliness. Instead, Plautus' figure establishes the oppositional scripts of foolish and wise throughout the play when he chooses to act at the boundaries of logic and meaning and negotiates between comedy's phantasma and the audience's world and their systems. The chosen terminology of *ludus/ludere* and coding describes this complexity of the figure and its ability to move within dimensions that question the empirically-oriented 'cause-consequence-thinking'.[782] Coding refers to his verbal labyrinth of wise and absurd or wit and comic. *Ludus/ludere* and coding, both help to identify the professionality and skills of how the figure provides moments of *ridiculum*.

The playfulness of the *servus callidus* as a *servus ludens* is utilitarian for laughter and thus, amusement, and as a dramatic technique, for the comic contextualisation of the scene, the figures, and the matter presented in it. It is not playing in a self-rewarding sense.[783] Laughter generates more laughter as he is active in the drive of comic creation as a profoundly witty jester in the system of playing. The paradoxical pair of wisdom and folly realized in a single figure indicates a major reason for its productivity, making him flexible and applicable for drama in every century.

Résumé: The servus callidus, a prototypical professional fool

Palaestrio, Epidicus, Chrysalus, Pseudolus, and Tranio—their names stand for figures of cunning and wit. Their functions and their aesthetically effective construction have been examined in detail in the last five chapters. The sympathetic protagonists occupy the position of the ally for the young generation seeking for help to resolve their catastrophic situation. Usually, comedy's resolution is grounded in money and bargain; the clever slave is responsible

---

780 On the significance of play for human beings, see Johan Huizinga, *Das Spielelement der Kultur. Spieltheorien nach Johan Huizinga von Georges Bataille, Roger Caillois, Eric Voegelin*, Markus Knut Ebeling et al. (eds.), introduced by Markus Knut Ebeling, Berlin: Matthes & Seitz, 2014, 46-50.

781 In Greek antiquity, the scripts of social events and festivity included the categories of play and nonsense positively connoted. "Nonsense as language or activity cut off from and bearing no relationship to reality—when viewed in a positive light—is very similar to the category of 'play' (*paidia*)". The context of play sheds a positive light on nonsense in contrast to the context of mental illnesses and to the perspective of a doctor (Kidd [2014], 19).

782 Cf. Stefan Horlacher, 'Nonsense', *HWRh* VI (2003) 301–307. "*Er stellt an der Empirie ausgerichtetes 'Ursache-Folge-Denken' in Frage*" (301).

783 For Koestler, the activity of playing shows a "self-arousing and self-rewarding nature […], characteristic of the exploratory drive" (Koestler [1964], 510).

for the politics of love and money. In intrigue comedies, lovesickness longs for remedy, causing *turbae*. The spectator does not watch the performance of an amatory relationship and lovers' private moments when they confess their devotion to each other but a clever slave and his scheme. *Palliata* is not yet the Italian romance or the romantic comedy of later periods when the Plautine package of desire and bargain slowly turned into the increasingly differentiated presentation of love: falling in love, private dialogues between the lovers, their oaths, courtship, and marriage.[784] As long as a socio-economic access to love rules the stage, the clever slave's services are needed. Therefore, he does not negotiate between the beloved girl and his young master but acts as a merchant, who deals with those that prohibit the lovers' union. He also mediates between the young and old generation; he often keeps the young master informed of the progress of intrigue, satisfies his longing for a cure, and faces the master's rage. Having replaced the desperate master, he can become the scapegoat hit by the rage of a *senex iratus* at the end. Typically, his altruistic and sympathetic mode protects him; usually, the young master pleads for mercy on behalf of the slave. He always gets himself out of danger by remaining off-stage after his detection or by talking himself out of it.

His repertoire within the course of intrigue contains spontaneous scheming, performing other personae, inventing stories, manipulating other figures by paradoxical behaviour, recruiting helpers, instructing and leading them, whereby he strikes his opponents. The figure produces nets of nodus, when he sets his trap for his adversaries and causes *turbae* for his surroundings. As a protagonist and intriguer, he does not simply dominate the main part of the discourse but Plautus presents a figure that is interwoven with the play's structure. He is seen as responsible for the catastrophic situation he must then resolve. The exposition presents a slave bearing a bad influence on the young master, seducing him to a luxurious life-style or at least, not keeping him from behaving against his father's wishes, helping him in getting girls, and joining him at feasts sponsored by the father's wealth. The audience often watches how the old and young reconcile because of the figure's victimization and his brilliant plans.

Until having restored harmony again, the figure remains responsible and influential for the course of action. He is often aware of his duty and his function as a trickster, demanding to be an actor and inventor, who changes to a poet in the theatrical context. This consciousness is an essential condition for his aesthetic contribution to comedy's coherence and the recognition of its schema. He creates amazing developments, expresses the impossibility of finding solutions, and addresses unexpected but fortunate changes happening just at the right time, whereby he underlines comedy's utopia. The type knows how to perform extravagant soliloquies or sharp asides exposing figures and himself to *ridiculum*. During the intrigue, the clever slaves inhabit and control the Saturnalian stage, inverting the social hierarchy at least temporarily while challenging their masters or another opponent. They guide the audience through their labyrinth of deception, commenting on the stage action e.g. when they creatively illuminate the deception as illusion. Their knowledge of theatrical operations and self-awareness of their figure make them excellent role players, determiners of stage action when they dominate movement and speaking of other figures by their imperative mode and tricolon of *impero, iubeo*, and *volo*. Despite their inversion of hierarchy, the violation of convention, and fooling their master, they are not punished, acting all-licensed as a true upside-down figure. The upside-down characteristic echoes in his tricks and verbal

---

784 Cf. Miola (2018), esp. 44. The role of the *meretrix* is much more prominent in Plautus' world than it can be the case for Shakespeare's romantic comedies transferring attention from prostitution to the female and male perspective on marriage and partially, adultery.

experiments. The most prominent instrument to do so has been identified as miscommunication.

The clever slave's miscommunication neglects Grice's categories of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner, infringing their maxims for his needs. He flouts the maxims of quantity, when he exaggerates and enjoys to describe something at length by redundant information. Often, the clever slave's excess of information is only introduced to support an opposing script and thus, for comic reasons. Similarly, it is true when it comes to the infringement of the other maxims as his miscommunication is deeply embedded within his duty of producing moments of *ridiculum* and deceiving. The clever slave as an intriguer must be freed from sticking to the maxims otherwise he could not construct his net of lies and manipulation. When Tranio comes up with the story of the haunted house, which violates the supermaxim of Quality as it is not at all true, Theopropides believes the clever slave's story. Neglecting false quality of his utterances allows the clever slave an advantage and domination in conversation as well as the all-license for creativity: exaggerated and imagined constructs do not rely on evidence; nor are they thought to be true.

Hence, when the clever slave miscommunicates, he does not engage in an effective exchange but intrudes comments into the dialogue. He does not address the needs of the dialogue partner but is ambitious to post his humorous texts to the other figures and most of all, the audience. He comments on the play, the situation, and the specific issue like a joke teller. The clever slave is trained in interpreting what is happening on stage to form moments of *ridiculum* in his habit of a *servus ludens* without the restrictions of the CP and the categories. Briefly, the trickster turns into a comedian with a fool's habit, acting or speaking nonsense.

Not being cooperative and flouting maxims not only allows the clever slave to produce myriad moments of *ridiculum* about stereotypical human traits issued in comedy and its figures but also to show himself powerful and in charge of conversation, where he is able to manipulate his dialogue partner and surpass him despite his social inferiority. The agonistic attitude is traceable in the slave's skilful management of confabulation. Some of these tactical sequences contain compositions of sense and nonsense, constructed by the clever slave's coding, which delays the process of comprehension and presents his dialogue partner structures of sense as vessels of nonsense or seemingly silly remarks hiding comments wittily. Conclusively, miscommunication nourishes agon, while both foster the laughable.

His strategic use of language and communication is reminiscent of an orator's method, who hits his opponent sharply and instantly by appreciating the instrument of humour similarly. Rhetoric distinguishes between short arrangements of wit, *dicacitas*, and continuity or a lengthy form of humour spread through the text's structure, *cavillatio*.[785] In his myriad comments, the professional fool is very fond of applying both kinds. The tendency to speak what he thinks is a characteristic the fool seems to share with the wise and eloquent man. Both can hardly be silent as Cicero acknowledges when he states that

> *flammam a sapienti facilius ore in ardente opprimi, quam bona dicta teneat; haec scilicet bona dicta quae salsa sint; quam ea dicta appellantur proprio iam nomine.*[786]

---

785 See Cic. *de orat.* 2.218 and 1.17. See Fantham (2004), 187-88; and *Ibid.*, 189, ft. 9: "The division between witty remarks and humorous narrative seems to be formalized by the time of Quintilian, who tells us in his own discussion of humour (6.3.41) that his teacher Domitius Afer left behind both humorous narrations and a book of his own witty *dicta*."

786 Cic. *de orat.* 2.222. It was said that the quote stemmed from Ennius.

The professional fool in comedy lacks the same ability to keep his clever verbal dance to himself while he is not as restricted as the orator by formality, the expectation of sound judgement, and his dignity.

The *servus callidus*' programme 'sense plus nonsense' turns discourse into an intermingling of comments, reflections on the meaning underlying the main action, and entertainment relying on comic presentation. The essence of all his proverbial, commentary material could be comprehended as a poet's marginalia pinpointing the relevance and meaning of one scene, one type or one action without any resemblance to a stiff and earnest moralist the clever slave is not at all eager to appear. In fact, the *servus callidus*' wit and ambition to create *ridiculum* allow him to stretch and combine the categories of sense and nonsense or reality and *fabula* deliberately and *para prosdokian*. The clever slave is folly, wit, and wisdom in the context of comedy. When he digresses from congruity and is interested in supplying *ridiculum*, his verbal operations produce oppositions of scripts or clusters of scripts on the abstract level.

As it has been shown, Raskin classified three general abstract types of oppositions that can occur between scripts: "actual vs. non-actual, normal vs. abnormal, and possible vs. impossible".[787] These types have all been traced in the concept of the *servus callidus* in the last five chapters, starting with the non-actual image of a hero created by the mock heroic technique. Here, the opposition of low vs. high or inferior vs. superior is realized in the heroic anti-hero and his identities of the military leader or epic figures contrasting the slave.[788] In the second chapter, the abnormal quality of being all-licensed oscillates in the composition of life vs. death that is thematised in constant threats of punishment and the grant of freedom. Thirdly, the cluster of scripts concerning agon are determined by the opposition of possible vs. impossible and normal vs. abnormal and again highlight the essential contradictory pair of high vs. low or inferior vs. superior in comparison to the clever slave designing himself more as a leader and not as a serving figure. On the concrete level, the spectator recognizes the intrigue in the form of a competition, wherein fraud and deception turn into objects of bets and the slave dominates the master. The issue of manipulation and dominance becomes even more enhanced in clever slave's identity of the poet and creator of *fabula* when illusions or the non-actual stand in confrontation with the actual and more precisely, the acting and created figure hops between illuding as well as illuminating the illusion and changes to the creating craft that makes the others act. In the last chapter, the clever slave's interest in playing has been more thoroughly regarded when the possible meets the impossible, the actual contradicts the non-actual, and the normal faces the abnormal. On the lower level, the clever slave's behaviour can be identified as playfulness, constructing compounds of nonsense and sense when he indulges in playing the fool, which is realized in various cluster oppositions as visibility vs. non-visibility.

In sum, all three general types of script opposition on the abstract level span over the whole presence of the professional fool figure in the play texts and yield the figure with the potential of placing moments of *ridiculum*. Each *servus callidus* is constructed out of binary oppositional scripts, whose web results in the concept of the fool figure, while the prominence and proportion of the clusters in one play can differ. Chrysalus offers more material for the clusters of the heroic anti-hero than does Tranio, whereas Pseudolus excels at being a *poeta* emphasizing the net of illusions. If all the findings are taken together as the concept of Plautus'

---

787 Raskin (1985), 107-110 and 113-14.
788 Although Raskin's essential pair of low vs. high only refers to physical features and stature, it here includes social ranking. See *Ibid.*, 113-14, 127.

servus callidus, these oppositions and incongruences meet in a figure who is organized in the paradox pattern. It visualizes a contradictory and incongruent relation as foundation for the figure's functionality. It is the pattern that repeats itself in the single constituents or clusters that have been discussed as carriers of the *servus callidus*' concept. In other words, the choice of themes the clever slave is depicted by can be defined as the cultural-specific clusters of scripts realizing the Comic in the Hellenistic-Roman period.

By the concept, the fool figure fits comedy's schema since its structure images comedy's essential elements. The often occurring opposition of high vs. low in the themes of agon, the heroic slave, and the authorial voice from a slave stresses the principle of the carnivalesque, while the clever slave's fondness for playing with the impossible, non-actual, and abnormal emphasizes the utopian character and simultaneously, bears an enormous potential for moments of *ridiculum*. In comparison to former types of comedy, he thereby proves features of an *eiron*, meandering knowingly between the incompatible scripts; with a certain self-irony, he abuses the imposture of an *alazon* and follows the *bomolochos* in contributing inorganic material and entertaining for the sake of the laughable unlike the parasite's ambition to achieve an invitation to dinner. In contrast to the natural subtypes, he remains in control of the situation and deliberately applies his skills for *ludi* and *turbae*.

All along, Plautus' deliberate fool figure promotes comedy's utopian nature and its species of the ugly, when he produces moments of *ridiculum*, constructs and deconstructs spaces of expectation. His contradictory turns stand in close connection with the increase of suspense, the modus of *ludens*, the fiction of an authorial voice, and the element of improvisation. The *poeta* as well as *architectus* build fantastic realms filled with hyperboles and foster nesting of several levels of imitation on the theatrical stage, wherein the figure acts as a guidance negotiating foci for and to the audience and facilitating the recognition of the installed frames and incongruities by his monologues, asides, and other subjective contributions. In comedy's (self-) ironic perspective, the Plautine figure describes himself, the others, and their world with a witty tongue, deploying themes of mock-heroic, agonal spirit, and a poet's fabrication, shifting between the figure, the actor, and the playwright. He confirms the carnivalesque since he thematises human weakness in controlling physical needs; he expresses the conflict of body and mind in a comic tone. Inversion and opposition mean upending the play's world. Usually, the professional fool figure belongs to the lowest rank, accompanied by its stereotypical characteristics. In drama, the lower-class member can advance to the most clever persona, which is only possible by the application of utmost creativity to produce a complex net of identities. His agonistic attitude towards the empowered figures and his dialectic structure mark him as the primary supporter of the carnivalesque.

His competition with the masters and the disregard of class restrictions can emerge in a world that is without true fear. Punishing these unruly, threatened slaves is postponed after the play has finished when Saturnalian protection is not powerful any more. As long as the upside-down world exists, the clever slave can abuse it; only the acceptance of a temporary and festive exception allows the figure to pursue his game of foolery, which is needed to achieve final harmony. Order is restored by the figure's manipulations and wonderful incidents. The slave as an all-licensed player follows and constructs this path. The termed all-license expresses and thereby, reconfirms the utopian quality. For Bakhtin, "*[n]ur in einer Welt ohne Angst ist die schrankenlose Freiheit des Grotesken möglich*."[789] Comedy's utopia is a space, where a creative mind can play and change his face over and over again as long as it

---

789 Lachmann (ed.) (1995), 99.

remains harmless and does not affect the framework for laughter. The professional fool figure feels himself at home in this framework, where he is part of, is creative, and foregrounds the species of the ugly. The type's functionality means embodying and reflecting comedy's ugly for and to the audience. The deliberateness in offering that binary concept signifies him as being at a distance from his environment, where he has a bird's eye view and engage in the metacommunication of comedy's nature. For Plautus' intrigue comedy, the trickster figure realizes the plot of deception, while he makes use of and validates comedy's three principles. In accordance with his profession, the deliberate fool shows and confirms comedy's playfulness, while he incorporates and stabilizes its principles. Conclusively, comedy knows a type that is founded upon opposition, inversion, and incongruity as much as itself, which allows to speak of this type as a sign of comedy.

A Roman variant of that sign, the popular, available figure of the clever slave, is embedded in the cultural identity of laughter at the synchronic cross-section of Plautine time, while its functionality, the inherent potential for metamorphosis, the applicability of the *paradox* secures the diachronic productivity of the pattern and its comic configuration, the deliberate fool figure, whose manifestations are supported by the natural drive of laughter. The analysis will investigate the productivity of the pattern and its type in Shakespeare's comedies, focusing on Plautus' clever slave as an available source.

IV.i-iv. From Plautus' clever slave to Shakespeare's architects and wise fools

IV.i. Tranio, Shakespeare's *servus callidus*

Tranio in *The Taming of the Shrew* comes closest to the Plautine type and can be seen as a step in the transformation from a *servus callidus* to a wise fool. That Shakespeare draws on Plautus is explicit in Lucentio's Tranio as the ally and proxy of the young master.[790] It is argued that Shakespeare recognized the functional value of the *servus callidus* as a trickster for intrigue comedy, its schema and comic pursuit beyond the reading of Gascoigne and beyond *Mostellaria*.[791] He emphasized the servant figure as Plautine in *The Taming of the Shrew* and made it more recognizable by naming it after *Mostellaria's servus callidus*. To prove this hypothesis, the analysis will elaborate the *servus callidus*-like characteristics Tranio shows based on the discussion of Plautus' type in previous chapters. The considerations will include the essential differences to Gascoigne's *Supposes* and his Dulipo.

Lucentio's Tranio is comparable to Plautus' professional deceivers dedicated to the comic category of the ugly. Both comedies show their figures' low-class quality and comedy's *carnivalesque* since they promote or at least support the comic trinity: love, drink, food. It is *Mostellaria*'s Tranio, who confirms: *lubet potare, amare, scorta ducere* (*Most*. 36). Particularly, the first scene in *Mostellaria* is rich in the accusations Grumio makes against Tranio as the seducer who has taught the young master this lifestyle: *virtute id factum tua et magisterio tuo* (*Most*. 33). The rough style of the first scene confirming the type of *servus callidus* alters to become Shakespeare's more modest and eloquent servant, who seems to support the studies of his master, but diverts him from his ambition in "institut[ing]/ A course of learning and ingenious studies" (*TS* 1.1.8-9) as he adverts pleasure over studies in the first scene.

> I am in all affected as yourself,
> Glad that you thus continue your resolve
> To suck the sweets of sweet philosophy.
> Only, good master, while we do admire
> This virtue and this moral discipline,
> Let's be no stoics nor no stocks, I pray,

---

790 For a seminal analysis of New Comedy's influence and especially Plautus' comedies on Shakespeare's *Shrew*, to which the following text will pay attention, see Miola (1994), 62ff. This chapter focuses on Tranio's Plautine qualities and adds an examination of Tranio's difference to Dulipo as well as other characters in the play that rely on paradoxical construction.

791 For early considerations on the similarities between *Mostellaria* and *The Shrew*, see Edwin W. Fay, 'Further Notes on the *Mostellaria* of Plautus', *AJPH* 24.3 (1903): 245-277, 245-248; Petrus Joannes Enk, 'Shakespeare's "small Latine"', *Neoph* 5 (1919-20): 359-65, 363ff.; Felix Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama 1558-1642*, Vol. I, New York: Russel & Russel, 1959 (1908), 457; later, William E. Harrold, 'Shakespeare's use of *Mostellaria* in *The Taming of the Shrew*', *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West* (1970): 188-194. On page 193, he presents a diagram for the parallels between *The Shrew* and *Mostellaria*, listing the following points: The servants' names Grumio and Tranio, servant-beating-servant motif, knocking at the door by the father, banquet, country-town distinction (also in *A Shrew* as are the following points), music girl, begging pardon from punishment, a prompter of vice, lover eavesdropping, drunken man who calls for drink while falling asleep, man who has a shrew for a wife (Simo, the neighbour in comparison to Sly), young men (wooers) who are friends. And parallels only between *Mostellaria* and *A Shrew*: Setting in Athens, Simo, Philematium. The whole list appears to be inflationary as some of his findings are too vague.

Or so devote to Aristotle's checks
As Ovid be an outcast quite abjured.
Balk logic with acquaintance that you have
And practise rhetoric in your common talk;
Music and poesy use to quicken you;
The mathematics and the metaphysics,
Fall to them as you find your stomach serves you.
No profit grows where is no pleasure ta'en:
In brief, sir, study what you most affect.
(*TS* 1.1.26-40)[792]

Tranio's "only" initiates his attempt to persuade his good master Lucentio not to invest all his energy in his studies and advises him to "study what [he] most affects."[793] The world of sweetness and affection dominates in Tranio's speech and is juxtaposed with 'dry and too strict' philosophy since the Plautine servant tries to convince Lucentio to seek sweeter affection in the manner of Ovid rather than in austere philosophy. Some playgoers certainly knew Ovid as the writer of *Ars Amatoria*, which associates him with eroticism and makes him a fitting candidate to turn up elsewhere in the play in order to underline the quest for amorous relationships.[794] Hence, Tranio encourages his master to leave aside the negatively coloured activity of studying and turn to love. He intensifies his argument by inserting a rather simple word play on 'stoics and stocks'.[795] Base matters and everyday life, elements of a comic stage, confront academia again when Tranio pushes Lucentio to practice quibbles and rhetoric in everyday conversation, separating them from academic discussions.[796] In other words, his young master should not only sit at the desk and sweat over books but seek life, joy, and sweetness.[797] And Tranio is proven right: Love and sensual experience become what Lucentio will be eager to achieve in the comic discourse. Tranio promotes the foundation of romantic comedy, which means giving in love's irrationality, whereby he prepares the coming scene of falling in love.

In *Supposes*, there is no similar introduction by a hedonist. It is Polynesta, who describes the gentleman's, Erostrato's, original intention to her nurse as he

that came from grownd of Sicilia to studie in this citie, and even at his first arrivall met me in the street, fel enamored of me, and of suche vehement force were the passions he suffred, that immediatly he cast aside both long gowne and bookes, and determined on me only to apply his study.
(*Supposes*, 1.1.112-18)[798]

---

793 In his production of 1976, William Ball enhanced the sexual allusions by a Tranio, who shapes "an hourglass figure that women were 'what you most affect'." William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, Elizabeth Schafer (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 102, it is referred to a televised revival of Ball's production (1973) on WNET-TV, US in 1976.
794 Also see *TS* 4.2.8.
795 Cf. William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, Harold J. Oliver (ed.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1982, 107. Aristotle exemplifies a stoic here; And *OED*, s.v. 'stock, n. I.i.c.'.
796 Balk logic means "chop logic", "quibble", "bandy words" (*OED*, s.v. 'balk, v. III.6.'.).
797 Also see *TS* 1.1.73 ("gaze your fill").

The sight of Polynesta enslaved Erostrato with no encouragement from Dulipo. In contrast to the Italian play, Shakespeare's opening scene of the play-within-the-play vividly expresses the servant's affirmation to exchange books with lover's devotion. Shakespeare expands Polynesta's statement to a performance of the Plautine promoter, who espouses a policy against earnest and dry studies and for exchanging stock rationality with love's and comedy's folly. In that sense, Tranio echoes the rude stichomythia between Grumio and Tranio, wherein the audience is told about Philolaches' 'seduction' by Tranio. In other comedies by Plautus such as *Pseudolus*, *Poenulus,* or *Epidicus*, the clever slave is fond of fulfilling physical needs and is a supporter and confidant of his young master's amorous longings. Thus, the scene's issue of turning from studies to feelings of desire relates directly to *Supposes*, whereas the involvement and presentation of Tranio is originally Plautine. Due to adaptation to the Elizabethan age and its style, Shakespeare's Tranio does not copy the same farcical and vulgar poetics of a slave who knows how to *pergraecari*. Of course, he appreciates Katherina's quibbling with and mocking of her sister's suitors (see *TS* 1.1.68-69 and esp. 69: "That wench is stark mad or wonderful froward.").[799] However, he does not stylize his motivation in an overly ribald tone since he is not in the same situation as his predecessor. He talks to his master and is not confronted with another servant's accusation. Thus, Shakespeare transforms the slave, who is inclined to wine, food, and women, to a servant, who expresses his disposition with more caution and with a more polished rhetoric as he is not a Greek slave but a servant in a comedy of the Renaissance.

This membership is apparent in the principle "no profit grows where is no pleasure taken". Here, Tranio takes the proverb "no pains, no profit", abuses it by replacing pain with its opposite, and reverses the sequence by making pleasure a precondition to profit.[800] Inverting profit and pleasure as well as substituting pain with its opposite for a laugh is a delightful instance of coding by Tranio. In art, this verbal fabrication that abuses the proverb for comic means is reminiscent of Horace's well-known adage that survived in Shakespeare's time, *Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci*.[801] Horace here writes about the winning strategy of a poet to fame, the combination of *iucunda et idonea* (Hor. *ars.* 334). In the line after Tranio's mixed proverb, the clever servant follows a common directive Horace adds one verse later, *esto brevis* (*ars*. 335), most obviously, when Tranio's "in brief" ends his 'useful' and sweetly arranged admonitions to Lucentio before they get too long and tiring. Due to Horace's mixture but in contrast to its original mediation of values, the addressee, Lucentio, is admonished delightfully, while the second addressee, the spectator, should take their pleasure, learning from counterexample. By alluding to Horatian ideas and prominent issues of literary theory, the saying displays a binary image of Tranio. The servant obviously encourages a more hedonistic life, while the Plautine poet alludes to comedy's twofold profile of *prodesse et delectare* if it is seen from metatheatre's standpoint. In a clever slave's manner,

---

799 Oliver (ed.) (1984), 109, froward as "extraordinarily perverse".

800 Morris P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. A Collection of the Proverbs Found in English Literature and the Dictionaries of the Period*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950, P 24.

801 Cf. Oliver (ed.) (1984), 107, note 39; and cf. Ekbert Faas, *Shakespeare's Poetics*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986, 43; the sentence continues *lectorem delectando pariterque monendo* (Hor. *ars.* 344), again presenting the two-fold balance of delight and didactic impulse (also see Hor. *ars.* 333ff.). In the play, there is no explicit introduction or mentioning of Horace's poetics. Still, the Roman poet's theory was present in the Renaissance and in the minds of English playwrights. Other Shakespearean plays also offer considerations on the balance between profit and delight as Hamlet comments on drama's poetics (see *Ham.* 3.2.). See Faas (1986), esp. 33ff. Ekbert Faas is concerned with the closeness and difference of Hamlet's view in comparison to similar comments in Shakespeare's plays.

Tranio plays with proverbial form, interprets Horace's words to his own purposes and his prior lines arguing for pleasure, and enriches the encouraging speech to Lucentio with metatheatrical hints.

The clever servant's long speech at the beginning of the play reads as confirming that the coming performance is a 'sweet' romantic comedy. He discloses himself as sitting at the interface of New Comedic tradition and Renaissance adaptation since ranking affection, pleasure, and Lucentio's own wishes above studying, strict morals, and devotion to his father's order marks Tranio as rooted in Plautus, while the manner in which he speaks of love belongs to Italian romance. Instead of a vulgar tone, Tranio structures his speech thoughtfully, when he smoothly transfers from Lucentio's considerations to his intention, embellishes it with a proverbial piece of advice and an imperative to sum everything up ("in brief"). He constitutes a knowing and clever figure imitating that type, whose name he carries, by eloquence and by his Hellenistic-Roman background he relates to. Naming Aristotle and Ovid, alluding to Horace, and his prescriptive foreshadowing leave no doubt about Tranio's knowledge and insight a *servus callidus* can rely on. In this first scene, Tranio convinces by the 'profitability' or functionality of his delightful lines for romantic comedy's plot. Plautus' Tranio becomes Shakespeare's Italian servant, an intersection between the *servus callidus*' function promoting the comic and amorous lifestyle and a more sophisticated image of love, which lays the foundation for the comic discourse and the potential for *turbae* and *errores*, a change that will keep its relevance for the transformation to the wise fool.[802]

After Lucentio has fallen in love with Bianca, he contracts the disease of lover's folly captures him. In Ariosto, Gascoigne, and Shakespeare, love's power to drive people mad is reminiscent of Terence's *Eunuchus* and Chaerea's bypassing of rules. Terence's play confirms the tradition of depicting love's *furor* and its mighty manipulation of reason and mood, which is found across New Comedy's plays and non-dramatic genres.[803] In Plautus' intrigue comedies and *The Taming of the Shrew*, the lover needs a cure for lovers' folly. Only Tranio can bring the remedy as he "marked […] what's the pith of all […] [and can] stir [Lucentio] from his trance" since Tranio noticed Lucentio's longing for Bianca and the tricky situation the clever servant will use to make the lovers happy. Similarly, in *Mostellaria*, Tranio identifies himself as the provider of remedy: *Habe bonum animum: ego istum lepide medicabo metum* (*Most.* 387). As *Mostellaria's* protagonist easing the lover's despair, the *servus callidus* is often seen as rescuing Mnesilochus and his friend in *Bacchides*, the lover's mistress in *Miles gloriosus* or Calidorus in *Pseudolus*. In *Supposes*, Dulipo is identified by Erostrato and also identifies himself as the bringer of medicine.[804]

Due to the image of an illness, the lovesick young master desires some relief from his servant or slave. Gascoigne's Erostrato expresses his despair in a soliloquy to the audience and then to his servant, who answers with a stereotypical consolation.[805] Shakespeare depicts the same themes but intensifies the stereotypical dependence and concomitantly, the roles of the clever servant and his lovesick master as he has them developed and performed, which

---

802 Comic access to the love theme can be found in other genres: Roman love elegy and well-known representors, for instance Catullus, Ovid, and Propertius, come to mind when the love theme is wittily treated in oppositions of drastic images as death given in a mistress' corpse and a comic and even parodic tone. This is also valid for elements of the love theme as *remedium amoris* comedy and love elegy both address from different angles. On Propertius, see Alison Keith, 'Propertius', *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Thea S. Thorsen (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 97-113, esp. 107 and 111.
803 Cf. Miola (1994), 70.
804 See *Supposes*, 1.3.72-74 (the young lover's soliloquy) and 2.1.82-85 (Dulipo's assurance).
805 See *Supposes*, 1.3. (soliloquy) and 2.1.80-88.

recommends a direct use of Plautus again. Embedded in the first scene between Lucentio's falling in love and Tranio's part in inventing a strategy to win Bianca, Lucentio desperately calls the clever servant for help and determines the status of the ally for Tranio:

Tranio, I burn, I pine; I perish, *Tranio,*
[…]
Counsel me, *Tranio*, for I know thou canst;
Assist me, *Tranio*, for I know thou wilt.
(*TS* 1.1.154-57; italics are mine)

Shakespeare emphasizes Lucentio's distressed call for Tranio, when Lucentio cries out for Tranio four times in four lines. It is as if the name is a telling name denoting the type, his ability and his will to act as an ally and the provider of remedy. Consequently, Lucentio's affirmative lines foreshadow and illuminate the type of Tranio and his function to surrender any impediment he as a lover might face.[806] Such verses remind us of Calidorus's lament in *Pseudolus* or Philolaches' verses in *Mostellaria*, which show a similar despair and foreground the wretched situation and a longing for Tranio's counsel.

quid ego agam? pater iam hic me offendet **miserum**
adveniens ebrium,
[…] **miserum** *est opus*
[…]
sicut ego […] quaero quid faciam **miser.**
(*Most.* 378-81)[807]

In Plautus' comedy, Philolaches' direct and indirect questions (*quid ego agam* and *quaero quid faciam*) leave the decision what to do next to the clever slave. Designing the despair of Philolaches in the repetition of *miser* equates the emotional tricolon of Lucentio's 'I burn, I pine, I perish'. Lucentio's call for help underlines Tranio's instrumental use as a cure for the lover's folly, for his own happiness, and comedy's happy ending. The functions of the pair, the master and the slave/servant, are clearly distributed in accordance with New Comedy's traditional plot: the clever servant or slave takes the active part, which involves getting his hands dirty, whereas the lover in his sickness is not really helpful and takes a passive role in the strategic game for the happy ending.[808] Corresponding to his function, Tranio does not act as the moral guide or teacher since "it is no time to chide [him] now" (*TS* 1.1.158). Instead, he has the right counsel at hand, which eases Lucentio's pain as his master acknowledges with the lines: "Go forward, this contents;/ The rest will comfort, for thy counsel's sound." (*TS* 1.1.162-63).[809]

In both comedies, Shakespeare's play and Plautus' intrigue comedies, the lovers' union is dependent on the clever servant, his rank, and skills. Once Lucentio and Tranio have exchanged identities, Lucentio plays a minor role in the ongoing deception as he leaves the scheme to Tranio. To do so, Tranio demonstrates the talents incorporated by the epithet *callidus* as he seems a paragon of wit in the subplot as Petruccio does in the main plot. In

---

806 For instance, the main obstacle Tranio surrenders alone for the sake of his master: Baptista demands the assurance of Lucentio's father that his daughter will get her dower in case of Lucentio's death (see *TS* 3.1.395-400).
807 Bold letters are mine.
808 Note Lucentio's vocabulary resembling that of the elegic lover and its classical roots in 1.1.218-19 ("And let me be a slave to achieve that maid/ Whose sudden sight hath thralled my wounded eye.").
809 For commentary, see Oliver (ed.) (1984), 114.

Gascoigne's play, Dulipo and Erostrato's long dialogue does not image such an explicit Plautine contribution and identification of roles, by which the servant becomes the deceiver, but remains in a retrospective angle not presenting an active Dulipo.

In *The Shrew's* 'present', the servant can resolve the tricky situation. Lucentio himself introduces him as his "trusty servant, well approved in all" (*TS* 1.1.7), confirming the audience's associations they certainly had when they heard the name Tranio and thought of Plautus' clever slave. They could believe in Tranio's talents to solve all problems that come up but not without his involvement in and the production of comic entanglements. Lucentio's introduction of his servant in the first lines of the play-within-the-play seems to be a promise for entertainment of Plautine manner to come, drawing the figure 'Tranio' on the basis of a literary-historic construction that is only made explicit in the metonymic reference to Plautus in the name 'Tranio' and the accompanying description of his characteristics. Performing one of New Comedy's classics, the change of identities, is left to the clever servant Tranio for the most part. He succeeds in convincing other figures that he is Lucentio, while dominating conversation and sometimes ornamenting his speeches with classical references (e.g. *TS* 1.2.241ff.). He creates the illusion of being a master, which other servant figures as Biondello and Grumio could not.

Like Plautus' clever slave, Tranio is conscious of his status and ability to stand in for his young master and pursue his mission. At the end of *The Shrew*, Tranio evaluates his function in retrospect with the following words, "Lucentio slipped me like his greyhound,/ which runs himself and catches for his master." (*TS* 5.2.53-54). The perspicacity of the type becomes apparent in such phrases of self-reflection and recognition as Tranio shows in this comment on his position in the intrigue subplot. This *fabula*-similar image reminds us of the *servus callidus'* metaphors like *Mostellaria's* Tranio becoming a crow or *cornix* (834). Palaestrio's simile is especially worth noting here as he describes his activity as: *ibo odorans quasi canis venaticus* (*Mil.* 269). Did Shakespeare think here not only of the *servus callidus* Tranio but also of Palaestrio in *Miles gloriosus*? This cannot be proven but in regard to the sum of allusions to characteristics of the Plautine type and usual identities, the similarity should not be denied. Like that of his predecessors, Tranio's success is grounded in the ability to achieve an advantageous position which he abuses to manipulate other figures as he does with Hortensio. Still, Shakespeare's Tranio is not as talkative and self-reflective about his victories; he does not brag about them with the same intensity as Chrysalus boasts about his military genius.

A self-praising Tranio comments on his first step towards victory over Gremio: "A vengeance on your crafty withered hide!/ Yet I have faced it with a card of ten." (*TS* 2.1.407-8).[810] However, one waits in vain for verses corresponding to Chrysalus' Trojan song or a mock-heroic sequence of such a high class. There is only one allusion to that kind of mésalliance, which might be rejected as incidental and does not stem from the servant himself. During Lucentio's 'lessons' with Bianca, the lover cites a passage from Ovid quite freely and translates each piece with a part of Lucentio and Tranio's plan, which reveals the identity of the fake Lucentio. Tranio then becomes Priamus: "*Priami,* is my man Tranio" (*TS* 3.1.34-35).[811] The Latin phrases are interrupted by Lucentio's message given in bits and seem to be randomly distributed among the English words. However, the sentence about Tranio in the middle of

---

810 Cf. Miola (1994), 66-67. Miola does not name and examine *Heroides'* passage.
811 The Latin of the verses might be intentionally or accidentally bad as Shakespeare wanted to give Lucentio a false version to jest with his position of a teacher, or just cited the passage from memory (cf. Oliver [ed.] [1984], 158, note 28-29).

Lucentio's English lines offers a coherent meaning presenting Tranio as the wise Trojan king. It is beyond far-fetched to assume that the passage relies on Chrysalus' or Pseudolus' mythological hyperboles. It is beyond doubt that Shakespeare gave Lucentio lines taken from Ovid's *Heroides* (l. 33-4). He preferred Ovid's *Heroides* to *Ars Amatoria*, probably because of the woman speaking this passage. Penelope, "the model of the faithful and virtuous wife", matches the young lover's addressee, Bianca.[812] Besides this primary function, while constructing the passage with its interruptions and mostly, accidental links between Latin and English phrases, Shakespeare might have had in mind the mock heroic practices and chosen to give Tranio the epithets 'heroic' and 'wise' to enrich the passage with a joke or comic homage to Plautine techniques.[813] Additionally, the promotion from servant to master to an ancient king points at an exaggerated change of identities and "also parallels Sly's temporary metamorphosis into a lord."[814] Besides analogies with the induction, Jonathan Bate argues that

> the chief effect of this device is to take the Latin text out of the schoolroom and make it a means to the fulfilment of desire. Lucentio is following Tranio's advice and using his learning to pursue what he most affects.[815]

Tranio's ascription of a heroic identity stemming from Ovid's text matches the servant's own foregrounding of the authority in love's sweetness. If the line's purpose also lies in the emphasis on his carnivalesque feature remains a probable but open speculation. Throughout the play, a significant use of mythological hyperboles cannot be detected and even seems out of place since the *servus callidus*' identity of a mock-heroic military leader conquering and defeating a master or procurer does not fit the more elegantly orchestrated role of the suitor. Being a wooer invites the themes of trading (see *TS* 2.1.308ff.) and gambling (see *TS* 2.1.402-408) here. However, passages where Tranio exhibits his confidence that he will be victorious are scattered throughout the play (e.g. see *TS* 3.2.142-47).

There are four possible reasons for this moderation. First, the theme 'military' might not have been as appealing to Shakespeare or to Elizabethan playgoers as it was for Plautus and Roman society, who had seen two Punic wars. The second reason arises from pragmatic considerations since Lucentio and Bianca's plot remains subsidiary to the main plot, which leaves little space for a servant's mock-heroic soliloquies. Thirdly, the Italian servant intends to assume the role of his noble master, which bears a carnivalesque quality; Shakespeare was probably not interested to increase it. Finally, the identity of the noble master and the Italian element of romance does not open up a suitable framework for excessive bragging and mock-heroic songs. Plautus' mock-heroic belonging to the carnivalesque principle is one possible realisation of the juxtaposition of high and low, in which the deliberate fool engages. In Shakespeare's comedy, changing identities and the resulting moments of oppositions serve the upside-down world, where Tranio leads and prompts its perception in decisive proportions.

In comparison to the other clever slave's temper and working with metatheatricality, Tranio as the noble fake master seems less dominant than Pseudolus, the poet, since he does not reflect and illuminate the action on stage with such clearity. But he remains calmer and more confident than *Mostellaria's* slave since he does not have any panic attacks his Plautine

---

812 Miola (1994), 73.
813 The Arden edition edited by Barbara Hodgdon also acknowledges the possible allusion to the disruption of social roles by translating Tranio with Priamus, see Hodgdon (ed.) (2010), 221.
814 Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 127.
815 *Ibid.*, 127.

namesake sometimes does. Nevertheless, the confidence and the emphasis on particular themes varies among Plautus' *servus callidus* and does not negate Tranio's rootedness in the *servus callidus*. The analogies between the clever slave and Tranio should not be sought in mere copying themes but in aesthetic and functional symmetries. In fact, they share their main profession, deception, when it comes to their role in the plot.[816] This stereotypical feature given by Plautus' known figure enhanced the expressiveness and effect of the Shakespearean Tranio on the audience, without requiring the playwright to characterize the servant at any length. His Plautine figure probably already earned the audience's sympathy as soon as they recognized his name. The spectator could expect a net of deceit and illusion.

The greyhound running and catching for his master describes Tranio's constructions of deception. In that function for the major part of the plot, Plautus and Shakespeare's clever figures provide strings of manipulation and take a role as a tale teller and seller. The intrigues in Plautus' comedies consequently display the clever slave as schemer, instructor, and (agonistic) deceiver. These roles demand three different acts from the clever slave if his trickery is to succeed. First, he must adapt to the situation in order to formulate a scheme. Plautus often colours this as spontaneous, improvisatory scheming of a clever slave, who must do the impossible. Secondly, he instructs those he needs to fulfil his plan, which includes commanding other figures, assigning roles and directing them off and on stage. Thirdly, he realizes the scheme and constructs an illusion for his opponents. Shakespeare includes all three phases in the subplot 'Lucentio and Bianca': scheming, instructing, and deceiving.

The first phase, Tranio's plotting as a *servus callidus*, is displayed twice in *The Shrew*. After Lucentio has fallen into a lover's trance, his servant, who "stir[s] him from his trance" (*TS* 1.1.176), guides Lucentio to the decision that they change roles. Tranio informs Lucentio about how it stands and knows that his young master must "bend thoughts and wits to achieve her" (*TS* 1.1.178). After Tranio's summary for Lucentio and the spectator about Bianca's dependence on her sister, he affirms "[...]-'tis plotted" (*TS* 1.1.187) only some lines later. Lucentio also seems to have invented a plan when he confirms to have an idea. Tranio prophetically asserts that "[b]oth [their] inventions meet and jump in one" (*TS* 1.1.189).[817] He seems to have read Lucentio's mind. However, it is not Lucentio, who then takes the leading role but he asks Tranio to tell his plan first. Tranio outlining his tricking gives the young lover a role, the schoolmaster, in the deception ("That's your device.", *TS* 1.1.192), which Lucentio accepts:

> LUC. It is. May it be done?
> TRA. Not possible: for who shall bear your part
> And be in Padua here Vincentio's son,
> Keep house and ply his book, welcome his friends,
> Visit his countrymen and banquet them?
> LUC. *Basta*, content thee, for I have it full.
> [...]
> Thou shalt be master, Tranio, in my stead,
> Keep house and port and servants as I should;
> (*TS* 1.1.192-202)

---

816 Underlining deception, see 4.4.82 ("deceiving father of a deceitful son") Biondello talks about Tranio and his invented father.
817 Oliver (ed.) (1984), 115, note 187: "Tranio is virtually quoting the proverb 'Good wits jump (Tilley W578). 'Jump' means 'agree', 'come together' [....]." Compare to *Twelfth Night*, 5.1.243-4.

The following question of Lucentio—may it be done?—gives the impression that the young master did not actually contrive a plan or at least a good one but relies on his servant's cunning. His doubt about the success of the plan underlines his own insecurity.

Supposes does not offer any experience of scheming that remedy to the audience as it starts two years after Erostrato and Dulipo's exchange of roles, which discards almost every emphasis on how the device was planned and who came up with the idea.[818] Only one hint given in the adverb 'again' tells the audience that Dulipo, the servant, must have made the suggestion to exchange identities: "my servant promised me yesterday to devise yet againe some newe conspiracie to drive Maister Doctor out of conceite" (*Supp.* 1.3.127-30). Shakespeare takes the element of inversion for the plot from *Supposes* but presents the Plautine figure Tranio in his disposition: coming up with a plan to deceive.

Nevertheless, Tranio, who plotted so cleverly seconds earlier, now negates the feasibility of his own plan since his master's place will be vacant. He exaggerates the impossibility by naming all the activities Lucentio is normally expected to do. His list makes it obvious that he did too much thinking about it and presumably knows the answer to his quasi rhetorical question but wants Lucentio to suggest it. From the servant's perspective, it seems more appropriate for the servant-master relationship to give the command to change roles to Lucentio. Whenever the master instructs his servant about being a master and wooer (see *TS* 1.1.197-206 and 243-46), Tranio's position as a cunning slave is not negated but proposes Shakespeare's direct use of Plautus' comedy *Captivi*. These lines call attention to the decision of inverting roles in the play since Shakespeare here relies on a passage in *Captivi*, where Philocrates illustrates the plan of trading identities and directs Tyndarus.[819] The conversation's content comprises instruction and the expression of worries and faith. Tyndarus' lines like *ero ut me voles esse* (228) or *pro tuo caro capite carum offere me meum caput* (229-30) shows the same devotion as Tranio, who affirms his love for Lucentio (see *TS* 1.1.215-16). By comparison, Tyndarus passively listens to his master's words. Shakespeare knowing of Ariosto and automatically Gascoigne's primary source, *Captivi*, evidently offers a direct employment of Plautus' play, while he modifies the scene to a process of invention with a more sovereign and more manipulative servant.

This variation adds a more carnivalesque subtext to the scene when Shakespeare's Tranio resonates a *servus callidus* while knowing his plot drawn from *Supposes* and originally, *Captivi*. For instance, Monette's production of 1988 underlines Tranio's implicit guidance when Lucentio partakes in the plotting as a marionette with Tranio pulling the strings.[820] Unlike Tyndarus, Tranio's last reply in their dialogue takes the form of an ironic remark about the ordered change of roles, which betrays that he already held the plan:

> In brief, sir, sith it your pleasure is,
> And I am tied to be obedient—
> For so your father charged me at our parting:
> 'Be serviceable to my son,' quoth he,
> Although I think 'twas in another sense—
> (*TS* 1.1.210-14)

---

818 Informing and affirming the roles' inversion, see *Supp.* 1.1.145ff. Polynesta to Balia and 1.3.71ff. Dulipo's soliloquy.
819 Cf. Miola (1994), 74-75. Miola also refers to the servants' similar devoted attitude.
820 Cf. Schafer (ed.) (2002), 109.

The idea of obedience is undermined and exposed to ridicule, not in a farcical and offensive but in a light way. A master demands his servant to act as his master, following his servant's order. The order is inverted directly by the superior but primarily and indirectly by the lowest. Shakespeare here inserts a carnivalesque and agonistic passage. Citing the father's words, Tranio makes fun of his demand in opposing the intention of the father and the actual realisation of order. The servant's concessive 'although' and the verb 'think' intensify the 'maybe' wrong interpretation. In this part, Tranio ironically refers to his duty of obedience as if it is convention that makes him invert the social hierarchy while he alludes to the beginning when he already deviated from the course of study the father had planned for his son. Thus, at the end of the scene, before they exit, Lucentio's last order that Tranio should become one among the wooers occurs as a pure formality after Tranio gave Lucentio the role of the schoolmaster and the charming suitor. The servant's name recommends him to take the place at the front of trickery. Tranio identifies himself as a descendant of the Plautine cunning slave, who operates for the 'pleasure' of his young master and takes a leading position in the agenda to rescue his master from the enslavement by love. Lucentio needs to be "a slave t'achieve that maid" (*TS* 1.1.218). Shakespeare uses the lyric motif of love's enslavement when Lucentio calls himself a slave after switching roles with his servant Tranio. The master's change of identities becomes double-layered on the social and metaphoric levels, which makes the pair's roots, master and servant, in Hellenistic-Roman Comedy shine through. Shakespeare enriches the whole part of plotting with thematic allusions to the predetermination and New Comedic functions of roles and their inversion, leaving no doubt about incorporating elements of Roman Comedy and especially Plautus' *servus callidus*.

In that scene of plotting, Tranio's scheming is added a second strategy. The clever servant's contriver identity becomes more apparent when he invents a father. Shakespeare leaves all the planning to Tranio and even gives him a short Plautine soliloquy, where he explains his wonderful machinery to the audience and makes fun of the upside-down relation from child to father.

> 'Tis in my head to do my master good:
> […] supposed Lucentio
> Must get a father called supposed Vincentio;
> And that's a wonder—[…]
> A child shall get a sire, if I fail not of my cunning.
> (*TS* 2.1.409-14)

While the idea of a supposed Vincentio stems from Gascoigne's text of Ariosto's play, to which the repetition of supposed directly alludes, Tranio's reference to his skills and the dependence of the plot on him echoes the announcement of a *servus callidus*. There is not a parallel passage in Gascoigne as the audience gets to know about Dulipo's idea for a scheme in a soliloquy of Erostrato (see *Supp.* 1.3.127ff.) and then, is directly confronted with Dulipo's finding a father in a dialogue between Erostrato and Dulipo (see *Supp.* 2.1) the analysis will later discuss.[821] Plautus' clever slaves regularly announce their contriving and their upcoming *turbae*, *ludi* and *machina*. Here, they confirm to the audience that they are about to plan something, what their plan is, and often they highlight the improbability of their trickery.

---

821 It is not the servant but Erostrato, who conveys his servant's promise of tricking: "Wel, my servant promised me yesterday to devise yet againe some newe conspiracie to drive Maister Doctor out of conceite, and to laye a snare that the foxe himselfe might be caught in : what it is, I knowe not, nor I saw him not since he went about it" (*Supp.* 1.3.127-32).

Tranio, Palaestrio, Epidicus, and especially Pseudolus and Chrysalus deliver many of these soliloquies. In *Mostellaria*, Tranio calls the senate in his head to scheme: *dum mihi senatum consili in cor convoco* (*Most.* 688). Quick and spontaneous contriving indicates the clever servant and the slave's idiosyncratic functionality to provide the spectators with spectacles of impossible and risky missions. Tranio emphasises the wonder his plan contains when he mentions his cunning as the source for coming intricacies, reminding us of the clever slaves' promise to do the impossible.

Once Tranio has finished plotting, the second phase begins and the clever servant now informs and instructs his confidants, establishing him as a superior figure profiting from his distance and a bird's eye view of the action on stage. In terms of the invented father, Biondello is instructed to look for someone to play the father, which the audience indirectly finds out about when Biondello comes to Tranio and reports him about the arrival of a satisfactory candidate. Biondello serves Tranio and follows his instructions as he is now supposed to be Lucentio's servant. In contrast to the first act and scheme of inverting roles, Shakespeare does not show a manipulative Tranio but a clever servant, who directs his temporary servant and just imparts the plan to his real master. Lucentio does not take part in contriving; Tranio reassures his master that he "shall quietly enjoy [his] hope and marry sweet Bianca with consent." (*TS* 3.2.135-36). Similarly to Plautus' comedies, the power of decision falls to the clever servant due to the carnivalesque contract of comedy.

After the man to play Vincentio has been found, Tranio acts as a true *servus callidus* by directing the couple off stage:

If he be credulous and trust my tale,
I'll make him glad to seem Vincentio
And give assurance to Baptista Minola
As if he were the right Vincentio.
Take in your love, and then let me alone.[822]
(*TS* 4.2.68-72; italics are mine)

Tranio expresses confidence in his plan and puts to rest the doubts of Lucentio and Bianca. The clever servant presents himself as the mastermind, who manages his master's future wedding all alone, as plotting sets the plotter in the leading position, who tells everyone else how to act. In *Supposes*, one line of Dulipo bears verbal resemblance to Tranio's last instruction when the servant affirms his promising plots to his master ("As for that, let me alone." *Supp.* 2.1.311). However, Dulipo's demand appears more like a stereotypical phrase silencing any doubts Erostrato might have. The dialogue does not end here and Erostrato does not leave Dulipo alone. Furthermore, the phrase repeats an earlier demand Erostrato made of his servant (see *Supp.* 2.1.13). Tranio's speech ending in this climax relates to the common sovereign speech and demand of a *servus callidus* like Philolaches' Tranio makes the couples and slaves clear the stage of all suspicious things, exit the stage and stay home so that he can manage the trickery on his own.[823]

As Tranio is now in charge of the deception, he can fulfil his potential as the clever servant. The Shakespearean Tranio spins his yarn for the Pedant and tells a tale about Mantua and Padua's conflict to the man in order to persuade him that he must stay at his house. He brilliantly makes the proposals look as if he is doing the foreigner a great favour ("courtesy", *TS* 4.2.92 and 4.2.113, "to save your life", 4.2.104), which he spices up with the expressions of

---

822 Italics are mine to underline the last verse's significance.
823 See ch. III.iv.

incredibility ('careless of your life', 'Know you not the cause?', 'Tis marvel') that range far from the fact that the story has just been invented. These oppositions make Tranio's fiction a laughable incident and the deceit more entertaining for the audience. Only in the end and just "by the way" (4.2.117), after preparing, does Tranio introduce his actual intention. Thereby, he makes the Pedant an instrument in his trickery, he now needs to instruct how to play:[824]

> Then go with me to make the matter good.
> [...]
> In all these circumstances I'll instruct you.
> Go with me to clothe you as becomes you.
> (*TS* 4.2.116-122)

The vocabulary of instruction and clothing is typical of the *architectus* as Palaestrio in *Miles gloriosus* describes the dress code for his young master in detail, emulating a captain (see *Mil.* 1175ff.). The clever slave applies figures with a new identity while he performs to pulls the strings of his puppets.[825]

Parallel to Gascoigne's play, a stranger assists in Dulipo's plan to gain the consent of Polynesta's father.[826] Tranio's story of peril relies on Dulipo's construct, only with a difference in names. However, the conversation described above with such an explicit order cannot be found in *Supposes*, which does also not offer the servant's sudden scheming or the staging of a direct manipulation. At the heart of Dulipo's portrayal as a trickster like the *servus callidus*, there is only one long dialogue available, which must be seen in analogy to Tranio's witty recruiting of the Pedant. Still, Shakespeare's design of the phases, scheming, deceiving, and instructing, is arguably closer to the Plautine model. In contrast to Tranio's live encounter with the stranger, the feigned Erostrato elucidates his off-stage trickery like a repeated version attached to the stage directions of the performer and inventor. Dulipo fashions the report of his doings as a play-within-the-play with Erostrato as his audience: "As soone as I knewe him to be a Scenese, sodenly lifting up mine eyes (as it were with an admiration), I sayd unto him, 'Are you a Scenese, and come to Ferrara?'" (*Supp.* 2.3.100-04). The extravagant scene suits a Plautine trickster though Dulipo's short sequence omits the performance of the Scenese, while he concentrates on his speech and its enactment to Erostrato. Dulipo's inventing and telling the tale with great gestures cannot fully expend its energy and potentially comic drive as the spectator cannot watch the opposition of a gullible and naïve victim tricked by a supposed master, which is a frequent theme in Plautus' comedies. But Shakespeare revives that moment in his play by Tranio's live machinations.

Dulipo misses his last chance to prove himself as a schemer to the audience since the audience did not get to enjoy a prior contriving for the exchange of identities. The binary, mimetic and telling, account on Dulipo's deception of the Scenese ends with him asking his young master for permission, who then finishes the dialogue, directing Dulipo's steps (see 2.1).[827] Like a Plautine clever slave, Dulipo seizes the initiative and tells the Scenese his own invented story of peril independently, whereas the ending of the dialogue somewhat undermines this independence. Such finishing lines resemble Lucentio's final affirmation to

---

824 Also see *TS* 4.4.6-7, 10-12, 17-18. Tranio gives last instructions to the supposed Vincentio and Biondello. There is only one scene, where the supposed Erostrato directs the Scenese directly and very shortly, yet comparably (see *Supp.* 2.2.41ff.).

825 For example, Palaestrio instructing everyone around him (see *Mil.* 1156ff.). For more instances, see ch. III.iv.

826 See *Supp.* 2.3.97ff.

827 *Supp.* 2.1.231-235: Dulipo: "I thought better to use your advise first." Erostrato: "Well, goe take him home, make him all the cheere you can, spare for no cost ; I will alowe it."

exchange identities. It seems that the clever servant cannot be as autonomous and dominant as a Greek slave, who now lives in the adapted Italian world that a Renaissance audience is watching. Still, *Supposes'* invention of the father lacks the realisation of scheming and deceiving phases a *servus callidus* pursues. The types' common features seem not to be imaged as clearly as is customary for a *servus callidus* and Shakespeare's servant. Dulipo inhabits an advantageous position and exhibits some habits of a Plautine slave in this core scene like his done tricking, his imitation of himself, and his strategy of disclosing news to Erostrato bit by bit since he delays the process of informing Erostrato about the purpose and kernel of his story, which is reminiscent of Plautus' *servus currens*.

The clever servant Dulipo stems from Plautus' *servus callidus* and can be identified as a possible source for Shakespeare; he is yet mostly ascribed to be that type and hardly persuades by being one in the flesh. *Supposes'* dialogue of Erostrato and Dulipo alone does not explain the Shakespearean servant's image in the analogical scenes. By comparison, Dulipo remains a rather passive Plautine type, whereas Tranio's performances are shot through with hallmarks of the clever slave turning into the live schemer and deceiver. Tranio's masquerading as Lucentio and disguising other figures means that he constructs illusionary frames in the comic discourse. He thus shows moderate features of an *architectus* like Palaestrio, a *magister* as Epidicus, and slightly touches a poet's position like Pseudolus. Even Biondello, the former boy of Lucentio, starts to obey Tranio, his fake master, more than he obeys Lucentio since he interrupts his master's attempt at giving him an order with the reference what the other master wants ("My master has appointed me to go to Saint Luke's to bid [...]", *TS* 4.4.99-100).

We can say that after changing roles, the position of the master, the Saturnalian environment enables Tranio to dominate the subplot and ensure comedy's resolution for Lucentio and Bianca. Tranio repeatedly foregrounds this function as he will and can make the matter good. Similarly, *Mostellaria's* Tranio affirms that "[...] *ego efficiam, quae facta hic turbavimus,/ profecto ut liqueant omnia et tranquilla sint*" (*Most*. 416-17). To achieve dénouement, he can freely act out his advantageous position being more knowledgeable and cunning than the other courtiers. So, coming to the third phase, it is the street-wise deceiver who can promise and foreshadow the discourse, which illuminates his status of power over illusion. His steps of deception are:

> That by degrees we mean to look into
> And watch our vantage in this business:
> We'll overreach the greybeard Gremio,
> The narrow-prying father Minola,
> The quaint-musician, amorous Licio,
> *All for my master's sake*, Lucentio.
> (*TS* 3.2.142-47; italics are mine)

His listing of the opponents sounds as a promise of victory but confirms Tranio's altruism.[828] He ensures the audience of comic romance matters as it is all for his master's sake and not for his own sake. He only contributes to New Comedy's nucleus of pleasure in deceit and error. Plautus and Shakespeare's Tranio govern the comedy's discourse, or at least a subplot, and realize comedy's happy ending in their utopian deceptive construction.

Shakespeare's schemer, instructor, and deceiver proves himself to be as skilled as Plautus' clever type in spinning and realizing an intrigue as he can adapt to a sudden change,

---

828 Also see *TS* 1.1.238-9 (Tranio assures Biondello).

recognize the right moment to strike and control a conversation like he wittily manipulates Hortensio to foreswear Bianca with him.[829] The second suitor Hortensio disguised as Licio hopes to discover Bianca's unfaithfulness to the supposed Vincentio, while his assumed revelation backfires on him. Ironically, Tranio asserts that the scene between Lucentio and Bianca he eavesdrops along with Hortensio as "wonderful" (*TS* 4.2.15). For Tranio, the servant and not the suitor, to see his master and future mistress so affected is not a cause for amazement. In short, his plan succeeds, whereby he makes Hortensio look like a fool. The manipulation of Hortensio does not only serve pragmatic reasons as he is the next suitor to get out of Lucentio's way but the staged deception is also exploited to supply comic moments. As a fake suitor, Tranio can easily foreswear Bianca. His feigned dismay and oath must sound quite ridiculous to the audience (see *TS* 4.2.32-34). This humorous sequence continues when he repeats the joke by bringing Bianca, his 'gentle love', the happy news that she was foresworn (see *TS* 4.2.46-7). Bianca picks up the comic tone when she ironically asserts that Tranio is jesting (see *TS* 4.2.48)—a quality that is quite likely for the witty servant. The illusion of the noble suitor loving and foreswearing his *virgo* stands in opposition to the genuine servant delivering remedy for the lovers. The clever servant like his predecessor displays an ideal combination of deception and joking about his adversaries. The clever servant constructs illusionary frames the audience can perceive, but the opponents cannot. In his nesting of illusionary frames, he can code his fooling and ridiculing the other. He makes the audience his confidants, giving them access to the moments of *ridiculum*—that is how a professional fool works.

In *Supposes*, it is not the real Dulipo but Erostrato himself as the disguised servant, who participates in most similarly competitive scenes, where he indirectly fights with his adversary Cleander (see *Supp*. 2.4).[830] Apart from desire as a secret suitor of Polynesta, the fake servant deals with laughter, his 'new' profession: "Alas! I jest and have no joy. I will stand here aside and laugh a little at this lobcocke." (*Supp*. 2.3.16-18). Eavesdropping Cleander and the doctor's man Carion, he is ready to make fun of Cleander and plans to turn Cleander against Pasiphilo. As with Plautine techniques, fake Dulipo informs the audience about his plan in a row of asides, vying for their attention for the game of ridicule to come, wherein Erostrato convinces Cleander to believe in an invented story. He promises to make the feigned Erostrato, the pretending master, laugh by making sport with the doctor Cleander, his rival (see *Supp*. 3.1.77-81)—the sort of sport that Tranio uses against Gremio and Hortensio. The feigned Dulipo's role in that thematic compound of sport and deception is emphasized by the words of a servant, Carion: "Surely it is some toye devised to get some money of him." (*Supp*. 2.4.91-92). Carion utters this telling aside, watching a dialogue between Cleander and feigned Dulipo. He comments on the feigned servant's duplicity. That comment evokes a frequent scenario in New Comedic intrigues led by a servant hunting for money in order to win the girl for his young master. The audience possessing that literary background may have been amused about the Carion's correct guess that it is a toy but not for money. The allusion makes the young master and the performing servant's application of Plautine habits normally attached to the cunning slave in the play obvious, whereby the real master here seems as close or maybe even closer to the clever servant's type as his ally Dulipo does. Erostrato's behaviour conforms to the young master's role as a servant; for two years, he has played the role. The comic discourse

829 Note *TS* 3.2.143 ("watch our vantage in this business" = "be alert for an opportunity favourable to us"). Oliver (ed.) (1984), 171, commentary on l. 143.
830 Fake Dulipo: "Since I can doe no better, I will set such a staunce betweene him and Pasiphilo, that all this towne shall not make them friendes." (*Supp*. 2.4.34-36).

ascribes to the fake Dulipo features of a clever servant not only by such agonistic scenes or entertaining 'sport' but also when the feigned servant's soliloquy assesses their situation, while he reflects on fortune and triumph, a thematic passage usually known from a *servus callidus*.[831] *Supposes* deals with the Plautine slave by distributing its elements and techniques among several 'servant' figures. Shakespeare reunites Erostrato and Dulipo's characteristics stemming from the Plautine type in Tranio. *Supposes* constructs its Saturnalian atmosphere decisively by presenting the long-term Erostrato, his services, confabulations with masters, and his hidden mockery. Throughout *The Shrew*, however, the Saturnalian element is not advanced by a similar young master, who stands in Tranio's shadow in regard to the performance and presentation of hierarchical opposition. For the subplot, Shakespeare centralizes the carnivalesque quality in Tranio.

The 'Tranios' tricking their social superior inhabit the Saturnalian environment on stage: while Tranio challenges Theopropides in *Mostellaria* and fools him, Tranio in *The Shrew* inverts hierarchy by exchanging identities with his master, engaging in the wooers' competition with the other noblemen, and denies Lucentio's father when he arrives, which last scene reveals utmost visibility of hierarchical inversion and simultaneously, its dissolution. Until his flight from stage, the clever servant can persuade in his master's role, manipulate conversation brilliantly, engage in sport for the laughable, and surpass the other figures, especially the suitors, who stand for blocking characters inhabiting the same function the father and master usually has in some of Plautus' plays. Concerning carnivalesque context, an agonistic attitude appears in the wooing competition among Tranio, Hortensio, and Gremio. When they meet in the second scene, Tranio does not introduce himself at first but presents himself confidently to the other suitors (*TS* 1.2.217ff.). He holds his cards close to his chest, keeping them ignorant as long as he likes by not giving precise answers or even replying to questions with questions. His conditional sentences add to the ambiguity of his statements (229). He even dares to interrupt Gremio (223) and implies that this is none of his business. After having provoked them, he makes them introduce themselves to him, though he is the stranger and they are the citizens. He leaves them no choice but to listen to him and his intentions since he appeals to their status and etiquette ("If you be gentlemen", *TS* 1.2.237 and ff.). After Tranio's eloquent reasoning for why he has joined the circle of Bianca's wooers, Gremio rightly assesses Tranio's rhetorical superiority when he even predicts surprised that "this gentleman will out-talk [them] all" (*TS* 1.2.247). At the end of their talk, as if confirming Gremio's impression, Tranio wins them over by inviting them to "eat and drink as friends" (*TS* 1.2.278). His final lines in 1.2. reiterate the appeal to revel in food and drink since Tranio's invitation to "quaff carouses" (*TS* 1.2.276) underlines excessive drinking; 'carouse' means "drinking full bumpers" and "drinking without restraint".[832] Interestingly, the first positive reaction Tranio receives comes from the two servants, Biondello and Grumio, eager to join the group and their revelry. The lower classes are stereotyped as always on the lookout for free food and drink. Simultaneously, the wooers are adversaries, who "strive mightily" (*TS* 1.2.278). Tranio dominates the scene and his dialogue partners in the comic discourse.

The clever servant eliminates one suitor after another in an atmosphere of agon, starting with Gremio in the bidding over Bianca in 2.1.329ff. One of New Comedy's typical pairs of adversaries opposes each other as the "Youngling" tries to outdo the "Greybeard" (*TS* 2.1.341 and 342). They start with firing remarks back and forth: freezing and frying love,

---

831 See *Supp.* 2.3 and esp. 3.2; also note 2.3.1-2, Erostrato employs a metatheatrical comment on their scheme in one of his soliloquies.
832 Oliver (ed.) (1984), 133, note 274. Also see Petruccio's use in *TS* 3.2.225-7.

nourishing age and flourishing youth (see *TS* 2.1.343-44). As measuring love by oaths is hardly possible, Baptista decides to weigh their offers. The competition turns into an auction, with Baptista as the auctioneer who will sell his daughter to the highest bidder (see *TS* 2.1.345-49). Tranio raises Gremio's offer every time and at the same time he diminishes and denigrates Gremio's deal when he transfers from his opponent's list of fortune to his own by picking up Gremio's 'only' mockingly (GRE. "[…] she will be only mine." / TRA. "That 'only' came well in." [*TS* 2.1.366-67]). He begins scornfully outbidding Gremio as he ends his enormous bid with a quasi-rhetorical question that pushes Gremio into a corner and enrages him.[833] Tranio responds to Gremio's second attempt with an exaggerating raise, while he is calling a bluff as a true gambler since he "will assure her,/ And twice as much as whate'er [Gremio] offer'st next" (*TS* 2.1.383-84).[834] As the true deceiving figure, the clever servant must adapt and make persuasive offers about a fortune that is neither his nor his heritage. Probably, he does not know the exact numbers of houses, argosies, and definitely not how many ducats the land's revenue is. Like Plautine slaves, he needs to improvise and to play a risky game, during which his deception offers the audience a carnivalesque feast of inversion. The supposed gentleman promises huge sums of money that are not his and will never be as he remains a servant winning against the old gentleman.

The auction underlines Tranio's financial responsibility in the subplot, while his master can 'study' whatever he wants. Bidding, haggling, and calling a bluff belong to common New Comedic activities like Tranio tries to get rid of the moneylender in *Mostellaria*.[835] In contrast, *Supposes* does not know a similar scene, in which Dulipo could show such features. As disputatious as the *servus callidus* is, Tranio presents himsef for the sake of his young master. In a combative mood, Tranio is not interested in confabulating with Gremio. After the bidding, the old man remains Tranio's opponent, teasing Gremio in 3.2.155—when Tranio repeats but inverts Gremio's tricolon while he draws back upon Gremio's own words about Katherina ("You may go to the devil's dam!", *TS* 1.1.105).[836]

As soon as Tranio changes roles with his master, he becomes a suitor and thus, a competitor, who takes on the *servus callidus*' characteristics. Nevertheless, his circumstances and his task do not correspond to the Plautine theme of tricking someone out of money, which would give him more opportunities to behave as the competitive deceiver openly and secretly. Therefore, the practice of framing deception as a competition does not recur identically in Shakespeare's Tranio since it simply cannot. Here, carnivalesque agon is imminent in the constant contrast between true gentlemen, Gremio and Hortensio, and an actual servant outdoing them both in rhetoric and strategy. Shakespeare's Tranio instead must follow the rules of his role, playing a gentleman wooing a maid. As with all considerations made here, it is very important to keep in mind the differences in plot between Shakespeare's play and Plautus' comedies, which affect Tranio's behaviour as a clever servant in disguise. His mask delimits flexibility like misbehaviour as an irrational deviation from his original agenda and intention is not an option. He is also more moderate with deliberate miscommunication since he sticks to his role's etiquette. In addition, Plautus' coherent complex of central themes, military and agon, appeals to the audience of Plautus' day but does not translate in the same form to Shakespeare's time. There are undeniable parallels in Tranio's scheming and deceiving

---

833 Note the typical opposition of young and old, also explicitly in *TS* 2.1.394, Tranio: "That's but a cavil: he is old, I young."

834 Compare to the gambling theme in *TS* 2.1.403 and 8 and especially Gremio naming Tranio a "young gamester" (403).

835 See *Most*. 532ff.

836 Cf. Oliver (ed.) (1984), 111, note 105, the devil's dam "said to be worse than the devil himself".

parts and in his ability to change from a servant to a genuine master. When he introduces himself to Baptista as the son of the mighty Vincentio, the fake master's tone adapts (see *TS* 2.1.87ff.). Lucentio acknowledges his servant's metamorphosis by giving him a compliment, "Well begun, Tranio" (*TS* 1.2.227), in an aside. In *Captivi*, it is Tyndarus, who values his master's imitation of a slave's tongue: *ut facete orationem ad servitutem contulit* (*Capt*. 276).[837] Not only in the wooing scenes does Tranio persuade with his use of language, strategic behaviour, and competitive attitude but throughout the play he exhibits his Plautine skills.

But even the most skillful clever servant gets caught. As for the other *servi callidi*, the core conflict concentrates on the deceiver and the deceived and thereby, turns figures like Tranio into scapegoats at the end of the play. In contrast to Gascoigne, Tranio does not show a fear of punishment, which Dulipo shares with the audience in one of his soliloquies (see *Supp.* 4.1) after he has learned that the true Philogano has arrived.[838] Dulipo's despair is clear in the questions placed right at the beginning: "What shall I doe? Alas, what remedie shall I finde for my ruefull estate? What escape, or what excuse may I now devise to shifte over our subtile supposes?" (*Supp.* 4.1.1-4). But he does not present any solution that could bring some remedy as the audience can expect from a cunning figure. For the rest of the play, the servant pretends to be a surrendered delinquent and panics without rising above his station again. In comparison, the Plautine type runs the gauntlet of threat, fear, and triumph, augmenting the degree of suspense and underlining his incredible success if he achieves his aim.[839] In this sense, Dulipo is not a persuasive imitation of Plautus' clever slave in this aspect. Shakespeare bypasses this Plautine technique, probably for dramaturgic reasons, since he does not slow down the confrontation between the counterfeits and the originals with a soliloquy of a panic attack by Tranio but concentrates on the threat itself, the becoming of a *senex iratus*.

Both Tranios and other *servi callidi* face a *senex iratus* at the end of the play. Though Shakespeare draws upon Gascoigne's Philogano and his encounter with his counterfeit in this last scene, harmony and immunity for the clever servant are guaranteed differently since Shakespeare does not have any use for a prodigal son like Dulipo in Gascoigne appears to be.[840] Common for Roman comedy, especially Plautus' comedies, a *senex iratus* wants to confront the brain of deception with his rage like Vincentio threatens Tranio with brutal punishment a *servus callidus* is quite used to. The old master outrageously pursues Gremio's recognition that "[h]ere's packing, with a witness, to deceive [them] all" (*TS* 5.1.109) with a threat only against Tranio, not Biondello and not Lucentio.

> Where is that damned villain, Tranio,
> That faced and braved me in this matter so?
> […]
> I'll slit the villain's nose that would have sent me to the jail.
> (*TS* 5.1.110-11 and 121-22)

---

837 Cf. Miola (1994), 75.

838 Biondello instead addresses their ruin in 5.2.39 and 99-100.

839 See ch. III.ii. (threat of punishment and all-license). In *Bacchides*, for instance, Chrysalus responds to the first shock (after Mnesilochus has confessed his slave that he revealed their scheme to his father) with the promise of attack and a triumphant voice of a military leader (see *Bacch*. 671ff.).

840 Cf. Miola (1994), 68-69. The scene of Vincentio's knocking recalls Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* when Antipholus of Ephesus wants admittance, knocks, and faces trouble concerning his identity. Generally, the unexpected arrival of the father as well as the knocking at the door are usual New Comedic elements—the latter found in *Menaechmi*, *Amphitruo*, and *Mostellaria*, while the former is known for instance from Terence's *Phormio* and *Eunuchus* or Plautus' *Mostellaria*; it is worth to add that when Lucentio's father, Vincentio, comes to the fake father, it reminds us of *Trinummus* (870ff.), "where the sycophant pretends to be Charmides and encounters the real Charmides." (Duckworth [1952], 417).

In *Supposes* instead, the audience listens to a puzzled Philogano, who is quite tame compared to the choleric Vincentio. The rage is also alleviated as it is interrupted and split over some encounters. Several scenes here offer the conflict and peril for Erostrato and Dulipo's operations by Philogano's arrival in bits and pieces, which cuts off the intense effect Shakespeare achieves by bringing all involved figures on stage.[841] In *Supposes*, at the end of 4.3, the revelation begins when Philogano orders Litio to knock on the door of his house, where the cook informs him that the house is already full since Erostrato's father arrived some hours ago. In 4.4., the three men in front of the house, the true father, Litio, and Ferarese try to make sense of the cook's information. In 4.5, Philogano meets his counterfeit separately, becoming the *senex iratus* the audience expects, which is interrupted by a short scene, when the three men think about these puzzling incidents. In 4.7, he finally encounters the supposed Erostrato and can now be a *senex iratus*. But as suddenly as the rage came, it dissipated with the exit of Dulipo and his servants who rush to protect him and make Philogano take his refuge. Seemingly alone, a miserable Philogano starts a monologue about his desolate situation (see *Supp.* 4.8.1-18), which is not eased by the arrival of his son as it is in *The Shrew*.

The Shrew and *Supposes* differ in their dramaturgic composition of resolution, which affects the function and presentation of the clever servant. *Supposes* avoids having both Erostrato and Dulipo, on stage at the same time, having Lucentio reveal their identities, which task Lucentio fulfils, when he enters the stage after getting married. Until then Tranio maintains the illusion he created by denying Vincentio by calling him 'mad'.[842] Tranio wants the officer to take his master to jail, which is only prevented by the entrance of Lucentio and Bianca. In Gascoigne's play, such a climax is stopped after the feigned Erostrato escapes into the house. Damon, the father of Polynesta, does not have the chance to become aware of these supposes because of his absence. It is the parasite telling Damon the good news about Dulipo, the servant, becoming Erostrato, the rich gentleman.[843] Such a lengthy and drawn-out revelation does not need a *servus callidus*, who, hence, cannot face the threats of punishment, mock anybody for his gullibility, trick his victims into immunity or boast about his deeds. *The Shrew*'s compact revelation differs therein and allows a typical Plautine clash of the furious tricked and the all-licensed trickster and the young master pleading for mercy.

Lucentio asks for mercy on behalf of Tranio: "What Tranio did, myself enforced him to;/ Then pardon him, sweet father, for my sake" (*TS* 5.1.119-20). In *Mostellaria*, it is Callidamates, who pleads for mercy for Tranio in 1159, whose words Duckworth also sees echoed in the plea of Lucentio: *quidquid fecit nobiscum una fecit: nos deliquimus*.[844] The beneficiaries of Tranio's 'villainy' confess their pressure on him and try to protect him. Similarly to Theopropides in *Mostellaria*, Vincentio does not leave his anger and follows Tranio, who flees his irate master. Without giving in to his son's pleas, he confirms his decision for punishment and revenge a second time: "But I will in to be revenged for this villainy." (*TS* 5.1.126). Although Tranio has violated decorum and made Vincentio look like a fool, Vincentio's threats are marvellously left aside and his rage seems to vanish. Shakespeare dissolves the threats of punishment and transforms revenge to festivity and cheerfulness, wherein he does not need the justification of happy family reunion. In *Supposes*, the juxtaposition of the father's rage and the servant's immunity is not as relevant as in *The Shrew*.

---

841 Cf. Miola (1994), 69.
842 See *TS* 5.1.
843 See *Supp.* 5.7.29-39.
844 Cf. Duckworth (1952), 414; also see Percy Simpson, *Studies in Elizabethan Drama*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955, 22; and Miola (1994), 69, note 13. But the earliest mentioning can be found in Edwin W. Fay, 'Further Notes on the *Mostellaria* of Plautus', *AJPH* 24.3 (1903), 245-77, 247-8.

Cleander and Dulipo are reunited as a family only off-stage, which grants the former servant immunity. Gascoigne's ending thus deviates markedly from Shakespeare's *Shrew* and Tranio's destiny. While *Supposes* shows the reconciliation at length, especially in the last scene, when Philogano, Cleander, Damon, Erostrato, and Pasiphilo exchange oaths of friendship and affirm new family bonds, Shakespeare puts the twists, clashes, and conflicts into one pinnacle in a compact Plautine manner. After the detection of all illusions and manipulations, the banquet closes the upside-down world with a Saturnalian feast, where the figures confirm the thematic connection between both plots in courtship as competition as well as hunting and present an agon in the bet on a wife's obedience.[845] As a *servus callidus*, Tranio causes trouble everywhere but goes unpunished. He is even allowed to join the banquet and to enjoy the atmosphere of the Saturnalian feast.[846] His all-license confirms the utopian quality of comedy that ends with the play's final line as it does for Plautus' Tranio, who knows that he will be punished the next day. The play's utopia guarantees that everything will return to normal after the figures have fulfilled their function. As long as Tranio remains the clever servant, his scheming and wit are applauded.

His all-license also stretches to the construction of *ridiculum*. Besides his agonistic mocking in the wooing competition, Tranio bickers with the others as Tranio joins the word play of Gremio and Baptista, contributing lively comments that culminate in the bidding scene.[847] Nevertheless, the skill of a *servus ludens*, how to play with the themes of the play, as well as his engagement in the verbal dance just for its own sake remains secondary to Tranio as a Plautine stereotypical schemer, instructor, and deceiver. There is only one passage of comparable miscommunication for comic means embedded in a verbal battle of ambiguous and metaphorical expressions between Tranio, again a servant, and Petruccio:

> PET. […] Here, Signor Tranio,
> This bird you aimed at, though you hit her not;
> Therefore a health to all that shot and missed.
> TRA. O sir, Lucentio slipped me like his greyhound,
> Which runs himself, and catches for his master.
> PET. A good swift simile, but something currish.
> TRA. 'Tis well, sir, that you hunted for yourself —
> 'Tis thought your deer does hold you at a bay.
> (*TS* 5.2.50-57)

After the women have left the banquet, Tranio seems to be the equal of Lucentio and Petruccio again since the latter exaggerates this status by addressing him as "Signor Tranio" (50). Tranio participates in the badinage as the only servant; Biondello and Grumio are present at the banquet but have no role in the dialogue (Biondello is merely a messenger).[848] The main repartee takes place between Tranio and Petruccio, who are equally clever. The passage

---

845 *The Shrew* also lacks an equivalent to the discussion of Cleander and Philogano about how the deceit and the identity of the right Philogano could be proven (see *Supp.* 5.5), which serves as an introduction to Dulipo's recognition as Cleander's son.

846 Here, Plautus' *Stichus* springs to mind.

847 They compare Katherina to a piece of goods. Baptista starts the theme by giving himself the role of a merchant (*TS* 2.1.330-1); Oliver (ed.) (1984), 152, note 330, Tranio's quibble: "'Twas a commodity lay fretting by you;/ 'Twill bring you gain, or perish on the seas." First, "the goods for sale or exchange –namely Katherina was a piece of merchandise that was becoming corroded or worn away (*OED* s.v. 'fret v. 6,7')". The second implication of 'fret': "'it was wearing *you* out by a process of irritation'".

848 Cf. Oliver (ed.) (1984), 224, note 49.

affirms their analogy as the clever and deceptive performer in the two plots while they assess their success. Petruccio appeals to a supposed loss by Tranio because he courted Bianca but did not marry her. Hence, the issue of competition and the final result of winner and loser comes up again, in which game Petruccio sees himself as the winning party. Tranio replies with "a good swift simile" and Petruccio acknowledges Tranio's quick wit. But in the next half-line, he tries to insult Tranio by describing the servant as quarrelsome, probably referring to his inferior and farcical nature. Tranio strikes back with a mention of hunting as Bianca had compared herself to a bird (see *TS* 5.2.47-49). He describes Petruccio's situation with Katherina as hound, hunting the deer—or his dear—can face his 'prey' ready to fight and defend herself. In other words, Tranio destabilizes Petruccio's status as the victorious hunter. Like the *servus callidus*, both argue with metaphorical artificiality, obscurity of expression and ambiguous references, attacking weaknesses in the other's argument, especially when they could find a comic association.

Like the audience, Baptista Minola acknowledges Tranio's clever remarks as a strike against Petruccio, which Lucentio confirms with a pun. A third observer of the short repartee, Hortensio, likewise enjoys Tranio's witty rejoinder to Petruccio and gloats "[c]onfess, confess, hath he not hit you here?" (*TS* 5.2.60). Hitting cues punishment and triumph describing the hierarchical relation between master and servant that is traditionally underscored in comedy. The relation of the classes is upside-down and has a carnivalesque nature when the master's physical violence against the unruly servant is paralleled to servant's verbal abuse of a superior. It signifies the clever servant's ability to make someone else wear the ugly mask. In comparison to *Mostellaria*, Tranio offers a much longer fooling of an ignorant Theopropides during the walk-through of Simo's house. Such scenes belong to a traditional body of the upside-down comedic world, wherein the type of *servus callidus* is not an archetype but a paragon of its maker. The humour of both clever figures is aggressive, but not hostile and does not show open malice but sums up and repeats the sequence of agon and success in deceit. The passage at the banquet displays the parallel between two manipulators, Petruccio and Tranio. Both are talented in deliberate miscommunication, try to outwit each other, and "act demanding roles in an amorous play with their own design".[849] It is not surprising that the three gentlemen watching the verbal fight celebrate Tranio's remarks. The short head-to-head battle of wits foregrounds the clever servant's superiority in hindsight as well as his Plautine disposition during the Saturnalian banquet.

Shakespeare's Plautine figure resides more in the realm of a deceiver than exhausting the full compound of a *servus ludens* and the metatheatrical *architectus*. When it comes to the comic driver, *Supposes* does not develop Dulipo as a full *servus ludens*, too—however, the play dedicates at least one scene to the servant's useless nonsense. It is the report of finding the supposed father, the most Plautine scene concerning the cunning type. In 2.1, Dulipo teases his desperate master, who does not understand the lengthy and useless report of his servant, demanding a clear response several times; this part is reminiscent of scenes involving a *servus currens*. Here, the playful servant exploits his superior position and performs how he approached the Scenese with his tale. Especially in the middle of the scene when Erostrato is eager to hear the rest of Dulipo's story about his conversation with the Scenese and before Erostrato becomes aware of Dulipo's intention, the servant can abuse his superior position and adds another climax. He takes a comic detour instead of following Erostrato's forceful "foorth" (*Supp.* 2.1.128). Similar to a *servus callidus*, the servant prohibits an efficient exchange of information and delays comprehension for the sake of a joke. Programmatically

---

849 Miola (1994), 67-68.

for the elaborate report of the scene, he continues his master's 'foorth' with a detailed but superfluous account of what caused the conflict between Scienna and Ferrara. Dulipo exaggerates the list of goods of the 'Ambassadures' although those details do not satisfy the master.[850] Despite this example, Dulipo's ludicrous episodes are rare. This is something that both transformations of the Plautine figure, Dulipo and Tranio, share since they do not supply many instances of comic escapades.

In *The Shrew*, the part of the *servus ludens* seems to be given to Grumio, who does not reappear on stage after the quarrel scene with Tranio in *Mostellaria*. Except for the name and their status, the two figures do not have much in common. At least, Plautus' rustic figure contrasting the urban Tranio shares the quarrelsome nature with Shakespeare's servant. The fact that Shakespeare named Petruccio's servant after Plautus' slave and Tranio's counterpart underlines Shakespeare's reliance on Plautus and hints at the relation of Petruccio and Tranio. As a complementary piece to the Plautine Tranio as well as his cunning master, Grumio appears as a clownish figure, who offers the audience mocking comments, playfulness, and foolish behaviour.[851] Tranio in *The Shrew* does not show that extreme follies, which is left to the clownish figure Grumio and partly, to Biondello. Throughout the play, the former is more of a *servus ludens* in several scenes prolonged by comic escapades as when Grumio deliberately misunderstands orders and slows things down for his master in the joke about "knock me here" (*TS* 1.2.8). Furthermore, in the dialogue between the servant and Curtis, Curtis is eager to hear a tale from Grumio, who tells the story 'accidentally' after listing what the servant has missed ("thou shouldst have heard in how […]", *TS* 4.1.66). A simple conveyance of a tale of what happened off stage becomes a plaything for the servant. The quarrel between Grumio and the Tailor is similarly rich in the servant's false conclusions and proves Grumio as a comic driver in inorganic passages.[852]

Besides her husband and the other servants, Katherina is one of Grumio's 'victims'. She had never needed or "knew how to entreat" (*TS* 4.3.7) but now begs him for food. In 4.3.17-30, the seemingly obedient servant suggests different dishes to the starving Katherina only to deny them to her.[853] He contradicts his own offers and finally decides to serve "the mustard without the beef". The passage can be read as the performance of a too careful servant, whose weird objections are quite amusing, or—and that is more likely—as a deliberate mocking of a choleric woman, who should not be served spicy dishes. The scene ends significantly with Katherina cursing him as a "false deluding slave" (*TS* 4.3.31), which appeals to his closeness to Plautus' farcical world. As a Milphio, who mistranslates, the servant exhibits great

---

850 *Supp.* 2.1.129-39, Dulipo responds: "I tolde him further, these Ambassadoures of Counte Hercules had dyvers mules, waggons, and charettes, laden with divers costly jewels, gorgeous furniture, and other things which they caried as presents (passing that way) to the King of Naples : the which were not only stayd in Sciene by the officers whom you cal customers, but serched, ransacked, tossed and turned, and in the end exacted for tribute, as if they had bene the goods of a meane marchaunt." And also see *Supp.* 2.1.61-64.

851 Videbæk (1996), 9. She classifies Grumio as a "true *Commedia dell'Arte Zanni*". Her analysis mentions but hardly discusses Greek and Roman predecessors.

852 See *TS* 1.2.5ff.; 4.1., e.g. esp. 50-75, dialogue between Curtis and Grumio; Grumio and the Tailor in 4.3.117ff., Grumio's bad attempt of drawing a conclusion allures to nonsense. Their quarrel is stylized as they use vocabulary insinuating a fight and a trial. At 4.3.156-58, Grumio deliberately misunderstands his master's order and pretends to understand a different meaning, assuming that 'take up' means 'lift up', which inserts a sexual allusion (see Oliver [ed.] [1984], 202, note 154).

853 At 4.3.19, Grumio's conclusion that particular food fosters choler might be an invention here or refers to some medical texts recommending not to consume mustard and dry or overcooked meat. See Oliver (ed.) (1984), 195, note 19.

incompetence but does not care if the audience thinks him truly stupid or pretending. For comic effect, it does not matter whether the servant is making mistakes on purpose.

Nevertheless, there is one passage that allows us to speak of Grumio as a figure that reflects upon those activities going on around him from a distance. When Petruccio visits Hortensio, the servant's remarks spice up the scene's content with their comic dynamic since Grumio comments on the gentlemen's wooing of Katherina and Bianca.[854] Listening to the suitors, he who is not addressed takes their entrances and phrases, responding with some evaluation and often, ridiculing inversion of what had been said. The turn-taking affirms Grumio at the outside of the dialogue, moving closer to the audience and reminding us of Plautine chain of asides, which grants the audience access to the assessment of the figures and their stereotypical involvement in the play. In his foolery, he foregrounds his master's nature, while he reflects and foreshadows the plot's development, which links him to the deliberate fool. In contrast to the clever slave, Petruccio's servant is neither an influential nor a superior part in the plot, but openly clownish and cheeky. Though he shows similar glimpses of understanding and reflecting the stage's activities, he does not reach the cleverness and comic complexity of the *servus callidus* and cannot compete with later polished deliberate wise fools. The type's concept does not rely on a clearly worked out pattern of incongruity like folly and wisdom but on joy of exposure and failure, regardless if it is because of feigned or true incapability.[855] With respect to Shakespeare's other early comedies, Grumio stands in the line of Dromios in *The Comedy of Errors* and Plautus' kinds of Sosia, forming another group of New Comedy's slaves, who are not clever and not always masters of trickery.[856] They play in satirical skits, become dupes of ridicule and/or inventors of nugatory instances, whereby they show an overlapping with the habits of a professional fool but do not use their folly and playfulness consciously to supply images or other constructs to deepen the stage's matter and grant the audience access to themes, roles, and core elements of the play.[857] In comparison to the servant Grumio, *The Shrew* knows a second and an even more deliberate fool figure following his agenda of paradoxical behaviour: Petruccio, the second cunning figure.

Grumio describes Petruccio as a master in "rope-tricks" he uses to throw figures in other people's faces and so "disfigure" them (see *TS* 1.2.110 and 12). Knavery as well as "extempore […] mother-wit" lie in his nature as they do in the clever slaves.[858] Relying on his talents, Petruccio intends to behave opposite to what can be expected of a gentleman who encounters Katherina and is repulsed by her shrewishness (see *TS* 2.1.159ff.). In a soliloquy, he tells the audience his plans that presumably sound 'crazy' since to his ears, Katherina's railing is a nightingale's song; when she stays silent, he plans to praise her eloquence. His scheme contains an upside-down relation of action to reaction, by which he wants to conquer Katherina. At the end of his soliloquy, the clever gentleman orders himself to speak in accordance with the plan he just discovered to the spectators, calling the image of an Epidicus forth: "and now, Petruccio, speak" (*TS* 2.1.181). Meeting Katherina alone in the following scene, he truly manages to oppose Katherina's behaviour, sticking to his plan since he enjoys quarrelling with her sharp tongue and evaluates her as gentle, "pleasant, gamesome, passing courteous,/ But slow in speech, yet sweet as springtime flowers" (*TS* 2.1.247-48). The more

---

854 See *TS* 1.2.127-8, 136-8, 141, 158, 176, 196, 216 (sounding like a parasite, who wants a good dinner). He becomes silent and remains in that position until the end of the scene as soon as Tranio enters the stage and intrudes into the group of men.
855 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 58.
856 Cf. Miola (1994), 69.
857 For a profound analysis of Plautine elements in Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*, see *Ibid.*, 20ff. esp. 22.
858 *TS* 2.1.265. Petruccio responds to one of Katherina's attacks.

difficult she is, the more appealing she seems to Petruccio.[859] The encounters of an extraordinary suitor, later husband, and a "wildcat" becoming tamed resemble an agon, wherein Petruccio confronts Katherina with unexpected emotional outbursts, and inversions of semantic pairs. Like Tranio or a *servus callidus*, he can scheme, mask himself and play a role, hopping from sweet tones to railing or from orders to their objection as it suits the situation and his purpose.[860]

In his opinion, only his opposition to Katherina counts, which turns the sun into the moon and back. While riding to the house of Kate's father, Petruccio admires the bright moon which is actually the sun, daring Kate to disagree with him.[861] To the amusement of the audience and the puzzlement of the others, he plays with appearances, names, and exchange of opposites. Kate compares Petruccio's behaviour to the moon as "the moon changes even as [his] mind" (*TS* 4.5.21). Petruccio's method is effective since Petruccio finally gets Kate not to argue with him anymore but to follow his instructions and look through his comic 'looking glass' when she addresses Vincentio as a "young budding virgin, fair, and fresh, and sweet" according to Petruccio's will (*TS* 4.5.38). In the end of agon, all these misbehaviours 'defeat' his Kate turning her in the submissive person presented at the banquet. Shakespeare's Petruccio is a trickster and deceiver as much as the Plautine servant while the clever gentleman's tactics resemble those of the agonistic slave constructing illusionary frames, juggling with expectation, knowledge, and the obvious to his conditions of playfulness.[862] Tranio evokes the stereotypical clever servant as the ally of the master, the mediator, schemer, and deceiver. The *servus ludens*' foolish behaviour, either of the clownish Grumio or of his cunning master, does not fit the role of the suitor bargaining for the father's consent. The supposed gentleman must maintain his dignity as Tranio must stick to "his signs and tokens" in his disguise (see *TS* Biondello, 4.4.78). In one subplot, there is not much space for escapades in the manner of a *servus ludens*, especially if the main plot already has the clever suitor Petruccio and his comic servant Grumio.[863]

Shakespeare integrates Lucentio's Tranio with the clever Petruccio; the figures' concepts build a conglomerate of the features the clever slave employs. By realizing a Plautine transformation in Tranio, Shakespeare gains a symmetrical construction and an additional link between the two plots. Following the strategy of multiplying those elements that the classical sources demonstrate, Shakespeare presents two tricksters: Petruccio and Tranio, both of whom relate to the New Comedic protagonist hinging on the same functionality stemming from incongruity. While Petruccio appears as a noble version of the clever comic hero, Tranio reiterates the status of Plautus' figure. Their significant parallels, their symmetrical

---

859 *TS* 2.1.159-61.

860 Compare his rage in the tailor scene in 4.3. and his words of honey in 2.1.; note changes of tone in one scene: Petruccio tries to cheer Kate up and promises her the nicest garments (see *TS* 4.3.36ff.). The next moment, he criticizes the haberdasher and the tailor's products heavily, denying her to wear any of these (see *TS* 4.3.64ff.); at the end of 4.3., Petruccio decides to ride to Kate's father but after her crossing, he delays the departure to a non-specific point of time. It seems as if he "will command the sun" (*TS* 4.3.195).

861 This passage is reminiscent of Mnesilochus' compliment about Chrysalus' impact on the father, who now believes automatically the opposite of what Chrysalus says to him, so the actual sun could become the moon (*Bacch*. 698-700). Cf. Simpson (1955), 23.

862 Cf. Miola (1994), 62, and also see 67-68. Similarly, *Much Ado about Nothing* shows more than one central deceiver.

863 It seems that the fastidious figure of Petruccio does not need a competitor in this manner. Ornstein defines the taming as "a Punch-and-Judy farce in which a bully-boy hero imposes his will on a wild-eyed but ultimately supine heroine." Ornstein (1986), 63.

arrangement, and Tranio's role as a Plautine deceiver disclose Shakespeare's expertise and reliance on Plautus and his protagonist in intrigue comedies.

For the subplot, he enriches the exchange of identities by a prime mover of Plautine quality. Shakespeare's Tranio is dedicated to Plautus' type although he does not exhaust the concept of the *servus callidus* fully. In fact, Shakespeare seems to have split the concept in its functions. The clever servant contributes to the web of organic parts, whereas inorganic engagement like the misbehaviour shown by Grumio and other servants is spread over the discourse and found in the method of taming by Petruccio. Concerning the coherence of the subplot, Tranio's activities as a witty wooer, bidder, and manipulator are inclined to the clever servant's talents to compete, mock, and jest, though the master Tranio leaves the clownish business to his fellow 'slave' and extravagant behaviour as well as folly to his correspondent part in the main plot. His comic lifestyle of sweetness reflects the young master's romantic yearning and reveals him as a moderate carnivalesque model. To restore harmony again, he replaces the young lover and supports him in his courtship as a schemer, instructor, and deceiver. In these roles, he inverts the social hierarchy and constructs illusionary frames as he deceives the other noblemen about his identity. The ease with which a servant uses the diction of a gentleman affirms that he is superior and special in contrast to other servants. Despite his impertinence, he goes unpunished—even after he denies knowing his master Vincentio. The previously threatened servant feasting at the end describes the Saturnalian quality of Plautus' slaves. The same is true for Tranio's image as a greyhound, which emphasises his replacement of someone superior. He supports the resolution of conflicts without forgetting to fulfil his function for intricacies.

The question of how much of Dulipo, also a successor of the Plautine clever slave, can be found in Tranio and how 'originally' Plautine is the clever servant in *The Shrew* has been addressed, while the significance of these difference should now be evaluated. Similar to the clever slave, Dulipo takes the role of a master, promises remedy, fears detection, pulls a few comic escapades, and finds a way to keep his promise. Ariosto and Gascoigne's role of the deceiving servant definitely goes back on Plautus' type since they employ a talent for ranks the young master relies upon and are fond of providing some skits and jests. But several passages, wherein Tranio functions as the Plautine type, deviate from *Supposes*. It starts in the first scene since where Dulipo is introduced and presents contrasts to Tranio's involvement in the first scene, how he vies for attention of his function for Lucentio, and how he provides the audience with the concept of a schemer with all his talents typically for Plautus' *servus callidus*. Shakespeare receives the skeleton of the plot of the romantic affair from Ariosto's *I Suppositi* and Gacsoigne's adaptation.

The Shrew does not tell the scheming and the inversion of roles by Polynesta/Bianca, who tells her nurse Balya in *Supposes* that "the man whom you have Supposed to be Dulipo is (as I say) Erostrato" (*Supp.* 1.1.110-12). The figures in *Supposes* commit the error of changing identities as a tale that can be believed, told, or not heard.[864] The Italian play intensifies the intersection between fiction and performance, blurring the direct access of what is seen and what is acted with what is heard and told as story. *Supposes* sometimes even puts narrative over mimetic access to the play's content and development. In contrast, Shakespeare prefers the spectacle when he stages Lucentio's falling in love with Bianca as an eavesdropping scene that resembles Philolaches' eavesdropping and praising Philematio's beauty. Performing the start of a romance to the audience coincides with the need of a plan and the contriver how to bring the romance to a happy ending. Hence, Tranio, the clever servant, outlines his type and

---

864 E.g. see *Supp.* 5.8.25-63. Pasiphilo informs Damon about Erostrato and Dulipo's exchange of identities.

builds in reminiscences of Plautus' clever slave as the scene foregrounds the comic absorption of Lucentio in love and pleasure, supported by Tranio. Shakespeare presents the master-servant inversion in contrast to telling the audience about the kernel trigger of error, whereby he also visualizes the Saturnalian atmosphere.

Tranio as one central figure proves Shakespeare's transfer from a 'story' of *Supposes* to a more active and immediate approach as Tranio concocts plans on stage and guides the characters as well as the audience in the intrigue of the subplot. Phases of scheming and instructions are performed and reflected upon at the moment they are needed. They are not given in retrospect as Dulipo in *Supposes* does in the dialogue with Erostrato, where he tells him about his last scheme involving the fake father he already met.[865] Though the report of a plan or a deception is not unlike Plautus' habits, clever slaves persuade by their improvisatory talent since they react right away. They concoct plans live on stage while they are sure of their plans' success. Periplectomenus watches and comments on Palaestrio's scheming (*Mil.* 195ff.); Chrysalus assures Pistoclerus and the audience of a brilliant plan (*Bacch.* 225ff.). Similarly, the clever servant Tranio directly adapts to tricky situations, plots, and assures the audience of wonders as he does when he invents a father. Typically, he completes his machinations without expressing regret. On the contrary, Dulipo shows deep regrets over having denied his father. He speaks of "a sorowfull successe" (*Supp.* 5.3.30), lamenting Erostrato's imprisonment and thinking "it is too late now to imagine any further deceite" (*Supp.* 5.3.31-32) as now he can only tell the truth to Philogano to rescue his young master.[866] Dulipo wants to turn himself in since he chooses to lose heart instead of trusting in his talents after some moment of panic like the audience could expect from a clever slave. Tranio keeps his dominance, confidence, and role intact as long as he can even after he meets the true Vincentio.

Dulipo becomes a weakened *servus callidus* as his two soliloquies strike a more tragic tone unfitting for a jester type like the clever slave, who usually responds to detection with only a temporary fear of punishment. Regularly, the final discovery of his plans triggers in him boldness but never such confessions of earnest pain. The servant's misery, moral doubts, and final surrender are juxtaposed with Tranio's continuation of being a witty deceiver until the end of *The Shrew* like a confident *servus callidus*.

Shakespeare programmatically changes the name of Ariosto's clever servant to Tranio, while he underlines the decisive elements of Plautus' type. He recognizes his functionality to foster the Saturnalian inversion of roles more intensely and emphasizes the plot of deception and agonistic scenes of wit, whereby he leaves the opportunity for Lucentio to engage in the more romanticized subplot in comparison to amorous adventures in *Supposes*. In his idiosyncratic way, Shakespeare follows the tradition of New Comedy and that of *commedia erudita* in the play while Tranio appears to continue New Comedy's elements of deceit. Shakespeare visualizes the stage of the play-within-the-play in the same carnivalesque atmosphere and activates comic incongruity in the figures, whereby the audience can engage in the pleasure of error. In contrast to Gascoigne, who highlights moments of perception and

---

865 See *Supp.* 2.1.

866 See *Supp.* 5.1.1ff. And note Dulipo's soliloquy, 5.3.1-7: "I was glad to rid him out of the way, least he shoulde see me burst out of these swelling teares, which hitherto with great payne I have prisoned in my brest, and least he shoulde heare the eccho of my doubled sighes, whiche bounce from the botome of my hevy heart. O cursed I! O cruell fortune!"; in *Captivi*, Tyndarus foregrounds his braveness and loyalty that he is willing to forsake himself for his master, too, whereas he is not in an equally depressive mood.

misperception or deception and decipherment,[867] Shakespeare emphasizes Tranio as the performer of the classical model of deceit and gives a main part of lines to the stereotypical plotter, instructor, and deceiver in order to act out his illusionary talent, whereby he also gains a balanced parallel to Petruccio. Dulipo does not share the same proportion of dominance in the play but is often absent from the action as when his servants pull him back into the house after his encounter with his master Philogano.[868]

As it is the case for Ariosto and Gascoigne, the change of identities is central to Shakespeare's play. But he does not tell the audience about it. In these phases, the shape-shifter from Plautus calls the processes of masking and unmasking to mind, which elicits the utopian character of comedy. The phases become vivid by the functional clever servant, who links the comic subtext with his praise of sweetness, contriving talents, insights into the 'pith' of the play, and persuasive speeches. Tranio supports the successful change of identities as well as the realisation of romance. The clever servant/*servus callidus* serves as a known and popular type to realize Shakespeare's alternate course and probably, also satisfies Elizabethan fondness for a Plautine-like play with error and deceit. Indeed, Shakespeare's audience is quite likely to have recognized Plautus' elements, whereas later spectators probably identify those as 'Italian' and 'romantic'.[869]

For both plays, *Supposes* and *The Shrew*, the servant or the supposed master originates from Hellenistic-Roman comedy's body of intrigue and error of identity, but it is Shakespeare's chosen name that claims distinctive parallels to the original *servus callidus*. It is not at all just about verbal parallels to *Mostellaria* Shakespeare implies. But in the fondness and inflation of blending, the play can draw upon several Italian, Latin, and English sources, among which most presumably some plays of Plautus were at hand.[870] There, he can find many examples of the *servus callidus'* concept available for his own creation of the deceitful servant. To enhance the functional figure of the clever servant Dulipo found in Gascoigne's translation of Ariosto, Shakespeare avails himself of that compilation of *servi callidi* to constitute Tranio. In that sense, it can be said that the more deviated Tranio will occur from *Supposes'* employment of the *servus callidus* figure and its characteristics, the more obvious Shakespeare's knowledge as well as his autarchy and individual use of Plautus' type will become. The *servus callidus* becomes the clever, eloquent, and mannered Elizabethan servant as the self-aware performer of illusion and deceit. On the abstract level, both Tranios are prototypical professional fool, whose aesthetic value and functionality for comedy Shakespeare and Plautus recognized and used, although Shakespeare did not incorporate all thematic constituents Plautus' type offers in a single figure.

The clever servant's role in the subplot of Bianca's wooing helps to realize comedy's happy ending while the figure is protected as the Saturnalian type. Being all-license is not thematised with the same intensity as it is for Plautus' slave but taken as a given. Issues of *ridiculum* such as opposing life and death in threats of punishment, fear, and the reward of freedom seem not to be as productive for this play as they were in farcical plays watched by

---

867 Cf. George Gascoigne, *A hundreth sundrie flowres*, George W. Pigman (ed.), Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press, 2000, 479.
868 Miola (1994), 69: Dulipo "fades permanently from the action".
869 Cf. Madeleine Doran, *Endeavors of Art. A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954, 77; and Riehle (1990), 272.
870 For an overview of others sources used for the Induction, e.g. *The Journeys of Marco Polo* containing a man dreaming, see Fernando Cioni, 'Shakespeare's Italian Intertexts: *The Taming of the Shrew/a Shrew*', *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*, Michele Marrapodi (ed.), Manchester et al.: Manchester University Press, 2004, 118-130, 119.

Roman society built on slavery. Tranio furthermore has no lengthy mock-heroic passages and self-praising parts as a military leader but presents himself as a gentleman, who is confident in his abilities to scheme and deceive. His separately presented roles of a schemer, instructor, and deceiver grant access to a carnivalesque world of hierarchical inversions, an agonistic attitude, desires of the body, and oppositions of low and high or actual and non-actual. Like the support of the utopian quality by the *servus callidus*, Tranio's roles allow the possible to meet the impossible, which sometimes reveals the servant at the outside of the stage. His distance from the stage's matter enables the servant to recognize the problem's essence and its remedy. With his superior status, he gives the audience access to the utopia of romantic comedy as the figure exemplifies in the most Plautine passages at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the play when he foreshadows romantic processes, provides a Plautine soliloquy of promising machinations and designs himself in self-reflection. Although playfulness and the management of *ridiculum* are not among his key tasks, he adds sources for *ridiculum* in his competitive attacks against rival suitors and in his deceptive activities. His gentleman disguise mainly bypasses clownish elements as deliberate misunderstanding, twisting of sense or puzzling responses. Later productions of the play, however, recognized Tranio's roots and visualized them by putting him in a Harlequin's mask and giving him a "parti-coloured dress, and lath sword", which was the case at Williams in 1931.[871] Indeed, the idea to dress Tranio up as a Harlequin is not far from the truth. George Richard Hibbard suggests that in the text, there is a hint at Tranio's nature as a knave and "facetious servant" in Italian farce. Vincentio tells Tranio that his father "is a sailmaker in Bergamo" (*TS* 5.1.69-70); Bergamo was known as a centre of Harlequins.[872] Shakespeare might intend to intensify the servant's connection to the laughable and oppose his true identity to his disguise.

In *Supposes*, Dulipo offers some of the clever slave's features; yet, Dulipo's role does not explain Shakespeare's Tranio fully as their realisations of the Plautine concept stress single constituents differently. The Italian play misses chances to foreground Dulipo as the same sovereign Plautine figure Tranio incorporates as he proves by his performances of deceit. Shakespeare arranges Plautus' type primarily due to its functionality for the plot, whereas Tranio does not emphasise its functionality for comedy's aesthetic coherence on the sublevel as intensely as his predecessors do. In proportion to his part in the play, Tranio fits the main plot's organization since the themes and identities or in other words, the cluster of scripts, Tranio puts forward is arranged in juxtaposition and often, contradiction. His performances underlie a moderate understanding of the full tripartite concept of *ludus-ludere*, acting, tricking, and playing games of jests. Therefore, Tranio cannot be considered a full version of the professional fool figure but a part of Shakespeare's use of Plautus' material. In brief, *The Shrew's* business of the Plautine model leaves no doubt about Shakespeare's reception of Plautus' clever slave.

Both Tranios are stereotypes of the intriguer synchronized to their contemporary theatre and culture. They prompt a dynamic of illusion for comedy's plot and represent one New Comedic nucleus, deceit. Hence, their core profession is the performance of wit, which

---

871 Schafer (ed.) (2002), 81.

872 William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, George Richard Hibbard (ed.), Harmondsworth et al.: Penguin Books, 1969, 237; Oliver (ed.) (1984), 217, note 68-9. Harold J. Oliver himself offers two alternatives to explain the phrase: Shakespeare's geographic knowledge might have been false again since Bergamo is not a sea-port or being a sailmaker in Bergamo is a stock joke. He also mentions Coryate's suggestion that Bergamo recommended itself as an adequate birthplace for Tranio since Italy did not know any other place where a ruder or grosser language was spoken (see Thomas Coryate, *Crudities*, Vol. II [1611], Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1905, 56, also see Vol. I, xviii, his explications of the 'emblemes of the frontispice').

can be the realisation of intrigue and manipulation in conversation as well as the comments and reflections on the plot, other figures' behaviour, failures and vices. Plautus' art of entertainment and comic design was appealing to the Elizabethans, who appreciated Plautine wit. The main creator of that wit displays the *servus callidus*.[873] Shakespeare reorganized the manipulative brain Tranio, the prototypical professional fool, to a spicy depiction of Italian elements of romance. Shakespeare understood, as Plautus did, that a playwright should distribute an equal and coherent mixture of organic and inorganic elements, while he deepens the comic discourse by stabilizing and reflecting the illusion the audience perceives. Throughout Shakespeare's play, New Comedy's voice speaks loudly and clearly, to which the playwright's use of Plautus contributes decisively. Besides the clever slave and in regard to the whole dramaturgy, Shakespeare applies common Plautine techniques, which occur in chains of asides, eavesdropping scenes, and separate groups acting concurrently.[874] The classical tradition is not simply mediated via the Italian intertexts or English translations, but taken from Shakespeare's work with the originals as he proves with material directly transferred from *Captivi*, *Eunuchus*, *Mostellaria*, and Plautus' other plays.

This is not to say that Shakespeare simply copied the *servus callidus* in Tranio without any recognition of Dulipo's heritage of the Plautine slave. He intensified the type and used its functionality for his comedy. In the deliberate fool and the paradox tradition in comedy, Shakespeare arranges his protagonists as descendants supplemented by a 'foolish' servant. Plautus' comedies and their reception supply a decisive source for the prototypical deliberate fool figure with its popular manifestations like Palaestrio, Pseudolus, Chrysalus, or Tranio, and later male and female tricksters, the zanni from *Commedia dell'arte*, and other witty, quarrelsome illusionists. Shakespeare's *Shrew* is part of this tradition and undoubtedly, appeal of such comic types that are productive by the paradox pattern. In Shakespeare's play, several figures resemble the deliberate fool figure, of whom Tranio consciously pivots on Plautus' clever slave.

To understand Shakespeare's development of the witty servant and his conception of the figurative performance of wit in the wise fool, we must differentiate the figure's function for the plot (to scheme, instruct, and deceive) from its functionality for comedy's nature, to engage in and support the carnivalesque, *ridiculum*, and utopian quality. Shakespeare's transformation of the *servus callidus* depends on the 'romanticization' of plot, figures, and style. Tranio's advice, "*Redime te captum quam queas minimo*" (*TS* 1.1.161), recalls New Comedy's conditioning of love on money and concomitantly, the servant's function to concoct a plan to provide the young master with the money needed. In the First Folio from 1623, the line reads *captam* instead of *captum*.[875] Tranio's Latin phrase is one of several inaccurate phrases in Italian or Latin in Shakespeare's plays. It is not clear if the mistake was intentional and whose it was. But it is certain that the Folio's *captam* was changed to *captum*. Tranio's advice fitting his own Plautine function echoes Terence's slave Parmeno in *Eunuchus* when he counsels Phaedria (see *Eun*. 74-75.).[876] Terence's opening scene is of Roman Comedy's desperate young man and his slave ministering to the young lover. Ariosto draws heavily upon Terence's play, which makes it an indirect source for Shakespeare. The precise order of words and the disparate Latin form suggest that Shakespeare directly quotes the phrase from Lily's

---

873 Cf. Riehle (1990), 215.
874 Cf. *Ibid*., 214.
875 Cf. Hodgdon (2010), 169, note 161.
876 Parmeno: "*nisi ut te redimas captum quam queas minumo*" (Terence, *Eunuchus*, John Barsby [ed.], Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 37). Barsby defines Parmeno as "a cynical realist" (91), which does not make him an appropriate source for Tranio, the clever servant.

Grammar, which was first argued by Samuel Johnson. This caused some scholars to argue against Shakespeare's use of Terence.[877] But Shakespeare's knowledge of the original cannot be denied simply because of an error in citation. The popularity of the play and its history of Renaissance imitation demonstrates the opposite.[878] The assumption that Shakespeare rarely uses Latin sources in the original is strongly misleading. New Comedy's elements are reinterpreted in his plays. Underlining Roman Comedy's typical relation of *adulescens* and *servus* here by a Latin proverb found in Terence's *Eunuchus* signifies Shakespeare's awareness of using stereotypical elements for his scene, whereby he links the speaker Tranio even more closely to his type's antecedents in Roman sources.

Looking at the citation as an interruption of the English lines, the sentence means a conscious insertion recalling New Comedic love and marriage's monetization. By the instrument of intertextuality, Shakespeare employs a moment of decision since the reference could break with, follow, or change the tradition it is based on. In regard to Barthes' term of circular reading, this manipulation is a self-conscious use of repetition to establish difference, a sign of the deeply eristic nature of the later text.[879]

Tranio's maxim that Lucentio should "redeem [himself] from captivity at the lowest price possible" exemplifies the romance's dependence on money and bargaining. In Shakespeare, Tranio's duty is to create an illusion for Baptista Minola and that is the fake father's appearance of wealth.[880] The servant's primary instruments to achieve a happy ending are money and wealth. In *Mostellaria* as in most other intrigue comedies, scenes of wooing do not fill the plot but it is the question what trick will achieve the money and the girl. The triangle of Lucentio, Bianca, and Tranio leaves the Latin phrase's stereotypical firmness for plot and figure partly behind as it also concentrates on romantic moments in the subplot. Shakespeare cites the proverb from Lily's *Latin Grammar* at the beginning, which hints at the core circumstances of Plautus' intrigue comedies.[881] Getting money is the responsibility of the clever slave. However, the audience watches a more modest clever servant, who does not silence and substitute his young master in that intensity known from many Plautus' intrigue comedies. He does not negotiate romance, which is left to Lucentio and Bianca, but the contract for marriage. In other words, he is bound to the subordinate condition of Hellenistic-Roman amorous relationship: money.

From Plautus' farce to romantic comedy, a change can be observed; it is the decline of the scheming protagonist as well as the prominence of courtship. It ceases to be a game of bargaining without the involvement of both lovers.[882] Shakespeare deviates intentionally from

---

877 Cf. Miola (1994), 70, esp. ft. 14. Miola refers to Farmer's wrong conclusion (see Farmer, 1767 in Brian Vickers [ed.], *Shakespeare, The Critical Heritage*, 6 Vols., London: 1974-81, 261, 275-6, 291-2).
878 Cf. *Ibid.*, 70.
879 *Ibid.*, 73. Miola defines the evocation of *Eunuchus*. To illustrate his point, he refers to the introduction in Michael Worton and Judith Still's *Intertextuality. Theories and Practice* (Manchester [1990], 10). Cf. Miller (1975), 35-6 (Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte*). "Proust is what comes to me, not what I summon up; not an 'authority,' simply a *circular memory*. Which is what the inter-text is: the impossibility of living outside the infinite text— whether this text be Proust or the daily newspaper or the television screen: the book creates the meaning, the meaning creates life." (36).
880 See for the prominent relation of money and love/marriage, e.g. *Most.* 229-30, Philolaches on money: *siquidem hercle vendundust pater, venibit multo potius,/ quam te me vivo umquam sinam egere aut mendicare.*
881 Cf. William Lily, *Lily's grammar of Latin in English*, Hedwig Gwosdek (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 43; and cf. Baldwin (1944), 367.
882 Compare Jonathan Bate, *How the Classics made Shakespeare*, Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2019, 66-71, esp. 71 on *The Comedy of Errors* echoing Plautus. In *The Comedy of Errors*, money dominating the city, its citizen, and all its lowlife characters echoes the central status of trade and money in Plautus' comedies.

former patriarchal politics of love and marriage. The comic centralization of romantic love starts to alter the depiction of desire, sexual appetite, and male satisfaction. Love's portrayal is apparent in the sheer number of love scenes: when Lucentio pretends to teach Bianca, he exchanges affectionate but secret messages with her. The former purpose of Vincentio that his son should study in Padua is undermined when Latin literature, here the passage of *Heroides*, is utilized and loses its value and purpose. In regard to such pretentious teaching, the scene interprets the conventional combination of utility and pleasure ironically. There is no parody of Ovid's passage, but a charming evolution of 'comic' romance and comedy's treatment of it. Bianca and Lucentio prefer to ignore repetitions of grammar rules but stylize their talk to their own verbal harmony since they end their coded conversation by setting 'art' and 'heart' parallel to each other in a significant rhyme.[883] Bianca names her Lucentio "master of [his] art", which alludes to the young lover's preference for Ovid, the erotic poet, and Lucentio calls her "mistress of [his] heart" underlining his affection for her (see *TS* 4.2.9-10).

To realize such wooing scenes, Shakespeare needs to adapt the presence of the beloved mistress. Unlike a Polynesta, a Philematio, or a Pamphila, Bianca is not as exchangeable as her antecedents but gains shape by stressing her own position when she talks to her suitors with an emphasis on the first-person pronoun and her own will (see *TS* 3.1.16-23). Analogically, she does not participate in activities of desire willingly or unwillingly. The amorous relationship is preceded by chastity and courtship opposing rape, sexual intercourse, and pregnancy.[884] In contrast to the affair of desire triggering more desire in Erostrato over two years, Lucentio's wooing is never consummated while Tranio's culminates in a wedding.

Whereas Plautus' trickster most often conquers the main plot of the Roman farcical plays, fighting with his opponent, romantic comedies tend to leave him a more subsidiary role in proportion and preferably, focus on courtship and lovers' encounter. In the subplot of *TS* courtship becomes more seminal but still has not unfolded its full potential as in Shakespeare's later comedies. Tranio belongs to Plautine types of cunning in wooing Bianca in the form of an agon and bargain. In accordance with Miola, a crucial function of the clever slave is that Tranio frees his young master from negotiation but achieves private time for him and his fair Bianca.[885] Shakespeare separates the public and private spheres in courtship, allowing the experience of a young lovesick man wooing his lady, which adds the level of romance to the classical comedy's depiction of courtship as socio-economic politics.[886] In contrast to *Supposes*, Shakespeare's play intensifies the performance of courtship by fake and true suitors, while the audience can enjoy a mastermind and his manipulations. In that sense, the Plautine slave in Dulipo must be revived in Tranio. The subplot's deviations blend New Comedy's element and romance, removing everything superfluous like *Supposes'* parasite stemming from *Captivi* does not belong to *The Shrew's* cast. In so doing, he enhances New Comedic constituents' visibility and vitality on stage.

The Shrew, its romantic dominance, and the subplot's young couple is still remote from Rosalind and Orlando's encounters as for Lucentio, it is not the mistress' favour securing marriage, but it is the negotiation and affirmation of a dowry that conditions the lovers' union. In Shakespeare's later comedies, wooing is a negotiation of sovereignty, honesty, and pain but not financial superiority. Economic security and social requirements are not ignored but do not control the discourse of courtship. Analogically, the configuration of the mostly silent *virgo*

---

883 Cf. Miola (1994), 73.
884 Cf. *Ibid.*, 71-72.
885 *Ibid.*, 72, "the disguise creates a two-planed wooing action, one part performed by Lucentio himself, the other by Tranio as Lucentio."
886 Compare *Ibid.*, 72.

evolves from a bargaining chip to an autonomous young woman who negotiates for herself.[887] Shakespeare is no longer in need of a sympathetic protagonist, who tricks the master out of money for his son, since the private process of courtship, the agon of wit between the genders and the performance of the foolish lover are now at the centre of the plot, for instance *As You Like It*. A deceptive and disguised heroine now occupies this central role.

Tranio—a witty servant who influences and concocts the plot—must change accordingly. Plautine routines of the deliberate fool are still in operation in the play but transformed. The intrigue, tricking, and deception are opened up and simultaneously, multiplied through numerous sovereign figures that construct coils of deceit and illusion, not altruistically as servants but for their own self-interest and (re)stabilization of social identity. After the parallel plots of Sly's Induction, Petruccio's taming of Kate, and Lucentio's courting of Bianca, *Much Ado about Nothing* deals with pairs of sympathetic deceivers, Beatrice and Benedick and Claudio and Hero. These characters share and compete for the qualities of the New Comedic principal figure, whose scheming, masking themselves and others, manipulating others in conversation, and enjoying badinage now enrich romantic discourse. Shakespeare takes the comic agon the clever slave pursues often with the older characters and expands it to a quarrel of identities. He obfuscates the trickster's usual operations in and outside the illusionary frames by allowing more figures to alternate between these boundaries of fiction and reality. Due to Miola,

> Shakespeare's New Comedic intrigues raise questions about personal and social identity, while exploring the powerful, often subversive and destabilizing energies of the theatre and role-playing.[888]

Intrigue remains a spicy piece of action in the plot but as far as Shakespeare's later course of comedy is concerned, the seminal issue in the subtext is not a carnivalesque competition of social ranks but a sophisticated look at women and men attempting to shatter stereotypes and male-dominated courtship. His characters face and produce alternations of illusions about their identity and their private and public portrayals. A decisive instrument for that experience is disguise. In his career, Shakespeare's plays show a range from lightness and innocence to darkness and satire. *Much Ado about Nothing* or *As You Like It* are fairy-tale romances in comparison to *Troilus and Cressida*, which also features a deliberate fool. Though the Plautine tricking servant like Tranio disappears, Shakespeare transforms it, acknowledging Plautus' understanding of a powerful comic figure living at the peripheries of the stage. He transfers his features to his cunning heroines and his wise fools. The latter become arrangers of wits in words more than deeds, taking a supporting role to the heroine. The clever servant stays the ally but evolves into the wise fool. Touchstone can be seen as the first professional fool in Shakespeare's comedies.

---

887 See also Bate (2019), 71 on Plautus in *Errors*. The key role of money and trade, which is still valid for *The Comedy of Errors*, is supplanted by a strong heroine.
888 Miola (1994), 62.

IV.ii. Shakespeare's first wise fool: Touchstone

Renaissance comedy inherited New Comedy's depiction of error and deceit, which Shakespeare's canon of comedies also exhibits evidently. From the starting of his writing, he develops his way of integrating traditional models of the ugly into Elizabethan ideas of love, romance, and social standards. The pursuit of and obstacles to love are central to the romance. If the technique, whereby intrigue and trickery remove all impediments, vanishes, the Plautine form changes and adapts to the subtext of illusion; the stereotypical instigator has a different foundation and thus, could either cease to exist or adapt to the altered conditions of achieving denouement. It is argued that the latter is the case. Following Salingar, Miola, and Riehle's theories, the thesis has shown that chapter that the Plautine concept remains productive in its functionality though its role and its masks look different in the transformations of the heroine and the deliberate fool. Romantic comedy and specifically, the resources of plots Shakespeare chooses to bring to London's stage do not feature a cheeky mastermind in the form of a principal servant. Shakespeare's Tranio cannot pertain to his visibility as the schemer, instructor, and deceiver but such cunning autonomy is given to more than one type of character in various settings. Prime movers are found in Oberon (*Midsummer Night's Dream*), in Prospero (*The Tempest*), Iago (*Othello*) or Viola and Maria in *Twelfth Night*. Shakespeare's plays show the Renaissance's fondness for blending and multiplying elements from a variety of sources, to which the New Comedic model of deceit and in particular, Plautus' aesthetically effective clever slave definitely belongs. This is undeniable in *As You Like It* bringing Touchstone, the first of the wise fools, and the female illusionist, Rosalind, onto the stage.[889] This pair is based upon the paradox pattern, moving in the same traditional stream of self-aware comic figures can fool themselves and others, define themselves by their contribution to the laughable, and foster the coherence of comedy's world in addition to the visibility of the specific discourse they play in since they grant the audience access to comic illusion, its types and themes, or the utopian condition of an upside-down sphere. They are significant for the comic experience, which includes not only laughter but the whole aesthetic experience of understanding, joyful laughter, superiority, and cathartic feelings. As it will be shown in the analysis of *AYL*, Shakespeare achieves such effects mainly by having Touchstone and Rosalind rely on the *paradox*. The analysis will first look at the heroine, her surroundings, and her closeness to the Plautine type to understand Shakespeare's parallel construction. The findings will be examined in comparison to Touchstone.

Rosalind/Ganymede works with masking and unmasking, omniscience, subversive energies, and concepts of gender. She is not a servant intriguer but responsible for her own fortune as a *virgo* voicing her difficult position in courtship. While her part in the plot is based upon Lodge's *Rosalynde*, her wit and magical influence on the others stem from Shakespeare's feather.[890] The female persona attains a more sovereign voice speaking critically and asserts herself against other male figures.[891] What the clever slave is for intrigue comedy, she seems to be for romantic comedy. Shakespeare takes her involvement in the plot from Lodge, but

---

889 Cf. Robert Hillis Goldsmith, *Wise Fools in Shakespeare*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1958, 15.

890 Cf. Edward I. Berry, 'Rosalynde and Rosalind', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31.1 (1980): 42-52.

891 On the transformation of the voice of Rosalind from Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*, Lodge's *Rosalynde* and *AYL* see Clare R. Kinney, 'Feigning Female Faining: Spenser, Lodge, Shakespeare, and Rosalind', *Modern Philology* (1980): 291-315, esp. 303ff.

draws her against the background of Plautus' cunning male and female figures, his experience and success with these kind of figures.

She has 686 lines—no other character has as many in the play. Orlando has fewer than half, slightly more than the number accorded to Celia.[892] She holds together the side plots of the other love stories and determines the course of action. She combines a trickster's "omnipotence" with the affinity for wordplay in the context of wooing, a battle of wills, wishes, and longing.[893] Shakespeare gives the audience two variations of that battle in *The Shrew* and *Much Ado about Nothing*, where the latter had a similarly strong spirit in Beatrice.

In addition to the role of such a female voice, *AYL's* heroine encompasses two personae, Ganymede and Rosalind, which have layers of identities and erotic allusions since her wooing role and disguise imply female and male attributions at the same time. On the London stage, no women played the female roles but a boy actors did. The prohibition of women on stage advanced to a functional device of cross-dressing since

> [t]he use of the boy actor to impersonate women became the focal point of vituperation of the theatre, on the grounds that cross-dressing excited homoerotic feeling both in the actors on stage and in the audience.[894]

The device's popularity, the shift to romance, and the plot's construction left no space for a traditional Plautine illusionist of tales since his natural surroundings transform into a comic world, where a heroine, an actual boy, rules, courts, and is courted. Her quality of an instigator is clear from the beginning when the two young women think about how to escape Celia's father. It is Rosalind who comes up with the plan to dress like a man since she is "more than common tall" (*AYL* 1.3.112), but her friend Celia decides to go with her to the Forest of Arden, encouraging her to devise together how to fly from banishment to liberty (see *AYL* 1.3.97, 134-35). The two girls conceive the plan together, give themselves incognitos, determine how to disguise themselves and with whom they want to travel.

Rosalind suggests to take Touchstone, or more likely, to steal mirth from Frederick and gain a companion (see *AYL* 1.3.126-28). Shakespeare gives her a foil that is constructed symmetrically for the production of the laughable and asymmetrically in the realisation of courtship.[895] Rosalind's ally and friend are found in Celia who is her equal in wit. She accompanies Rosalind on her adventure (of courtship), sometimes silently watching the lovers' dialogue. Once they arrive in the forest, she stands behind Rosalind but sometimes, she can advance to an equal commentator and director. It is she who reveals Ganymede's identity and dominates the discourse playfully, which aligns her next to Rosalind and Touchstone.[896] Celia reflects Rosalind and to an extent, Touchstone. Since she has only a

---

892 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 361-2. She relies on King's table taken from T.J. King, *Casting Shakespeare's Plays: London Actors and Their Roles, 1590-1642* (Cambridge, 1992).

893 *Ibid.*, 140. For a further striking reading of the power of Rosalind's part, see Camille Paglia, *Sexual Personae, Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*, London/New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990, 194-229, esp. 208-209 and 200: In comparison to another female figure, Rosalind's skills in rhetoric remind us of Portia's, who revolves the most tricky law case and outstands each man taking part there.

For Hardin, Portia can be summoned under "Shakespeare's cleverest manipulators" in comedy (Richard F. Hardin, *Plautus and the English Renaissance of Comedy*, Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2018, 94).

894 Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 9. Here, she refers to Laura Levine's book *Men in Women's Clothes* (1994) and Valerie Traub's book *Desire and Anxiety* (1992).

895 In comparison, Touchstone in his supporting role has 273 lines. See *Ibid.*, 361-2.

896 Dusinberre highlights her function as "audience, commentator and agent in the mock marriage (see *AYL* 4.1.119-27)." *Ibid.*, 30.

supporting role to the heroine, there is no separate analysis of her role. Shakespeare places Rosalind at the centre, accompanied by other free spirits investing in pure mirth, sometimes in combination with an analytical understanding of what is happening on stage.

The three exiles are outsiders by rank and gender. Such figures are usually assumed to be intellectually inferior. Even so, it is them, primarily Rosalind, who dominates comedy's stage and understands the comic grounds they and others inhabit. The clever slave's characteristics appear once Rosalind becomes Ganymede and arrives in the forest where she manipulates, teaches, and instructs other figures how to behave. She sets the date for her own marriage by telling Orlando to dress appropriately and "bid [his] friends" (*AYL* 5.2.70). Phoebe faces the assumed boy instructing her whom to love: "look upon [Silvius]; love him" (*AYL* 5.2.78). In analogy to the clever slave, she silences the other lovers' sighing, orders them off stage and tells them when to come back.[897] She persuades them of her abilities like Rosalind promises Orlando's brother that she "shall devise something" (*AYL* 4.3.180). A woman commanding as well as teaching women and particularly men has a carnivalesque aspect, also found in the shepherd Ganymede ordering Orlando from court. As an *architectus*, she uses fiction to reach her aims, spinning an illusionary net. In her teaching of Orlando, she invents tales and plays with identities for herself, resembling a *poeta* of her own chance and the fortune of others. That is the case when she (re)masks herself as Orlando's Rosalind (see *AYL* 3.2.103-4). Before she addresses Orlando as Ganymede, she starts her agenda by a seeming aside in a clever slave's tone, denigrating herself a cheeky low-rank figure: "I will speak to him like a saucy lackey and under that habit play the knave with him?" (*AYL* 3.2.287-88). All these features indicate her kinship to Plautine deceiver.[898] Though her social background does not recommend her for the typical trickster role, which was usually given to the low-ranked figures in New Comedy; the utopian Arden world allows her to play the knave.[899] In other words, Shakespeare does not copy and delimit his representations of human life with stock characteristics but transfers processes of inversion and dynamics of incongruity for his comic characters. Transgressions of rank and gender crack order and system of categories as Plautus' figures had already experienced.

The Plautine slave and the disguised heroine share a superior position towards love and its folly; at least Ganymede does. The moment when the trickster counsels the young lover and promises remedy calls attention to the clever slave's relation to the young master. The lover, who seeks remedy for folly as Orlando beseeches Ganymede to "tell [him] [her] remedy" (*AYL* 3.2.353-54), can be cured by a cunning figure.[900] The relationship between the clever slave and the young master thus finds its analogy in that of the student and the teacher, who decides how the encounters with Orlando should look. As Ganymede, she uses illusionary frames to teach him and test him but also to persuade him of her identity by telling him a tale about "an old religious uncle of [hers] taught [her] to speak" and her previous success as a curer (*AYL* 3.2.332 and see 390ff.). By the end of the play, she has spun a biographical story

---

897 See esp. *AYL* 3.5ff.; 5.2.105-06, 114-116. For more examples on a commanding Rosalind/Ganymede, see 3.2.120-1, 245, 412, 416; 3.4.53-54; 4.1.30-34, 37, 62, 103-104, 114-15, 134, 136, 183-4; 4.3.68-73; 5.2.69-70; 5.4.19-23.

898 Female tricksters are an exception in comparison to their male counterpart as well as their centrality. Plautus offers a female version, the *meretrix* supported by her slave Astaphium, in *Truculentus*, two helpers for Palaestrio in *Miles gloriosus*, and an old matron in *Casina*. Also note the *virgo callida* in *Persa*, see J.C.B. Lowe, 'The *Virgo Callida* of Plautus, *Persa*', *The Classical Quarterly* 39.2 (1989): 390-399.

899 Cf. Rei (1998), esp. 92-4. *Casina* depicts female identity ambiguously, first in the disguised clever slave and secondly, in the wife, which causes an intersected double of rank and gender as the wife "is 'high' in status but 'low' in gender" (93).

900 See *AYL* 3.2.308, 388, and 403.

for Orlando: "I have since I was three years old conversed with a magician, most profound in his art and yet not damnable." (*AYL* 5.2.58-60).[901] Thereby, she constructs for herself an identity that combines her status as the trickster with her surroundings and especially the utopian nature of the forest, where her uncle, the hermit and magician, fits.[902]

In the pastoral world, unlike in Tranio's Italy, tricking transforms from a negotiation without the involvement of the lovers to a direct negotiation of longing and its cure, whose discourse the heroine determines. The servant as mediator is no longer needed; instead, the young woman as a participant and constructor of courtship mediates a lover's problems, thoughts, and doubts via her masks of Ganymede and Rosalind. Different roles are played in the process of courtship as Ganymede becomes a bride in the mock wedding scene. A courtly lady takes on the mask of a seducer challenging Orlando with sexual allusions, to which he responds chastely (see *AYL* 4.1.102-4). The duke's daughter in male disguise using sexual vocabulary unites male as well as female qualities, whereby she mocks social standards and gender stereotypes.[903] The clever woman full of oppositions makes courtship a time of chaos, wherein Rosalind as Ganymede is all at once a seducer, teacher, mocker, and reluctant lover.

In the lovers' game, she underscores all her actions and speech acts with an ironic tone, sometimes even willingly and openly; the female protagonist entertains by her control of lovers in a male disguise, while she is in love herself but 'her' actor is a boy.[904] Rosalind can put on the comic mask herself and expose others but also her own failure, which nourishes *ridiculum*. As a figure standing at the outside and knowingly carrying the comic mask, her comprehension of her roles, its layers, and its surroundings makes her capable of metatheatrical evaluation when she can "prove a busy actor in their play" (*AYL* 3.4.55). She moves close to the Plautine type whenever she directs self-consciously and tellingly, which becomes apparent when she calls herself "a magician" (*AYL* 5.2.69). Machinations and wonderful developments are replaced by magical cures, whereby she ceases to be an altruistic clever slave as she operates with illusions for herself, only simulating to replace another figure. She can look on the illusionary frames she constructed from the outside, knowing and discussing their net. Her figure takes a distanced view on the discourse and uses her perspicacity to elucidate the action on stage, the personae there, and the underlying themes, which echoes the *servus callidus*' philosophizing and illuminating passages. The complexity of her examinations likewise varies in length and in abstraction, moving from one-line comments to long monologues, sometimes pinpointing the performance on stage and at other times outlining of entities reaching beyond the stage as she deals with the timeless forest, the complications of love, or its control over lovers' life and their stereotypical behaviour.

This feature is especially fruitful when she discusses love with Orlando. Such scenes are rich in her portrayal of a stereotypical lover, whose "hose should be ungartered, […] bonnet unbanded, […] and everything about [him] demonstrating a careless desolation" (*AYL* 3.2.364-67). Rosalind defines the stereotypical appearance in detail as she does later with the

---

901 The idea of a magician as a friend stems from Lodge (cf. Dusinberre [ed.] [2006], 322 ft. 59.).
902 Cf. *Ibid.*, 322, ft. 58 and 59.
903 Talbot van den Berg even argues that Rosalind's various forms are reflected in Phoebe's cruelty, in Silvius's romantic longing and sufferance, in Oliver and Celia's love at first sight, which relates to the impulsiveness of passion, and in the inevitable marriage for all couples she manages to organize. The audience perceives different standards and conventional tactics of love and courtship, for instance in Rosalind, which enables each spectator to mirror their personal view in her Cf. Kent Talbot van den Berg, 'Theatrical Fiction and the Reality of Love in *As You like It*', *PMLA* 90.5 (1975): 885-893, 888.
904 For instance, see *AYL* 4.1.5-7 (she suffers from the extremity of love for Orlando), and note the following analysed scenes.

emotional life of the lover's darling or in other words, the mood swings a teenager experiences:

> A moonish youth – grieve, be effeminate, changeable, longing and liking, proud, fantastical, apish, shallow, inconstant, full of tears, full of smiles; for every passion something and for no passion truly anything, as boys and women are for the most part cattle of this colour.
> (*AYL* 3.2.392-97)

Both explanations outline lovesickness: "Love is merely a madness, and […] deserves as well dark house and a whip as madmen do." (*AYL* 3.2.384-85). The definition of love as the disease 'madness' emphatically relates to the need of a cure and a curer. Two lovers meet; but instead of an exchange of oaths, the audience watches a teacher, who judges if Orlando is a lover. She gives a theoretical account about love's impact on men and woman, but she veils her doubts about Orlando's true affection.[905] As the instigator, her disguise allows her not to trick Orlando for anybody else's sake but to gain answers and be persuaded of his true love for her. Consequently, her reflections on love do not only involve Orlando but illuminate her constitution in an ironic light. Whereas the *servus callidus* replaces the foolish lover on stage, the clever female deceiver only seems to substitute the lover but embodies incongruous fractions since her role contains the teacher, curer, and sufferer. That becomes explicit when she reasons that there is no difference between women and men. Hidden from her dialogue partner, she comments on their situation for the audience while she simultaneously mirrors love's pain and errors in courtship, something with which every spectator can identify.

Not only does she supply that ability of reflecting on her relation to Orlando but also on the country couple, Phoebe and Silvius, on whose constellation she grants similar insights. In 3.5.67-68, Ganymede summarizes the problem: "[Silvius]'s fallen in love with [Phoebe's] foulness, and she 'll fall in love with my anger". In her superior position, she counsels Phoebe not to be too proud, not to overestimate her beauty, and to see Silvius as a proper match. She addresses women's inability to woo on their behalf but that they need to accept an offer as long as they are young and pretty.[906] Such instances prove her influential and analytical voice, whose explanations are given from a self-conscious figure that moves closer to the edge of the stage than most of the others and knows the core themes and how to support their coherence.

She uses her acumen also on abstract entities as her thoughts on time discusses the difference between life outside and inside the forest of Arden. Her thesis describes the different perceptions of time pivoting on the emotional condition and the activity of the individual:

> Time travels in divers paces with divers persons. I'll tell you who Time ambles withal, who Time trots withal, who Time gallops withal and who he stands still withal.
> (*AYL* 3.2.299-302)

She supports her argument with several examples from everyday life: a young maid between the contract of her marriage and the day it is solemnized, a priest who does not know Latin, a thief to the gallows, and lawyers on vacation.[907] Here, the female *orator speciei vitae* does not

---

905 Also see *AYL* 3.2.372-75 (stereotypical behaviour of women); also, Rosalind on women's tricking of their husbands, see *AYL* 4.1.130-164.
906 See esp. *AYL* 3.5.36-64, 77-81.
907 See *AYL* 3.2.304-07, 309-14, 316-19, and 320-22.

give a monologue but responds to Orlando's request for examples. With the different perception of time, she explains a condition of real life that loses its strength in the timeless forest as Orlando states that "there is no clock in the forest" (*AYL* 3.2.292-93). Rosalind thus grants the audience access to the play's sublevel when she juxtaposes the golden Age with realism, in which scope the lover is situated, moving between ideal and sceptic:

> [t]hen there is no true lover in the forest, else sighing every minute and groaning every hour would detect the lazy foot of time as well as a clock.
> (*AYL* 3.2.294-96)

The passages define Rosalind as a mediator for herself and the audience, while as Ganymede she takes the position as a 'distanced' teacher counselling the figures, mostly the lovers, on stage. From that perspective, she enlightens the play's relations and themes in short, analytical summaries of what is happening on stage, in proverbs and philosophizing speeches, wherein she acts as a commentator and *poeta*.[908]

Nevertheless, like the Plautine type, she is not interested in being only a philosopher or provider of sense. The analytical mind of a comic heroine does not spare self-irony or teasing but embraces *ridiculum* as Rosalind often embellishes her examinations with a exaggeration and ridicule. In her teaching, she does not neglect her holiday humour and contributes to the evolution of the laughable through her wit and comic moments. As the clever slave, she pairs teasing and teaching, laughter and recognition. Like the *servus ludens* and Touchstone, she stylizes and often prolongs the organic discourse by deviating from the progressive course and changing to the comic driver. Her production of the laughable ranges from brief comments to turning of a wedding ceremony upside down.[909] In such scenes, Rosalind enjoys taking her dialogue partner's remarks up for underscoring ripostes and evading conclusions, matching wits and adopting the agonistic tone of the deliberate fool. She delights in verbal dances as she engages with her companion of mirth and her supposed sister in playful associations and proverbial jests. After her first encounter with Orlando, she adds erotic allusions to the wrestling theme with Celia, while it is about the simple question if Rosalind fell in love at first sight with Orlando after she had watched his performance in the wrestling match.[910] After 24 lines of joking, Celia proposes to "[turn] these jests out of service, let us talk in good earnest" (*AYL* 1.3.24-25). Serious conversation is rare between those two, who are aware of their changes of tone. Celia's demand previews such a singular moment of seriousness in the severe atmosphere of the next scene. Verbal games are interrupted as the girls are banished by Duke Frederick. Away from the Duke and his threat, in the company of Touchstone, the laughable is reinforced, enters Arden with them, and soon aligns with Rosalind's behaviour.

After finding Orlando's masterpiece of poetry, Rosalind behaves like a *servus ludens*. She continues Touchstone's jesting citation by ridiculing the anonymous love poem:

---

908 For more examples on proverbial wisdom and advice, see *AYL* 1.3.58, 107; 3.2.374-5, 384-88; 3.4.53; 4.1.5-7, 40-44, 69-71, 130-1, 137-39, 151-154, 162-164, 187-8; note Celia's few proverbial lines, esp. when Rosalind is too occupied with Orlando's absence, see 3.2.179-80, 225-26; 3.4.27-29, 40-41.

909 For more examples, see *AYL* 1.2.90ff. (Rosalind and especially Celia puzzling Le Beau by their jests; the messenger needs to ask how he should answer Celia's weird question. He tries to tell them about some wrestling sport while they make some good sport of him and the message.); 2.4.53, 56; 3.2.114, 152ff.; 4.1.46-56, 63ff., 196; 4.3.13ff., 165-67, 180-1; 5.2.37-38, 105-6.

910 See *AYL* 1.3.1ff., esp. 20-22.

> [F]or look here what I found on a palmtree. I was never so berhymed since Pythagoras'
> time that I was an Irish rat, which I can hardly remember.
> (*AYL* 3.2.171-73)

The joke refers to metempsychosis underlining the psycho-physical transformations in the play. Forms, gender, rank, and genre are playthings. Metamorphosing the sweet Rosalind in a rat, an animal that seems to be most inappropriate for a young girl, offers a ridiculous image. The image of an Irish rat is reminiscent of the Epilogue of Jonson's *Poetaster* ("Rhyme 'em to the death, as they do Irish rats/ In drumming tunes") and Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* ("Nor to be rimed to death, as is said to be done in Ireland"), which passages might allude to an exaggerative power of poetry and an old belief that verses recited by Irish bards can kill rats.[911] Rosalind compliments the love poem in a jeering way by constructing a former life for herself without clear remembrance but with the certainty that she was ill-rhymed. The use of the philosophical device seems to promise some construct of metaphoric evaluation but discloses to be a misleading presentation of meaning as an opaque joke on the bad quality of the poem. Without caring about the obscurity in her sentence, she throws that paradox at the audience and Celia, which identifies her remark as an open miscommunication that does not satisfy perspicuity, sincerity, or relevance but remains a construct of nonsense.[912] Rosalind does not care about the content but is interested in moments of *ridiculum* by producing illogical and hypothetical realities as the memory of a former life.

Her uncooperativeness in the conversation is apparent in the scene, in which she learns that the man carving her name in trees is Orlando. She bombards Celia with questions about Orlando and his stay in the forest. There are ten questions, of which only one can be answered yes or no. Still, she demands Celia to "answer [her] with one word" (*AYL* 3.2.217). The number of questions and her impatience are attributable to Rosalind's excitement as a lover, while her impossible order continues her former habit of miscommunication and hints at her habit of playing with the possible and actual. She uses self-irony in the play more than once; the heroine reveals the parody of a lover, putting on the mask of folly. Ganymede ends Rosalind's 'performance' when the 'mad' lover reasons that she as a woman must speak her mind (see *AYL* 3.2.242-43). In that sense, she resembles the deliberate fool that can hardly hold his tongue, but falls "in a holiday humour" (*AYL* 4.1.63). Her announcements can be acknowledged as putting on the comic mask and confirming the place to be a utopian ground, where she can invest in teasing and jesting. That disposition draws upon the skills of miscommunication. Rosalind uses her creativity, license to violations, and turn-taking abilities to provide such moments of *ridiculum*. As the curer of lover's foolishness like the clever slave and at the same time, a woman in love, as insider and outsider she is best positioned to make fun of the situation. In short, the playfulness of the tricking woman intersects with the lover's folly.

Of course, her stay in the forest, the time, while she is disguised as Ganymede, and thus, the lessons of Orlando are rich in her productions of the laughable that span from amusing *nugae* shown in the previously given examples to derision. Her nature as a *persona*

---

911 Ben Jonson, *Poetaster*, Apologetical Dialogue, 150-51; Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry or The Defence of Poesy*, Geoffrey Shepherd (ed.), London et al.: Nelson, 1965, 142, verses 24-26; and cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 249, ft.172-3.
912 Few lines later, Celia takes on the same path of Rosalind's mocking when she counters Rosalind's weird passage and comments on her failure of recognizing the poet of the ill-rhymed love poem with an ironic exaggeration embedded in proverbial style: "it is hard a matter for friends to meet; but mountains may be removed with earthquakes and so encounter." (*AYL* 3.2.179-81), and see Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 249, ft. 180-1.

ludens includes mock heroism, exemplified in a dark passage where she expresses her doubts about endless love. She resorts to mythological 'negative' hyperboles demystifying and underscoring the loving hero. She introduces her speech cynically by suggesting the impossible: Orlando should "die by attorney" since

> [t]he poor world is almost six thousand years old, and in all this time there was not any man died in his own person (videlicet, in a love-cause). Troilus had his brains dashed out with a Grecian club, yet he did what he could do to die before, and he is one of the patterns of love. Leander, he would have lived many a fair year though Hero had turned nun, if it had not been for a hot midsummer night; for, good youth, he went but forth to wash him in the Hellespont and, being taken with the cramp, was drowned, and the foolish chroniclers of that age found it was Hero of Sestos. But these are all lies. Men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love.
> (*AYL* 4.1.86-99)

The 'attorney' depicts death as a business opposing and diminishing its pathetic connotation. The tone pursues when plain and undramatic reasons for death substitute the tragic loss of lovers' lives, which just does not exist in history but is only the stuff tale tellers or overplaying chroniclers made out of it. Legends become lies and mythic heroes become weak and ordinary men, whose deaths are described by non-pathetic images. Rosalind's cynical message reads that there is not one example for dying because of love, while it does not matter if you die in love since worms do not distinguish between bodies. Her speech ridicules the pattern and ideals of romantic love, which shocks the young lover Orlando, who does not want to hear such scorn from his mock Rosalind. Her clear words devour men's devotion to their lovers, disclose love as a mere business women face like they must watch for the trap of romantic oaths. This mock-heroic piece found between her instances of folly and light antics demonstrates her flexibility in tone as well as license to ridicule and rail. As unexpectedly as her outburst has come as abruptly her mood can switch.[913]

As a skin-changer, she adopts "a more coming-on disposition" (*AYL* 4.1.103-4), pursuing the playful, lighter mood fitting *nugae*. Here, Rosalind exhibits the same mechanisms as the clever slave to dominate the discourse and Orlando playfully, who witnesses and wonders about her coded speech acts:[914]

ORL.   Then love me, Rosalind.
ROS.   Yes, faith, will I, Fridays and Saturdays and all.
ORL.   And wilt thou have me?
ROS.   Ay, and twenty such.
ORL.   What sayst thou?
ROS.   Are you not good?
ORL.   I hope so.
ROS.   Why then, can one desire too much of a good thing?
(*AYL* 4.1.105-114)

---

913 Her swiftness and ability to switch between moods and tone evoke parallels to the kernel theme, the verbal texture, and the weaving of stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. On Ovid's poetics and the metaphor of weaving, see Merit Laine, 'Creating Mythological Space', *Allusions and Reflections, Greek and Roman Mythology in Renaissance Europe*, Elisabeth Wåghäll Nivre (ed.), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015, 77-93, esp. 81-83.

914 For more examples of becoming the comic driver lengthening the discourse by means of miscommunication and here, coding: *AYL* 3.2.170, 175; 4.1.46-56; 4.3.13ff.

The young woman exaggerates her oath that she will love him by naming days when she is in love and choosing those days of the week that are linked to fasting and feasting, making puns about the idea of holy days and holidays.[915] The ending in 'all' makes the first two pieces of information obsolete, which ridicules lovers' style of swearing by using verbosity. Orlando leaves her pun without comment, only to get the next weird response to his question. Monogamy is turned into polygamy by the wish of having twenty like Orlando. The future husband is understandably puzzled about such a 'greedy' answer and needs an explanation from his 'fake' Rosalind, who counters his line with a suggestive question her dialogue partner can only answer 'Yes'. In her punchline, she reasons by a rhetorical question that suggests the opposite. The deliberate fool or the foolish lover can celebrate such intertwining of sense and nonsense, disregarding the content of a previous conversation. It is as if she has forgotten her argument with Jaques where she argued that "[t]hose that are in extremity […] are abominable fellows" (*AYL* 4.1.5-6). Following her agenda of the laughable, she can contradict herself. Her expansion of the oaths make them and herself as a lover a source of *ridiculum* while her folly seems to control the longing lover. Shakespeare's sequences of romantic courtship are enlivened by Rosalind's deliberate *ludens* and misbehaviour. Like the clever slave, she resorts to coding when she reveals the logic in her apparent nonsense. By urging the other dialogue partner into the inferior position as he does not understand her remarks, the heroine keeps the upper hand, directing the conversation and deciding when it is time for the laughable. The given passages signify Rosalind as the deliberate fool figure, who can skilfully build a dissatisfying construct of sense or a puzzling construct of nonsense impeding processing. In applying the same strategy of coding, she can shift from nonsense to sense and back again, dominate the discourse by miscommunication aiming at the laughable, and employs the flexible (im)balance of word and substance.

When she integrates a comic view on fortune, nature, love or other thematic entities into her speech by inviting ambiguity or matching non-matching complexes, she proves herself as a professional for the laughable, skilled in miscommunication and deception. The heroine can even apply this mode on her own figure since she is as capable of self-irony and exposure of stereotypical traits as the clever slave proves in his self-design, for instance in his exaggerated 'fear of punishment'. From her self-conscious and omniscient status, she knows how to confront and control her dialogue partner, which she demonstrates in agonistic scenes like her argument with Jaques.[916]

Constructing, viewing, and illuminating the net of illusions destine her to become a *poeta*-like figure moving at the peripheries, from where she can phrase her philosophical and advisory wisdom without wearing the mask of folly. She raises suspense and surprise by her alternations of insights, clarifying annotations as well as miscommunication and misbehaviour. Programmatically as the teacher, her escapades are licensed and announced in the contract between Orlando and herself, the curer, as she promises him to drive him to "a living humour of madness" (*AYL* 3.2.401). Her roles indicate the incongruity of the wooed woman and the magician, the foolish lover and deriding voice. The production of the laughable is dedicated not only to *nugae* but follows the Plautine type's combination of tricking, manipulation, playfulness, competitions of wit, and reflections on comedy's and the play's essence. The heroine's complexity echoes the slave's complex of *ludens* since her personae play in the form of theatrical illusion, deception of gender and agenda as well as playing the folly (lover). Within this tripartite compound, her figure illuminates her personae, the acting

---

915 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 293, ft. 106.
916 See *AYL* 4.1.1-29.

boy, the heroine, and the disguised boy, when she alludes to the net of illusionary frames by inner- and extradramatic references, allowing the audience to catch the laughable quality of the situation when Orlando remains ignorant of the disguise and the truth.[917] Conclusively, if Rosalind is compared to the clever slave, she fits an *architecta*, *poeta*, and *virgo ludens*. Hence, she bears parallel functionality for the comic discourse by her verbal abuses, wise phrases, and identities supporting *ridiculum*, carnivalesque, and utopian nature as well as for the plot in her position of the heroine and trickster figure, who is as assured of her success as the *servus callidus* when she confirms to "make all these doubts even" (*AYL* 5.4.25).

Once she reveals her true identity, her trickster's costume is exchanged for that of the married woman or the *virgo* to be married and the daughter. The resolution found in Hymen's entry renders the cunning figure obsolete. But as long as she is Ganymede, the clever boy, a carnivalesque nature determines her presence; an agonistic, dominant attitude prevails in most conversation. Her sovereignty is only disturbed, when Cupid's mechanisms puzzle the young woman and as a consequence, her nature of a *virgo* in love now rules her reactions as she is for instance blind to realize the love poem's crafter, Orlando, although Celia hints at him. In those moments of Rosalind's folly, Shakespeare makes Celia the 'heroine', who takes the superior position and a temporary prompter of the comic mask as now, she can abuse her advantage in knowledge over Rosalind and make fun of her blindness. For example, she delays passing information with her exaggerated and unnecessary excitement as well as incident of verbosity ("O wonderful, wonderful, and most wonderful wonderful, and yet again wonderful, and after that out all hooping!" (*AYL* 3.2.186-88).[918] Celia proves herself particularly witty and distanced, exhibiting her supporting function and similar construction as the other female wit. Celia discloses analogical skills of the laughable in terms of miscommunication but remains in the shadow of the heroine.

Rosalind's purpose in the plot echoes the clever slave's agenda of resolution, mediation, and harmonization between the genders and the elder and younger generation since here, she manages the communication between the couples and orchestrates her own courtship finalized by the four weddings. Comparing the dominance of male parts to the number of female ones in Plautus' comedies and their participation in romance, women define themselves through absence and passivity, certainly when marriage is concerned. On Shakespeare's stage, romance emancipates and Rosalind unites the clever instigator as well as the pursuer of her own courtship in a cross-dressed figure. Once she achieved her agenda and changes to Rosalind, the courtier and wife, her dominance is not represented any more (see *AYL* 5.4.111-14). In short, her function as the trickster and the skin-changer Ganymede dissolves with the resolution. Until then, the mastermind can view the illusionary frames instead of being entangled in them. Finally, she ends the play, stepping outside the illusion, addressing the audience, and speaking the epilogue from a metatheatrical perspective. Her distance from the play's action does not come surprising but is subsumed under her double layered role, whose comments invite the audience throughout the play to perceive the thematic kernels in the play. In her conversations with Jaques, Orlando, and Touchstone, her rhetoric skills and proverbial expressions balance, oppose, or use melancholy, foolish lovers,

---

917 See the above-analysed passages and given instances in regard to self-irony and for example, note in addition, *AYL* 2.4.41-42; 3.5.74; 4.1.84.

918 Also see *AYL* 3.2.198; 3.4.1ff., esp. 21-23 and 36-40. Here, Celia counsels and reflects upon the situation of the worried and weeping lover Rosalind. She substitutes Rosalind in her superior and guiding position shortly. Also note Celia's accusation of Rosalind's misuse of their sex in 4.1.189-192 and 197-98 although Rosalind does not react remorsefully.

and folly, while she twists convention and on a broader scale, sense.[919] On the abstract, she grants access to these juxtaposed clusters of scripts and the play's grander discussion of public, official portrayal of love and private amorous affair, the ideal and sceptical image of love, gender opposition, poetry and lies, substance and emptiness, truth and deception as well as golden and real, which pairs play an equally important role for Touchstone.

In analogy to the cunning figure and these features, Shakespeare's romantic comedy exhibits her role "span[ning] regality and rebelliousness, sovereignty and subversion" while her part involves the court, exile to the pastoral world, and theatrical, comic grounds that are part of laughing culture.[920] Thus, Shakespeare composes Rosalind and her personae out of oppositions and incongruity, which starts with her protective male behaviour and intellectual superiority opposing the stereotypical woman governed by emotions and passion like Rosalind faints upon hearing about Orlando's injury. Weakness and fear alternates with power and dominance. In regard to the layers of gender, both male and female attributions are subsumed under the two greater poles of an ideal and real perspective. Her love at first sight and seeking marriage belong to the pole of idealism, whereas Rosalind's scepticism in eternal love deviates from a purely romantic vision.[921] In that regard, the oppositions of the clever slave, the leading slave, and the heroic anti-hero are transformed to a young woman played by a boy, leading her lover as a sceptical mistress, a parodied version of a foolish lover, to the ideal haven of love, marriage. Although the clever slave's themes and context differs from the female wit, the Plautine concept's contributions to the plot, its transparency as well as comic moments echo the heroine's programme of playfulness, dominance, creation, and illusion, which discloses both constructions built on the paradox pattern. Both figures can be identified as deliberate fools displaying the aesthetically effective entity for the coherence of the comedy they play in. In *AYL*, this programme of the central trickster or magician Rosalind/Ganymede is complemented and partially, echoed by the professional fool figure and his function, which combination seminally images Plautine figural concept of *ludus*/*ludere*, tricking, providing laughter, acting playfully and naturally, playing. Though Touchstone might not be as obviously close to the clever slave figure as Tranio or Rosalind in her omnipotent position in the plot, the professional fool figure draws upon the same paradox pattern the clever slave's aesthetic effect grounds on and stands in the continuity of that type of deliberate fool figures Plautus' clever slave has been identified as one prototype. Touchstone's similarity will be clarified by discussing his agonistic habit, playing with illusionary frames, the all-license, his game of nonsense and sense, and ridiculing attitude, in sum his role and functions in the romantic comedy.

To start with, since the clever slave promotes *pergraecari*, one might ask how the fool is integrated into the presentation of romance and courtship. Touchstone engages in courtship as the rural and rough mirror to Rosalind and Orlando's 'romantic' wooing that is spiced by the comic depiction of lovers' folly and Rosalind's crossdressing. The professional masterminds, Touchstone and Rosalind, represent the dominant part to Orlando and Audrey. The latter cannot compete with the female magician but is "a living prop [for Touchstone], not

---

919 Note *AYL* 4.1.5-7.
920 Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 141.
921 Cf. Margaret Boerner Beckman, 'The Figure of Rosalind In *As You Like It*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 29.1 (1978): 44-51, esp. 45-48. She rightly argues for the balance of these opposites and their co-existence until the end. Shortly, Rosalind "represents a *concordia discors*" (46). A similar configuration of male and female oppositions can be found in Viola, Portia, Cleopatra, and Imogene.
Examples of Rosalind's male and female attributions, see *AYL* 1.3.116-23; 4.3.155.

unlike Launce's dog Crab" to make a point.[922] The country girl stands in an asymmetrical relation to Lady Rosalind, whose disguise as a boy in the Forest of Arden enables her to be more challenging, utilize her wit, and leave the corset of the female role in courtship aside.[923] Like Rosalind, Touchstone outwits his rival suitor William and Audrey. Thus, Shakespeare instantiates two dominant and skilled figures, Rosalind and Touchstone, in a juxtaposition of courtship. As with the intrigue comedies, Tranio's use in *The Shrew*, the pursuit of love and marriage involves a competitive and manipulative persona that knows how to trick, of which *AYL* presents two, one main and one subordinate. In contrast to the *servus callidus*, these figures now do not substitute or support the actual suitor but chase their own lovers; the scenes are all a competition of interests.[924] Touchstone does not need money or a girl in order to contribute to the lovers' union and the solution of the exposition. Consequently, he is not the central schemer like Tranio, pretending to be a suitor and actually, playing a role for his master; he competes and quarrels for his own sake. Both, Rosalind and Touchstone, share functionality in foregrounding the peculiarities in courtship. While Touchstone in *AYL* loses the central agenda to achieve denouement, he invests in his own scheme to satisfy his physical needs since his carnivalesque nature is ill-suited to marriage.[925]

The professional fool does not discard the sweetness of desire but functions more as its speaking channel and its promoter as his fellow more or less witty servants Tranio, Launce, Dromio, or Lavatch do.[926] Usually, his type is not given as many scenes to invest in the fulfilment of his own amorous longings, while he yearns for marriage. Such figures stick to the non-romantic version of courtship, emphasising *ridiculum* in the behaviour and expectations of lovers as the scenes do when Touchstone woos. Significantly, the first 'wooing' scene between Audrey and Touchstone follows Ganymede and Orlando's first encounter. Touchstone is juxtaposed with the male part Orlando since the wise fool's performance does not parallel Rosalind's previously described lover but matches his jester image, his low rank as well as his carnivalesque interest in sexual affairs as his courtship is full of bawdy overtones disclosing his purpose to the audience. Touchstone initiates the comic sequence by a simile: "I am here with thee and thy goats, as the most capricious poet, honest Ovid, was among the Goths." (*AYL* 3.3.5-7). The fool leaves no doubt about his longings by using vocabularies of lust since capricious alludes to the Latin *caper*; he emphasises the 'lustful' animal goat also given in the homophone 'Goths' to goats in Elizabethan English. The antithetic compounding of 'honest' and 'Ovid' ironically relates to the exiled man's reputation for dishonesty. Being a poet bears the association to lies and temptation. And metonymically, the poet's works *Ars Amatoria* and *Amores* contribute to the image of dishonour and reveal Touchstone's actual

---

922 Videbæk (1996), 89.

923 Cf. *Ibid.*, 89-90.

924 If Plautus' comedies are concerned, *Cistellaria* for instance shows a stronger female voice that can express her desire and view. But generally, New Comedy does not know a stock type of the strong heroine figure but an inferior *virgo* often silenced in her self-assertion. Cf. Susan Lape, 'Menander's Comedy', *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, James J. Clauss and Martine Cuypers (eds.), Malden et al.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, 282-296, esp. 295-6.

925 The emphasis on his carnivalesque 'ugliness', also see *AYL* 1.2.103-104. Rosalind refers to the possibility that Touchstone releases a fart. See Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 167. For further reading, see François Laroque, *Shakespeare's Festive World*, transl. by Janet Lloyd, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, esp. 47.

926 Other comic servant figures promoting bodily needs, esp. sexual longings, see Lavatch in *All's Well That Ends Well*, Dromio about his cook in *The Comedy of Errors*, or Launce in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Cf. Videbæk (1996), 55-57. She analyses Dromio's relation to marriage.

intention as they stand for erotic impulses. Outspoken honesty transforms into the unchastity in women and dishonesty in men.[927]

Touchstone's relation to Audrey focuses on lust at the expense of love and oaths. He hopes that Audrey is poetical and proves her "sluttishness" to him so that his sexual appetite will be satisfied (*AYL* 3.3.36). His remedy can only be found in marriage since "as the ox has his bow, […] so man hath his desires" (*AYL* 3.3.73-74). A man's uncontrolled desire often incorporated by animals in the play sets the satisfaction of physical needs ahead of the importance of truth, honesty, and chastity. His intentions become clear when he announces to Audrey his preparations for the wedding without much excitement (see *AYL* 3.3.34-41 and 3.3.70-88).[928] The marriage permits him to be intimate with Audrey; the only thing he seems to care about is whether the marriage is accepted legally as "it will be a good excuse for [him] hereafter to leave [his] wife" (*AYL* 3.3.84-85). Whether he sticks to his plan or not, the audience does not know.

The fact that the sake of the husband Touchstone is left open invites speculations. Videbæk argues that Audrey has tamed Touchstone, which appears far-fetched since Audrey cannot demonstrate her influence on Touchstone and says nothing about taming him in the last scene of the play.[929] To interpret marriage as taming does not suffice. The fool and the shepherdess take part in the big wedding ceremony. Only Hymen and Jaques comment on their relation and future that is expected not to be too harmonious and presumably, will not last since they come from different worlds.[930] That he is not made for a life in the pastoral world is underlined constantly, which makes his return to court plausible.[931] Nevertheless, where he lives and if he stays with Audrey are not relevant as he has fulfilled his function as the bawdy and folly philosopher, whose license and existence ends with the play. Although he can look beyond the stage, his true home as an entertainer is the place of show time. Thus, during his performance, Touchstone's pursuit in love as well as sexuality does not come across as real lovesickness. His desire to marry lacks the intention to live happily ever after but his behaviour as a suitor underscores and thus outlines the other lovers' blindness, pitfalls in courtship and Cupid's spell with the mean of *ridiculum*.[932] The professional fool figure is the mirror of vice not only in regard to Orlando and Rosalind but for the triangle of Silvius, Phoebe, and Ganymede/Rosalind (see *AYL* 3.5).

Touchstone occurs as one part in Shakespeare's future for Plautus' prototype in the romanticized genre of error and deceit of the Elizabethan Age. The play involves the tricky heroine and the professional fool sticking to the three principles, whereas the latter no longer occupies the functional centrum for plot development, which suggests that his features deliver the same aesthetically effective functionality in inorganic scenes, equal in number to the organic scenes. Indeed, *AYL* does not yield a tight plot of actions and turns but persuades by its investment in verbal acrobacy, which is delivered by several personae of wit. Especially in the separate world of the forest of Arden, where a dense course of action and activity is

---

927 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 265, ft. 6 and 7.
928 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 92-93.
929 Cf. *Ibid.*, 94.
930 See *AYL* 5.4.133-34 and 189.
931 Ornstein argues similarly when he says that "[a]lthough Touchstone can offer at times a barnyard view of love, his sense of bourgeois propriety is evident in his desire that Audrey have a ladylike bearing at her wedding. He will perforce marry a goatmaid but he has no intention of starting a career in animal husbandry. His natural place is the court, and like most of the exiles he is destined to return to it." (Ornstein [1986], 150).
932 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 89. "The very fact that Touchstone admits to having sexual feelings and is willing to act upon them sets him apart from most of his brother clowns, and only Costard goes further than Touchstone" in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

neglected but which allows musing on love and roles in life, Rosalind, Celia, Touchstone, and Jaques are sources of sententiousness. They give the impression of having a mind of rhetoric and academia, seem to excel in improvisation and perceptiveness, and draw a veil of morality and deep meaning.[933] They appear as creators and participants in losing and finding sense in the labyrinth of verbal material and beyond, a utopian exile.

How the wise fool deals with sententiousness and misuses this thrust will be looked at under the premise of the *servus ludens*. By infusing his folly with sense, he targets at kernels in the discourse, which foregrounds his nature as an entertainer culturally designated the court fool as well as the observatory perspective. It will be shown how Touchstone's constructions of the laughable mirror the habits and devices of the clever slave. They range from ludicrous, spontaneous ridiculing of others to coded wisdom, while they all share the comic moment, wherein he goes to the extreme, surpassing Rosalind. As it is the case for the clever slave, the fool's construction of comic moments is permeated with an agonistic attitude as well as with an excess of highlighting illusion and its mechanisms, which will be addressed in subsequence. In terms of stereotypical configuration, the clown, the court fool or the *servus ludens* promise moments of *ridiculum* by their deliberately foolish mask as it is clearly the case for Touchstone's first appearance on stage, which introduces him as the figure of merriment.

Celia's wish that Rosalind should be merrier and Rosalind's promise to come up with amusing games becomes incorporated by Touchstone's entry following the girls' words, when he joins the girls' exchange of wit. As if he has overheard their conversation, he makes puns about their discussed situation and core theme brought up by the girls: honour as it is found in Celia's betrayal of her father and trust in oaths.[934]

TOUCH.	Mistress, you must come away to your father.
CELIA	Were you made the messenger?
TOUCH.	No, by mine honour, but I was bid to come for you.
ROS.	Where learned you that oath, fool?
TOUCH.	Of a certain knight that swore by his honour they were good pancakes, and swore by his honour the mustard was naught. Now I'll stand to it: the pancakes were naught and the mustard was good, and yet was not the knight foresworn.

(*AYL* 1.2.56-66)

He appears as a bad messenger in the second scene though he conveys the one-sentence message to Celia that "[she] must come away to [her] father". A message invites a response, which usually means some activity on stage. Touchstone brings folly. The three whetstones of wits prefer to leave the matter aside until the second messenger, Le Beau, enters the stage and explains why Frederick has sent for his daughter, which is the performance of wrestling. All three, the two girls and Touchstone, participate in misbehaviour, enjoying exchanging banter with each other, which shows Celia and Rosalind as adept at Touchstone's kind of sport.

Touchstone is not interested in whether Celia follows her father's demand but parodies on the sender since the messenger's extraordinary formality, calling Celia 'mistress', is obsolete and stands out against his usual tone of fooling. He is parodying Frederick.[935] In typical carnivalesque style, the lower ranks mock their social betters, who remain the invisible

---

933 Cf. Julian Lamb, 'Sense and Sententiousness: Wittgenstein, Milton, Shakespeare', *Wittgenstein Reading*, Sascha Bru, Wolfgang Huemer, and Daniel Steuer (eds.), Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013, 55-73, 65-66.
934 See *AYL* 1.2.1-29, esp. 20-22.
935 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 164. Compare to Frederick's use in 1.3.38; Rosalind in 3.5.46, 58.

target in Touchstone's inversion. Exaggeratingly and without relevance, he swears 'by his honour' and thereby, deprives the term of its strength and value, which reflects and underlines Frederick's unfaithfulness. As a deliberate fool, he does not care about violating Grice's maxims, removing words' normative character, the underlying concepts, and leaving them to insignificance or the verbal shell. He denies the significance of the word 'honour', which is nothing more than the wish for significance. Pursuing his jesting profession, he joins Rosalind's model for making fun of honour and opposes commonness to court. The seemingly senseless mixture of a knight swearing by his honour about something as trivial as the quality of mustard and pancakes can be decoded as ridiculing honour and exposing its value at court in the play.[936] Enhancing his argument, the fool, a knave, revels in the conventional opposition to the knight and inverts the knight's oath by mixing the qualities of mustard and pancakes. Conveying a message turns into a parade of playing with values and creating a carnivalesque image of a knight and a knave.

Encouraged by Rosalind and Celia, Touchstone finishes his attack against honour and Frederick by inserting a nonsense scene of oaths suddenly. In an illusionary frame, he commands Rosalind and Celia in an mock swearing simulating an official tone: "Stroke your chins and swear by your beards that I am a knave." (*AYL* 1.2.70-71). He deliberately violates the purpose of swearing by swearing on something that is not. After the story of the false knight, the second example for honour's and oaths' emptiness serves as a demonstration and thus, explanation of his first account, outlining and emphasizing the logic in his inverting game by visualizing the ridiculousness of swearing on something non-existent.[937] In this merriment, Touchstone, who estimates the situation perfectly, prepares the audience of how the themes are significant for the play's development and understanding since the inflationary use of oaths foreshadows not only Frederick's oath against Rosalind, but also the problematics of lovers' oaths and Rosalind's mistrust in them.[938]

Touchstone's first performance exemplifies his speech acts as permeated with a carnivalesque atmosphere and exhibiting his function of mockery by the method of coding, veiling his message with incongruous pictures of the actual and non-actual, or illusion and reality. The fool's entrance interrupts in the verbal sport the two girls engage in since he is said to deviate their logic course of thoughts by his nature 'folly'. On the contrary, he joins an already non-earnest conversation Rosalind and Celia seem to use as a training camp for wit. The two girls pun on the servant's ambiguous term 'fool' when Rosalind refers to him as the

---

936 The choice of pancakes affirms the carnivalesque nature, too, as they "were the traditional fare for Shrove Tuesday, a time of pre-Lenten revel, when plays were given at court." Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 164; Touchstone even addresses the audience by naming that dish since "Queen and court were eating pancakes in the Great Hall at Richmond for Shrove Tuesday night when, according to the Declared Accounts, the Chamberlain's Men performed a play". (Juliet Dusinberre, 'Pancakes and a Date for 'As You Like It'', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.4 [2003]: 371-405, 379-80). Thereby, Touchstone includes a metatheatrical reference in his jests, looking from the stage into the audience. Furthermore, an intertextual reference is given to Jonson's *Every Man out of his Humour* and one of its characters, Sogliardo, whose coat of arms shows the phrase "not without mustard". Stupidly, Sogliardo praises the coat's variety of colours, which makes it appear as a motley and thus, the right costume for a fool, whereas Touchstone wears his motley knowingly and as an instrument. He distinguishes himself from Sogliardo.

937 For the disruption of the value 'honour', also see Falstaff on honour in *1H4*, 5.1.129-40. Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 165.

938 See *AYL* 1.3.77 and 84-86. In fact, after Touchstone's derision of honour, everybody in the audience must have understood Frederick's lines as most dishonourable and laughable. Calling Celia a fool twice falls back on him.

"fool to cut off the argument" or "the cutter-off of Nature's wit" (*AYL* 1.2.46 and 48-49).[939] Illegitimate, unconventional treatment lies in the nature of the fool, who despite his name, serves to sharpen other people's wit by his own. One central opposition stands out between the cluster of scripts concerning the fool, dullness, and stupidity, and the other cluster in regard to wisdom, wit, and sharpness. The professional fool advances to a paradoxical teacher of didactic impulses in the negative forum of comedy. The jester complements the two young women's circle of punning perfectly since all three are outsiders, who enjoy commenting on the others from a distance. Their style does not express lyrical fineness but is rooted in vernacular prose.[940] Nevertheless, their use of language is not acknowledged as high quality though there is method behind the verbal sequence of folly concerning how they construct associations and exaggerate verbal dance without any interest in informative exchange but adding allusions and reflections on gender confusion, honour, or the trust in words. Women and fools cannot be silent or silenced.

Rosalind witnesses that license when she cannot stop the fool of crafting ridiculing verses on the ridiculous love poem from Orlando. Touchstone acts as a *servus ludens* when he decides to do so right after he heard the young man's "bad fruit" (*AYL* 3.2.113):

I'll rhyme you so eight years together, dinners and suppers and sleeping-hours excepted. It is the right butter-women's rank to market.
(*AYL* 3.2.93-95)

The fool can make a poetic mess in abundance—for eight years, a dimension of time not to be performed on stage and thus, out of reach. He can only be productive without giving up food and sleep since he is in need of them as a carnivalesque and non-melancholic persona in contrast to the stereotypical lover, who does not care about such profane urges. Touchstone assesses the style as fitting the low social level of the marketplace, a location of laughing culture the fool figure himself relates to.[941] Thus, he invites his realms to the pastoral world once again. Like the clever slave, the audience can enjoy a quick wit adapting to the situation and composing a machinery to mock. In his twelve verses from 3.2.98-109, his bawdy style demeaning love to sexual longings emphasises the lover's inability to write fine style and lovely verses. Behind the clownish escapade, his mock love poem exposes the former bad attempt and foreshadows Touchstone's treatment of Audrey.[942] The wise fool proves to be a comic poet performing, who is nothing else or less than a deliberate fool—a show already a Chrysalus magnificently manages to put on stage.[943]

The clever servant intrudes upon the discourse, whereby he often puzzles his dialogue partners and can act superior to them. The wise fool dominates his conversations as does the clever slave by interrupting the discourse, confronting his dialogue partners with turns and

939 Also note Celia's tripartite alliteration addressing Touchstone ambiguously as wit, which contains an ironic remark as well as the true identity of the professional fool's brilliance in being more witty than any other, see 1.2.54-55 ("How now, wit, wither wander you?").
940 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 8 and 163, ft. 45.
941 Cf. *Ibid.*, 242, ft. 95 and 243.
942 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 88-89; for an analysis on the numerous sexual hints, see David Carlyon, '"Find Love's Prick": Touchstone Improvises', *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes, and Reviews* 24.3 (2011): 131–137; and see Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 245, ft. 135. In 3.2.122ff. and after Touchstone's teasing, Celia reads out a second piece of Orlando's poetry referring to the style of the previous verses, where the name 'Rosalind' stands symptomatic at the end of each sentence or phrase for the lover's longing, the non-refined poetry and rhyming, which style Touchstone picks up in his spontaneous imitation.
943 A similar moment of impromptu action is given in Touchstone's song on Sir Oliver Mar-Text, see *AYL* 3.3.90-97.

illogical reactions, advising them, and commanding them. The simulating fool fools the less witty persona or simply those who address him. This calls the term agon to mind. Like the *servus callidus*, Touchstone's miscommunication usually implies an agonistic attitude, attacking visible or invisible opponents, on or off stage, with his puns and quibbles.[944] He seeks adversaries in verbal battles, wherein he uses his opponents' naivety, weaknesses, and false superiority as fodder for jokes.[945] Certainly, in the forest and among the shepherds, Touchstone finds many occasions to fool the others or at least, he tries. Competition is instanced at his participation in courtship as well as his differentiations between life at court and the rustic life.

Against the country clods, he acts superior since he comes from court, which is foregrounded and he foregrounds repetitively.[946] He attempts to teach Audrey, Corin, and William since he has aphorisms at hand, throws Latin words at them, and poses as a learned man.[947] He calls his rival a clown and exposes his inferiority by translating refined vocabulary to more vulgar terms so that William can understand what he means.[948] The competition with the rustics is expanded when he adopts a mock heroic tendency against the type of the courtier he designs himself during the play. He stabilizes the identity by telling a biographical tale listing his deeds that mark him as a courtier, which reaches a climax when he demonstrates to the Duke and Jaques how courtiers challenge. This last show of the wise fool is an example of Touchstone resembling a *servus ludens*.[949] His image as a seemingly honourable man contradicts that of the courtier believed in particularly at the turn of the 15th century:

> The perfect courtier was required to be witty, full of counsel and jests, skilled in music and poetry, a horseman, a patron of all noble science. Such arts of living could be learned only at the court. He should be ambitious of honor—like Hotspur and Prince Hal—truthful and loyal, kindly and modest.[950]

Touchstone is witty, jovial, and skilled in music but all these skills come with the attribute of folly denying any nobility and honour, which are those characteristics the traitor Frederick and his court wish that they had. The wise fool represents a mocking bird of and ridiculing juxtaposition to the perfect courtier.

---

944 For more examples see *AYL* 2.4.10-12 (He plays with Celia's 'bear'); 2.4.53-54 (Touchstone's riposte to Rosalind's mock compliment); 2.4.59; 2.4.63, 66 (mocking the lovesick shepherd Corin); 3.2.13-21 and 30-31 (by inflationary use of "in respect of", Touchstone juxtaposes life at court with life in the country. The pro and con list does not offer a clear answer, ending with the challenging question if Corin has "any philosophy in [him]" [21]; here, Touchstone also hints at Corin's inability to read between the lines; for 30, Dusinberre highlights Touchstone's ambiguity of 'natural' appealing to Corin's understanding of the world, a rustic man's natural wisdom, and the philosophy of the Natural school. Cf. Dusinberre [ed.] [2006], 237, ft. 30); 5.1.11ff.; 5.3.40ff.; 5.4.43ff. (Touchstone acts seemingly advisory with his *sententiae* and dares to place himself next to the Duke, which stresses the carnivalesque undertone as "Touchstone treats the Duke like his equal", *ibid*., 334, she refers esp. to 5.4.54.); and see for example ft. 62 from beneath, giving examples for ripostes among Touchstone, Celia, and Rosalind, and ft. 73 listing further examples on miscommunication including coding.
945 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 99.
946 See *AYL* 3.2.11-12. Corin addresses him as "Master Touchstone".
947 For example see *AYL* 5.1.17-57, questioning and teaching of William.
948 See *AYL* 5.1.11 and 46-57. Probably, Touchstone's substitutions also help the non-educated in the audience to comprehend his remarks.
949 See *AYL* 5.4.43ff.
950 Muriel C. Bradbrook, 'Virtue is the True Nobility. A Study of the Structure of *All's Well That Ends Well*', *William Shakespeare. Comedies and Romances*, ed. with an introd. by Harold Bloom, New York et al.: Chelsea House, 1986, 55-67, 59.

Following that manner, Touchstone's wit is not responsible for machinations and influential deeds but the clever slave's activities dominating the discourse turn into spread spots of verbal dominance, wherein he tends to deviate from the organic progress of the plot. The artistic agon with words determines his clownish escapades whereby he inserts habits of a *servus ludens* such as violating communication and its conventions. The audience can witness Touchstone's antics from the beginning. Though Le Beau, the messenger, in 1.2 has just informed Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone about the wrestling, the fool seems to ignore the messenger's speech and asks Le Beau about the kind of sport "that the ladies have lost" (*AYL* 1.2.127-28). He does so only to prepare his punchline. The senselessness of his question reveals itself as the foundation for his proverb "Thus men may grow wiser every day. It is the first time that ever I heard breaking of ribs was sport for ladies" (*AYL* 1.2.130-32), whereby Touchstone relates back to Rosalind's and Celia's word play with 'news'. He plays with the appropriateness of the sport for the girls as active participants. As in that scene, it is not just the wise fool that deals with the situation playfully by engaging in miscommunication to create moments of *ridiculum*, but often, it is the witty triangle of Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone who joins in foolish behaviour. They use miscommunication against others like the clever slave abuses turn-taking for his verbal game exposing his dialogue partner. Such a constellation does not occur in Plautus' comedies; however, some plays do not show one clever slave but sometimes give the trickster comparable figures such as Simia, the second *servus callidus* in *Pseudolus*, or Palaestrio's helpers, the cunning women, in *Miles gloriosus*, with whom they can engage in verbal battles. They share an affinity for ridiculing the other and competing in wit, which they can also apply against each other.

AYL's trio with their agenda of *ridiculum* supplies matches of sallies against each other like Touchstone, the court jester, supplying mirth by joking about Rosalind and Celia's exhaustion after their arrival in Arden.[951] In their fondness for demonstrating their wit and surpassing the other in the production of *ridiculum*, especially Rosalind and Touchstone undermine each other with their retorts, whose comic quality the audience should judge. Their competition is made explicit after the recitation of Orlando's poem and the fool's extempore imitation of the lover's verses when Rosalind tries in vain to silence the fool's derision.[952] Agon among producers of *ludus/ludens* is a perfect occasion for a feast of jests like Plautus stages the quarrel of two *servi callidi* in *Pseudolus*. In the Plautine *palliata*, it is mainly the clever slave who occupies the centre of *ridiculum* production throughout the play, from where he designs his trickery as an agon of wit. In *AYL*, by his symmetrical pairs, Shakespeare multiplies such providers of the laughable and the competitors in wit, colouring the discourse with comic errors. Therein, Touchstone takes a significant part in fooling around and fooling the other, while the professional fool remains in a decentralized position as well as an official figure of the laughable supplementing Rosalind.

Appropriately to the master of sense and nonsense, Jaques announces Touchstone as "the motley-minded gentlemen" (*AYL* 5.4.40-41), which should not be mistaken to mean a confused mind; Touchstone's mind stands for a multi-coloured mixture of wit, bringing forth foolish moments as well as wise words. The combination strikes when he offers proverbs as advice. In his repertoire of popular elements, sententiousness allows him to place proverbial wisdom sometimes astonishing by their substance, sometimes hitting by abusing the

---

951 See *AYL* 2.4.2-3 (Touchstone replaces Rosalind's 'spirit' with 'legs', juxtaposing mood and physical condition or generally, spirit and body. Also note *2H4*, Epilogue, cf. Dusinberre [ed.] [2006], 203, ft. 2-3.); 2.4.09-12 (After his retort on Rosalind's exhaustion, Touchstone puns with Celia's 'bear'. In both cases, he replies to the girls' mood with word plays, probably trying to cheer up.).
952 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 244, ft. 119. Touchstone addresses the audience indirectly to decide.

structures for his punchlines.[953] Touchstone stands in comedy's tradition of *sententiae*, which can be subsumed under the catalogue of how common life is conventionally depicted in short verbal forms. Their abuse has ever been a rich source for *ridiculum* the wise fool and the clever slave know how to exhaust it. In other words, Touchstone and others

> calling upon proverbs in these passages to sharpen their witticisms, are true not only to their own general practice, but to the practice of most of Shakespeare's clownish servants and jesters, who grow merry over the proverbial quips they crack to the delight of their proverb-loving audiences.[954]

Rosalind's father acknowledges the fool's sententiousness, whereby he foregrounds the wise fool's capability to juggle with standards in language and thoughts. Simultaneously, his statement hints at the wise fool's compound of a poet, the courtier poet, and the jester.[955] In contrast to the humanist, who teaches and delights with the aspiration for persistence, the comic (courtier) poet catches the ear and likes to prove his conceit. He is pragmatic in his fooling and carnivalesque depiction by inverting common structures and underscoring categories of values like virtue and honour while he uses manners of combining sense with nonsense. The wise fool and the clever slave draw on the same artistry with conventional material by coding and by addressing the audience (directly or indirectly).

> Shakespeare's figure realizes such mixture in his impromptu speech on adultery. In other words, "Touchstone rewrites the defence of marriage as a defence of cuckolds."[956]

> Courage! As horns are odious, they are necessary. It is said, many a man knows no end of his goods; right. Many a man has good horns and knows no end of them. Well, that is the dowry of his wife – 'tis one of his own getting. Horns? Even so. Poor men alone? No, no, the noblest deer hath them as huge as the rascal. Is the single man therefore blessed? No. As a walled town is more worthier than a village, so is the forehead of a married man more honourable than the bare brow of a bachelor. And by how much defence is better than no skill, by so much is a horn more precious than to want.
> (*AYL* 3.3.47-58)

The fool creates a dialogue, addressing the audience and specifically, married men in his sequence of encouraging exclamation, question, and answer. He starts with an illogical thesis concluding from the odiousness of horns and their stigmatization in society to their necessity. He reasons that by an ironic simile between the estate a man owns and the social stigma he gains by the 'dowry of his wife'. Appealing richness of material turns into disgracing reception of something non-material. In his nonsensical presentation of marriage, Touchstone distributes value to horns as their possession should be preferred to a lack of them. The horned husband still surpasses the non-horned bachelor in honour. His playful sequence embraces an abundance of horns in his speech reiterating the notion and creating a picture of masses of horns on the foreheads of each husband that ridicules their unwanted possession and their wives' 'gift' as an advantage to the bachelor. Abundance dominates the speech on

---

953 For instance, a wise recapitulation of lover's delusion, see *AYL* 2.4.53-55; on the abuse of wise words, see the discussion of miscommunication and coding.

954 Morris P. Tilley, 'Pun and Proverb as Aids to Unexplained Shakespearean Jests', *Studies in Philology* 21.3 (1924): 492-5, 495.

955 Cf. Heinrich F. Plett, 'The Place and Function of Style in Renaissance Poetics', *Renaissance Eloquence*, James J. Murphy (ed.), Berkeley et al.: University of California, 1983, 356-375, 368 (on Puttenham about the courtier's style) and esp. 374. Sententiousness belongs to the style of the courtier poet in contrast to the scholar.

956 Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 269, ft. 54-6; compare to the song of Jaques and the foresters in 4.2.1ff.

the semantic as well as on the rhetoric level.[957] In mirroring the vice of adultery that can be found in every class, even among 'the noblest deer', he toys with his created picture as the plenitude of horns turns into a praise of *cornucopia*.[958] Simply, the married man at least has a horn in contrast to the 'un-horned' bachelor. In the habit of the *servus ludens*, he codes his satirical approach on marriage as an encouraging speech and some advice to achieve plenty of precious horns and not stay a bachelor just before his own wedding. His lines of deliberate folly and incongruity unfold desire as a source of both honour and disgrace.

Before he can be wedded, he must get rid of his rival William, which he achieves by a strategy of folly and illogic. He wants to impress and uses aphorisms but also supposedly wise but unsystematically chosen anecdotes to defeat William:

TOUCH.   'So-so' is good, very good, very excellent good and yet it is not, it is but so-so. Art thou wise?

WILL.   Ay, sir, I have a pretty wit.

TOUCH.   Why, thou sayst well. I do now remember a saying: 'The fool doth think he is wise, but the wise man knows himself to be a fool.' The heathen philosopher, when he had a desire to eat a grape, would open his lips when he put it into his mouth, meaning thereby that grapes were made to eat and lips to open.
[…]
Then learn this of me: to have is to have. For it is a figure in rhetoric that drink, being poured out of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty the other. For all your writers do consent that *ipse* is 'he'. Now you are not *ipse*, for I am he.

(*AYL* 5.1.27-44)

Touchstone assesses William's former 'so-so' with a tricolon coming to a climax with the exaggerating pair of excellent good, which proves to be abundant prolixity. This becomes evident when the fool suddenly disrupts his construction with the insertion of 'yet'. The former hyperbole of quality is negated and turns circular since it ends in the prior answer by William and the fool's repetition. The illogical sequence carries an ironic tone audible to the audience but not to William. Then, William commits the great failure to design himself not in a modest way but too arrogantly as a pretty wit, which Touchstone takes deliciously up as a hook to insert a second teasing coded by the chiasmic aphorism the 'pretty witty' William hardly comprehends and could sound as nonsense to him. Here, the adverb 'now' intends to underline Touchstone's spontaneous reaction to William's failure, while the fool draws upon his repertoire of sayings. The chiasmus of fool and wise man continues his paradoxical nature and course of juxtaposing nonsense and wisdom with the introduction of an unidentified philosopher, about whom he conveys a mock anecdote that stylizes a simple and obvious sequence of action to a philosophical reasoning wherein he links entities, here grapes and lips, with purpose and thus adds meaning to them.[959] There are two options to interpret this cryptic reference: either he could only echo William's mouth that starts to open by astonishment and puzzlement in regard to the above-mentioned aphorism; or in his usually bawdy manner,

Touchstone could imply women and men's nature as they are made to love and have sexual intercourse.

The fool's lesson endures with a short proverb that does not fit smoothly to the former wisdom but dangles in mid-air, expressing some dull advice: to have is to have. The announcement of something to be learned ends in a simple truism the audience could understand as a warning to William since he should be satisfied with what he has and not aspire more, and that is Audrey. The fool's truism and following coded sequence disappoint in its promise to be something valuable to be learned as the plain phrase is just followed by a row of nonsensical explanation linked by two illogical 'for'. Touchstone identifies his coming basic conclusion to be a rhetorical figure, which might imply 'amplification' referring to the whole passage because of the fool's intersection of *copia verborum* and *copia rerum* as well as his tendency towards exaggeration and tautology. The 'reallocation' of liquid, a common process, is expressed and defined in 'pouring out' and extended in 'filling' and 'empty'. He wants to sound erudite but his cryptic sentences are merely hot air.

Though they cannot sustain their image of logic and profound rhetoric, fitting the fool's fuzzy way, Touchstone seems to hide beneath his two wisdoms some allusion to the Tantalus episode from the *Odyssey*, where water vanishes as soon as the old man wants to drink it and the wind moves fruit out of his reach as soon as he wants to lay hold of it.[960] Touchstone confirms that Audrey will remain out of William's reach as only Touchstone can open his lips to eat her 'grapes' and drink from the full glass of water. It should be him, who is more learned even in Latin than the rustic William, which he underlines in the last two sentences. In the penultimate sentence, the learned fool uses 'for' again misleading and introduces the Latin *ipse*, a word William does not know. The pronoun can relate to all three personae, which is why Touchstone excludes William and identifies himself as *ipse*, whereby he prepares the only line that is clearly understandable and significant for the rivalry scene as here, he claims Audrey as his future wife.[961] All the former aphorisms and anecdotes spring from Touchstone's profession to mix meaning and reason with folly and violation of structure and logic maximizing the laughable in regard to William.

Plautus' comedies contain equivalent rivalry scenes to outwit the dialogue partner like Simia tries to do the same with Pseudolus. Both, the wise fool and the clever slave, are skilled in confronting the other with the laughable, which can involve everybody on stage as well as beyond. The clever slave knows how to address the audience in order to mirror vices, while he illuminates the subject's relevance for each spectator sitting in the auditorium. For example, Touchstone's monologue on cuckoldry can be compared to Epidicus' opinion on fashion and men's lust; they share the same functionality. Such escapades amplify the organic course with comedy's species in the thematic framework of opposing those entities of vice and virtue in the play.

Touchstone leads that portion of inorganic material in the same manner as it is known from Plautine comedy. The deliberate fool abuses and highlights his advantage in knowledge and inserts moments of (prior) non-comprehension, puzzling his dialogue partner urging him to ask, veiling sense with nonsense and vice versa, while he drives on with his playful

---

960 Cf. Hom. *Od*. XI, 582-92. There is no verbal reminiscence to Tantalus scene. Grapes are not mentioned among the fruits (pears, pomegranates, apples, figs, and olives). Cf. Homer, *The Odyssey. Book 1-12*, transl. by A. T. Murray, Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, ²1995, 443. For Touchstone's passage, the parallel can just be the kernel point of the Tantalus episode that somebody is not able to reach what he longs for and that is heavily stressed in the most essential elements to survive, food and drink.

961 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 317, ft. 43-4. She mentions Lily's *Latin Grammar* entry on *ipse*, stating its indication of all three grammatical persons.

treatment of matter. The method of coding, sense with nonsense, and hidden or open miscommunication, the same the analysis found in the clever slave, often means a challenge of the other figures, but likewise, a challenge for all, figures and audience, to decode and understand their net of semantic entanglement.[962] In other words, the type achieves a perfect balance between escapades, competitions of wit, and insights into the play's semantic texture. The latter especially distinguishes him from natural folly as a source for laughter. By his epithet 'wise,' Shakespeare's deliberate fool grants access to the subtext of the play, reflecting on the behaviour of the others. After the examination of his miscommunication, the following will explore by what means Touchstone reveals himself as the illuminator of and player in and with the utopian grounds. The instances overlap with his antics but the analysis will focus on him as a *poeta*-like figure visualizing the play's major topics as love and the lover as well as truth and illusion.

Like the clever slave, he can achieve that by looking from the outside on the play's inner coherence, which status becomes apparent in his self-consciousness defining himself. He does so by addressing the audience, for instance when he competes with Rosalind for their laughter. He wants to be seen as deliberately foolish. Meeting William, he separates himself from the clods and the simpleton:

> It is meat and drink to me to see a clown. By my troth, we that have good wits have much to answer for. We shall be flouting; we cannot hold.
> (*AYL* 5.1.11-13)

He defines his source of *ridiculum* with the carnivalesque tokens of meat and drink as the folly in others that he knows how to expose with his skills and his unrestricted tongue that cannot be silent. Ironically, by pledging his loyalty to his profession not to be limited by seriousness ('by my troth'), he separates himself from any dignified and formal structures.[963] His consciousness embraces not only himself but the world of comedy and playing. Celia and Rosalind match his description. Their skills are employed for giving responses that express failures on a bi-sensorial level: eyes and ears witness mockery, initiating processes of reflection including the self. The wise fool and the symmetrical complements knowingly avail themselves of the laughable, resembling the Plautine *poeta* as he illuminates a body of stereotypes, the acting of roles, of carrying 'masks', and finally, illusion.

Touchstone's position as an outsider goes hand in hand with his understanding for the utopian playgrounds is explicit in his favourite word 'if', a magical formula that is binary. It can open up hypothetical worlds and illuminate illusionary frames.[964] As in the scene of Touchstone's first trip of playfulness, the fool uses 'if' to make fun of expectation and stereotypes, playing with the obvious ("By my knavery—if I had it—then I were." *AYL* 1.2.73).[965] In the following passage, he elaborates on his ridiculing of honour:

---

962 For more examples on comic deviation, miscommunication including coding, see *AYL* 3.2.30-42 (Corin must ask Touchstone to reason his hard judgement.); 3.2.49ff. (Touchstone turns the conversation into a lesson, pinching Corin to give "sounder instance" several times to persuade him about Corin's argument that "courtesy would be uncleanly if courtiers were shepherds" [47-48]. Though, the jester's play is ended by a resigning Corin, who pinpoints the non-match between the court fool and the shepherd's life.); 3.2.85-119 (Touchstone's variation of the love poem); 5.4.43ff..

963 An analogical understanding of the professional fool figure can be found in *TN*; Viola even gives an expansion of the fool figure's definition in 3.1.57-65, which will also be addressed in the following chapter on Feste.

964 For hypothetical worlds to create jests, also see *AYL* 2.4.11-12; 3.2.38-41; 3.3.23-24; 3.3.44-46.

965 Also see *AYL* 1.2.103, 2.4.2-3.

But if you swear by that that is not, you are not foresworn. No more was this knight swearing by his honour, for he never had any; or if he had, he had sworn it away before ever he saw those pancakes or that mustard.
(*AYL* 1.2.74-78)

In his habit of miscommunication, he veils his sense by a labyrinth of conditionals, telling about the false assumption of honour at court.

Such mock performances and tales draw on Touchstone's distance and perspective from the outside, where he can view the play's action and recognize its thematic coherence. This ability is noticeable in his imaging of Rosalind and Celia as male since they are masked with 'beards to strike', which illuminates and ridicules the boy actor beneath the girls' dresses, who presumably does not have a beard yet, while it foreshadows the metamorphosis of Rosalind into Ganymede. Beards are also matter of another verbal show in the play, Touchstone's last show of folly but his first in front of the Duke that is discussed here to understand the combination of the hypothetical and inventory 'if' with the clownish habit. Touchstone tells Jaques and the Duke a tale about his quarrel with a courtier on the quality of that man's beard-cut: "He sent me word if I said his beard was not cut well, he was in the mind it was. This is called the 'retort courteous'." (*AYL* 5.4.70-72). He explains the lengthy course of critique and challenge at court, which contains seven "degrees of the lie" (*AYL* 5.4.87-88). Touchstone constructs his tale of the course of a challenge on the teasing omnipresence of lies between two courtiers. His construct is built upon the circumstance that "[t]he Elizabethan code of honor supposed a gentleman to be absolutely incapable of a lie."[966] Using if exaggeratingly and putting it central to his story, Touchstone ridicules the opposition of two judgements or two courtiers' words and the reaction to a verbal challenge that can range from a "retort courteous" to a "lie direct". The conditional opens up two perspectives and can offer alternatives of behaviour. For example, a comment can be rejected as an opinion or denounced as a lie, which elicits different reactions from the dialogue partner. Touchstone indicates the options how an argument between two gentlemen can develop; he also addresses the challenge of recognizing truth. Words are ephemeral and transitory. A lie can cease to be the simple negation of truth but can depend on manners. By the use of 'if', Touchstone shows words' instability as "if you said so, then I said so" (*AYL* 5.4.99). The powerful word 'if' displays protection, allowing the speaker not to stick to his word or create a potential frame of how the meaning of former words can dissolve. Again, Touchstone thematizes honour and the validity of oaths and words that can be found in several passages like Frederick's words are not worth a thing or Rosalind doubts a lover's faithful words. The wise fool devalues words' value at court or their standardized forms in society, where he identifies them as the means of courtship that can produce quick turns of sighs, tears, and passion.[967]

In regard to wooing, his use of 'if' mirrors Ganymede's own 'if' emphasising her illusion, while in the manner of *ridiculum*, it stands in juxtaposition to the heroine's options for a happy solution. Throughout the play, the disguised Rosalind works with the conditional to submit hidden references to her true identity like she wants to explain her situation and relation to the other three lovers, Silvius ("I will help you if I can"), Phoebe ("I would love you if I could. [...] I will marry you if ever I marry woman"), and Orlando ([...] I will satisfy you if I ever satisfied man"). Her true figure shines through her second role when she pivots on the conditional. For

966 Bradbrook (1986), 58.
967 See Silvius' list of love and worship, see *AYL* 5.2.80, 90-95.

her, it is an existential question whereas Touchstone abuses it for his reflections on the entanglements between fantasy and reality, golden, pastoral world and realism, lie and truth.

Like the clever slave, who achieves his deception and mocking by his tales and deceptive persona, the wise fool creates hypothetical worlds that allows more chances for jests, ridiculous mirrors, and a greater scope to juxtapose the actual with the non-actual and the possible with the impossible. A significant device herein is 'if' of which creational strength Touchstone is aware.[968] Phrasing illusionary frames with 'if' foregrounds their temporary existence and finally, their harmlessness, which reveals 'if' not only as an essential word in the creative process but also for the fool's license. In his programmatic use of 'if', the wise fool producing and illuminating illusionary frames on stage and beyond parallels the clever slave's ambitions as an *architectus* and a poet, who can unfold illusions.

So far, the fool has been identified as a carnivalesque juggler with words standing at the outside with the advantage of knowledge and comprehension of how the world of comic theatre runs. He applies his devices, sequences of 'if', proverbial assessment, and mixing sense with nonsense to provide merry marginalia to the mere action and hereby, fosters the play's understanding, while he elucidates core themes such as the type of the lover. In 2.4.43-52, Touchstone expresses some thoughts on love and the suffering lover while he appears to tell his own past experience as a suitor, exaggerated by his repetition of 'remember'. His story comments on the outworn phrasing of Silvius' verse when he interrupts the pathetic tone with his bear prose including bawdy allusion, ridiculing lover's blindness, and opposing the lover's pain.[969] After telling his "strange capers" (*AYL* 2.4.51), he concludes his story in an affirmation of lovers' collective failure by summming up his reflections in an aphorism: "But as all is mortal in nature, so is all nature in love mortal in folly." (*AYL* 2.4.51-52). The professional fool speaks from a clearer point of view as he is not under Cupid's spell; though he courts Audrey, he keeps up his perspicacity and distance from the happenings in the Forest.[970] To the amusement of the audience, he parodies lovesickness, reiterating the clever slave's favourite theme, deriding the lovesick master and playing with his folly, as does Chrysalus (see *Bacch*. 192-98) or Pseudolus, who ridicules the exuberant sighing of Calidorus (see *Pseud*. 78-79).[971]

In the courtship scenes and beyond, Touchstone addresses the instability of lovers' oath, the ephemerality of fine sounds, and poetical as a synonym for deceiving.[972] Honest sighing, longing, and pain the audience experiences with Phoebe, Silvius, Rosalind, and Orlando is juxtaposed and mocked by Touchstone's governance over the situations and their personae therein, whereby he colours these more earnest tones with comic attributions.[973] Married men become horned husbands, while marriage consists of women's adultery and men's endurance. As Rosalind does when tutoring Orlando, Touchstone illuminates core themes of the play. He manages to do so even from offstage when Jaques reports the Duke about his encounter with the fool (see *AYL* 2.7.12ff.) and becomes the messenger of Touchstone's 'deep contemplations' about time that "[…] from hour to hour we ripe and ripe,/ And then from hour to hour we rot and rot" (*AYL* 2.7.26-27).[974] His illuminations carry the

---

968 Esp. see *AYL* 5.4.100-1 ("Your 'if' is the only peacemaker; much virtue in 'if'"). 'If' stands for the golden world programmatically.

969 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 86 and 94, ft. 2. Touchstone's sword was probably made of wood. Note Feste's song in *Twelfth Night*, 4.2.125-132, where he refers to a "dagger of lath".

970 See *AYL* 3.3.39 and 5.4.57-60. Audrey is portrayed as ugly, again an asymmetry to Rosalind.

971 Cf. Goldsmith (1958), 86.

972 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 90. She pinpoints "poetry as a route of ingress into the fortress of the female" (90).

973 For example, see their encounter at *AYL* 5.2.79ff.

974 Note Rosalind's meditation on time, *AYL* 3.2.299ff. and Jaques on the circle of life.

carnivalesque, stabilizing the upside-down world on stage. Herein, inversion and violation of standards play a significant role.

It is not surprising that the topic he cannot stop talking about is the versatility and instability of those entities whose quality contributes to realize the world on stage: words either in oaths, among gentlemen, on a meta-level or in an intertextual complex of love, poetry, and theatre. The last passage to be examined here on that account and to provide a insight into Touchstone's visualizing the semantic textures of the play can be found in the fool's dialogue with Audrey. After using Ovid as an image of unchasteness in his wooing scene with his future bride, Touchstone continues the allusion to the Roman writer as well as the negative image of the dishonest and misunderstood poet:

> When a man's verses cannot be understood, nor a man's good wit seconded with the forward child, understanding, it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room.
> (*AYL* 3.3.10-13)

It seems he takes the poet's position as if he responds to the attacks against poetry and theatre as a source and influence for dishonesty. He thus expands the theme of lust to a common argument in society when he addresses the often-done equation of poetry with lies. In a coding manner, he underlines that analogy by responding paradoxically:

> AUD.   I do not know what poetical is. Is it honest in deed and word? Is it a true thing?
>
> TOUCH.   No, truly; for the truest poetry is the most faining, and lovers are given to poetry, and what they swear in poetry may be said, as lovers, they do feign.
> (*AYL* 3.3.15-19)

The fool combines antithetic pairs like 'no' and 'truly'—an adverb he repeats five times in the scene—, 'truest' and 'poetry' or the superlatives 'truest' and 'most faining' that can be replaced with feigning as the fool insinuates in his pun. By his nonsense pairs, he highlights the extremes of mixing fantasy with lie as well as fantasy with truth. This issue accompanies the discourse on the level of the subtext throughout the play, while it is exemplified by figures' suspicions against and overestimation of words' truth, their solidity as well as their durability. In his mocking attitude, the wise fool intertwines poetry, lie, and fiction, whereby he as a subject of the theatre addresses his own construction, the stage's utopian harmlessness, and his own one. The fool's disposition as a known juggler with words makes him the best speaker to account for language's flexibility he takes to its limits. With that skill and use of language, Touchstone's stay in the forest and his courtship are merely an occasion for comic inversions of the romantic versions and reflections on frames of illusions on stage and beyond;[975] he makes fun of those entities that are out of tune as love, honour, and identity with a plus of wisdom, illuminating the differences between the court and the Golden Age in the Forest, questioning the dream world of peaceful and ideal living, and highlighting the incompatibility of courtiers inhabiting that non-political space since the Duke and his nobles do not belong there.[976]

---

975 For instance, on courtship, see esp. *AYL* 3.3.9-23, as it has been partially discussed above.

976 For a discussion on Shakespeare's use of the utopian vision in the play, see Ryan Farrar, '*As You Like It*: The Thin Line Between Legitimate Utopia and Compensatory Vacation', *Utopian Studies* 25.2 (2014): 359-383. He defines the wise fool in his attitude towards Arden as "the borderline anti-utopian Touchstone" and in contrast

The instances where he proves a mediative and liminal characteristic indicate his position as an outsider and distanced observer, which is linked to his privilege of being all-licensed, while he always remains active as an 'insider'. The clever slave's dilemma between punishment, fear, and liberty to trick and make fun of continues in the servant's service of mirth and harmless mirroring of error. Only for the time of the play, the wise fool remains protected. Rosalind threatens when she commands that he should "speak no more. [He]'ll be whipped for taxation one of these days" (*AYL* 1.2.83-84). Until then, he is released as he now should "unmuzzle [his] wisdom" (*AYL* 1.2.69) that can hardly be caught and controlled as Rosalind experiences when she tries to silence him in the further course of the play.[977] The fool is aware of his own license as he refers to it through Jaques, who reports the Duke about his encounter with Touchstone. Here, the fool pinpoints his license granted by Fortune as it is she that favours fools.[978] Exactly that license is elaborated in Jaques' praise and longing for motley when he describes the fool's "bob" (*AYL* 2.7.55 and see 44ff.). The only judges he might fear or he must face is the taste of the audience and their access to his jokes.[979] His direct and indirect addresses to the audience visualize him clearly at the edge of the stage. He knows of the license's limitations to the utopian frames of comedy and opposes his theatrical freedom of speech to real life's censure in his aphoristic manner: "The more pity that fools may not speak wisely what wise men do foolishly." (*AYL* 1.2.85-86). Celia supports his remark right away and argues that "since the little wit that fools have was silenced, the little foolery that wise men have makes a great show." (*AYL* 1.2.87-89).

Such sentences refer to the body of types comedy's representation deals with: failure and ideal or vice and virtue, while comedy puts them in an upside-down proportion elucidating the flaws and defects in human nature. In this mixture, the professional fool figure moves freely as does the clever slave as well as the wise fool. These aphorisms describe Touchstone's nature identifying the deliberate fool, which is done by figures or by the fool himself as he speaks about his own figure's stereotypical features self-consciously.[980] The Duke pinpoints him as the figure who "shoots his wit" under the pretence of the mask 'fool'.[981] This is the line closing Touchstone's last performance in the play as he is present at the joyful celebration with Hymen but does not give any speech or comment. He remains passive, which fits the end of the utopian era of Arden and that of the play; his all-license expires. Until the end and under the protection of the all-license, Touchstone embodies the professional "whetstone of wits" (*AYL* 1.2.53-54) Falstaff claims for himself as: "I am not only witty in myself, but the cause that wit is in other men." (*2H4* 1.2.9-10). The wise fool's programmatic name highlights his functions since 'Touchstone' stands for "test[ing] all that the world takes for gold, especially the gold of the golden world of pastoralism."[982] In accordance, "Touchstone in his relationships advances a standard by which we are invited to measure the other relationships in the play."[983] And being that standard could not be thought without him being the observer and illuminator of the play's subtext.

to that, "the radically Utopian Jacques" (380). On life in the forest, see esp. *AYL* 3.2.13-21., where he is juxtaposed with Corin, and cf. Videbæk (1996), 87-88.

977 For instance, see *AYL* 2.4.64 and 68.

978 Cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 217, ft. 18-19.

979 For instance, see *AYL* 3.2.119 ("let the forest judge").

980 For further examples, see *AYL* 2.4.54-55, 5.4.64-65.

981 *AYL* 5.4.105.

982 John Dover Wilson, *Shakespeare's Happy Comedies*, London: Faber and Faber, 1962, 156.

983 Ralph Berry, *Shakespeare's Comedies. Explorations in Form*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972, 187.

As with the clever slave, the heroine and the wise fool are not the exclusive sources creating moments of *ridiculum*, making speeches about stage, and emphasizing metatheatrical considerations in *AYL* as does Jaques in "All the world's a stage" (*AYL* 2.7.140).[984] Shakespeare does not offer a second wise fool but an asymmetrical competitor. While Touchstone persuades as the ridiculing, deliberately clownish source of mirth, who toys with the epithet 'wise', Jaques sees himself as the wise man satirizing the world.[985] The traveller's voice allows the audience satirical insights but cannot cope with Touchstone's compound of reflectiveness and jests as he is too self-indulgent and restricted by his melancholic solitude.

> He enjoys Touchstone's reflections on time without understanding his sly humor. He thinks Touchstone a natural fool, but Touchstone plays the fool with a whimsicality that no coat of motley could give to Jaques. Where Touchstone is a true original, Jaques is all manner and the only one in the play who can make Orlando seem the soul of wit.[986]

Melancholic Jaques aims at the motley he praises after his encounter with Touchstone (see *AYL* 2.7.12), but he overestimates his flexibility and clings to melancholy, moralizing and longing in vain for the joyful folly.[987] The Duke Senior does not see in him a potential wise fool because of his history as "a libertine" (*AYL* 2.7.65). While Touchstone belongs outside the forest at court, Jaques remains a traveller and an inhabitant of the utopian forest.

Both figures show "a high level of self-conscious performance" and provide a source for agonistic opposition as well as insights but range at two poles in the play, wherein Touchstone remains the official all-licensed figure offering delightful mirrors to recognize men's own inferiority as well as weakness and attesting the ally in Rosalind's folly.[988] His motley coat offering polyvalence distinguishes Touchstone from the taunting satirist, who perceives "a miserable world" (*AYL* 2.7.13). As a misanthrope, fond of discordance, Jaques does not suit the deliberate fool figure's choreography of the laughable on stage usually including dancing and singing, whose verve is linked to the ecstatic activity in laughing culture.[989] Jaques fails to become mirth's equal and Touchstone's companion.[990] Further minor figures of jollity contrasting Jaques and engaging in corresponding activities as dancing and singing can be found in two anonymous pages, the foresters, and Amiens. While Jaques does not have a sense for music, the singer Amiens and Touchstone repel 'broken music' and discordance.[991] Amiens is similar to Touchstone in comedy's show of singing and dancing but

---

984 At the banquet the Duke Senior introduces the subject of world as a theatre or the theatre as a fictive world, which reaches its climax with Jaques' speech. The realistic and devouring tone ending in death suits the satirist's voice.

985 For instance, see *AYL* 2.5.10ff.

986 Ornstein (1986), 145.

987 Cf. Bernhard Greiner (Tübingen RWG), "Comedy", in: *Brill's New Pauly*, Antiquity volumes edited by: Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Consulted online on 05 January 2022 http://dx.doi.org.ubproxy.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1409960; First published online: 2006; First print edition: 9789004122598, 20110510. (citation style given by website). An oppositional category to Touchstone, the fool, is expressed in the Melancholic, whose antithetic pair represents "facilitating figures in the comedial world of Shakespeare, in which the principles of invention and transgression of ancient comedy continue to be influential".

988 Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 107.

989 Cf. *Ibid.*, 111-12.

990 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 87; and see *AYL* 2.5.52-54.

991 For Amiens and his contrast to Jaques, see *AYL* 2.5ff. and cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 211, ft. 13-15; for the song of foresters, lords, and Jaques, who is only interested in noise and not in music in tune, see *AYL* 4.2.5ff.; for

is not appropriate for any 'morosophical' manifestations. In essence, Amiens and Jaques cannot reach Touchstone's status of a deliberate fool.

Most of those satirizing or entertaining figures are not available in Lodge's prose tale but are added to represent and comprehend the comic mask. As a consequence, the audience receives several inorganic scenes led by merrymakers, whereby they often gain access to the sublevel of the play and the generic environment. In a significant proportion, the triangle of Celia, Rosalind, and Touchstone utilize their distanced and witty voices with a critical and jesting attitude and reach each other in the arrangements of wit on their world and beyond.[992] Celia supports Rosalind as an equally clever woman, reminding her of her womanhood and accompanying her in courtship. Touchstone acts for his own (lust), remains a challenging servant underscoring superiority, functionally serves *ridiculum* and remains a decentralized deliberate fool to Rosalind.

Now, it is time to sum up how much of the heroine and (her) wise fool can be detected in the construction of the clever slave. In comparison to the low-rank knave, Rosalind is not the heroic anti-heroine and cannot free herself from ethics. She evokes incongruity by her design as the loving curer of love, counselling and guiding the other figures due to her agenda. Shakespeare casts Rosalind as a cunning *architecta*, an observer of discourse, mediator and participant in the resolution. Hence, she is put in the middle of entangled fictional ideas and roles bound to dramatic and non-dramatic (con)texts, which makes her the one to pull the strings. Embedded in comedy, the heroine yields a similar constellation of *ludus/ludens*, tricking, ridiculing, and speaking as well as acting playfully (*ludos facere* or *reddere alicui*; *ludos praebere*). Her playfulness is supported by her identity as the programmatic magician, who seems to cure by provocation and surprising contradictory mood shifts towards Orlando.

Rosalind's closeness to earlier trickster figures evokes the question of how different she appears to the design of Lodge's Rosalynde, Shakespeare's source. Shakespeare transforms Rosalind from Lodge's modest protagonist to the comic heroine as he has to adapt a prose tale to a comedy. He images her as a relative to the clever trickster of New Comedy. Plautine types and habits remain an integral part of Shakespeare's plays. Though there is no need of a male intriguer determining the comic discourse as an unromantic but agonistic sequence, the Elizabethan playwright clings to a schemer in the plot but shows scheming and manipulation in a female figure who courts and is courted. The sovereign figure uses her cunning to triumph in love's name and for her sake and not as the clever slave for a higher-ranked figure. A female clever protagonist does not move in the realms of knavery and bragging but casts herself as a clever, charming, innocent, and feigned boy, which allows her to reveal the *virgo*, the maiden she never ceased to be. While that status makes her comparable to Viola, her dominance over male voices and instigating feature is repeated in Maria in *Twelfth Night*.

In Touchstone, a predecessor to Feste, Shakespeare's creation of the wise fool includes the transformation of Rosalynde to Rosalind, his fondness for symmetrical, supporting pairs on stage, and the need to introduce a popular clown in his adaption of Lodge's *Rosalynde*. Though Lodge's *Rosalynde* gives Shakespeare the basic plot, it does not provide Shakespeare with the full cast in *AYL*. Lodge's play does not contain a model for Touchstone and for Touchstone's partner Audrey so that they can form an asymmetrical couple to Rosalind and

---

the two pages and Touchstone, who probably dances with them, listens to their song, assesses that it lacks substance and tune, see *AYL* 5.3.8ff.; Touchstone encouraging Audrey to exit dancing, see *AYL* 5.1.62 and cf. Dusinberre (ed.) (2006), 319, ft. 62.
992 Cf. Ornstein (1986), 141 and 146.

Orlando. The same is true for William, the rival to be fooled by Touchstone, and Jaques, the satirist, the non-motley critical voice as a contradictory mirror in the play. In Edward Berry's words,

> [t]he addition of Touchstone and Jaques to Lodge's story extends the role of the heroine considerably. When Rosalind jests with Touchstone or, better, endures his jests at her and her lover's expense, as in his parody of Orlando's verses, the effect is not only to complicate the comedy of the play but to extend the range of her character. The same is true of her brief encounter with Jaques […]. Touchstone and Jaques serve as foils to Rosalind, setting off her distinctive qualities.[993]

However, Berry does not explain what background can be disclosed for the foil as well as for Rosalind and where else Shakespeare sought for inspiration. Why should Shakespeare not have thought about Plautus' clever slave and his concept here? Rosalind is not Shakespeare's new creation but a form of *contaminatio;* Touchstone stems from the process of transformation.

Videbæk wrongly asserts that "the idea of comic mirroring is Shakespeare's own".[994] Shakespeare was not the first to use such a figure with perspicacity, creativity for comic escapades, and fondness for carnivalesque behaviour to mirror the ugly on stage and deepen it by visualizing the subtext to the mere plot. In Plautus' *servus callidus*, there is one prototype that grounds on these functions. If only the characteristic of commenting and explanation is concerned, voices from the outside are as old as theatre itself, dating back to the chorus in Greek drama.[995] It is not Shakespeare's invention but his wise fools stand in a complex tradition of myriad figures that fulfil exactly this function. Comic drivers and comic heroes can serve this purpose temporarily or throughout the play, among whom the type of deliberate fool figure must be subsumed. How they instantiate hinges on numerous factors participating in the process of metamorphosing: Shakespeare's wise fool follows the tradition of the deliberate fool including contemporary categories as the 'court jester', influences dispersed in the circulation of Latin, Italian, French as well as the first English plays in this period, and the non-constitutive impact from New Comedy onwards. Watching Rosalind and Touchstone, parts of the audience might be reminded of tricksters and clowns that are active on European stages. Of course, Touchstone's antics can be compared to those of the clown.[996] If the agenda was to find the archetype or a non-complex linear reception of deliberate fool figures, the success of such an approach would be highly doubtable. The type's embedment in comedy's essence produced a variety of manifestations, dating back to Atellan Farce and mimes. It is not about presenting the inventor and the imitator of one type but about identifying one type's functional facets and their continuous diachronic series.

Shakespeare's early plays include tricksters and deliberate comic drivers but not such a professional as Touchstone. Robert Ornstein says that "[h]e has more wit than the clowns of the earlier comedies, but he lacks the shrewdness that will keep Speed in pocket money all

---

993 Berry (1980), 43. He does not take similarities to the New Comedic type into considerations.

994 Videbæk (1996), 87.

995 Cf. Bernd Seidensticker, *Das antike Theater*, München: C.H. Beck, 2010, 44-45. The role of the chorus changed from the beginnings of tragedy slowly since its participation in the dramatic action and its number of verses declined. The chorus lost its status as an actor and remained more at the peripheries, commentating and observing.

996 Ornstein (1986), esp. 146: Ornstein speaks of Touchstone's "zaniness"; and cf. Frances Teague (ed.), *Acting Funny. Comic Theory and Practice in Shakespeare's Plays*, Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994, 34. He thinks of Iago as constructed on the foundation of the clever slave figure.

of his life."[997] The professional fool in his intersection between folly and wisdom deviates from the former species of the laughable, found in Grumio, rather a vulgar clown, and grounds on the paradox pattern in a more open and polished version. For Touchstone and Feste, the programmatic wise fools stand out since there are no equal predecessors in the decades of English drama prior to Shakespeare's working.[998] Touchstone's idiosyncrasy and strength are the constant and fruitful opposition of contemplation and ludicrous mirth, whose combination is extraordinary, certainly for someone as Jaques, who wonders "[t]hat fools should be so deep-contemplative" (*AYL* 2.7.31). Shakespeare does not invent such a composition but his figure looks back on a pool of deliberate fool figures in drama, wherein the clever slave is a popular prototype. Hence, besides the stream of aesthetic consciousness for that type, for Shakespeare's wise fool, a decisive factor is Shakespeare's expertise in Plautus' comedies making him more sensitive for the functionality of the type's concept for the coherence of comedy and its conveyance to the audience. The metamorphosis of Rosalind and Touchstone involves Shakespeare's knowledge of the clever slave and the type's *paradox*. In other words, besides his roots in Elizabethan court jesting, Touchstone's concept is based on New Comedic jesters and on his symmetry to Rosalind. The wise fool's similarity to *servus callidus* can only be detected fully by comparing Touchstone's embedment in the plot as well as his functionality for comedy and its parameters to Rosalind's. Both have been analysed for their contribution to *ridiculum* by miscommunication and coding, their skills how to jeer and knowledge of the utopian quality, their carnivalesque nature, and their distanced perspicacity.

Women and fools are outsiders who are underestimated and cannot control their tongues. As fools cannot stay silent, women "must speak" when they think (*AYL* 3.2.242-43). The two witty figures' symmetry is shown when Rosalind states that a woman's wit can never be stopped especially not by her husband. Orlando's responds to that ("Wit, whither wilt?" *AYL* 4.1.156) reflects Celia's introduction of Touchstone and his beginning of *ludens* ("Wit, whither wander you?", *AYL* 1.2.54-55). The *virgo* and jester are linked by their freedom to use their wit unpredictably.

Indeed, Touchstone's playfulness is never stopped. Once they reach the forest, he takes part in the pursuit of love by his courtship of Audrey, which embeds him in the plot as a parallel to the other pair of lovers while he stays attached to his profession of *ridiculum*. In contrast to the disguised Rosalind, he cannot appear as a trickster or a clever deceiving slave, who changes from playful misbehaviour to machinations. Such turns are not necessary; though Touchstone intends to marry Audrey, there seems hardly any obstacle to pass apart from William. And although the fool attempts to dominate discourse agonistically, when he woos Audrey and attacks William as "a master of courtly bravado" (see *AYL* 5.1.47-57), Touchstone cannot take off his mask of folly but hides behind it. [999] While Rosalind shifts between her roles, manipulates, and deceives others, that shape-shifter remains the faceless persona of *ludens* that allows him to reflect on the others in combination with the production of *ridiculum*. He plays a courtier, whose natural environment is the codes-dominated court opposing the innocence and timelessness of Arden. The clever servant becomes a playful manager not of *turbae* but of follies that are present on stage. As Rosalind temporarily becomes the comic driver, Touchstone remains the merrymaker, fitting the repertoire of a cheeky low-rank figure. He is truly all-licensed and competitive in turn-taking and proving his wit.

---

997 Ornstein (1986), 146.
998 Cf. Videbæk (1996), 195.
999 Cf. Ornstein (1986), 150.

His motley is not famous for contributing substance to the plot but for ridiculing and throwing light on the action. In that way, Touchstone illuminates the boundaries between impossibilities, fantasies, and dreams of the pastoral world and the real life of court; he makes the illusionary frames between roles and performances visible.[1000] The type's functionality becomes apparent in the juxtaposition of thematic clusters he constructs in his comments and monologues: servant vs. master, lust vs. love, rustic life vs. court, Frederick's court vs. a court of ideals, court vs. forest, peaceful life against politics, Golden Age vs. reality, idealism vs. realism, truth vs. lies, words vs. substance.[1001] They appeal to the horizon of Shakespeare's audience and fit the romantic comedy, substituting the Plautine themes a clever slave avails himself of: military invasion and occupation turn into love's spell and therapy. Both figures can design their identity and surroundings from an offstage perspective just as Touchstone looks upon the twofold stage of court and exile. From that position, he conforms to the jesting profession, when he pursues a line of incongruity, fostering such oppositional clusters of scripts that elucidate the play's discourse.

Concerning Shakespeare's early comedy *The Shrew*, the question comes up of how much Petruccio, Grumio, and Tranio foreshadow Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone. Certainly, it is not suggested that *The Shrew* exhibits a parallel triangle in operation but Petruccio and Rosalind design and dominate the discourse between their lovers and themselves. They are similarly rich in opposition and share a fondness for miscommunication. Furthermore, *The Shrew* knows a short repartee between two professional dominant deceivers, Petruccio and Tranio, competing with their weapon wit, which kind of scenes *AYL* shows in abundance in the dialogues of Celia, Rosalind, and Touchstone. Shakespeare recognizes the productivity of a comic figure for the laughable and the comic mirroring when he constructs it as shifting between the rational and folly or between two oppositional identities. He gains a flexible persona that can change behaviour and tone, design himself or herself, and freely move within and outside comedy's illusion. Shakespeare constructs the figure on the basis of the paradox pattern, where Plautus comes in useful, while he manages to mold the concept of the Plautine trickster to his needs and to Elizabethan comedy. In comparison to Tranio, the counterpart to the clever slave, the Plautine type diffuses in the construction to Shakespeare's female trickster and in special regard to its features of the *servus ludens,* in the supportive figure of the wise fool. For the former, the mock hero becomes the disguised lover fighting for her own chance always with the right portion of wit. For the latter, the manager of plot and *ridiculum* specializes to the court jester and occupies a niche on the comedy's stage, which juggles with word and substance in its utopian freedom. Not occupied with a central agenda for the plot, his parts are dedicated to a firework of sense and nonsense and agonistic quarrel. Deception persists in coded fooling the superior or holding up the mirror in front of the audience, laughing at the vices.

In his figure, rationality and wisdom meet nonsense and folly, not only foregrounded in the figure's title: the wise fool. This opposition allows him to foster the laughable and present the themes and their coherence in the play's subtext to the audience. The poles of sense and nonsense become blurred in the comic figure, the professional fool, who incorporates the upside-down world in full terms, since he can violate social code without retribution. The playwright comprehends the functionality of the figure's unexpected turns as the figure is not obliged to any sort of dignity. He can use the figure's thematic flexibility since the type owns a creative force and a body of identities. In Touchstone and the later

---

1000 Cf. Ornstein (1986), 151.
1001 Cf. Boerner Beckman (1978), 44-45.

manifestations of the deliberate fool figure, Shakespeare puts the emphasis on supplying an epistemic value hidden in the fool's art of folly. His figure is set in poetry's traditional binary 'pleasure and teaching', beneath which the escapades exposing some failure and revealing some kernel in the play fall. The composition of 'pleasure and teaching' does also invite the grander debate in the play about truth and lie, trust in words, or how much impact and stability words provide (in contrast to deeds). In comparison to Rosalind, Touchstone's part underscores words' substance constantly, partaking in miscommunication and advocating language's flexibility abused by playfulness. In line with Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*, he is aware of the universality of the laughable in human nature and the usefulness of laughter to reflect failure. His embodiment of deliberate folly offers a utilitarian mirror for human errors and addresses the principle of pleasure and teaching.

Plautus creates a heroic anti-hero, a deceiver, a tale teller, an entertainer, while Shakespeare transforms the type within the socio-cultural and theatrical framework of his days to a female instigator and makes use of the pattern for a wise fool, a jester, and a philosopher. New Comedic pleasure in deceit and error is active in Shakespeare's comedies but no longer embodied by one leading servant figure that determines a plot with surprising turns. Plautine cunning and sympathetic instigators are now echoed in female protagonists like Rosalind. But those heroines do not provide an atmosphere as carnivalesque as the clever servant does because the trinity of desire, food, and drink does not fit the *virgo's* attribute of innocence, whereas the low rank figure can constantly mix the profane and sacred, mind and body, reason and folly, and invert the social hierarchy. Shakespeare's Rosalind focuses on gender juxtaposition, inversion, conflicts of mind and body and reason and folly. It seems that Shakespeare breaks Roman Comedy into functional pieces. He reinterprets them by intensifying the complexity of identity and human fallibility. In other words, the playwright relies on the New Comedic concept of deceit, error, and *turbae* but changes its centre from comic deception by an intrigue to the struggle of the individual and the failure of eye and ear. His figures move in a cosmos where oaths are not trusted. Though Rosalind occupies the centre of the play's discourse, she does not impress by great machinations, but her figure seminally enriches the discourse by her production and illumination of false or misleading perception. Shakespeare offers more than one figure that contributes to that comic structure of incongruity consciously and programmatically as it is true for the three whetstones of wit, among whom Rosalind and Touchstone receive the greater part. As the Plautine deceiver influences the sequence of action, while he abuses the quality of words and their substance, the Shakespearean juggler of words, female and male, withdraws from being a 'maker' but manifests the irregularities between truth and lie as well as words and deeds as a comic orator.

His first comedies do not yield a competitive figure that has reached the pinnacle of verbal dance, wit, and reflective comic comments on the relation between life and comedy as Rosalind or Touchstone do. *As You Like It* displays the female trickster's time for folly and mirroring in her lessons on gender behaviour. The wise fool parallels her in the programme of the laughable as both fall into holiday humour, veiling meaning by nonsense or selling illogical constructs as sense. They also share unpredictability, which means that Rosalind can act a skin-changer, whereas Touchstone adopts a merry disposition and can speak freely. Their function as a commentator eases the processing of the play's sublevel, which becomes palpable in their use of aphorisms and proverbial wisdom. Both overlap in giving access to epistemic value in their manner of reflecting and teaching, jesting and deluding. As Plautus does for his intrigue comedies, Shakespeare gains figures that turn the prose tale into a comedy and on the abstract level, stabilize the coherence of his comedy since they operate as its sign by their construction on the paradox pattern. The concept of the female heroine and

Touchstone echoes a clever slave's essential incongruity, unpredictability, and flexibility that foster the realisation of comedy's parameters.

Certainly the court jester's configuration on the *paradox* evokes a Tranio, a Grumio, a Speed, or a Launcelot Gobbo, who are all servants usually with a crude wit. They all share a tendency towards verbal abuse but the official fool surpasses them by applying the complex of *ludus-ludere*.[1002] These instantiations including Touchstone, the wise fool, originate from a process that urges every playwright dominated by the principle of imitation, which is the process of refinement actually meaning the own playwright's phrased intention and the metamorphosis of something already aesthetically effective but adapted to the cultural disposition. The wise fool is a deliberate fool constructed on the paradox pattern, while he relies on similar oppositional constituents and operates with analogical devices of miscommunication. Plautus' comedies offer a distinctive, popular, and available prototype in Shakespeare's time that is used for Shakespeare's cunning Tranio and comic heroines. The clever slave and its instantiations are sources for the wise fool.

1002 See ch. III.v.

IV.iii. Plautine fooling in *Twelfth Night*

Twelfth Night closes the sequence of Shakespeare's romantic comedies, which Miola describes as "a most recapitulatory play" since it combines several elements from the body of New Comedy; the female twin Viola cross-dressed as a boy is a case in point.[1003] Leo Salingar looked at Shakespeare's use of classical tradition of comedy from *The Comedy of Errors* to *Twelfth Night* and traces the classical patterns to be found in the two plots.[1004] Among those, the clever trickster and his functional constituents appear as it has been shown for the employment of a witty disguised hero or heroine and the symmetrical arrangement of wise folly or fooling wit. In *AYL*, Rosalind finds her assistant and counterpart in Touchstone for identifying and fostering the laughable. Their pair is reformed in *Twelfth Night*, whose stage changes from an Arcadian world to a gathering of self-absorbed Illyrians, in another utopia that leaves room for the spectators' imagination and interpretation.[1005] Among those, the pairing of Rosalind and Touchstone reoccurs in Viola and Feste, who are placed in the sequence of the modified Plautine prototype. In addition to the binary concept, the third witty figure resembling the clever slave is found in Maria dominating the subplot of Malvolio's undoing. Her role as a female schemer looking back upon her New Comedic background will be examined separately. While the two female roles can be compared in their operation with illusion and as knowing figures in the (sub)plots, Feste takes part in both discourses, freely moving and mirroring the heroines' wit as a species of the laughable. Consequently, there are three figures and potentially, two couples that have similar constituents and rely on the paradox pattern in their functionality. They will be looked at in terms of their embedment in the plot and their contribution to comedy's schema. As it has been done for *AYL*, *TN* will be analysed for if and how Maria, Viola, and Feste exhibit the components of Plautus' type and where they show similarities and differences. These findings will then be evaluated in relation to those made in the previous chapter about the triangle of whetstone found in Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone and thus, Shakespeare's further use of and course of metamorphosing the clever tricking persona and deliberate fool figure.

The analysis will start with Viola, "a Plautine schemer without scheme and superimposes the errors plot on Italianate intrigue."[1006] Indeed, she does not seem like the strong contriver, who is so common in comedy. Viola's trademark and her difference from Plautus' type is her individuality and the genuineness with which she reacts to changes with; her emotional ups and downs make her a believable character. Notwithstanding that the change between anxiety, bravery, doubts, and self-confidence is part of the comic programme, which an unpredictable trickster in Plautine comedies often runs, Viola's emotional alternations do not bear any exaggeration or unpredictability but are authentic enough to elicit empathy instead of laughter. In comparison to Rosalind, Viola resorts to the laughable or ironic exaggeration to a lesser extent; she confirms her genuine human character and her dilemma. This is connected to the different reasons for Viola's disguise. In contrast to

---

1003 Miola (1994), 38, also cf. 39.

1004 Cf. Salingar (1974), esp. 238-242 and *Id.*, *Dramatic Form in Shakespeare and the Jacobeans*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986, 74-77; cf. Riehle (1990), 230-4; also note Geoffrey Bullough (ed.), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. I. Early Comedies, Poems, Romeo and Juliet*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957, 3-11, 57; and Miola (1994), 38-39.

1005 Cf. Elam (2008), 71-3. Probably many spectators could not identify Illyria on the map clearly; for them, the name implied some exoticism and not familiarity.

1006 Miola (1994), 39.

a Plautine trickster, Viola's motivation to take on a male appearance lies in a disaster she has not caused. She does not want to deceive the others for her own benefit but because of her hopeless situation. Her despair forces her to come up with a plan, to hide her identity, and to deceive others about her desires, making her an innocuous schemer. From the beginning, she plans not to 'deliver her estate to the world' when she thinks about serving Olivia.[1007] She does not explain to the audience how she arrived at the decision to serve Olivia with the audience.[1008] The captain and the spectators see how she quickly changes her plan and announces that "[she]'ll serve this duke." (*TN* 1.2.55). The captain becomes her aide and agrees not to betray her. The announcement of her plan in verse is much more moderate than the great promises delivered by a clever mock-hero. Her verses include a rather passive voice depending on time as "what else may hap to time [she] will commit" (*TN* 1.2.60). She is not as impulsive as her Plautine predecessors and waits for time to "untangle this" (*TN* 2.2.38). She seems unsure when she confesses to the audience in a soliloquy that "it is too hard a knot for me t'untie" (*TN* 2.2.39).

This primary deceit has no clear aim as a *servus callidus* does. Only after she has entered the Duke's service as the page Cesario does she receive her mandate from Orsino, who longs for Olivia like the young master in Plautine comedy seeks for help in amorous affairs.[1009] The Duke even wants to recompense her if she succeeds, which reminds us of those offers the young master like Agorastocles makes to his slave Milphio in *Poenulus* or those granted to Epidicus.[1010] As the Plautine schemer, she should bring someone else a happy ending and cure the lover's illness; however, unlike the clever slave, she is stuck between her own desire and that of her master since her substitution of the lover produces an unfortunate situation: Cesario is a young woman who loves Orsino but must woo Olivia on behalf of her beloved. In an aside, she informs the audience about "that bareful strife" (*TN* 1.4.40) several times, alluding to the illusions in courtship.[1011]

Cesario is in service to the Duke, to whom she shows high devotion, but not because of her subordinate position, but because she loves him, which dominates her confabulation with Olivia. When Cesario/Viola is ordered to bring Orsino's message to Olivia, talking to a social superior demands politeness from the servant but the young woman beneath the persona makes Cesario add a subversive impudence by destabilizing Olivia's identity while addressing her. The messenger exaggerates her beauty (see *TN* 1.5.165), while she cannot tell which "the honourable lady of the house" is but asks for disclosure.[1012] The veil will hardly conceal Olivia's rank as her clothes, her position in the room, and most obviously, the fact that she rises to speak first reveal her as the lady of the house. Thus, the dual figure of Viola and Cesario has a complex relation to service since one figure simultaneously acts in pursuit of her own benefit and for the sake of another. David Schalkwyk notes that the play "is as much a study of service and master-servant relations as it is a comedy of romantic love".[1013] Cesario serves the Duke as a servant while Viola indirectly serves the Duke, caught by her love towards

---

1007 See *TN* 1.2.41-44.
1008 Miola (1994), 40. Miola speaks of "a difficult syntax and vague expression [that] cloud Viola's thoughts."
1009 Cf. Geoffrey Bullough (ed.), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. II. The Comedies 1597-1603*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963, 269 ff. On Shakespeare's indebtedness to *Gl'Ingannati,* the later novel *Of Apolonius and Silla* from Barnaby Riche, and his experience from former plays reworking Plautine elements and framework.
1010 Cf. Miola (1994), 50.
1011 Also note Viola's soliloquy on her desperate situation, *TN* 2.2.15ff.
1012 Elam (2008), 82.
1013 David Schalkwyk, 'Love and Service in *Twelfth Night* and the Sonnets', *SQ* 56.1 (2005): 76-100, 86. And cf. *Id.*, *Shakespeare, Love and Service*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 115ff.

him. Service or class relations contain loyalty, trust, worship, obedience, and dominance; the vocabulary of service is comparable to that of romance.

Indeed, the relations of servant and master in Shakespeare's comedy are sometimes much more complicated than they appear since they can carry erotic allusions as the cross-dressed *virgo* Viola faces the same gender confusion as Rosalind does in their encounters with their lovers. The actor playing Viola is a boy disguised as a boy who courts another boy costumed as Olivia. Such moments bear gender oppositions as well as a carnivalesque atmosphere, apparent in the 'fake' courtship between Olivia and Cesario, the master-servant relation between the Duke and his page and the figures' motivation by desire deluding them. These occasions can also be described in terms of functionality since the levels of the several masks and reality entangle to a net of illusionary frames that give rise to erotic moments, moments of the laughable as well as a source for metatheatrical comments, which certainly find their analogies in Plautus' clever figure. Shakespeare pursues New Comedic juxtapositions and errors of roles and identities in courtship but enriches the complex by the constant presence of desire and eroticism as well as a more polished distinction through individuality in Viola/Cesario.

As the inventor of her disguise and because of her advantage in knowledge, she directs and manipulates other figures to achieve her ends similarly to a *servus callidus* though not as aggressively. First, she makes the Captain her ally. Once she has become Cesario and been tasked with wooing Olivia, the audience learns about the presence of an assertive young man when Malvolio tells Olivia about a man who refuses rejection.[1014] In the manner of a clever slave and illusionist, the disguised Viola claims to know beforehand whatever excuse Malvolio might use to prevent her seeing Olivia so that the steward returns 'defeated' and without any ideas left how to get rid of that stubborn young man.[1015] She can enforce the discourse as and when she achieves access to Olivia. Like the prime mover, she knows how to play her cards, to provoke other figures with her wit, and finally, reaches her goals. Viola has a bird's eye view to a certain extent when she talks to Olivia from her dual perspective since she is a young man and a woman in love, revealing her as a commentator illuminating the illusion in the discourse.

In comparison to the male and female examples in Plautus' plays, she moves between the illusionary frames and thematizes them not as boldly as Pseudolus or Chrysalus, who enjoy their scheming and above all, the moment of surrender. She does not enjoy her double-dealing but is forced to play Cesario and Viola. Though disguised as the page, her verbal constructs hint at the young woman beneath the disguise. Not altruistically but stuck in a hidden dilemma heated in the gender-twisted courtship, she alludes to the truth eloquently, sheding light on the illusion and spicing her speech with metatheatrical comments when she speaks to Olivia, the woman she does not want to woo and to the Duke the man she cannot woo.[1016] She invents for herself a sister who "lov'd a man" (*TN* 2.4.106 and 109ff.) and applies the conditional 'if' to point at her hidden persona and the second 'reality' lying silently in front of the other figures.[1017] Her advantage in knowledge and her omniscient status make her an outsider who can evaluate the situation and comment on the behaviour of the other characters as she confronts Olivia with her "too proud" behaviour since she "can see what [she is]" (*TN* 1.5.234). She knows that women "are as true of heart as [men]" (*TN* 2.4.105). Her

---

1014 "He's fortified against any denial." (*TN* 1.5.140-1)
1015 See *TN* 1.5.131-37 and 45.
1016 See *TN* 1.2.5-8; 1.5.173 (I am not that I play), 176-8, 202-3, 262-3; 2.2.25-26; 2.4.23ff. (she does not lie but describes the fake lover as a twin sister to the Duke), 3.1.43-44 (Viola is sick for a beard but not on her chin); 3.4.295-6 (Viola in fear for the duel); 5.1.133-34.
1017 See *TN* 1.5.248-51; 2.2.23-24.

insight, her status as an outsider, and her constructions and illuminations of illusionary frames mark her out as a witty and sympathetic deceiver without clear machinations.

Plautus' figure can only be detected in the depths of Viola's structure and as a dramaturgic device highly metamorphosed. She looks back on the prior manifestations of schemers, instances of erratic losses as well as constructions of identity, and cross-gender courtship. In this catalogue, the Plautine schemer shines through then and now when she plans and takes the role of a male servant, deceiving by her appearance and manipulating by her wit, which draws her close to Rosalind/Ganymede. Though she differs from Rosalind since she does not show the same omnipresence and does not share the potential of influence and commandment over other figures' action, both women use illusion to their advantage and consciously play with their ambiguous quality.[1018] Like Rosalind, Viola constructs her identity when she tells a tale about a sister, whereby she also proves her talent to extemporaneous performance. As Rosalind, she plays a role, which automatically adds another layer of performance concerning a double net of gender as well as the theatrical context. In her advantage in knowledge and as an outsider to the other citizens in Illyria, she can refer to that binary playing by using theatrical vocabulary when she pretends to recite a speech Orsino wrote for Olivia after she learned it by heart.[1019]

As in *AYL*, a transition allows the 'tricking' to happen when the young woman disguises as a boy before she can be a *virgo* again and finally, metamorphoses into a bride. Until that revelation, both heroines must hide their female attributes and project male qualities. Stereotypical gender features are set in juxtaposition: physical strength expected from men opposes female frailty. Rosalind's nature shines through when she faints in *AYL*, while Viola is challenged to a duel and fears as the fight could reveal her secret.[1020] The two women show their mental strength and wit especially when they must protect their disguise. Rosalind and Viola are Shakespearean male-female heroines, related to clever 'illusionists' and schemers in New Comedy, while Shakespeare adapts his male-female heroine, Viola, to the melancholic atmosphere of the play and to courtship as a triangle of distress and confusion. More vehemently than in *AYL*, the audience is confronted with Viola's despair, who relies on fortune, entangled in her precarious situation and her presumed loss, which makes her appeal much more earnest than the foolish lover Rosalind appears to be and compared to Rosalind's 'love game'.

Their differences can be explained by their surroundings. In contrast to the 'knavish' Ganymede/Rosalind, Viola cannot rely on the protective and liberating nature of an exile or on a pastoral world as Rosalind can and make use of in order to unfold her masking and shifting to holiday humour. Rosalind rarely loses her sense of humour and leading position since she always seems to have a witty riposte that serves comedy as the clever slave does. Viola is not as bound to the laughable as Rosalind is. Comic business is chiefly done by the carnivalesque figures around Maria, their pranking of Malvolio, and the jester Feste's exchanges. In sum, though she seems less powerful than Rosalind, some of Viola's functions rely on New Comedic tradition while her character is more individualistic. Rosalind and Viola, both embody qualities of previous deceivers for their functionality but as an integral part of their role as desired and desiring masterminds in romantic comedy. Their perspective on courtship produces a foundation for a course of errors, oppositions, and incongruity as well as a marvellous final solution when identities are revealed and genders can switch.

1018 See the following examples when Viola directs others, *TN* 1.2.61, 64.
1019 See *TN* 1.5.167ff. and cf. Elam (2008), 195, ft. 167-79 and 169.
1020 See *TN* 3.4.295-6. Viola herself refers to that possibility.

In addition to 'who woos whom', *TN* bears a side plot, wherein Shakespeare realizes New Comedic intrigue led by a *serva callida*, Maria.[1021] In other words, Maria is another female schemer and her role in Malvolio's downfall reprises Plautine features much more clearly than Viola.[1022] Before the analysis continues with Feste, Maria's figure as a descendant of Plautus' *servus callidus* will be examined. Her rootedness to Plautus' clever slaves is palpable when she takes control over Malvolio's undoing after Malvolio provokes her since he wants to inform on her to Olivia.[1023] As a reaction and with the group dynamic around the parasitic Sir Toby, she becomes a schemer, instructor, and deceiver. She demands to "let [her] alone with him" (*TN* 2.3.125-26) and announces to become the inventor of a plot like her male predecessors, who rely on their wits (*consilia in animum*, *Mil.* 197).[1024] She promises the success of her cunning that she will "gull him into a nay-word, and make him a common recreation" (*TN* 2.3.126-27).[1025]

Maria is the brain of the group that knows what types move on stage when she assesses Malvolio as "a kind of Puritan" (*TN* 2.3.131) and comments on him as a *miles gloriosus*, who thinks "that all that look on him love him" (*TN* 2.3.141-42). Although she had tried to delimit the three merrymakers and only observed the conversation between the comic three and Malvolio, she castigated the arrogant steward and declares her plan to get even with him. As the leader, she determines what she needs for it.[1026] Her strategy includes a letter, a device that Chrysalus had already used successfully. In the phase of scheming, Maria promises "[o]bscure epistles of love" (*TN* 2.3.145-46) that incorporate deception crafted by the servant's hand and created by the servant's fantasy, which is meant to substitute her when Malvolio mistakes Maria's words for Olivia's.[1027] After dropping the letter, she exits and leaves the ridicule to her co-conspirators, Sir Toby, Sir Andrew, and Fabian.

After the deception, she enters and takes the position as the instigator again to "see the fruits of the sport" (*TN* 2.5.191). Between the first and second phases, Maria watches Malvolio's transformation into the foolish clown wearing abominable clothes—she informs Sir Toby and the audience that she has done so.[1028] She continues to present herself as responsible for the deception and takes the place at the peripheries of the illusionary frames. Since the clever servant already has the steward on her hook, she can predict what will happen between Malvolio and Olivia when Malvolio comes to the melancholic Olivia, who abhors yellow, dressed in yellow stockings and cross-gartered.[1029] She now acts as a performing deceiver and a commentator on her own deception while she plays an innocent woman when she warns Olivia of the steward's "strange manner" (*TN* 3.4.8). Ironically, it is Maria who is sent to bring Malvolio to Olivia and enters with him the stage as the victim with his "murderer" (*TN* 3.2.72). When the two women face Malvolio, Maria asks him about his "ridiculous boldness" (*TN* 3.4.36).[1030] For Maria, the question is unnecessary but as it is often the case for

---

1021 A female clever slave can be found in the here-analysed play *Miles gloriosus* in Milphidippa, whose role exists for the show of intrigue. However, Milphidippa is subordinate to Palaestrio, the main *architectus* in the play, but complements him as the perfect female match.
1022 Cf. Miola (1994), 44.
1023 See *TN* 2.3.118-20 (Malvolio criticizes and warns Maria).
1024 Cf. Miola (1994), 44.
1025 Also note *TN* 2.3.129:"I know I can do it."
1026 See *TN* 2.3.150-56, 62, and 167-71.
1027 The instrument seems to be alive when Maria commands the letter: "lie thou there" (*TN* 2.5.19).
1028 See *TN* 3.2.71-79.
1029 Cf. *TN* 2.5.177-84.
1030 During the encounter between Malvolio and Olivia, Maria only participates by asking two questions to Malvolio in order to highlight his strange manner and trigger his arrogant behaviour (note *TN* 3.4.32-37).

Plautus' clever slaves, such superfluous sentences underline the fooling and the presence of the laughable.[1031]

The deception reaches its climax in the third and final phase, when the intriguers lock up the mad Malvolio.[1032] Olivia charges Maria to tell Sir Toby and "some of [her] people [to] have special care of him" (*TN* 3.4.59-60).[1033] The clever chambermaid's plan goes perfectly; now Sir Toby can oppose Malvolio as one of the 'jesters' and as the parasitic and drunken anti-Puritan, who now makes fun of Malvolio as mad, possessed, or bewitched. The three conspirators construct their last piece of trickery, wherein Maria and Sir Toby decide to "pursue him" (*TN* 3.4.127) and "have him in a dark room" (*TN* 3.4.131).[1034] Maria prepares the coming scene but does not participate in it, which she leaves to Feste. She remains in the back in a *poeta*-like position after bringing him a gown and a beard, which are unnecessary,[1035] since Malvolio "sees [him] not" and is so absorbed that he would still believe the jester's altered voice (*TN* 4.2.64). In a metatheatrical comment, Maria underlines the costume's quality of being a common dramaturgic device and its purpose of visualizing the change of role to the audience.[1036] The props change Feste into a double-layered actor, highlighted by leaving Feste alone on stage to comment on his costuming and thus, staging it for the audience. In short, Maria foregrounds the act of performance and installation of illusion.

In a double layer of illusion, the dressed performer, Feste, announces the re-entrance of Sir Toby and Maria, the potential audience on stage, as "the competitors [that] enter" (*TN* 4.2.10). His words define the scene as the promised sport. The jester assuming the identity of Sir Topas, the curate, now takes the lead in Malvolio's fooling. The competitors remain at the back, watching the play-in-the play and applauding Feste's performance. Sir Toby calls him "a good knave" (*TN* 4.2.19).[1037] The deliberate fool takes part in a metatheatrical, upside-down scene, where he can visualize Malvolio's attack on him in front of Olivia. Malviolo had offended Feste when he reduced him to an "ordinary fool that has not more brain than a stone" (*TN* 1.5.81) and taunted him by accusing him of the fool's worst sin: speechless.[1038] In revenge, the 'sane' fake priest attempts to exorcize Malvolio, said to be possessed by the devil. Now, it is the fool that "look[s] to the madman" (*TN* 1.5.33-34), which as if in hidden prophecy Feste promises Olivia to do so several scenes earlier though the actual madman is the drunken Sir Toby in that scene.[1039] The jester ridicules the similarity of a drunken man, a fool, and a madman, all of whom the audience encounters in the dark-room scene. When Feste imitates Sir Topas, the clever figure turns every move of the blocking character Malvolio into a foolish escapade. Feste intentionally misunderstands Malvolio in order to continue the show of knavery—this will be analysed later.

1031 Also note Maria's emphasis on her success as Malvolio offers great moments of *ridiculum*, *TN* 3.2.63-64.

1032 See *TN* 3.4.80ff.

1033 See *TN* 3.4.58-61 for Olivia's order.

1034 Although the final order is given to Sir Toby, the idea of arresting him is already prepared in Maria's previous line (see *TN* 3.4.130). And *TN* 3.4.125-36, note Maria's use of imperative in contrast to Fabian's and Sir Toby's use of the personal pronoun 'we'.
The timing of Maria's appearance on stage to continue the subplot around Malvolio's maddening by instructing Feste is quite telling since it happens right after Sir Toby is defeated in his challenge and sent off stage by an enraged Olivia. See *TN* 4.1.44ff. and *TN* 4.2.ff.

1035 See *TN* 4.2.1-3.

1036 See *TN* 4.2.63-4.

1037 Also see *TN* 4.2.27, 63-64, and 65-70 (Sir Toby instructs Feste while he slightly fears the outcome of the knavery).

1038 See *TN* 1.5.62-83.

1039 Cf. Miola (1994), 46.

The skin-changer reaches his pinnacle after the fellow conspirators left. Feste then shifts between his two roles: himself and Sir Topas. Beginning with a song, Feste announces his coming to Malvolio, who tries to persuade the fool of his "five wits" (*TN* 4.2.86), making the mistake of trying to match his wits with the fool: "I am as well in my wits, fool, as thou art" (*TN* 4.2.88). For Feste, it is the perfect occasion to claim that the steward is "mad indeed, if [he] be no better in [his] wits than a fool" (*TN* 4.2.89-90). The previous attack of Malvolio is addressed and implies the failure of mixing acted folly with true foolishness as the fooled and foolish Malvolio does. By his disguise, abuse of illusion, and with an agonistic tone, the deliberate fool makes fun of a man who had overestimated his wit. Malvolio cannot free himself from the epithet 'mad' when Feste pushes him by turns and tricks in the inevitability of being or simulating to be mad.[1040] Here, the jester uses the comic opposition of knowledge and ignorance or fool and wit, proving himself a wise fool.

The performing trickster in that final phase is Feste. Maria and Sir Toby remain in the background, as his onstage audience. In contrast to prior scenes, Maria is not an active intriguer, schemer, and instructor. In the phases of trickery, she is represented by her handwriting, her ideas, and her letter. Through her words, Malvolio reading and reacting to them makes a fool of himself and his vanity, which affirms Maria as a director of the laughable. Although she does not take on the roles of the schemer, instructor, and deceiver, actively and directly during the whole machination, she remains the central figure for the trickery as she stage-manages everyone else as the *architecta* "will plant […] two, and let the fool make the third", instructing them to "observe his construction of it" (*TN* 2.3.163-64).[1041] She separates the stage in audience and unwilling performer, rearranges the figures, and organizes the practical joke on Malvolio by dressing Feste as Sir Topas.

Like a clever slave, she is certain of her success when she describes her deception as a "sport royal" she guarantees for (*TN* 2.3.161). Such words of triumph usually accompany the plotting of the clever slave. Miola underlines the Plautine echo of confidence and the promise of success in Maria's lines where she boasts of her talents as a trickster.[1042] The cunning servant stuns her audience, Sir Toby, Sir Andrew and later, Fabian, with such self-confidence, keenness, and creativity.[1043] Fabian admires her as a "noble gull-catcher" (*TN* 2.5.181), alluding to the comic mirror of human errors, while her future husband compares her to the queen of Amazons, naming Maria "Penthesilea" (*TN* 2.3.172) and foregrounds her talents as a deceiver by making her "a beagle true-bred" (*TN* 2.3.174).[1044] The latter bears some resemblance to Tranio's identity of a greyhound in *The Shrew* and Palaestrio's becoming a dog.[1045] Amazed looks and praise in the form of approving epithets are familiar features a Plautine slave encounters when he aspires or has done the impossible. Even Malvolio inadvertently praises her after reading the letter, thinking that "it is Jove's doing" and "Jove […] is the doer of this, and he is to be thanked" (*TN* 3.4.72 and 79-80). Hilarious words out of a stock Puritan's mouth cast Maria as a quasi *deus ex machina* for Malvolio's hopes and

---

1040 See *TN* 4.2.114-15 and cf. Elam (2008), 315, ft. 114-15; where ignorance and deceit clash together, madness is not far as a similar incident happens in *The Comedy of Errors* when Antipholus of Ephesus is accused of madness and imprisoned (cf. Miola [1994], 45).

1041 For examples, see *TN* 2.3.169-70; 2.5.13, 16, 17, 191, 198; 3.2.64-65; 3.4.127-28; 4.2.1-3; note that Maria plans to have the fool as the third but his place is taken by Fabian without any further justification in the letter scene; the clown gains his role in 4.2.ff.

1042 See *TN* esp. 2.3.128-33, 147-48, 167-68; Miola calls Pseudolus' assurance in 582-3 to mind (cf. Miola [1994], 44-45).

1043 See *TN* 2.5.166ff. and esp. 188-92.

1044 Also note *TN* 2.5.11 ("the little villain"), 101 and 185.

1045 Cf. *TS* 5.2.52-3 and *Mil.* 269.

dreams but actually, for his humiliation. The audience perceives a mock-heroic outline and an intense praising of the clever servant figure similar to Plautus' *servus callidus* and more strongly drawn than it is the case for Tranio in *The Shrew*.

As dominantly as the clever type and similarly positioned at the outside, she manages to design the course of action and foresee the reactions to her ploy in "the first approach before [her] lady" (*TN* 2.5.178) in detail, where she becomes a *poeta*-like figure.[1046] Once she has gotten Malvolio declared as 'mad', her verbal presence and influence decline. Maria plays the clever servant as long as she as a *poeta* set the course. The vocabulary and tone used throughout the subplot leave no doubt about Maria as the one who set the trap for Malvolio, the victim, "in the name of jesting" (*TN* 2.5.17-18), which assigns a harmless but aggressive quality to the scenes of trickery. Though, whether the last fooling of Malvolio, the dark room scene, can still be assessed as harmless raised critical voices accounting the comic quality of the scene. Could it be evaluated as a hostile episode that gets out of control? Ridiculing is said to become an extreme form of humiliation. For Riehle, Feste's playing the curate causes that he

> himself becomes a fool (with a strong bent towards malice) because he is induced to overdo his cure; he thus becomes involved and commits a serious wrong. The victim Malvolio rightly feels that he has been treated most unjustly. We believe him when in his anguish he exclaims that he is no more mad than all the others.[1047]

Such a critique depends on whether justice is appropriate for evaluating scenes of teasing and practical jokes. For the spectator, it is a question of taste and expectation; does the spectator appreciate dark humour? In *Miles gloriosus*, when the arrogant soldier is punished in front of his house, spectators in antiquity probably reacted to Pyrgopolynices' fate differently from an audience of the 21st century. The humour of such scenes depends on the socio-cultural background of the audience.[1048] The more interesting question is how the scene outlines folly as universal. Shakespeare's familiarity with Erasmian and Lucianic collection of thoughts, ideas, their presentation, and their treatment of folly allows him to satirize Malvolio's cure.[1049] Is Feste truly a malicious fool? In Shakespeare's comedy, the side plot exists in mockery or in comic punishment, rooted in New Comedic traditional structures. In Enid Welsford's words,

> Shakespeare transmutes into poetry the quintessence of the Saturnalia. […]. Illyria is a country permeated with the spirit of the Feast of Fools, where identities are confused, 'uncivil rule' applauded, cakes and ale successfully defended against virtuous onslaughts, and no harm is done.[1050]

Regardless whether the episode in the dark room triggers laughter, pity, or repulsion, Malvolio is tricked as an *agelast* and is humiliated because of his excessive pride. The utopian nature and a Saturnalian understanding of and in *TN* allows to perceive the deception as amusing.

In that Saturnalian world, the '*serva callida*' is in best company for her ploy. For the machinations leading up to the final scene, the clever woman has her helpers, among whom a *parasitus*-like figure in Sir Toby Belch, a clever second intriguer Fabian, and the professional fool foster the carnivalesque atmosphere of the scene. Hierarchical structure, obedience to

---

1046 See *TN* 2.5.191ff.; 3.2.71ff.
1047 Riehle (1990), 232.
1048 In his self-love and dream of becoming Olivia's husband, Malvolio resembles Pyrgopolynices overestimating his impact on women (cf. *Ibid.*, 232).
1049 Cf. *Ibid.*, 231-2.
1050 Welsford (1935), 251.

rules, and conventions are undermined in the universe they drag Malvolio into, where a chambermaid and a drunken 'gentleman' rule. When it comes to retribution and punishment, Maria does not need to justify her behaviour but one representative of the group exculpates Maria; the clever slave usually has a protector. Fabian argues that the "sportful malice" against Malvolio is licensed since it is situated in comedy, where it triggers laughter and does not cause true pain or the need for revenge (*TN* 5.1.359 and see 5.1.349ff.).[1051] At the happy ending of the play, retribution could 'taint' the atmosphere set after the family reunion and lovers' union. Fabian's argument reads like a generic justification. Although Fabian confesses himself and Sir Toby to be primer of the device and not Maria to Olivia, it protects them all.

Their co-conspirator, Feste, completes Fabian's excuse by reminding the audience of the earlier argument between Malvolio and himself when the jester rewords Malvolio's accusation against himself and indirectly against Olivia: "But do you remember, 'Madam, why laugh you at such a barren rascal, an you smile not, he's gagged'?" (*TN* 5.1.367-9). It seems that now things are evened up as "thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges" (*TN* 5.1.369-70). Feste hints at the medieval wheel of fortune, implying constant change and the rise and fall, where the undoing of Malvolio can be predicted.[1052] Hence, the responsibility of the deceivers recedes while comedy's system and its parameters are emphasized since comedy's plot knows and is indebted to *fortuna*; the embodiment of marvellous development and the structure offer the course from bottom to top and top to bottom. Feste pursues Fabian's line of argument, explaining the side-plot through an automatic and evitable process of punishing the *agelast* and pardoning comic intriguers. The actors performing in the name of jest are framed in a Saturnalian world on stage and follow the carnivalesque principle of comedy from the beginning of the subplot of intrigue showing a parasitic noble, his low-minded, bragging friend carousing with him, a cunning servant, a jester with the qualities of an eiron and a bomolochos and the downfall of the arrogant Malvolio.[1053]

The subplot is resolved in Maria and Sir Toby's off-stage marriage. Maria acquires the telling name Lady Belch. As the typical multiplication of unions at the end, well-practised in *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night* ends with another wedding and perfect match. Maria fits her husband in the capability to deceive and their love for mockery perfectly as Sir Toby and Maria both make fun of Sir Andrew.[1054] With a talent for "dry jests" (*TN* 1.3.74) shedding an ironic light on the other, the chambermaid exposes the gentleman as an impotent fool, who cannot follow her comic constructions.[1055] Sir Toby and Fabian also trick Sir Andrew.[1056] Still, they cannot compete with the female clever figures as they overestimate themselves, are stopped in their arranged duel and finally, must face the fact that Sir Toby's concocting of "some horrid message for a challenge" did not succeed (*TN* 3.4.194-95). In short, their trickery fails. The marriage between Sir Toby and Maria validates her license and is a reward as Fabian calls it in

---

1051 *TN* 5.1.345-55.

1052 Cf. Elam (2008), 351, ft. 369-70. Elam assumes that Feste brings in the theme of the wheel of fortune with a parodying tone.

1053 Riehle (1990), 233: "How well the saturnalian element in Elizabethan drama agrees with the Plautine form of New Comedy is reflected by the fact, first observed by Salingar, that the saturnalian character of the Parasite Peniculus in *Menaechmi* recurs in *Twelfth Night* transformed into the Epicurean character of Sir Toby." And cf. Salingar (1986), 55-56; on Sir Andrew's familiarity with a *miles gloriosus*, see Miola (1994), 48-49.

1054 Note Hardin (2018), 134. He compares the 'pair work' of Palaestrio and Milphidippa to that of Sir Toby and Maria.

1055 See *TN* 1.3.61ff. and cf. Elam (2008), 86.

1056 See *TN* 2.3.ff. and 3.4.179-191, 194-5 (Sir Toby invents "some horrid message for a challenge"), 215ff. (In the deception, Fabian acts as Sir Toby's ally; both creating images of willing fighters, excelling in exaggerations and imaginary constructs), 282-3 and 286-8.

front of Olivia.[1057] Indeed, Maria is rewarded for her prank unlike Malvolio, who does not acquire status he longed for by marrying Olivia.[1058]

The trick on Malvolio is a farcical escapade of Plautine manner in the melancholically-romantic main plot of *Twelfth Night*.[1059] The figures and their underlying qualities are part of the tradition of New Comedy: a parasite, a trickster and deceiver, a skin-changer as well as *servus ludens*, and a *miles gloriosus*. Plautine remembrance takes form in Maria, who attains success, schemes spontaneously, builds illusionary frames, is applauded, mocks and victimizes the (seemingly) superior. Not only the verve of a *serva callida* but also the structure of the gulling scene that is first split in observers commenting on the contemplative victim and Malvolio's monologue draw reminiscences to Plautus' dramatic techniques.[1060] Malvolio moves inside the illusionary frame, where his imagination can flourish, while the tricksters visualize the frame to the spectator's eyes constantly by their comments and prognoses of the braggart's failure. They appeal to the audience indirectly as they demand silence and attention, probably especially from the groundlings, who could feel quite provoked and use this occasion to accompany the remarks of outrageousness stemming from Sir Toby and Sir Andrew. The audience watches elements from New Comedy's catalogue fostering the comic discourse, which includes attacking the *agelast* and exposing arrogance and self-love, while the episode depicts comedy's schema by a traditional contribution to the carnivalesque, utopian quality, and *ridiculum*. The issue of false and misled perception is deeply involved in the success of Malvolio's deception and in intrigue, linked to comedy's fundamental issue 'failure'. On the macro-level, false perception results in or is forced by ignorance standing central to the sources of error found in New Comedy, where the side plot parallels the main plot around Viola's disguise. The subplot interrupts and complements the melancholic major discourse by its farcical antics; Shakespeare creates a play appealing to all social strata.

Feste enters, participates, and most of all, comments on both discourses. It is Feste, who expresses the significance of knowledge and perception and supports comedy's coherence by his insights into failure, error, and ignorance.[1061] The audience gets to know the clown's name once from Curio, who informs the Duke about the singer's identity: "Feste, the jester, […]; a fool" (*TN* 2.4.11). The identification states clearly that he has the same profession as Touchstone fulfils in *AYL*, for which he is paid with coins several times in the play. To augment his sum of coins, he offers to take on another role, the stock role of matchmaker, to Cesario when he refers to the story of Troilus and Cressida and himself as Pandarus: "I would play Lord Pandarus of Phrygia, sir, to bring a Cressida to this Troilus." (*TN* 3.1.49-50). Such sentences define him as a figure that knows more than an actual fool could be expected to do; by an intertextual reference he exhibits the expertise of (comic) stereotypes.[1062] He can abuse others' misperceptions and their limitations by convention, which he exhausts as heavily as Touchstone although Touchstone is not as well paid. In *Twelfth Night*, Feste's contribution to the plot is limited to teasing Malvolio, wherein he moves between illusionary

---

1057 See *TN* 5.1.349-51.
1058 Cf. Miola (1994), 45; and note Sir Toby's remark foreshadowing the wedding, *TN* 2.5.162-65.
1059 *Ibid.*, 42, ft. 47: Miola agrees with Pyle, who argues that "the Dametas episode in *Arcadia* inspires both the gulling of Malvolio and the mock-duel." He adds that "as usual, native influences join classical and neo-classical ones". Fitzroy Pyle, '"Twelfth Night", "King Lear", and "Arcadia"', *MLR* 43.4 (1948): 449-55, esp. 450-52.
1060 Also note the row of asides in particularly applied by the manipulators, Sir Toby and Fabian, in the (pre-)duel scene between Viola and Sir Andrew, *TN* 3.4.282ff.
1061 See *TN* 4.2.42-4.
1062 Also note *TN* 3.1.53 ("Cressida was a beggar").

frames. In the main plot, Feste is an outsider, who has no agenda besides earning coins. He is the court jester, a merrymaker, and a marker of comic discourse.

In this position, he fits in with the parasite and simpleton, who are relatives of comic types fostering the laughable: the latter cannot help it but often exposes himself to *ridiculum* unwillingly and by his nature, whereas the former knows exactly how to trick and make fun of his rich friend.[1063] The trio belongs to the body of laughing culture representing carnivalesque nature, which is visualized in the knave and his name Sir Toby Belch, who craves "cakes and ale" (*TN* 2.3.110) and "a stoup of wine" (*TN* 1.5.117 and 2.3.13), enters stage "half-drunk" (*TN* 1.5.112) and hiccupping.[1064] When these three come together, they exchange bawdy comments and songs, while they enjoy their bad behaviour and oppose the puritanical Malvolio.[1065] Such an *agelast* as Malvolio cannot understand such behaviour but appears to be disgusted by so much playfulness since he condemns fooling around as madness. Sir Toby invests in a lifestyle of fun; Malvolio is humourless. They are both bound to their extreme nature while Feste sticks to his profession implying a license and a specific role he takes on. He knows how to make his skills useful as an instigator of *ridiculum*, who sees the laughable in others and the discourse, which stands in analogy to the *servus ludens*.

Feste joins Sir Toby and Sir Andrew in jesting as a source of tips, yet he never loses his wit and insight. He knows Sir Toby to be "a most weak [brain]" (*TN* 1.5.111) and in a 'mad' condition because of his drunkenness.[1066] He puts his exceptional nature among the other two comic drivers forward and keeps his distance and perspective by posing a riddle. In greeting and addressing Sir Andrew and Sir Toby, he evokes "the picture of 'we three'" (*TN* 2.3.15-16), which shows two asses. The number 'three' suggests a third ass that is an onlooker.[1067] Feste uses the joke produced by a combination of picture and caption, while he can rely on the audience's knowledge of what picture he means. The caption is meant to trigger a memory, envision the painting, and project its picture onto the stage. His question "did you never see the picture of 'we three'?" (*TN* 2.3.15-16) confronts the audience with a multi-layered web of interpretation circling around the question of who the third ass is. Feste's 'never' and use of past tense implies that neither man has seen the picture; they remain inside the frame and are the two asses. Feste coming to them identifies himself as the third ass—an identity Sir Toby confirms by welcoming him as an ass.[1068] At the same time, he leaves his audience no choice but to ask who the third ass is, which falls back on them. They have been watching the two asses and they simply ask the foolish question that comes back to the questioner and thus, to the spectator. Feste's question can be read as an address to the audience subtly pointing at comedy's representation of the species of the ugly, in which the spectator takes part.[1069] The jester's unexpected riddle affirms him as the deliberate fool holding up the comic mask as a mirror to the audience, which can decode the joke. In accordance with Keir Elam, Feste's fooling "makes explicit a question that runs throughout the play: who is the true fool

---

1063 See Miola (1994), 48 on Sir Andrew. And note the simpleton and natural fool, Sir Andrew, who falls to Sir Toby and Fabian's swindle, see *TN* 3.2.1ff. esp. 12 and 52-3 (Sir Toby refers to the sum Sir Andrew has probably spent).

1064 *Ibid.*, 42: Sir Toby, "an English version of the classical *parasitus*, a great gorger of food and drink at the others' expense". Miola himself refers to E.P. Vandiver's article 'The Elizabethan Dramatic Parasite', *SP* 32.3 (1935): 411-27.

1065 Note for instance, Sir Andrew: "I care not for good life." (*TN* 2.3.37).

1066 See *TN* 1.5.126-34.

1067 Cf. Elam (2008), 212, ft. 15-16.

1068 See *TN* 2.3.17.

1069 Cf. Elam (2008), 10-11.

(or, indeed, are we all fools)?".[1070] The paradox pattern in the wise fool allows him to look at that essence from the perspective of an insider, outsider, comic player, interpreter or product of the laughable and as producer. This binary concept is realized in the fool's miscommunication, coding and operating with nonsense and sense, while he offers clever guidance to the thematic cores of the play like Plautus' *servus callidus*.

In violating verbal standards, Feste entertains the audience with his verbal acrobatics. Disregarding conventional limits, he creates words, authorities, and figures.[1071] He torpedoes effective conversation to add jokes by taking remarks literally or deliberately misinterpreting them:

VIOLA […] Dost thou live by thy tabor?
FESTE No, sir, I live by the church.
VIOLA Art thou a churchman?
FESTE No such matter, sir. I do live by the church, for I do live at my house, and my house doth stand by the church.
VIOLA So thou mayst say the king lies by a beggar if a beggar dwell near him, or the church stands by thy tabor if thy tabor stand by the church.
(*TN* 3.1.1-10)

Their dialogue displays the applications of the preposition 'by' when used with the verb 'live': 'to live by the church' can be understood either as 'make your living by' or 'live next to'.[1072] Viola emphasizes the ambiguity and malleability of language in her response to Feste's punning when she adds another example of understanding 'by' as indexing locality and presents the phrase of 'to stand by' as 'to be maintained by'.[1073] In that scene, both dialogue partners toy with language's instability. The jester proves that "a sentence is but a cheverel glove to a good wit: how quickly the wrong side may be turned outward." (*TN* 3.1.11-13). Viola rephrases this statement by associating 'wrong side' with innuendo: "They that dally nicely with words may quickly make them wanton." (*TN* 3.1.14-15). The verb 'dally' implies sexual amusement with courtesans, while 'wanton' can mean unchaste.[1074] Further reaching than the sexual allusion, the opposition of 'nice' and 'wanton' underlines ostensible infection of words by their users, any misuse of words as with oaths between lovers, gentlemen, in business or politics. The passage reads as an example for the unreliability of language and the danger in taking words literally—a topic that can be encountered elsewhere in the play.

The dialogue shows Viola to be as witty as Feste although she does not indulge as enthusiastically in the verbal games. Like the jester puns with Viola, he fulfils his profession in dialogues with the other figures. Sebastian, the Duke, Olivia, Maria, Malvolio, or Fabian experience his excellence as a contaminator of words when he uses means of miscommunication.[1075] By his twisting of sense, he achieves inversion and proves the impossible when he talks himself out of a punishment by Lady Olivia:

1070 Elam (2008), 11.
1071 Feste forms the phrase "impeticos thy gratility" (*TN* 2.3.25), " nonce word compounded from the verb 'impocket' and the noun 'petticoat'" (*Ibid.*, 213, ft. 25). And cf. *Ibid.*, 79; for the invention of names and figures, see *TN* 1.5.33-34 (Quintapulus, an invented authority as the source for his proverb); 4.2.12-16.
1072 Cf. *Ibid.*, 250, ft. 1 and 3.
1073 Cf. *Ibid.*, 251, ft. 8 and 9.
1074 Cf. *Ibid.*, 251, ft. 14-15. And *OED*, s.v. 'wanton, v. *a*. 2'.
1075 For further examples of miscommunication including coding: *TN* 1.5.4-7 (preparing his punchline against Maria, veiling sense with nonsense); 2.3.25-27 (non-coherent sequence, random choice of information), 67-68 (taking literally); 2.4.72-77 (A compliment and farewell wish turns out to be a ridiculing account on the Duke's melancholy. The compliment devours to an empty vessel that carries oppositions of stability and mood changes;

> OLI.   Take the fool away.
> FESTE   Do you not hear, fellows? Take away the lady.
> […]
> FESTE   Lady, *cucullus non facit monachum* – that's as much to say as I wear not motley
>   in my brain. […] give me leave to prove you a fool.
> OLI.   Can you do it?
> FESTE   Dexteriously, good madonna.
> OLI.   Make your proof.
> […]
> FESTE   Good madonna, why mourn'st thou?
> OLI.   Good fool, for my brother's death.
> FESTE   I think his soul is in hell, madonna.
> OLI.   I know his soul is in heaven, fool.
> FESTE   The more fool, madonna, to mourn for your brother's soul being in heaven. –
>   Take away the fool, gentlemen.
> (*TN* 1.5.35-68)

After Olivia's order to take him away, the fool calls Olivia the fool. Instead of pleading, Feste insists on the inverted order and in a Latin proverb, he elucidates her failure since appearance should not be mistaken for intelligence or morality. He thus obtains her permission to challenge her. Even so, the jester knows how to trap Olivia by suggesting that her brother might be in hell. His thoughtful constructions are clear in the parallelism and repetition of the oppositional labels 'madonna' and 'fool'. Achieving a carnivalesque structure, the socially inferior fool now demands to take his social superior away, which makes his order appear like saying *quod erat demonstrandum*. The impossibility of calling Olivia a fool to her face turns into a real perspective, which is the result of the jester's logical sequence, whereby his previous order changes to a reasonable demand. In short, he again shows the power of words to modify reality.

A similar manipulation of reality and inversion of roles happens when Sir Topas/Feste comes to the lunatic Malvolio, Feste inverts the roles given to the figures, while he imagines their true characters. The madman sits in darkness and does not recognize the jester, while Feste sees the light playhouse:

> Why, it hath bay-windows transparent as barricadoes, and the clerestories toward the
> south-north are as lustruous as ebony […]
> (*TN* 4.2.36-38)

---

the indefinite pronoun compound 'everything' 'everywhere' produces 'nothing'; here also cf. Miola [1994], 41. He speaks of Orsino's "morbidity" being mocked. "Feste directly contradicts Orsino's pretension of constancy" [41]); 3.1.15-19 and 21-23 (words should not be used to reason something although he cannot but use words to reason); 4.2.5-9 (unexpected turn; nonsense veiling sense: First, Feste addresses his lack to perform the curate perfectly because of some deficiencies in appearance—he is too small and too fat—when suddenly turns to a proverbial conclusion that does not depend on the formerly said in an available logic. Feste believes that an honourable and hospital man is as appreciated as a thoughtful scholar but he does not reason. Elam speaks of "paradoxical 'nonsense'", which carries the message of "levelling social differences between men" [306, ft. 6-9]); 4.2.14 (false Latin or false Spanish to underline the parody; keeping up the pretension of a priest that lacks knowledge of Latin); 5.1.1-4 (he tricks Fabian); 5.1.7-8ff., 32-35 (pun on numbers) and 277-95 (Feste mimes the madman's *vox*).

The jester is speaking more like a mad man than the one in the dark room. The transparency of the bay-windows is made impossible by comparing it to opaque barricades.[1076] There is no such direction as south-north. Ebony is black, which makes it unsuitable for the simile. The antithetic pairs of darkness and light display the problematic opposition of madness and knowledge in the jester's passage as he affirms that "there is no darkness but ignorance" three lines later (*TN* 4.2.42-43)—a remark that makes fun of Malvolio having erred about the letter and himself, while it points out a great source of failure for the others in the play.

Behind the priestly gown, the deliberate fool continues his *ludens*-ability with his miscommunication against Malvolio when he abuses Pythagoras' metempsychosis to trick his victim and evince the steward's madness. As a Christian priest, he wants Malvolio to believe in an antique doctrine.[1077] In the course of mockery, the assumed madman is forced to listen to crazy propositions from the professional fool. The audience watches a sane victim who cannot prove to be sane while trapped by an unpredictable player of sense. From the spectator's point of view, it is a chiastic opposition as the roles of the madman and the curate are inverted since Malvolio displays a sane but vain man penetrated by Sir Topas' nonsense fitting a madman. The steward lost his credibility and authority, which places the conspirators in the upper position. Malvolio represents humourlessness and the enemy of harmless fun, facing his opponent, the jester, who makes a living from amusement.[1078] Malvolio is inevitably defeated by the fool—the laughable exposes the stock Puritan.[1079]

Olivia explains their difference at 1.5.86-90 since she knows the distinction between railing and reproving. She knows that folly in men is the nourishment of the professional fool, while virtuous men should be able to laugh at the fool's observations. Her words are echoed when Viola defines the fool's nature or Feste refers to himself—such definitions find their analogy in *AYL*. These passages underline the closeness of Feste and Touchstone or Shakespeare's understanding and continuation of the type.[1080] In both plays, the fools' concept is singled out for several reasons. The audience should be reminded of the tradition of the court jester and not be offended by attacks by the figure against any class, gender, or human trait. Besides giving information, Shakespeare juxtaposes folly with wisdom, confronting the audience with a satirical look at human nature, traps of language and convention, and the failure to abandon the laughable and folly. Both professional fools do so by pursuing sense and nonsense, which now will be considered further with one more example of their use of punchlines.

The court fool takes on the failure of his master or social superior, while he entertains them for money. Formerly it was Touchstone; now it is Feste, who veils sense with nonsense, delivering his punchlines and making his opponents marvel at his wit:

ORS.   […] How dost thou, my good fellow?
FESTE Truly, sir, the better for my foes, and the worse for my friends.
ORS.   Just the contrary: the better for thy friends.
FESTE No, sir, the worse.

1076 Cf. Elam (2008), 309, ft. 37.
1077 See *TN* 4.2.49-59. And note Rosalind's use of Pythagorean metempsychosis in *AYL*, which is involved in a nonsense passage analysed in the prior chapter.
1078 On Malvolio, see Segal (1968), 70-76. For Segal, Malvolio bears resemblance to the enemy of laughter, an *agelast*, who wants to block comic discourse but is made the object of comic discourse and the target of laughter.
1079 New Comedy knows similar anti-laughter figures as Miola sees remote parallels between Grumio's accusations against Tranio in *Mostellaria*, Lydus the tutor out of *Bacchides* and Malvolio's repressive nature. (cf. Miola [1994], 42).
1080 See *AYL* 1.2.85-86; 2.7.12ff.; 5.1.313-32; 5.4.104-5.

ORS.   How can that be?

FESTE Marry, sir, they praise me and make an ass of me. Now my foes tell me plainly
       I am an ass, so that by my foes, sir, I profit in the knowledge of myself, and by
       my friends I am abused. So that, conclusions to be as kisses, if your four
       negatives make your two affirmatives, why then, the worse for my friends and
       the better for my foes.

(*TN* 5.1.9-21)

Feste takes advantage of Orsino's greeting, turning a proverb into its chiastic equivalent that bears a paradox Orsino comprehends as a mistake. The fool's response occurs as a false greeting, ridiculing Orsino's former address of those on stage as "friends" (*TN* 5.1.7).[1081] Now, as a friend, Feste wishes him the worse, introducing the incongruous pairs of better and foes as well as worse and friends. The jester underlines his 'cheverel glove' by introducing it with 'truly' ironically. Orsino wants to rectify Feste's seeming failure by repeating only the part he can be interested in but Feste sticks to his plan, rejecting the Duke's suggestion. Orsino now needs to ask the fool for clarification, so that he can display his reasoning while making fun of the maxim *nosce teipsum* or 'know thyself'.[1082] Feste weighs his friends' false oaths or words against his foes' true offence, both of whom present him as an ass. His logic ends in the same result of being an ass but at least, he knows himself to be one. Feste's playful message reads that unpleasant truth seems to exceed pleasant ignorance, which intersects with the demand or preciousness of truth, its constant violation, and nearly impossible manifestation. In his 'inflation' of logic, he underlines his argument with an implication that truth can be masked as its opposite. The riddler abuses the transformation of four negatives into two affirmatives for his labyrinth of concluding.[1083] The rule dangles in mid-air, waiting to be applied, which it cannot as there are not four negatives. It only delivers another piece of evidence in Feste's programme of how easily meaning can be altered and words corrupted. Although the deliberate fool plays with his social superior, the Duke is not offended by the jester's wit but rewards it.

Similar to that scene and in analogy to miscommunication, Feste invigorates the comic discourse by miming a philosopher, who does not offer substantial maxims but only random association or self-consistent and self-evident constructs that are only a parody of logical analysis.[1084] Pursuing his profession requires demonstrating his wit and making people laugh by veiling sense with nonsense. Due to his unpredictability, the wise fool's speech can range from aphorisms to seemingly empty, contradictory, and superfluous maxims. They all need decoding. He realizes his concept of folly and wisdom, wherein the spectator can recognize a guidance in the comic discourse.

One of his main instruments to combine entertainment with providing thematic messages on the play's themes can be identified in his songs. Like Touchstone, the deliberate fool "take[s] pleasure in singing" (*TN* 2.4.67) and can draw upon a catalogue of songs as part of his entertainment and thus, income.[1085] Not surprisingly, he continues his allusions and

---

1081 Cf. Elam (2008), 321, ft. 10-11.

1082 Cf. *Ibid.*, 321, ft. 15-18.

1083 Note *Ibid.*, 322, ft. 18-19. The sentence is likely to refer to Sidney's *Astrophel*, sonnet 63. Here, Astrophel interprets Stella's two 'no' as one yes to a kiss due to grammar rules.

1084 Cf. *Ibid.*, 307, ft. 14-16 ("Feste parodies logical analysis").

1085 Note *TN* 2.3.34-35 (Feste suggests two songs Sir Andrew can choose from); on the relevance of music as a topic on its own, see *Ibid.*, 383-88. The frequency of the singing Feste might go hand in hand with the musical talent of the clown actor in Shakespeare's company, Robert Armin, who was known as a good singer. On Robert

guidance in the thematic net of the play in his songs like he sings on the relation between love and death in his love-song (see *TN* 2.3.38-51) offering remembrances of the imperative *carpe diem*. He gives the grander issues of death and love in the plot around Sebastian's assumed doom and scenes of falling in love a popular music platform. In comic style, he performs the song not to the lovers but to two drunken men. It implicitly stands for a climax in Feste's conjecture about his surroundings and their failures. The song includes the common advisory principles in love matters as young maids should not rely on their youth and beauty too long, which is reminiscent of Rosalind's advice to Phoebe. The song addresses longing lovers and hints at the failure of the lovers' triangle, especially Olivia and Orsino, to overcome self-absorption, misinterpretation, or illusion. Feste gives a similar insinuation to the audience when he exposes Olivia's exaggerated mourning for her brother by cutting off the world.[1086] In the song for the Duke at 2.4.50-65, he sings about the Duke's hyperbolic melancholy and the lovers' self-absorption, which keeps them tangled in the strings of desire and preoccupation.[1087] Only the outsider Feste can look objectively on the situation, reflect on his surroundings and offer access to the sublevel of the play.[1088] The wise fool knows that self-absorption, self-pity, melancholy and blindness against real identity impede the exchange of love, thus, remedy, and anagnorisis.[1089]

He supplies the audience with his insight and knowledge of an outsider in his songs, in most of his folly and speech. Feste says to Viola: "who you are and what you would are out of my welkin" (*TN* 3.1.54-55). The sentence can be understood as a confirmation that Feste is neither interested in nor cares about Cesario's agenda. But a professional fool seldom speaks so unequivocally. Although he cannot know Viola's identity until everybody else does and knows Cesario only as the Duke's page, he affirms his little knowledge of the servant too obviously. It seems he directs these words not simply to Cesario but to Viola, who is wearing the 'mask' of the page. The audience can interpret the exaggeration and redundancy as a jest, wherein Feste refers to his role's scope of knowledge that does not allow him to be acquainted with Viola playing Cesario but still points at the illusion of identity.

The clever fool shows his omniscience when he repeats a similarly ambiguous statement, mistaking Sebastian for Cesario: "Nothing that is so is so." (*TN* 4.1.8). The sentence can be read as a patently ironic phrase in the scene where Sebastian denies being who Feste believes him to be; but at second glance, it acknowledges mistaken identity, a source of error throughout the play. The jester cites the old hermit of Prague: "'That that is is'" (*TN* 4.2.14-15). In all three incidents, he appeals to the contradictions on stage between outer appearance and true identity and urges the audience to think of the difference. Shakespeare concludes the fool's remarks in the play's final scene when Sebastian and Viola are finally on stage at the same time and Orsino repeats the clown's allusions: "One face, one voice, one habit and two persons: A natural perspective, that is and is not." (*TN* 5.1.212-13). Until then, the flexibility of the jester and his omniscience allow Feste to set statements in juxtaposition

---

Armin and the time of his arrival in the company cf. *Ibid.*, 134; furthermore, Elam argues that Robert Armin could have played Touchstone already; for allusions and hidden compliments to Robert Armin as the actor of Feste in the play text, see *Ibid.*, 135.

1086 See *TN* 1.5.58ff.

1087 Orsino is a figure embodying the play's tone of ironic melodramatic as for instance at 1.1.17-22. Cf. Miola (1994),40.

1088 For more examples, see *TN* 1.5.18 (marriage and hanging, which should be compared to Grumio's comment: "Will he woo her? Ay, or I'll hang her." [*TS* 1.2.195]), 126ff. (the fool's definition of drunken men).

1089 Self-absorption is imaged in the discourse as it shows more incidents of locking in than locking out, which can be understood in a physical as well as in a spiritual and psychological account (cf. Miola [1994], 39-40 and 45).

and deliberately, foregrounding the play's complexity in form, formation, and transformation. His incongruous clusters of scripts image the play's own incongruity in the net of mistaken identities and the illusion for Malvolio to which the audience gains access by Feste's wise folly. Thus, significant clusters can be found in ignorance vs. knowledge or lie vs. truth linked to stability vs. instability of language. Until the solution to error and incongruity, Shakespeare makes heavy use of the clown as the comic mediator of New Comedic principles in the romantic comedy: trickery, deception, and ignorance or the failure of *anagnorisis*.

Shakespeare constructs Feste as a decentralized observer that speaks with almost every other character in the play although he does not drive the plot. He indirectly refers to his 'ubiquitous' presence and mocks the failure in human nature when he states "[f]oolery […] does walk about the orb like the sun – it shines everywhere." (*TN* 3.1.36-37). His encounters with Sir Toby, Sir Andrew, Malvolio, Maria, Viola, Olivia, the Duke, and Sebastian enrich the play with comments from his outside perspective in comic style, evoking the comic *poeta*, who produces moments of the laughable and elucidates something about the figures. He can only do so because of his paradoxical condition:

> he is wise enough to play the fool;
> And to do that well craves a kind of wit.
> He must observe their mood on whom he jests,
> And, like the haggard, check at every feather
> That comes before his eye. This is a practice
> As full of labour as a wise man's art;
> For folly that he wisely shows is fit;
> But wise men, folly-fall'n quite taint their wit.
> (*TN* 3.1.57-65)

After her verbal game with Feste, Viola points out the wise fool's concept. These lines show the type's major functional elements since the fool chooses to wear the comic mask. The heroine acknowledges Feste's intellectual superiority. This observer moves at the peripheries of the stage, where he evaluates potential targets of mocking. In accordance with Riehle, the clown is an acrobat with quibbles, who shows "a masterly command of the dramatic play with language", wherein he resembles Plautine habits.[1090] Salingar thinks that Feste "should be the only character in Shakespeare to take pleasure, or refuge, in fantasies of pure nonsense", which should include Touchstone, Celia's and Rosalind's engagement with nonsensical constructs.[1091] The professional fool usually works with coding that relies on the slipperiness of meaning. The production of the laughable is not limited to nonsense but sticks to method; the deliberate fool knows how to abuse language and undermine convention to such an extent that he can combine jesting with some enlightening substance. Feste sees himself as a "corrupter of words" (*TN* 3.1.34), identifying his fondness for miscommunication, which he proves in toying with proverbs, infecting daily life, its structures and rules by the laughable. In equating "a sentence […with] a cheverel glove to a good wit" (*TN* 3.1.10-11), Feste himself speaks of his method, while assessing the power of language to (re)arrange matter or a version of 'truth' as he does when he takes part in Malvolio's delusion. He points at the possibility to construct, deconstruct, and turn meaning upside-down, which is what his species and similarly constructed types like Touchstone, Rosalind, and Celia enjoy doing. In the fool's method and in his and others' address of language's flexibility, Shakespeare cites a widely discussed subject

---

1090 Riehle (1990), 233.
1091 Salingar (1986), 73.

in his days: the extent to which language can represent truth.[1092] Elam defines Feste as "[t]he comedy's chief interrogator of the sign […], who repeatedly expresses a radical scepticism concerning the reliability of language as a means of representing truth".[1093]

In his oxymoronic disposition, the wise fool manifests language's conveyance of playful nonsense and wise substance, which illuminates truth as something metamorphosing. In the agon of wit, unpredictability adds to this web of qualities since what he wants or how he evolves the jest often lies in the dark. His vague phrase "I do care for something" (*TN* 3.1.26) emphasises the indefinite and thus the vast range of topics to be chosen. 'Something' hints at the fool's concern with a matter he has selected deliberately, which negates pure folly. Consequently, he is not an ordinary fool but a self-consciousness witty figure, whose brain is not motley coloured. He demonstrates his constitution in the play-in-the play, where he takes on the role of Sir Topas and persuades the audience in his art of dissembling. In the agon against Malvolio, he moves in the indefiniteness of who he actually is, while parodying a priest and observing the different illusionary frames.[1094] When the steward speaks of the surrounding space as dark "as hell", the jester perceives the world outside the 'box' and describes the space: the playhouse with "bay-windows" (*TN* 4.2.36).[1095] He is a self-conscious figure that does not fear punishment.[1096] In contrast to Malvolio and other railing types, Feste's harmlessness is believed in. Olivia knows that "there is no slander in an allow'd fool" (*TN* 1.5.88-89). The professional fool's license is rooted in the Saturnalian nature. He can trust in his impunity until his final song ending *Twelfth Night*, ending Saturnalia, and restoring the old social order, where desire is more destructive than balancing—a tragic account that will become more relevant in the 'problem plays', especially *Troilus and Cressida*. The professional fool in Feste evokes the licensed and omniscient commentator in Plautus' intrigue comedies and now speaks by drawing on the Lucianic satirical mode.[1097] Like an unpredictable and flexible figure in Plautus' comedies, Shakespeare sets "the Erasmian paradox of the Fool" disclosing the intersection of folly and wisdom in human nature.[1098]

Like his clever antecedents in Plautus' comedy, the wise fool is fond of mockery but is not interested in a destructive influence. He does not lose focus on the resolution even if he is not contributing directly since he is not interfering with the union of the lovers but attacks blocking characters and obstructions to the happy ending, like a loyal servant. Feste announces his plan to denounce Sir Toby and Sir Andrew to Olivia for their attack on Sebastian mixed up with Cesario.[1099] His loyalty extends to the protection of the couples but not to Malvolio; his license covers harmless escapades but not violations endangering the happy ending. In that sphere of license and for the sake of agon, he does not need to give up manipulative characteristics especially in his encounters with Malvolio. In the subplot of the intrigue, he possesses shape-shifter qualities, like confessing that he is "for all waters" (*TN* 4.2.62), revealing himself as someone who can take on every mask.

1092 Cf. Elam (2008), 251, ft. 11-13.
1093 *Ibid.*, 86. Esp. note *TN* 3.1.23-4, 3.1.11-13, 14-15.
1094 On the satirical perspective on the priest figure, cf. *Ibid.*, 306, ft. 5-6, and 307, ft. 12.
1095 Cf. *Ibid.*, 309, ft. 36-9.
1096 Note 1.5.8ff. (pun on colour, collars, choler; Feste's misbehaviour against Olivia).
1097 Cf. Riehle (1990), 232. Riehle especially relates to the mockery scene of Malvolio.
1098 *Ibid.*, 232.
1099 See *TN* 4.1.29-30. This approach could be criticized as too idealistically as Feste could only think of rescuing himself and profiting from the situation. But then, it is hard to explain why he sticks to the ploy against Malvolio, accepts the props Maria brings him and performs Sir Topas. He could easily tell Olivia both abuses.

Feste's quicksilver changes, his ability to create and destroy illusion, contrast with Malvolio's idiotic performance previously, his laborious and unsuccessful metamorphosis into a smiling lover. Feste, even more so than Viola has the ability to act, to lose one self (but not one's self) and become another.[1100]

With that ability and protected by a Saturnalian frame, Feste supplies mostly inorganic parts, while he excels in driving the comic and uses every occasion to put on a show. He once more proves himself a performer when Feste delivers Malvolio's letter to Olivia or when "the fool delivers the madman" (*TN* 5.1.285-86). Instead of following Olivia's request to read the letter to her, he combines the simple action with performance as he imitates Malvolio's madness while reading the letter, transporting the madness hidden in the words. This instance adds up to the sum of misbehaviour including miscommunication that mark a professional fool's production and treatment of the laughable. To exploit his qualities as a performer and merrymaker, he profits from his superiority in matters he shares with Maria and Viola. Such self-conscious figures living at the peripheries of the stage can be used to shed light on the sublevel of the play and the theatrical performance.

The most prominent disruption of the illusion is identified in metatheatrical comments illuminating the nets of illusionary frames.[1101] The entanglements of a fictive story, what is happening on stage, and the reality are addressed in the illogical comment made by Tranio about Theopropides since the tricked man should tell Plautus' predecessors, Diphilus and Philemon, about his fate to provide them with best material for such scenes. In such cases, the stage's fiction is interrupted by referring to the generic form, its relation to reality, and the process of imitation. The awareness of the figure encourages the awareness of the recipient as a spectator or a member of the audience, for which process the playwright needs self-conscious figures. Besides metatheatre, such commentators offer access to thematic kernels as shown for Rosalind, Touchstone, Viola, and Feste. They construct clusters of scripts that stand in an incompatible relation, fostering the *ridiculum* and marking the complexity in life and human nature. Viola refers to male and female concepts of love, the pairings of young and old, death and life, scepticism and idealism; Feste contributes to the juxtapositions of wisdom and folly, melancholy and laughter, desire and love, scepticism and idealism, illusion and reality, words and truth or word and substance, oaths and honour.

Twelfth Night's the heroine and the jester do not have the functional intersection that Rosalind does with Touchstone. Instead, Shakespeare offers two pairs, the professional fool Feste and the disguised witty heroine and the female mastermind Maria and the skin-changer Feste. The members of the pairs complement each other in their talents and their contributions to the coherence of the comedy. They share a New Comedic background. Certainly, Feste hints at the ancestors of his figure as he evokes Mercury, the god of deception, at 1.5.91-2. The deity for fools foreshadows the deception scene and calls attention to Plautus' *Amphitruo*, where Mercury tricks and mocks Sosia by taking on the slave's identity. Later in the play, Sebastian calls Feste a "foolish Greek" (*TN* 4.1.17) or 'buffoon', a type that belongs to the traditional catalogue of deliberate fools in comedy.[1102] In the conversation between Feste and Sebastian, the audience witnesses another hint at his concept and its semantic scope. When Sebastian demands Feste to "vent [his] folly somewhere else" (*TN* 4.1.9),

---

1100 Miola (1994), 46.
1101 Riehle highlights Fabian's metatheatrical comment: "If this were played upon a stage now, I could condemn it as an improbable fiction." (*TN* 3.4.127-28). Cf. Riehle (1990), 232.
1102 Cf. Elam (2008), 300, ft. 17.

Shakespeare makes several puns. The verb 'vent' means 'express' here, while Feste takes it as a keyword and plays with it in a way that leaves scope for interpretation. His use of the verb could relate to urinating, which adds a carnivalesque tone, or of pouring something out like a liquid, for instance wine, or smoke, which makes the fool a kind of vessel and might simulate the pouring of words out like wine.[1103] Both stand in connection to the literal meaning of 'blow' stemming from the Latin noun *ventus*.[1104] Significantly, in combination with its object, it calls forth even more word play. Sebastian throws the phrase at the fool, who can interpret it to be an offence against his nature since the Latin word '*follis*' means 'a windbag' in late popular Latin, implying the fool to be 'empty-headed'.[1105] If Feste vented his folly, he would release the windbag.[1106] In addition, the content of the windbag, 'air', describes the fleeting substance of his words and the emptiness of sense. Here, Shakespeare makes use of his Latin vocabulary to play with the fool as simpleton or as witty jester. Feste naturally responds to Sebastian, whom he has mistaken for Cesario, by making fun of his choice of words and repeating Sebastian's offence twice, framing an accusation against the young man: "He has heard that word of some great man and now applies it to a fool" (*TN* 4.1.11-12). He goes on punning on the verb 'vent' as if to prove that he is not empty-headed but a professional fool.

The last incident in the play showcases Feste's musical talent. It also shows Shakespeare's indebtedness to antiquity and the challenge of imitation. Sir Andrew Aguecheek describes Feste's singing voice with the adjective 'mellifluous'; his song contains the motto '*carpe diem*' (see *TN* 2.3.52). Apart from that passage, the adjective does not occur elsewhere in Shakespeare's works. He might have run across the adjective in Meres' *Palladis Tamia*, where Meres calls Shakespeare's voice mellifluous, having surpassed his classical predecessors.[1107] Shakespeare describes one of his self-conscious figures with the same epithet he was given because of how he interpreted the classical tradition. Shakespeare notes that Feste's voice originates from the imitation of antiquity and the effort of surpassing the Greek and Roman idols, which places Feste in the line of deliberate fools including Plautus' self-conscious and clever prototype. Sir Andrew Aguecheek, a natural fool, describes his partner in the comic drive in that way, which draws attention to their difference and the binary concept of the wise fool. Sir Andrew Aguecheek's sentence arguably makes the most intelligent allusion the simpleton utters in the play unintentionally. Ironically out of the natural fool's mouth, the hidden link to Meres' description of Shakespeare emphasizes the image of the wise fool as an outsider to the other figures and the poet-like commentator of the dramatic action. Shakespeare inserts a statement about his relation to antiquity's material and thereby a kind of self-fashioning, namely that his mellifluous voice relies on self-confident operations in the manner of a wise fool using material flexibly for the sake of entertainment mixed with acumen about human life.

1103 See *OED*, s.v. 'vent, v.² 2a'.

1104 Cf. Elam (2008), 300, ft. 9. Elam votes for 'vent' relating to 'excrete' (see *OED*, s.v. 'vent, v.² 2b', relating "to evacuate [urine]"). He does not discuss any further allusions.

1105 Cf. *OED*, s.v. 'fool, n¹' and s.v. 'fool, adj.', etymology: "lit. 'bellows,' but in late popular Latin employed in the sense of 'windbag,' empty-headed person, fool" (*follis*). And Willeford (1969), 10: "A fool is like a pair of bellows in that his words are only air, empty of meaning." For further considerations of the etymology and use of the word, see *Ibid.*, 9-11 and see ch. II.ii.

1106 The phrase could also hint at the possibility that the clown releases a fart as Touchstone is accused of by Rosalind (see *AYL* 1.2.103-104). Generally, the activity of release is also shown in the verb 'ungird' by Feste at *TN* 4.1.14.

1107 Cf. MacDonald Pairman Jackson, 'Francis Meres and the Cultural Contexts of Shakespeare's Rival Poet Sonnets', *The Review of English Studies* 56.224 (2005): 224-246, 239-40. Jackson shows several examples for Shakespeare's use of Meres' vocabulary in some plays like *King Lear* or *Julius Caesar* and his sonnets.

Feste represents the next generation of the deliberate fool after Touchstone. Unlike Touchstone, he does not engage in courtship. They are both paired with witty females, demonstrate acting skills, and their cleverness, while they use miscommunication, agonistic attitudes, and their license to visualize the comic mask to and on others. Touchstone and Feste function analogically but adapt to each play's discourse and atmosphere.

The term 'function' is central to describe the type and its manifestation, which does usually not appear as a personality. As Marjorie Garber sees Feste "less like a person than like a sprite or a spirit of music", the manifestation of his type tends to be opaque in terms of individuality but acts out the profession.[1108] Indeed, the deliberate fool is superior by extent consciousness over the comic realms but is delimited in his outline of personality and inner psychological life, which he simply does not need. Shakespeare transfers that quality to his heroines as Rosalind and Viola dominate the romantic discourse. Stock types prevail in Plautus' comedies in comparison to close-to-life and unique personalities. The clever slave sticks to his type and repeats functional designs. Shakespeare's witty heroines as Viola expand to more distinct and noble versions of Plautus' carnivalesque exaggeration and stereotypical construction of a clever slave.[1109] In a transition from figure to character, the dominance of stereotypical features ceases but the demonstration of the 'self' and the complexity of the persona that can develop, learn, and change manifest itself more apparently especially in soliloquies dealing with and disclosing inner processes more delicately. Shakespeare's comedies drop the deceiving stereotypical protagonist, dissolving his role into a net of deception, disguise, and play-within-the-play due to the 'romanticization' and privatisation of courtship and reconstructing the prototype in analogically functional pairs of heroines and witty jesters. Simultaneously, comedy's schema is supported by their contribution to *ridiculum*, carnivalesque, and its utopian nature. The metamorphosis of the prototype contributes to the formation of the witty heroine leading the romantic plot and to the construction of the wise fool, realizing the *paradox* as the *signum* of comedy.

The Shrew persuades by the two figures constructed on the paradox pattern, Tranio and Petruccio, who are complemented by the clownish figure, Grumio, who falls somewhere between the deliberate and non-deliberate fool. Shakespeare iterates the successful binary construction in the pair of Rosalind and Touchstone. Rosalind stands in a more direct tradition to the trickster and possesses the qualities of the clever slave, while Touchstone is constructed on the same pattern but metamorphosed to the culturally inclined court fool. Behind the mask of the court fool, the comic figure is based upon the same functionality the clever slave draws upon and is responsible for the same support of comedy's schema. Deceivers like Tranio, Petruccio, Rosalind, Viola, and Maria, as well as professional fools like Touchstone and Feste possess the same distanced spirit of dealing with the laughable. With these figures, Shakespeare shows his metamorphoses of traditional concepts combining them with contemporary popular subjects as Rosalind/Ganymede or Viola/Cesario are indebted to the erotic layers of male-female appearance and the deliberate fool figure also bears parallels to the mediaeval Vice figure investing in the corruption of appearance, learning, and words similarly.[1110] The metamorphosis does not state the exclusive transformation of one figure, here the Plautine protagonist but the streams of the paradox pattern validating in various

---

1108 Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All*, New York: Pantheon Books, 2004, 534. She goes on to compare Feste as "much akin to Puck as he is to Touchstone".
1109 Note Hardin (2018), 137-39 on characterization, credibility, alienation and comic practice on comedy's stage.
1110 Cf. Elam (2008) 315, ft. 123.

instantiations across several periods. In other words, they exist on the same condition of aesthetic consciousness with respect to their integration into comedy.

IV.iv. Shakespeare's dark 'Plautus': Fools and Architects

Built upon the paradox pattern, Plautus' architects and *servus ludens* are one seminal popular source for Shakespeare's figures. Shakespeare's drawing on Plautus' clever slave can be described in a twofold way: Plautus' trickster figure and instigator in the plot shines through in Shakespeare's disguised servant, taming suitor, and heroines, while his wise fools echo Plautus' prototypical professional fool figure and poet-like commentator. His oxymoronic professionals excel in their diversity, metamorphosing in dependence on the genre and the play's atmosphere. What remains the same are the discussed functional features and the *paradox*. In some of Shakespeare's later plays, comedy's utopia and New Comedy's wonderful denouement change places with darker images of how masks of folly, exposure, and carnivalesque chaos culminate in a devouring stage as in *Troilus and Cressida* showing the cacophonic Thersites, in the tragedy *King Lear* offering the Fool, in *Hamlet* blending folly and seriousness in the prince as a deliberate fool, and in *The Tempest* involving the 'magician' Prospero.[1111] The professional jester turns into the self-conscious observer and commentator in tragedy and dark comedy, keeping the type's functional elements.

Troilus and Cressida is a play in which the questioning of values and ideals is central.[1112] The problem of defining the play as a distinct tragedy or dark comedy has always aroused discussion but whether defined as tragedy or comedy, the play carries a satirical tone. Briefly, *Troilus and Cressida* is a showroom of farcicality in tragic costume. Thersites comments on the world arising in front of the audience and devours its illusion by his smart but harsh and polemical insights.[1113] He does not gain sympathy like his Homeric predecessor, but remains unpunished and licensed to corrupt principles the others believe in and try to hold on to. His immunity does not stem from his harmlessness or from an altruistic agenda but is based on his cowardice.[1114] Thersites' weapon displays his railing mouth while he is far from being a

---

1111 Convincing analyses upon the structural parallel between comedy and tragedy have shown that Shakespeare relies on his experience in comedy's matrix and also, applies it in his tragedies; for instance *Romeo and Juliet*'s Friar Laurence and his function as the leading 'intriguer' show links to the subplot around Lucentio and Bianca. For a short overview, see Riehle (1990), 234-5, esp. ft. 85. Also see Francis Teague, 'Othello and New Comedy', *CD* 20 (1986): 54-64; for one of the earliest analyses of comic elements in *Othello*, see Barbara Heliodora C. de Mendonça, '*Othello*: A Tragedy Built on a Comic Structure', *Shakespeare Survey* 21 (1968): 92-99. But Barbara H. C. de Mendonça chooses only the *commedia dell'arte* as a reference point and does not include the *commedia dell'arte*'s reception of Roman comedy. For a totally different account of Iago read as a trickster figure, see Susan Arndt, 'Trans*textuality in William Shakespeare's *Othello*: Italian, West African, and English Encounters', *Anglia* 136.3 (2018): 393–429. She compares *Othello* to African folktales and its popular figure of the trickster especially taken from Western Africa's oral literature.

It cannot be denied that Iago belongs to the sum of tricksters in Shakespeare's plays with Plautine background and will later be analysed shortly as an exemplification of a dark intriguer but without a comparable transformation of the pattern paradox. Riehle (1990), 235, ft.85: "Iago is so like the trickster in Roman comedy or the implied stage director in Plautine comedy that the connections with the medieval Vice, which are usually commented on, appear by comparison to be of minor importance."

1112 See for example, *TC* 2.2.52 and see 52ff. Troilus and Hector's discussion. All further citations will be given from the following edition: William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, Kenneth Muir (ed.), Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, reiss. 2008. And see also Riehle (1990), 237.

1113 A different kind of 'Thersites' can be found in Sir John Falstaff in *Henry IV,* or later in Josef Svejk in Jaroslav Haskek's *The Good Soldier Svejk, Mother Courage*, and Joseph Heller's Captain John Yossarian in *Catch-22.* They all "are inherently subversive because theirs is a world defined by war, a world in which they want no part." Peter Scheckner, 'Renegades in the Literature of War: From Homer to Heller', *War, Literature & Arts* 21 (2009): 197-205, 199.

1114 For instance, in *TC* 5.7a, Thersites cowardly flees Margarelon.

warrior; he is a cowardly outsider who predicts the dark ending. He acknowledges that the most important force in wartime is *envy*. Thersites concludes his short foreshadowing of the Trojan war's outcome with "devil Envy say 'Amen'" (*TC* 2.3.19). In the play, *Envy* is personified as a fatal power that devours and destroys.[1115]

Thersites is a misanthrope, who "'ll learn to conjure and raise devils but [he]'ll see some issue of [his] spiteful execrations" (*TC* 2.3.5-6).[1116] In his prayers against the camp, he seems to be based on Homer's Thersites, who accuses Agamemnon of materialism and greed. Shakespeare broadens Thersites' speeches to reveal their foulness. He is the commentator of the love story when he argues that Cressida's "mind is now turned whore" (*TC* 5.2.112). In fact, he embodies the dark prophet as "the foulest of Shakespeare's fools".[1117] As similar as the Elizabethan Thersites is to Homer's as far he is from fulfilling the same function. Now, he is not punished for his loose tongue by Ulysses and spared any harm. Consequently, he becomes a privileged Elizabethan fool, who has "the licence for sharp words".[1118]

In his expertise of verbal taunting constructions, Thersites as a dark juggler with words builds the contradictory, revealing part to Ulysses' overblown but useless rhetoric. Eloquence, its hyperbole, and the distortion of its virtue by (empty) words signifies the play's view of language as

> *Troilus and Cressida* is among the most language-conscious of Shakespeare's plays, densely rhetorical, stuffed with strange words—many of them nonce creations, invented for this one use only—and revealing an attempt to imitate what he thought to be Homeric style, having only Chapman's translation to go on.[1119]

The Lucianic mode challenges the themes of honour, order, and morals, the complex of ideology the *Iliad* and the medieval chivalry stands for. In other words, Shakespeare does not present a second Homeric Akhilleus or a Chaucerian heroine, but draws a dark and devouring atmosphere, where irony creates an insuperable distance between the epic world and the play. Shakespeare's play expresses scepticism by taking a humanist's perspective with a Lucianic mode and makes Thersites the critical voice who rails against the fragility of these ideological maxims.[1120] He illuminates the oppositional clusters of scripts: words against deeds, honor against pride, carnality against love, faith against unfaithfulness, body against mind. The Homeric figure exactly embodies that disharmony the stage's world bears.

Thersites expresses scepticism in the play and is not impressed by names, degree, symbols, words or honourable fights; he fights every attempt to reach the ideal.[1121] His character should not be understood as the inheritance of truth within the play, but a voice,

---

1115 Muir (2008), 30. "*Envy* feeds upon herself", an impression that is known from Ovid in his *Amores*, 1.15.39 (*pascitur in vivis Livor*) and also note *Met.* 2.768ff. (detailed description of *Invidia*).

1116 Cf. August Ruegg, 'Homerisches und Unhomerisches in Shakespeares *Troilus and Cressida*', *Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft –West* (1968): 28-42, 33; Compare *TC* 2.3.61, a "privileg'd man".

1117 *Ibid.*, 33.

1118 Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall Tillyard, *Shakespeare's Problem Plays*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949, 37.

1119 Vickers (1983), 423-4.

1120 Cf. Riehle (1990), 229 and 237. Shakespeare keeps that tone, even enhances it in his later plays, but it ceases to be prominent in the last plays.
And note William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, Kenneth Palmer (ed.), London et al.: Methuen, 1982, esp. 92.

1121 Additionally, scepticism "that gained ground throughout Europe in the second half of the century" can be seen as a pervaded method in Shakespeare's plays. (Michael Srigley, *The Probe of Doubt. Scepticism and Illusion in Shakespeare's Plays*, Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000, 9).

which subverts its surroundings and gives the audience (at least) an alternative to the play's surface. In that account, he is "the satyr satirist",[1122] who appeared in the theatres at the end of the 16th century. His pessimism reflects the devouring quality of war. This irony makes the Shakespearean fool Thersites the mirror of lechery, envy, hate and war. He cannot take part in a world he detests; additionally, the characters detest him; or actually, does he detest it because he cannot take part in it? In Homer's *Iliad*, Thersites' quality *aichros* means ugly but also shame or shame-causing.[1123] The Homeric Thersites is definitely shamed when Ulysses beats him in front of the whole army. But Shakespeare's Thersites is not ashamed at all and fails to arouse shame in the other characters. Social order and moral degrees have ceased to exist in the play. The Homeric shame-culture is dead and does not really work in Shakespeare's play, definitely not for Thersites. He does not function for comedy's schema and its principles of carnivalesque, utopia, and *ridiculum* with the same intention. The harmless laughable transforms to invective; illuminating the illusion is meant to destroy any utopian desire, and the 'servant-master' or soldier-leader relationship is not temporarily turned upside-down temporarily but interrogated.

It is thus the darker brother of the professional fool, who says that "[t]he common curse of mankind, [is] folly and ignorance" (*TC* 2.3.25-26). Ignorance and human foolishness equivocates comedy's source for error. This statement is a dark interpretation of New Comedy and manifests the ugly in tragic surroundings.[1124] Shakespeare is aware of the thin line between laughter and pain and uses it for his matrixes of comedy and tragedy to create intriguing new forms of classical and native traditions on stage.

The tragedy *King Lear* shows such motivations, especially concerning the wise fool and court. The deliberate folly of the Fool opposes the illness of folly, from which the king suffers. Shakespeare inserts contrasts and their upside-down relation between superiors and inferiors into a tragic setting but with familiarly comic constellations and elements. As a loyal servant, the Fool wants to show Lear his failure and his bleak situation. Their relationship is marked by loyalty and a kind of love-hatred. Lear protects his fool but threatens him, whereas his jester offers him advice but also makes fun of his ignorance. Such disturbance of the hierarchical order evokes the carnivalesque since "[t]he Fool registers loyalty to Lear by mocking him, as carnival mockery testify the authority of real kings."[1125] The Fool is among the elite at court but is more moral than his superiors. In his superiority, he acts as the advisory voice, who can read the atmosphere on stage. In an upside-down world, the Fool brings the type's talents of prognosis, perspicacity of himself as well as others, and hilarity with him on stage.

His professionality demands that he "labours to outjest [the king's] heart-struck injuries" (*KL* 3.1.16-17).[1126] The jester entertains by the typical methods his earlier colleagues of professional fools show since he varies proverbial structures to create veiled sense. He supplies obscure allusions, unexpected and inappropriate metaphors and similes to comment on the action on stage as well as Lear's situation.[1127] Miscommunication becomes as

---

1122 Robert Kimbrough, 'The Problem of Thersites', *Modern Language Review* 59.2 (1964): 173-6, 173; cf. as well Roger Stritmatter, 'The Tortured Signifier: Satire, Censorship, and the Textual History of *Troilus and Cressida*', *Critical Survey* 21.2 (2009): 60–82, 67. Thersites uses "the diseased-ridden, sexualized rhetoric of the Puritan satirists" (67).
1123 Cf. Eddie R. Lowry, *Thersites. A Study in Comic Shame*, New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1991, 3.
1124 Another figure that bears reminiscences with New Comedy is the pimp Pandarus.
1125 Lindley (1996), 11.
1126 William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, Reginald Anthony Foakes (ed.), London: Black Publishers, 1997. All further citations of the play will be given from this edition (Arden Shakespeare).
1127 For example, see *KL* 2.2.311-15; 3.2.40ff.

prominent as in *AYL* and *TN* when the king's jester surprises the audience and his dialogue partner with sudden turns and what Allan R. Shickman describes as "the product of a fool's vacillating wit".[1128] His thoughts contain bizarre and erratic associations that defy understanding.

Even so, the Fool does not fulfil his function alone; Shakespeare adds another rhyming and philosophizing figure to the group of men in the stormy night, partly replacing the Fool in 3.4., when they meet Edgar disguised as Poor Tom. Edgar draws the attention of Lear with his nonsense about devils, demons, and the night's devastation in his role as Poor Tom, the natural fool.[1129] While Lear and presumably Edgar sink into insanity, the Fool keeps control and is free from any inner deeper devastation and loss of self. His coding mannerisms are deliberate and effective and he shows himself to be a disbeliever in language and in the relations between words and matters.[1130] The professional fool knows how to (ab)use language's flexibility, addressing oppositional themes as truth and lie, illusion and reality, love and hatred, envy and loyalty. By his contributions, he keeps and guides the attention of the audience, striking by his perspicacity. Thus, he can look through illusionary frames or the failure of others to overcome their ignorance. The Fool produces worldly wisdom, which enables him to act as a cryptic and entertaining philosopher and prophet using the magical 'if', challenging by his enigmatic questions, condensing the complexities of the stage in words that are ambiguous.[1131]

As the social outsider and observer, he can give the audience access to the tragic situation, explicating Lear's failure. Ironically, the Fool displays the analysing and seriously warning counterpart to the truly foolish and naïve king, to whom he is an unexpected counterbalance. The ultimate rank in the play, the king, refuses to be a mere fool, but the jester becomes the wise figure, who looks down on his foolish king. Their connection implies the special relationship of king and court fool and their traditional challenge of wit, which unfolds as the inverted pair of the wise and the foolish, the flexible free spirit and the inflexible isolated character, the self-ridiculing and the self-important, the refusing and the recognizing character, and the controlled foolish behaviour in contrast to uncontrolled rising folly.[1132] His position in relation to the king and the audience seems to be that of a disinterested mediator and commentator. In symbolic terms, he is often equated with Lear's mirror. A mirror is often found among the fool's props in medieval and Renaissance depictions. The fool holds up a mirror that represents his "self- knowledge" and prophetic ability, confronting the others with their own folly.[1133]

Shakespeare avails himself of the "all-licensed fool" for his tragedy, where he mixes elements of the comic mask with the tragic discourse (*KL* 1.4.191). Though licensed or because of his license in regard back to Plautus' motif of threat-of-punishment, the professional fool must cope with threats against him for his truthfulness and honesty his comments on Lear's behaviour bear. On several occasions, he is threatened with being whipped—no matter what he does:

1128 Allan R. Shickman, 'The Fool's Mirror in *King Lear*', *English Literary Renaissance* 21.1 (1991): 75-86, 75.
1129 On Bedlam, cf. Rose A. Zimbardo, 'The King and The Fool: *King Lear* as Self-Deconstructing Text', *Criticism* 32.1 (1990): 1-29, 10-15 and 18-19.
1130 For example, note *KL* 1.4.106ff., 135; 1.5.12ff.
1131 For instance, see *KL* 3.2.79-96. The Fool's prophecy.
1132 Note Zimbardo (1990), 15: He indicates that "in the unconscious consciousness of the late sixteenth and very early seventeenth centuries the King-Fool configuration carries a much more complex and continuously variable burden of meaning than simple reversal or *coincidentia oppositorum*."
1133 Shickman (1991), 76.

I marvel what kin thou and thy daughters are. They'll have me whipped for speaking true, thou'lt have me whipped for lying, and sometimes I am whipped for holding my peace. I had rather be any kind o'thing than a fool, and yet I would not be thee, nuncle. (*KL* 1.4.173-77)

In contrast to the majority in the play and typically of a fool, the court jester cannot hold his tongue; he cannot but speak the truth. The original misfit reveals himself to be the only honest companion to the king.

As Touchstone and as Feste, he draws upon the same chiastic opposition of wisdom and folly when he opposes the 'mad' nobles assumed to be wise as the only 'sane' man keeping his wit.[1134] The professional fool matures to "a general voice of common sense in the storm scenes [...] and a social critic" in comparison to the maddening of the others, particularly Lear and Edgar.[1135] Consequently, the Fool's participation in the single scenes until he leaves are marked by a process of transformation, which goes hand in hand with the changes in Lear's constitution. After the Fool engages in rhyming jingles and ridiculing the king's folly, he becomes the advisory wit among madmen and a source of criticism. With the last mad words of Lear, the Fool vanishes, leaving at the point at which he is no longer needed.[1136] Until then, the professional fool is a channel for the oppositional clusters of scripts and sometimes, their inverted order in the play: madness and wisdom, majestic dominance and despairing helplessness, love and hatred, pain and hilarity, father and child, deceit and reality or illusion and truth, and in regard to genre, the configuration of parodic voices from New Comedy in a tragic matrix.[1137]

This tragedy knows another figure aligned to New Comedic elements. Shakespeare presents a form of the clever *architectus* by offering a dark intriguer in the "rough and lecherous" Edmund (*KL* 1.2.130-31).[1138] For Miola, he even "exhibit[s] the literary self-consciousness of a Pseudolus, Tranio or Chrysalus".[1139] His closeness to the clever slave is evident in his overview of the subplot as well as in the use of asides and soliloquies when he comments on his victims and architects his brother and father's downfall. After misleading his father, the too gullible *senex*, he shares his triumph with the audience and refashions New Comedic constellations as well as the course of resolving *turbae* into dark Machiavellian tricking and the villainous introduction of catastrophe. Accommodating himself to the tragic setting, the figure lacks any altruistic charm of a *servus callidus* but stands out as an ascending bastard tempted by the destructive longing for power, which determines the main plot and subplot.[1140]

1134 See *KL* 1.4.158-161 (The Fool's short song).

1135 Foakes (1997), 56.

1136 The Quarto and the Folio differ in the Fool's length of participation slightly; while the Quarto allows the Fool to take part in the mock trial, the Folio allows the Fool a final line preparing his exit. See *Ibid.*, 56 and 292-3, ft. 82.

And note that Foakes suggests that Edgar temporarily echoes the Fool's function as a commentator, see *Ibid.*, 293-4, ft. 94-112.

1137 Miola inscribes the Fool in the matrix of comedy and tragedy alike. Cf. Miola (1994), 187-88 and Frye (1957), esp. 175.

1138 Cf. Foakes (1997), 187, ft. 134.

1139 Miola (1994), 188. Edmund can be seen as another example that Shakespeare was familiar with the concept of the *servus callidus*. As Edmund is a dark intriguer with a selfish agenda as well as a part of the tragic subplot and lacks most of the clever slave's scripts that become present in the professional fool, the thesis decides to exclude a detailed analysis of the figure.

1140 Cf. *Ibid.*, 188-89. Like a *senex*, Gloucester makes the mistake to underestimate the young.

In *King Lear*, Shakespeare constructs the constellations of intrigue and trickster in the subplot around Edmund splitted from the theme of *ludere* and any commitment to ridiculum of the self, which is outsourced in the Fool illuminating Lear's loss of sanity. Showing New Comedy's routines, *King Lear* presents a subplot of intrigue, agonal structures between a *senex* and an *architectus*, the conflict of young and old, and a carnivalesque oppositional relation between the seemingly wise and the one playing the fool.[1141]

In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare offers the instrumental use of folly – not in a court fool but in the young prince choosing the antic disposition. He is the young avenger, who wants his antagonist to believe in the illusion of false security. Operating under the cover of being somebody else that is harmless, Hamlet draws reminiscences to similar figures in classical literature. Ovid's *Fasti* provides Shakespeare with Lucius Junius Brutus and his revenge plan of being *stulti sapiens imitator* (Ovid's *Fasti*, 2.717), while Plautus' *Menaechmi* shows Menaechmus of Syracuse embracing the idea of being mad in order to escape.[1142] Miola even retraces Plautus' *Menaechmi* not only in the element of the feigning mad man but furthermore in the situation of someone feeling astranged at home and facing the increasing instability of his identity as well as the collapse of the world he used to know.[1143] Menaechmus' temporary counterfeit as the mad man deepens into the inner conflict of Hamlet, whose situation turns from a temporary illusion to a permanent confrontation with a formerly familiar world changing to a strange world destroying his identity and self. Violence is endemic in the tragic irresolution and rising madness, which cannot be resolved in a comic utopia affirmed by laughter.[1144]

Polonius assumes that it is the "extremity for love" the prince suffers from (*Ham.* 2.2.189-90). Regarding New Comedy's constellations of figures and plot, he is an *adulescens* in love, facing Ophelia's father, the *agelast*.[1145] The verbal agon between Polonius and Hamlet resonates with the stereotypical conflict between the young passionate generation and the old blocking father when the young prince attacks his victim, exposes and dehumanizes him.[1146] Polonius is confronted with Hamlet's enigmatic style as he blends proverbs, prompts questions in the middle of a sentence, blocks consensus deliberately, encodes his mockings in ambivalent remarks hidden from Polonius,[1147] which matches the young prince of the

---

And compare Reibetanz (1977), esp. 58-9 and 58: For John Reibetanz, "Edmund reflects both an earlier figure from popular drama, the Vice, and a contemporary, the wily comic intriguer." The Vice and the contemporary instances rely on earlier theatrical traditions, which makes Edmund appear in a greater framework including antiquity's sources.

1141 See Miola (1994), 192-4. He discusses New Comedy's structures and configurations in regard to Lear, who rejects his daughter and refuses her a dowry as a *senex iratus*, echoing a blocking character and its misanthropic attitude like an Euclio from *Aulularia*.

1142 Cf. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor (eds.), London et al.: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, ³2016, 64. And cf. Harry Levin, *The Question of Hamlet*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1959, 119: "[…] the pseudo-lunatic is conventionally a figure of comedy".

1143 See Robert Miola, *Shakespeare's Reading*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2000, 80-81. And cf. Thompson and Taylor (³2016), 71-72.

1144 On madness in comedy and as a popular theme on Renaissance stages, see Duncan Salkeld, *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1993, 67-69.

1145 Cf. Miola (2018), esp. 37.

1146 Esp. see Hamlet's description of the old man in *Ham.* 2.2.196-203 ("plum-tree gum"; "like a crab").

1147 For example, *Ham.* 2.2.174, 176, 178-79, 181-2, 192, 194. On the complex associations of 'fishmonger', Hamlet's address of Polonius in *Ham.* 2.2.174, note Hibbard (1998), 212, ft. 174 and Harold Jenkins, 'Hamlet and the fishmonger', *Deutsche Shakespeare –Gesellschaft West Jahrbuch*, Hermann Heuer (ed.), Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1975, 109-20. The fishmonger can also mean 'a wencher' or 'a bawd'. Here, *fish* signifies female flesh.

fishmonger scene with *Mostellaria's* Tranio, who describes the tricking and ridiculing of his master and the neighbour as his pecking at two vultures.[1148] Both, the Plautine deliberate fool and Hamlet, take on masks, using artifice, provoking the other with their bewildering manner and hiding their knowledge behind it to act on behalf of somebody else; but it is not the lovers' union Hamlet wants to achieve but to take revenge on behalf of "[his] father's spirit" (*Ham.*1.2.257). The clever schemer and Hamlet act both concealed from authority but they differ in how they present their masterplan and their roles in it. The slave's soliloquies usually demonstrate, characterize, and glorify his scheming talents whereas Hamlet's soliloquies mainly contribute to the representation of the inner personal turmoil and his melancholic mood.

As Polonius points out, Hamlet is not merely mad but "there is method" in his exuberance (*Ham.* 2.2.204-05) and in his 'pregnant' replies (see *Ham.* 2.2.208). The clever slave and Hamlet sometimes seem to exclude "reason and sanity" (*Ham.* 2.2.209) while fulfilling a certain agenda. He achieves illusion by "put[ting] an antic disposition on" (*Ham.* 1.5.179), applying similar talents of comedic eloquence and wit and fostering the production of *ridiculum* as well as the participation in agonal scenes encoding the deflations of the other.[1149] He takes over a certain superior status by inviting the multiplicity of meaning, challenging his dialogue partners, recognizing pretence in others and commenting at the edge of stage.[1150] Beyond the mere confrontation between Hamlet and his dialogue partners, the play's sublevel contains a Lucianic mode voiced in comic dialogues revealing human follies. Hamlet's satirical rogue in 2.2. stands for an agenda of exposure and on closer inspection, it implies the theatrical dialectic of truth and lie, which Hamlet tries to use for himself.[1151] Prating figures like Laertes and Polonius, who is in love with the artistry of his choice of words, are satirized by exposing their artificiality when it comes to their use of language.[1152]

Hamlet's overview and separation from the others become even more apparent in the encounters with the playgroup when he instructs the players how to act and reflects on stereotypes and the aspect of improvisation, splitting role from actor.[1153] As the clever slave directs figures on and off stage to play their part in his deception, Hamlet puts a scene on stage to have certainty about Claudius being the murderer of his father, "set[ting] down [a

---

A further connotation is that the female offspring of the fishmonger are usually "beautiful, wanton, and prolific" (Hibbard [1998], 212, ft.174).

1148 Cf. Miola (1994), 175-176.

1149 Note *Ham*. 2.2.373-74, when Hamlet warns Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, saying "I am but mad north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw."

1150 Note John Russell-Brown, 'Multiplicity of Meaning in the Last Moments of Hamlet', *Connotations* 2.1 (1992): 16-33, 19: The young prince uses "wordplay as a disguise in which to taunt and trick both adversaries and friends, so that he is not fully understood and they are encouraged to disclose hidden thoughts".
Cf. Maurice Charney, *Hamlet's Fictions*, New York et al.: Routledge, 1988, 131-51. Maurice Charney uses six headings to categorize the comic elements in *Hamlet*: satire, irrelevance, aggression, exuberance, mastery of anxiety, and madness.
Note Levin (1959), 119: "Hamlet's pithy repartee becomes more grimly enigmatic and less politely ironic, increasingly rude to his enemies as the play progresses. He becomes a master of the trope that rhetoricians defined under the heading of *sarcasmus*".

1151 Cf. Riehle (1990), 196-97. The "satirical rogue", the author of the book Hamlet reads in 2.2.196, could stand for either Juvenal – as Baldwin suggests – or Lucian as Riehle argues (cf. Baldwin [1944], 526).

1152 Cf. Charney (1988), 140-143.

1153 Cf. Tanya Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2017, 117: "Hamlet is the most self-consciously preoccupied with the theater".; for a short summary, see Freddie Rokem, 'Meta-Theatricality and Screen-Scenes', *Hamlet-Handbuch. Stoffe, Aneignungen, Deutungen*, Peter W. Marx (ed.), Stuttgart/Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2014, 53-58, esp. 53.

speech of some dozen or sixteen lines]" (*Ham.* 2.2.529-30). A direct illusion to lure the victim becomes a separate official frame of visualizing the Ghost's report, testing its accusations, and imitating a scene preceding the play proper. In his role as a *poeta*, the multiple configurations of Hamlet are prominent when the figure takes a self-reflective look on the cosmos of *Hamlet*, where an eiron plays and discusses the mimetic relation between theatre and life but remains stuck in the dilemma between the passivity of words or imaginary transformations and physical power or simply, action in need for revenge in that fictional world of the stage.[1154] The audience is confronted with the ambivalence of 'roles' of Hamlet, setting up a play within the play, discussing theatrical conventions, theatrical experience, and the fundamentals of (re)presentations.[1155]

Beyond an *adulescens* and a kind of director, the young prince carries the epithet of *ludens* as he improvises, plays the fool and shifts between moods. Such flexibility and unpredictability remind of the clever slave's quick turns and creative output, moving outside the theatrical frame; both have the audience witness their thought processes, including the dualism between a figure and an actor, the tensions of an inner debate or the spontaneous reactions to a threat.[1156] In Hamlet's case, the tragic-comic performance of self-awareness and alienation underlines his struggle, rising death. The self becomes split in body and soul, in action and speech, in authenticity and illusion, which climaxes in questioning identity and even existence within the theatrical frame, finally reaching out to reality and addressing the smooth transition from theatre to the world surrounding it. Hamlet's famous fourth soliloquy ("To be or not to be", *Ham.* 3.1.57) expands the meditations on the self in theatre from the preceding soliloquy to the dimension of man, death, and afterlife.

Hamlet and the clever slave share a certain isolated position, operating against authority by their wit and taking an ommiscient viewpoint on their setting. Shakespeare "highlight[s] his link with witty male Plautine antic scheming".[1157] Comedy's deliberate fool is estranged from the dark grotesque world of violence and death, where the hero suffers from silencing himself as he cannot respond to the immorality of his "uncle-father and aunt-mother" openly and fails to act out the final revenge, but he is imprisoned in his role of antic disposition. The tragic eiron cannot become a *deus ex machina* but loses himself in the cognitive sphere, enslaved to his mind. His antic disposition is not only a mask but helps him create a comic realm where Hamlet temporarily takes advantage of its utopian quality when the deliberate fool invites the impossible, is one step ahead and relies on a certain immunity. But the actual tragic frame denies Hamlet safety, balance, and the utopian harmlessness; instead, it promises catastrophe.[1158] The infusion of comedy and its figure of the deliberate

---

1154 See Hamlet's suffering and self-contempt in his soliloquy at 2.2.537-594.

1155 Note Levin (1959), 125 on Hamlet's different personae: "Hamlet's complexity is compounded of many simples: the frustrated scholar, the unwilling courtier, the mourner who becomes a revenger, the lover whose imagination rages like that of the lunatic or the poet, and still others – not least, the witty fool."

1156 Cf. Martina Bross, *Versions of Hamlet. Poetic Economy on Page and Stage*, Paderborn et al.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2017, 225ff. (On poetic economy and the representation of thought).

1157 Tanya Pollard, 'Genre: Comedy and Tragedy', *The Routledge Research Companion to Shakespeare and Classical Literature*, Sean Keilen and Nick Moschovakis (eds.), London/New York: Routledge, 2017, 42-56, 47.

1158 Cf. Charney (1988), esp. 144. And cf. Levin (1959), 119. The recognition of Yorick (the dead jester), and Hamlet's encounter with the gravediggers display the inevitability of death and the duality of the grotesque. Mirth remains a temporary element. Cf. and for further discussion of the graveyard scene, see Peter W. Marx, 'Das Komische', *Hamlet-Handbuch. Stoffe, Aneignungen, Deutungen*, Peter W. Marx (ed.), Stuttgart/Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 2014, 41-44, 41-3. Comedy and its figures bound to laughability cannot persist in the tragic environment. Polonius and his family are victims of that very same dominance. Note *ibid.*, 42-3 and Susan Snyder,

fool remains temporary in the undissolvable net of truth and lie, fiction and reality, possibility and impossibility: Hamlet is situated in the middle of a conflict between the static and enclosed world of pretence and a multiple, open and elusive system of meaning.[1159] For Austin Nuttall, Hamlet is "Shakespeare's prime example of a thinker". If "[t]hought[s] [are] making Hamlet ill",[1160] then his soliloquies increase the disease immensely;[1161] they happen in a harmless separate space on stage, remaining ineffective and leaving Hamlet questioning himself without any response, license or a promising plan for resolution.

Among Shakespeare's problem plays, *The Tempest* with its a manipulative protagonist evokes parallels to New Comedic themes and configurations.[1162] As King Lear, Prospero, a *senex iratus*, conventionally rules over his daughter's destiny.[1163] He tries to dominate not only his daughter's life but the destiny of the island and their inhabitants, driven by his longing for revenge, which fits in the context of the Machiavellian desires also found in Antonio or Caliban and the other shipwrecked. With the help of Ariel, Prospero controls the fate of characters, plotting as a mastermind behind the scenes. Commanding his helper, the invisible spirit, he changes the setting, has music played, dogs barking, men hunted, and dominates the senses of the others by controlling ears and eyes.[1164] The magician is in charge of the island's nature and its spirits, which can be seen as analogue to the clever slave's dominance and his construction of scenes as well as his capacity to view the action and illuminate illusion from an external position.[1165]

Comparable to Pseudolus, who refers to himself as a *poeta*, Prospero epitomizes a stage director when he orchestrates the plot and the figures, reflecting on the manipulations, illuminations, and dramatic art. Prospero's dominance as a creator and master of the stage is also palpable in his monopole on the narrative: "one night [he presents] the story of [his] life" to Alonso (*Temp*. 5.1.303-05).[1166] The climax of representing a *poeta* is reached in the epilogue spoken by Prospero, who reflects on the dependence of the volatile constellation of actor and spectator. In the epilogue, which underlines the merging of two worlds, off and on stage,[1167] Prospero's power over the illusion and manipulation is laid bare, while actor, *poeta*, and playwright are visualized and co-existing.

As common in Roman comedy, Prospero's stage is a carnivalesque place, here the enchanted world of the island and its magic ruler Prospero, who manoeuvres against authority from the 'real' world, enslaving free men.[1168] *The Tempest* discussses ideas of humanism as

The Comic Matrix of Shakespeare's Tragedies. Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Othello, and King Lear, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979, 110.
1159 Cf. Josipovici (2016), 262-3.
1160 Austin D. Nuttall, *Shakespeare the Thinker*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007, 202 and cf. 37.
1161 Cf. Russell-Brown (1992), Russell-Brown sees Hamlet's wordplay a representative for the nature of his mind.
1162 For the impact of *Rudens* on *The Tempest*, offering principles of a humanist, Riehle (1990), 267: for Riehle, it is "a starting point" for further elaboration.
On finding New Comedy's elements (quest of the self; intrigue; Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo as alazons; demanding resolution in *anagnorisis*) in *The Tempest*, note Miola (1994), 155-59.
1163 Cf. Miola (1994), 159-62.
1164 Cf. e.g. *Temp*. 4.1.255-57 (when Trinculo, Stephano and Caliban are hunted by dogs and hounds [actually spirits]).
1165 See e.g. *Temp*. 3.3.19ff.
1166 Cf. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan (eds.), London: Arden Shakespeare, ²2006, 26. Prospero has "one of the lengthiest expositions in all Shakespearean drama".
1167 Cf. Vaughan and Vaughan (²2006), 6.
1168 Cf. Lester E. Barber, '*The Tempest* and New Comedy', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 21.3 (1970): 207-211.

well as the concepts of freedom, legitimation, civilization, and colonialism[1169], ending in the restoration of order and uplifting the enchantment when Prospero leaves his supernatural powers behind; his magic cannot persist without his utopian kingdom. Prospero's license as a trickster ends while his immunity is intact when he has succeeded and turns from the invisible magician eavesdropping and spying on his victims to a legitimate duke of the 'real' world. Until the end of the play, his roles are comparable to those of the clever slave, the manipulating *poeta*, when he acts as a ruler on his island, a separate world, and a figure that does not care about authority but makes the others stand in a subordinate position to him in conformity to his principles and plan; he constructs the course of the play and takes charge over the setting, his island, or he comments and reflects on the thematic complex of the play, permanently monitoring the plot and the figures.[1170] In contrast to the Plautine type, Prospero advances to a non-farcical aristocratic, imperialistic, highly-educated magus.

Masterminds in tragedy—they are often motivated by the urge of revenge and the longings for power, taking or at least trying to take control of events and sharing their superior position as well as their perspicacity with the audience. Such characters as Edmund or Prospero do not offer deliberate or non-deliberate folly a spectator could sympathize with but they concentrate on a spectacle of deception often triggering compulsion towards their actions. Such a deceptive villain is *Othello's* Iago reminding of Edmund's quality as a dark intriguer taking delight in machinations.[1171] Like Chrysalus in *Bacchides*, his great gift for persuading others — as it can be expected from an *architectus* — allows him to trick those that are superior to him, which helps him to keep up the illusion for his victims as he keeps up Roderigo's hopes that Desdemona will soon be his wife.[1172] The helpless Roderigo seems to be as dependent on Iago's guidance and planning as a young Mnesilochus in *Bacchides*.[1173] The lover's *architectus* commands him off stage, repeatedly underlining the key role of money in their plan. If Roderigo really wants Desdemona, he must invest more and "put money in [his] purse" – a refrain Iago repeats in slight variations but in a commanding tone (cf. *Oth*. 1.3.340, 346-7, 348, 353, 355, 359, 365, 372, 381).[1174] The importance of money reminds of how New Comedy designs romantic love as a kind of bargain, wherein women are alluded to as *praeda* and usually a slave takes care of the money transfer. For Iago though, Roderigo's money is only a secondary means to an end.

In his numerous soliloquies, Iago reveals his foul game to the audience, scheming in front of them as Plautus' Palaestrio does, and concludes his planning with an exclamation,

---

1169 Cf. Vaughan and Vaughan (²2006), 98-108 and 331-42. And note *Id.*, *Shakespeare's Caliban. A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

1170 Cf. *Ibid.*, 123. Prospero's character is associated with that of a philosopher, who was depicted in his library in some productions.

1171 Note Riehle (1990), 25-6 and esp. 235: He strongly suggests Iago's parallels to the Plautine architect predominating the parallels to the Vice figure. And *Id.*, 'Shakespeare's Reception of Plautus Reconsidered', *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Charles Martindale (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 109-21, esp. 113. And note William Shakespeare, *Othello*, Ernst A. J. Honigmann (ed.), London et al.: Thomson Learning, ²2006, 32-33. Honigmann lists the clever slave as one definite model for the clever slave.

1172 Benjamin V. Beier, 'The Art of Persuasion and Shakespeare's Two Iagos', *Studies in Philology* 111.1 (2014): 34-64, 61. He compares him to a sophist, which is highly skilled in persuasion, while his power of persuasion is compared to a disease or pestilence as he uses rhetoric and the art of persuasion destructively (And cf. 41, esp. ft. 17; e.g. *Oth*. 4.1.45).

1173 Note Iago's sequences of imperatives when he speaks to Roderigo; he is his 'commander', e.g. *Oth*. 1.1.67-72.

1174 From the start, the audience can witness how Iago abuses Roderigo and his wealth for his intentions. Cf. *Oth*. 1.1.ff., here compare Sir Toby's milking of Sir Andrew (*TN* 2.3.186), cf. Honigmann (²2006), 77. All further citations of the play will be given from this edition.

which echoes the enthusiastic and determined style of the clever slave: "I have't, it is engendered!" (*Oth*. 1.3.402).[1175] As a "direct descendant of the intriguing slave of classical comedy"[1176], the improvising schemer dominates the audience's experience, ensuring his success of destroying the man, the husband, and the soldier Othello, which reminds of the clever slave's anti-heroic boasting (cf. *Oth*. 2.1.284-310). As Palaestrio, Iago controls Othello's access to information since he gets him to listen to an arranged conversation (cf. *Oth*. 4.1.76ff.).[1177]

Fitting an intriguer's façade, he pretends to be undoubtedly loyal to Othello, to whom he seems to be the only true friend.[1178] Othello should even "thank [his envy enemy], love [him] and reward [him]" for such integrity (*Oth*. 2.1.306).[1179] The villain depicts himself as a friend with strong moral principles, who "is an honest man" (*Oth*. 2.3.262), weakening the validity of sincerity, trust, love, kindness, and honesty in the tragic context, especially every time he uses these terms (e.g. *Oth*. 2.3.322-3). Shakespeare thematizes Iago's duplicity in Othello's assumptions about his friend, which bear a certain dramatic irony as Iago is "of exceeding honesty and knows all qualities, with a learned spirit" (Othello about Iago, *Oth*. 3.3.263-64). The ambivalence here underlines the villain's successful illusions about his true persona as well as Othello's naivety and blindness. While the clever slaves, wily servants, foolish knaves or clowns usually show true loyalty to their (young) masters, the tricksters' characters in tragedy as Edmund or Iago are imbued with self-love and driven by cold-blooded practicality. In his false morality, Iago states that "we cannot all be masters, nor all masters cannot be truly followed" (*Oth*. 1.1.42-43).

He provokes his dialogue partner with insinuations and veiled allusions to inchastity or generally, immorality like he challenges Desdemona with a sequence of wordplays, which she debunks as "old fond paradoxes to make fools laugh in ale houses" (*Oth*. 2.1.138-39).[1180] Presenting himself superior to the others, he defines those around him, delivering stereotypical descriptions and seeing himself as a critic on stage, which comes close to Thersites as they both invest in provocation by reflecting on and constituting a disruptive world. Iago might be seen as "the chief humorist" of the play but his style of humour is dominated by his interest in causing pain as well as humiliation and in exposing the others as his victims and too gullible figures: "I think you think I love you" (Iago to Cassio, *Oth*. 2.3.306).[1181] In contrast to a deliberate fool from comedy, his actions and his words have a devouring and harmful impact.[1182] Destroying friendship, trust, and love around him, Iago sets doubts in Othello's mind through his manipulations resembling the clever slave's *turbae*. Such

---

1175 Cf. Honigmann (²2006), 75. e.g. *Oth*. 1.3.381-403, one of Iago's soliloquies, where the audience witnesses Iago's talent of improvisation. Also note Iago keeping control of timing and dominance over Roderigo, e.g. *Oth*. 2.3.365: "How poor are they that have not patience!".

1176 *Ibid.,*75.

1177 Cf. *Ibid.*, 77. Honigmann compares this passage to Plautus' *Miles gloriousus* (1210ff.).

1178 Cf. e.g. Iago's soliloquy in 3.6., where he tells the audience about his plan of hiding Desdemona's handkerchief in Cassio's room.

1179 Iago completes his sequence of imperatives with: "for making him egregiously an ass, and practising upon his peace and quiet even to madness" (*Oth*. 2.1.307-09).

1180 Cf. *Oth*. 1.3.320-33 ("our bodies are gardens"). Here, Iago demonstrates his mocking perspective on man.

1181 Honigmann (²2006), 39. As Falstaff, Lear, Hamlet, Cleopatra, or Viola, Iago has his distinct kind of humour marking him off from other intriguers. Iago's sadistic humour reminds of how Richard III and Aaron comment on their actions (e.g. *Oth*. 4.1.45-47, Iago compares his deceit to medicine.).

Another very minor figure infusing comic elements is the clown at 3.4., entertaining by a sequence of quibbles though the role is not valued for its entertainment. Productions have often deleted the role from the cast. Cf. Laurie Maguire, *Othello: Language and Writing*, London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014, 134-35.

1182 Iago defines himself as censorious (cf. *Oth*. 2.1.119).

an *architectus* claims to see through the charade of others, abusing his victims' blindness and orchestrating the figures and objects on stage as a *poeta* of downfall like a diametrical opposite of Chrysalus, the architect of the young lovers' union.[1183] Under Iago's spell, Othello even listens to the malign sophist when it comes to the question of how Desdemona should be killed (cf. *Oth*. 4.1.204-207).[1184] The director's overall influence manifests itself in Iago's ensurance of his success and his predictions of how the others act according to his plan.

The clever slave's *turbae* end in the discovery of his knavery and in the confrontation with his victim(s), but surprisingly, without any prompt punishment. Though the carnivalesque universe does not exist in tragedy, Iago's punishment is not shown but merely promised as Iago, the cunning "slave" (*Oth*. 5.2.330), must be tortured by "cunning cruelty" (*Oth*. 5.2.331).[1185] Even during the revelation of his villainy, the "semi-devil" (*Oth*. 5.2.298) cannot be hindered to stab his wife. Iago leaves the stage alive despite so many lives he ruined. He is allowed to play a diabolic persona of a *deus ex machina*, who enjoys his godlike superiority over the others. In his final words on stage, he refuses to discover his motives and to help Othello understand "why he has thus ensnared [his] soul and body" (*Oth*. 5.2.299); he rather states gloatingly that Othello simply "know[s] what [he] know[s]" (*Oth*. 5.2.300). By the ill thoughts or 'truth' he has planted in Othello's mind Iago can watch Othello's suicide as his last and ultimate success on stage.

On the destructive path, the evil mastermind steadily follows his stratagem of unscrupulousness, shocking the audience with cruelty and mercilessness; such figures do not create moments of surprise by shifting between sense and nonsense. In that regard, they do not show the ability of self-ridiculing, which does not exculpate them in such a way as the hilarious lines of self-love or excessive pride do when the clever slave takes the heroic anti-hero's ironic perspective on his figure, his class, and the farcical play he takes part in. The form of exculpation is comparable to that of the naive, light-hearted clowns. The evil architect or Machiavellian director is dominated by fatal powers like envy and revenge and is not supported by the usually altruistic agenda of comic, recognition, love, and marriage.

The painless tricking of comedy usually ending in the promised union of the lovers becomes a destructive villainy in revenge tragedies that looks for unscrupulousness *par exellence*. *Titus Andronicus* offers one of the most violent trickery by Aaron, a model for Iago and Tamora's scheming "slave" (*Tit*. 5.1.44)[1186], who seeks his opportunity to "shine in pearl and gold" alongside his mistress (*Tit*. 2.1.19), foreshadowing the villainy to come.[1187] Instead

---

1183 Cf. Beier (2014), 47. On the motif of blindness in the play.

1184 Cf. *Ibid.*, 45.

1185 Cf. *Oth*. 5.2.271-76. And cf. Beier (2014), 46.

1186 All further citations of this play will be given from William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, Alan Hughes (ed.), Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Note Pollard, *Greek Women*, (2017), 53: She underlines the frequency of the word 'slave' as a reference to Aaron and his son (*Tit*. 4.2.122, 4.2.177; 5.1.27; 5.1.44; 5.3.14). Using such references could hint at the transformation of the Plautine clever slave, adding up to the parallel features Aaron shows.

1187 Lorna Hutson, *The Invention of Suspicion. Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama*, Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2007, 47. "Titus Andronicus […] generates a civic revenge plot by transforming forensic tactics of Roman New Comedy's amorous youths and wily slaves into the criminal methods of Aaron and Tamora, playing on the transformation by way of jokes on the spatial and rhetorical senses of 'plot' as preparation against legal detection." She does not explicitly refer to Plautus here but to well-known Plautine material: the pairing of wily servants and adolescents wanting for help and instructions, and the poetic strategies coping with the question of probability as well as the self-referential creation of illusion.
Cf. Honigmann (²2006), 32-33. Apart from Aaron, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, joins the group of evil trickster models for Iago.

of the clever and loyal slave in comedy, who only temporarily leaves his status as a slave, Aaron wants to break his 'chains' of servitude, becoming an usurper.[1188]

Aaron's plotting is responsible for the bloody doom of so many characters as he plans the rape of Lavinia, encouraging Demetrius and Chiron to "strike her home by force if not by words" (*Tit*. 2.2.118), and leads Martius and Quintus into a trap by creating a wholly different crime scene. By tricking ears and eyes, he reinvents what has been done to a new experience of illusion; as the clever slave is committed to the young lovers, Aaron becomes the agent of revenge for Tamora and his own ascension; for the audience, he is a dramatist of deception. In asides and soliloquies, he ensures them about "a very excellent piece of villainy" (*Tit*. 2.3.7), commanding the others to succeed in "this fatal-plotted" […] "day of doom" (*Tit*. 2.3.47 and 42), commenting on his deceit (cf. *Tit*. 3.1.187-90, cutting off Titus' hand) as well as the plot's development (cf. *Tit*. 4.2.149ff.) and characterizing himself as the brutal anti-hero (cf. *Tit*. 3.1.201-4).[1189]

It is the quasi-omniscient schemer that deciphers young Lucius' message, recognizing threat and conceit (cf. *Tit*. 4.2.24ff.), and that persuades Demetrius and Chiron not to kill his son but brings them to sit down and to "subscribe to [his] advice" (*Tit*. 4.2.130). Aaron, the "chief architect and plotter of these woes" (*Tit*. 5.3.121), sends people off and on stage, has objects and a corpse moved, changes settings, decides who lives and who dies, and is "their tutor to instruct them" (*Tit*. 5.1.98). In his brutally honest 'confession' to Lucius, he calls his "abominable deeds" (*Tit*. 5.1.64) "[a] sport" (*Tit*. 5.1.118) causing "extreme laughter" (*Tit*. 5.1.113). Comedy's intrigue often paraphrased as bets, jests or sports to entertain is transformed to horrifying "complots of mischief, treason, villainies" (*Tit*. 5.1.65), the "incarnate devil" (*Tit*. 5.1.40) himself composed heinously.[1190] As an extremely dark version of the trickster, who is pitiless, he affirms that he would perform evils "[t]en thousand worse than ever yet [he] did." (*Tit*. 5.3.186). With aggressive bravado and taking pride in his abundance of violence, Aaron's figure is a construction set in the context of an aesthetics of vengeance.[1191]

Unlike Plautine slaves but fitting to the villain of revenge drama, the clever servant seems to be fearless about detection and does not have doubts about his scheming talents, though he neglects to perform his planning in front of the audience. Aaron focuses on the scheme's realisation, the details of its violence, and the success of vengeance, foregrounding the stratagem of ruthlessness against the victims, while he recognizes "Revenge['s]" (*Tit*. 5.2.3) vicious circle of violence they all take part in.[1192] Still, Aaron does not represent a *poeta*

For an overview of *Titus Andronicus* and Lavinia's fate echoing the fate of Philomela in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see Mas'udi, et al., 'Titus Andronicus', *Shakespeare and the Folktale: An Anthology of Stories*, Charlotte Artese (ed.), Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2019, 82-129.

Ovidian presence is significantly palpable in Lavinia's fate and – physically – in her reference to the *Metamorphoses* and use of the book as a written testimony or literary 'documentation' of her rape. Cf. Jonas Göhler, 'Erotik des Schreckens: Procne und Philomela', *Ovid-Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, Melanie Möller (ed.), Berlin: J.B. Metzler, 2021, 440-442, esp. 441.

1188 Cf. *Tit*. 2.1.1ff. esp. 18-21.

1189 In asides, a typical instrument to announce acts of deception, Tamora and Titus assure the audience of their different strings of intrigue (cf. *Tit*. 5.2.132ff.)

1190 *Tit*. 5.3.11, Aaron: "Some devil whisper curses in my ear".

1191 Cf. Ingo Gildenhard and Andrew Zissos, 'Barbarian variations. Tereus, Procne and Philomela in Ovid (*Met*. 6.412–674) and Beyond', *Dictynna* 4 (2007): 1–21, esp. 4 and 10ff.; see Göhler (2021), 440. An aesthetics of vengeance as one of the major features of the Ovidian tale, especially crucial for the tale's reception. For Gildenhard and Zissos, the reception of the Ovidian bloody Tereus myth could be seen – at least – as an essential impulse in the history of performing "human atrocities" on stage (3).

1192 Cf. *Tit*. 5.1.58, Aaron: "I'll speak no more but 'Vengeance rot you all!'".

like Pseudolus, whose remarks are a rich source for meta-theatrical references.[1193] The architect is rather replaceable; with Aaron's absence and imprisonment, it is Tamora's turn to find "some cunning practise" (*Tit*. 5.2.77), to summarize the plan for the audience, and to subscribe herself to another role, the goddess "Revenge" (*Tit*. 5.2.3). After detection, both intriguers are neither spared nor do they try to make excuses to avoid punishment. The vicious circle of violence devours the very villains that started and fuelled it by their aggressiveness.

While comedy's schema offers the utopian absence of morality and mortality that is needed to save the witty altruistic slave from punishment, Aaron and parallelly-constructed dark intriguers destroy others and are doomed by their denial of integrity and the aggressive demonstration of mortality. Comedy's clever slave profits from the temporary absence of morality and mortality;[1194] in tragedy, figures face or make use of the depressing and destructive power of false, misled or misinterpreted moral principles and the inevitable mortal fate. The callous trickster just declares an all-license for himself. As the clever slave in comedy foregrounds his harmlessness by his ironically-light boasting of heroic machinations, as repeatedly and intensively Aaron constructs his image of an evil heroic anti-hero: designing Aaron and Tamora's stratagems as heinious 'pranks', comparing their agenda of sociopathically-dark laughter to the enthusiastic and joyful jests in comedy, and associating the slave and his mistress with Aeneas and Dido, 'raping' epic excellency (cf. *Tit*. 2.3.43). Comparing Aaron to Aeneas, Shakespeare's Moor becomes a brutalized and savage exploration of the Ovidian lover, entailing the violent power of erotic desire.[1195]

The dark calculating architects of tragedy, Edmund, Iago, and Aaron, imposing threat, fear, and brutality upon their victims do not subscribe to the pattern paradox of the scheming deliberate fool figure integrated in comedy's texture and its network of paradoxical scripts that are steadily constructed and dissolved in the course of *ridiculum*. They cannot be interested in any harmless process of resolution but in seizing power and darkening the universe they operate in. Playful boasting and comic hyperboles of heroism change to ruthless desires for power and destructive demonstration of superiority. Their configurations overlap in poetic strategies of persuasion, pretence, irritation, successful manipulations, and machinations, serving his aims and boosting the architect's ego but with diametrically opposed outcomes: in tragedy, they cause mayem, in comedy, *turbae* while regardless of genre, both satisfy an audience's zest for (temporary) chaos and melodramatic exuberance.

In this subchapter, Plautus' type of the clever slave has been traced in dark intriguers, architects as well as playful or polemic commentators. What they all have in common is their power over how others are affected. The type of the schemer and *poeta* exerts major influence on those around him or her, making them dependent on his or her activities in how they see things, move, think, and act. They steer the storyline, (re)inventing characters and plot (fragments), irritating the given and known, contributing to world-making and simultaneously, challenging it. This power over the others is not only true for the figures on stage but also for those sitting or standing out front. It is the experience of the play, on which the *poeta*, the commentator, and focalizer have influence. While the intriguers, heroines, and

---

1193 Compare *Tit*. 5.1.66: "ruthful to hear, yet piteously performed."
1194 Cf. Hardin (2018), 138 ft. 60.
1195 Cf. Lisa S. Starks-Estes, *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Plays. Transforming Ovid*, Basingstoke et al.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, esp. 84-86, 87ff. Shakespeare's Aaron is an intensified construction of Marlowe's Aeneas, whose portray is indepted to the figure's multiple classical and medieval sources and faces: Marlowe's Aeneas follows "a counter-Virgilian, pro-Ovidian, and pro-native medieval tradition" (85).
Aaron can here be read as a Sarcastic version of the Virgilian Aeneas.

tricksters in Plautus and Shakespeare's universes are in major control of the action, figures, and objects and how they are presented or dramatized, the wise fool mainly guides the other's experience of what happens on stage, discerning the play's meaning(s) acutely.

This power or control correlates with the figures' special status on stage and competence the comic shape-shifter, the darker intriguer, and the wise fool share: the awareness of the plot and plotting, of playing, the stage, the audience, and themselves; and thereby they promote a dominant feature of Plautine comedy and Shakespearean drama: metatheatre.[1196] The dramatic world points towards itself and its process of becoming by game-playing, improvisation or every kind of performance watched by an onstage audience, soliloquy performed as a dialogue, or dissections of reality and illusions in tripartite constellations such as actor/figure/*poeta*. Apart from the sociopolitical status, the type of the deliberate fool can be seen as the artificial and aesthetically effective combination of a poet's perspective, his strategies, and a metatheatrically-positioned figure since they both negotiate between an inner world realized on stage, the dimension of intertextuality, and the awareness of the 'real' world, while they overlap in their external status sometimes developed thematically to the role of the outcast.

Beyond prologues and epilogues and via figures operating close to the edge of stage, applying elements of *ludens*, and referring to their tool 'imagination', Shakespeare and Plautus open up the dramatic illusion of a seemingly closed world, making its concept, its realization, its subtexts, the generic idiosyncrasies, and the generic boundaries palpable, which displays moments of *anagnorisis* in terms of being self-referential and self-critical. Their theatre gains another dimension and thus, experience for the spectator, offering some interaction between stage and audience and addressing the elements of performance as well as fiction as a work in progress. Challenged and disordered by self-aware figures as the deliberate fool, illusion switches between its intactness and its ephemeral elusiveness.

Besides metatheatre as an instrument to visualize the process of crafting a (comic) play and to explore the parametres of theatrical universe, the focus can shift to the world's quality of being a stage of its own, on which mankind acts. By the reflection of playing roles, how they are (inter)changable and manipulating the course of others, the poet, the clever slave or trickster figure gain freedom to (trans)form the world around him or her as he or she can read, analyse and (re)write already-given scripts. Truth and reality are revealed as flexible tokens bound to the transformatory quality of scripts as they can be rewritten. As a consequence, the playwright is replaced by the (seemingly) autonomous individual.

For the spectator, Plautus and Shakespeare's metatheatrical moments are a source of variety, even diversion, and jokes; they could stress certain elements of performing art such as visual effects: cross-dressing, wearing masks (hypothetically on the Roman stage), props and costumes.[1197] As a whole, metatheatrical references reveal the spectator the microcosmos of theatre. The term 'education' ranges too far. The actor/figure/*poeta* becomes more of an infographic, of which the audience can form his or her images of the multiple

---

[1196] On metatheatre, different approaches, and its categories, see Richard Hornby, *Drama, Metadrama, and Perception*, London/Toronto: Associated University Press, 1986, 31ff. and see Bill Angus*, Metadrama and the Informer in Shakespeare and Jonson*, Edingburgh: Edingburgh University Press, 2016, 20 and ff., esp. ft. 145. And cf. Slater (²2000), 10. He defines metatheatre as "theatre that demonstrates an awareness of its own theatricality."
Note Isabella Tardin Cardoso, 'Actors and Audience', *A Companion to Plautus*, George Fredric Franko and Dorota Dutsch (eds.), Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020, 61-75. Isabella Tardin Cardoso gives a valuable analysis of metapoetic references in Plautus' plays, especially considering plays-within-the-play.
[1197] Cf. Cardoso (2020), 66. And note Bungard (2020), 237-249, esp. 237-38 and 246-7.

dramatic 'illusion' in mind, draws parallels between reality and a dramatized one, and gets an idea of the Plautine and Shakespearean theatre and of the playwright-persona. Reading the playtext, metatheatrical references become reminders of the construction process, its purpose, and realization in the performing arts. For the playwright, applying metatheatre can be assumed as a sort of strategy for self-definition and self-marketing as how the playwright in combination with the cast of actors positions himself in the contemporary understanding of theatrical spectacle and art.

V.i. Conclusion: How Plautine are Shakespeare's fools?

In all plays crucially examined here, tricksters, cunning figures, and wise fools provide a coherent and balanced web of organic and inorganic elements. Plautus offers the clever slave, a hybrid of trickster and deliberate fool. In Shakespeare's comedies, it is usually a complex that meets the demands for an aesthetically effective comic discourse and the representation of love and courtship. The Elizabethan playwright uses a symmetrical pair that gives access to the sublevel of the comic discourse by (de)stabilizing the stage's illusion as they illuminate masks: a female trickster or the heroine and the professional fool. Shakespeare's heroines and professional fools convey clusters of scripts ordered in a dialectic structure as it is the case for the unreliability of language that is exemplified in oaths and promises constructing truths that turn into the incongruous pairs of words against matter, truth or reality against illusion.

From *The Shrew* to *As You Like It*, from Touchstone to *King Lear's* Fool, Shakespeare shows great ambition to give popular and functional devices idiosyncrasy and embed them into the play's context and genre as he does with the use and transformation of Plautus' type becoming diffused in Elizabethan instantiations. With Touchstone and Rosalind, Shakespeare intensifies the romanticization of comedy while he keeps New Comedic elements in the tricking heroine and the witty servant playing the fool by splitting and doubling the characteristics of the clever slave and mixing native tradition in. The romantic comedy *Twelfth Night* has two similarly constructed pairs of a clever young woman in disguise and the professional fool. In *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*, Shakespeare puts his unrestricted clever corrupter and polished professional fool in comedy not "in the prosaic urban setting of the Plautine tradition, with its obsessive concern with money and commerce" but in a more magical, even pastoral utopia that allows private encounters and marvelling transformations from *virgo* to a boy to a bride.[1198]

When romanticization has reached its climax, and with the rise of Mephistophelian spirits against values and the golden world, professional fools inhabit the stages of tragedy and problem plays. Thersites and the Fool join the group of professional fools while they display the tragic and darker counterparts to their comic colleagues. The Homeric figure highlights shame in his operations with the laughable, drifting into hostile humour. The king's jester, the Fool, remains one of the most perspicuous, loyal, and sane figures at court under his professional veil of folly. Tracing their concept to one pattern reveals a structure of paradox, which aligns them to all former instantiations that draw upon that pattern as the Plautine prototype does quite popularly.

Up to that point in his career, Shakespeare created a theatrical platform of individuality, identification, self-fashioning, and entertainment. That course is inconceivable without any knowledge of classical material since Shakespeare's first comedies show his deep knowledge of Plautus' and New Comedy's elements, which Shakespeare modifies for the Elizabethan taste. Furthermore, his use of and familiarity with Italian drama does not negate the presence of Plautine material in his plays since Italian comedies are vehicles of New Comedy elements and consequently, also Plautine concepts. In his modelling of English drama, Shakespeare deals with New Comedic and Italian romance structures, while he infuses concepts as the court fool or the female-male deceivers in cross-dressing habit. In comedy, Shakespeare's transformations embrace Tranio as the clever slave by name and function as well as Rosalind and Touchstone as the witty heroine and the professional fool, a *servus*

1198 William C. Carroll, *The Metamorphoses of Shakespearean Comedy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985, 64.

ludens, a philosophizing commentator, and a mock suitor. Such terms also apply to Feste, who accompanies Maria, a female *architectus,* and the other competitors in her intrigue, while he moves alongside Viola's wit. Shakespeare appreciates the functionality of a professional fool, harmonizing it to comic and tragic worlds alike. In dependence of the world the figure acts in, this type infuses conflicts, challenges, threats, puzzles, and/or verbal dances, identifying his or her victims or opponents.

The closeness of the heroine or other tricksters towards Plautus' *servus callidus* has been noticed before but the challenge to analyse the symmetry between the heroine and the professional fool and to test their functional parallel has not been taken on. It has been shown that the professional fool's concept relates to Plautus' clever slave, the prototype of the professional fool, since both concepts rely on the paradox pattern and echo many functional constituents. Shakespeare splits the functionality for the plot and comedy's schema, giving it to two figures in different proportions. While a mixture of organic and inorganic scenes is distributed to the heroine and intriguer, the fool figure gains a certain monopole of inorganic parts, the rich source of *ridiculum*. In other words, splitting means doubling New Comedy's features and blending them with contemporary and native elements, which multiplies the presence of figures supporting comedy's schema. Shakespeare installs a leading figure who manages exits and entrances, speaking parts, dramatic performance on stage, whereas the fool usually does not interfere with the dynamics of plot; Shakespeare deprives the wise fool or the male servant figure of the *architectus* status and the centre of scheming but allows him the power over words (re)arranging them freely, newly, and facetiously. The Shakespearean type does not control the main plot but manages the illumination of the sublevel of the discourse. Normally without any agenda of deception, the fool concentrates on the continuation of comic discourse he enriches with his juxtaposition of reason and folly. The leading deceptive female figure focuses on advancing the plot, while she does not neglect her comic verve and need not restrain her wit.

Besides their difference of how they are embedded in the plot, both resemble the *servus callidus* in the type's functional features, but in different proportions. Rosalind, Celia, Viola, and Maria dominate by their insight and advantage in knowledge of what wearing masks signify, how to deceive others about their real identity and intention. Their allies or merrymakers Touchstone and Feste move through the comic playgrounds omnisciently. Mostly decentralized from the plot, the deliberate fools promote their consciousness over the play and its essences. Hence, they share an awareness of the play-within-the-play, the subject of theatrical illusion, making it useful for their dominance or their participation in courtship. All of them demonstrate closed and/or open forms of miscommunication, manipulating their dialogue partner, illuminating illusionary frames, and providing the audience with moments of *ridiculum*. They all know the artificiality of language and abuse it in the forms of miscommunication and by the method of coding, interjecting nonsense into sense or sense into nonsense, whereby they perfectly match comedy's perspective on life since morals, standards, and golden rules of life become objects of species of the ugly. With their 'omniscience', the heroine and the wise fool stand in analogy to the clever slave's status of a focalizer and commentator. How motley and polyvalent the fool appears as unpredictable and twistable the clever trickster likes and needs to be. They are not natural fools but players, performers, and constructors using deceit, taking an upside-down perspective, applying folly, and relying on their license. Herein, their wit is one of their most effective weapons.

Out of the functional constituents, Shakespeare forms the manifestations on a certain hidden Plautine basis. Plautus' *servi callidi* are functionally comparable as the analysis of five

clever slaves has evinced, whereas their collection of single instantiation shines as a kaleidoscope, where the distinct figure tends to highlight one identity more clearly than another or raises one aspect to new intensity. Chrysalus and Pseudolus excel in their mock-heroic voice, whereas Palaestrio shines as the patent *architectus*. Analogically, Shakespeare draws his fool figures experimenting with the set concept and intensifying certain characteristics so that they perfectly match the play, deviating from a previous manifestation of the concept. Touchstone woos in a carnivalesque style and without neglecting the laughable and finally, marries; Feste engages in an intrigue, mocking the blocking character, while he entertains with musical comments; Thersites darkens and gets a polemical mouth devouring utopian ideals; Lear's Fool retains a sound and sharp mind, carrying a metaphorical or even literal mirror for the others' folly.[1199]

Plautus' agonistic challenge, deceitfulness, facetiousness, and farce change to the aesthetical design of wit, satirizing human nature. While Plautus' clever slaves exhibit a paradox between their agenda of tricking and their escapades of folly as it happens in bets, warnings, contradictory turns risking to torpedo their scheme and success, Shakespeare's wise fool focuses on the paradoxical construct of wisdom and folly in the discourse, explaining the play's key clusters. In conversation or verbal duels, the professional fools love to play with contradictions and means of *para prosdokian*, which makes the agonistic spirit in comedy persist in the encounters of deliberate fools and their opponents or dialogue partners. Both subscribe to a carnivalesque structure visualized in turning convention upside-down, ridiculing their social superiors, and playing topsy-turvy games with reality. The deliberate fools as cosmological corrupters meander between truth and lie, inserting deliberate defects and illuminating error. Their shared functionality can be deduced from the same pattern, which has been realized in processes of metamorphosis diachronically.

Many factors are involved in such a metamorphosis. Among Shakespeare's variety of fools, deliberate and natural, the professional fool does not rely exclusively on the native tradition of court fools, on clowns from the *commedia dell'arte* nor on Plautus' clever slave: it is a conglomerate where the tradition of the deliberate fool figure and the compass of embodied folly unfold. As one part of this conglomerate, his knowledge of the *servus callidus*, a reflective, comically eloquent, and sovereign figure, shapes his understanding for its functionality and contributes to the formations of his own type 'the wise fool'. Appreciating the value of the paradox pattern and of a flexible type, Shakespeare draws upon the self-conscious type's aesthetically effective construction but sets it in different thematic configurations when he embeds the type in the socio-cultural environment and the structure of romantic comedies.[1200] For his professional fools, he gains a combination out of subtypes primarily including the Vice, the court jester, the prototypical fool in the clever slave. As in *The Shrew*, he organizes comic drivers, masters in wit, and constructors of the discourse in a symmetrical structure as he aligns tricksters, the clever playful servants, comedy's heroes/heroines, and mock heroes. Petruccio parallels Tranio as Touchstone matches up to Rosalind, while Feste corresponds to Viola and is bound to Maria. The cheeky and cunning New Comedic figure embodying the tripartite issue of *ludus/ludere* is set in romantic comedy in the Elizabethan age, dispersed and split in hero(ine) and fool. In abstract terms, the New Comedic heritage is a complex that offers single patterns, stock types, functional constituents and other elements. Plautus' prototype of the deliberate fool figure evoking parallels to the

---

1199 Cf. Shickman (1991), 76ff.
1200 Note Miola (2018), 53. This process of transformation includes deleting "the moral and dramatic dissonances."

qualities of the eiron and the bomolochos finds its metamorphosed version of the English Renaissance in the wise fool offering the same functionality and support of the three principles.

Shakespeare's major techniques how to recreate the available literary landscape or how to deal with the inherited material are modification, blending, and multiplication; for example when Shakespeare changes, reinforces, or reduces figural characteristics, mixes generic elements, and duplicates stereotypes, creating symmetrical pairs. In *AYL*, the perspicuous, witty figure is multiplied in the heroine and the fool, while the *servus callidus* especially in his understanding of *ludens* is blended with the Elizabethan jester and court fool. The bomolochian feature of these subtypes is enhanced, whereas the agenda of deception becomes reduced. The clever slaves and *The Shrew's* Tranio can be sure of the Saturnalian frame protecting the clever intriguer that works for the lovers and the happy ending. Instead, Shakespeare's wise performer of folly can take advantage of the same invisible frame, while he can rely on his official title and a license that is made explicit. Therefore, they can fully exploit theatre's range of teasing, creativity outside convention, and playing, which becomes extraordinarily seminal in their violation and distortion of verbal standards, their abuse of language, and their ostentatious *loquacitas*. The choice of themes, names, proverbs, and other cultural material they make fun of or use in their verbal games depends on their synchronic scope. Analogically, the several identities and specific oppositional clusters of scripts are modified and chosen in regard to the socio-cultural context.

Besides the themes and concerning the macro-level, they dominantly move in the areas of actual vs. non-actual, impossible vs. possible, and normal vs. abnormal, whereby they achieve their ability to be skin-changer, magician, *architectus*, *servus ludens*, poeta, comic performer, constructor of the laughable, and ruling slave or servant, or knowing fool. In Shakespeare's utopia of romance, mock-heroic and agon between master and servant change and expand to an agon between 'wise' men and 'foolish' servants including flouting rules and triumphing over man's too quick, arrogant assumption to know the world. Conventionally given and assumed superiority is undermined by men's own shortcomings. Sometimes they think that they are too wise to be deceived; sometimes it is only the appeal of a challenge to prove the impossible. The type's use of inversion is part of his programme that grants the audience access to comedy's sublevel. In comparison to Plautus' active leader, Shakespeare enhances the fool's status as outsider when he focuses on the fool as commentator and on the visualization of the play's oppositional clusters of scripts. Shakespeare takes the paradox pattern and its constituents and makes it fruitful for his comedies, for their themes of love and gender, of identity and consciousness, to install a sceptical voice utilizing a Lucianic mode and to serve spectacle and refinement while he multiplies and masks it individually.[1201] Shaping the fool and lower-class members naturally linked to the obscene here to the advanced, self-conscious, witty, critical, and satirizing voice in the comedies also images Renaissance's tendency to raise the ugly to new self-confidence and philosophizing heights as Erasmus' *The Praise of Folly* evinces.[1202] In its style of coding, unpredictability, and playfulness, the deliberate fool figure belongs to the array of irrationality, whereas for its omniscience and his meditations of the play's themes, it can be awared the most rational figure on stage. Such a diametrically-different construction of the type predestinated to mediate paradoxes like the

---

1201 Apart from the paradox pattern and Shakespeare's professional fool figures, particularly in his later comedies and tragedies, Shakespeare's protagonist and his structure evolve around "distinctive feature of the mature comedies and histories-the presence of a central character whose consciousness takes in the central problems of his or her play." (Berry [1980], 43).
1202 Cf. Eco (2007), 145-46.

oppositional scripts of the possible and impossible hints to the ambivalence of theatre's reality and the illusion of reality.

The chapters on Plautus and Shakespeare's deliberate fool figures and tricksters have shown that the functionality of the prototypical fool in Plautus' comedies can be retraced in Shakespeare's wise fool. The processes of metamorphosis and the strands of reception play a dominant role in the realisation of the professional fool but they are still not the only influences since a playwright also works with external factors such as the composition of the cast, the availability of great comic actors as Will Kempe and Robert Armin, the urge to satisfy the audience's taste, and their constellation of all classes. There can only be speculations of how much creative input stems from Robert Armin and his talents as singer, dancer, and ventriloquist, playing Feste and Sir Topas.[1203] Every detail of each professional fool's origination and constitution cannot be discussed in isolation; this analysis has focused on a concept that is aware of but excludes single and mainly external circumstances but sets on availability and productivity. In sum, how closely and how individually Shakespeare constructs the wise fool in dependence on the indirect and direct reception of New Comedy underlies a huge range of single factors taking part in the final manifestations of the particularly clever servants and wise fools. Determinants can be found in the alteration and significance of courtship, the enhancement of romance elements, and other single variables in the socio-cultural context of Shakespeare's time, a vast net of (potential) influences such as concepts of the court fool, a strong woman on the English throne, rising popularity of public theatre, its themes of cross-dressing, and pragmatic circumstances as the cast playing the personae.

Coping with this vast net of (potential) influences, Shakespeare's oeuvre is a source of "multiple styles, so he had multiple masters."[1204] In his book *How the Classics made Shakespeare*, Bate shows that Shakespeare educated in the classics did not obey doctrines and generic rules too strictly but that his universe of imagination lives from the poet's open attitude towards different classical voices, their repertoires, and their way of thinking while the bard's hybrid style contradicts generalization and limitation. His force of imagination goes hand in hand with a sceptical view on human nature and the design of ironic counterparts.[1205] The same eclectic mixture can be found in his manifestations of architects, tricksters, and deliberate fool figures.

Comedy shows an affinity for comic drivers, underlining their concept's popularity, which results in a catalogue of fools, natural and deliberate, not only in Shakespeare's plays. They can be looked at from two perspectives. Either can they be subsumed under "the literary and philosophical traditions of folly epitomized in Erasmus's Praise of Folly", whereas these traditions are bound to the natural drive of laughter, satisfied within the socio-cultural history of laughing at and with the fool, which obviously goes far beyond Plautus and Shakespeare's figures.[1206] All instantiations in Plautus and Shakespeare's plays that fit the concept of the deliberate fool as described here are based upon the natural drive of laughter, while their realisation and transformation are contingent on comedy's matrix and are inevitably linked to a macrocosm of Lord of Misrules, tricksters, representations of irrationality, and merrymakers. In the abstract, the macrocosm nourished through comic instantiations relies on the

---

1203 Note Goldsmith (1958), 51. "The same actor who played Touchstone undoubtedly acted the roles of Feste, Lavache, and Lear's Fool. And since Shakespeare must have written the parts with Robert Armin in mind, we may expect to find a family likeness in them all."

1204 Jonathan Bate, *How the Classics made Shakespeare*, Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2019, 145.

1205 Cf. *Ibid.*, 1-7, 15, 144-45.

1206 Berry (1984), 112.

productivity of the deliberate fool's concept or rather the pattern in its applicability to comedy, which continues in the aesthetic consciousness of a culture or rather of cultures staying in connection and exchange. Western European history shows a huge and stable fascination with folly across genres.

To conclude this analysis, Plautus and Shakespeare's manifestations of a professional fool are figurative realisations of the paradox pattern, whose aesthetic effectiveness grants the type productivity essentially in comedy but can also be transferred to tragedy. In tragedy, the professional fool mediates a fearful image of life and folly on stage, confronting figures, actors, and the audience with the human abysses without the promise of harmlessness and resolution. In comedy, the professional fool incorporates and visualizes the ugly, easing the access to human deficiencies by laughter. Whereas the professional fool in tragedy helps to understand the downfall, the comic mastermind allows the audience to endure and enjoy the ugly in its harmlessness even if it suggests that they look at their folly; laughter offers them an exit from any (too) painful experience. Finally, the *paradox* in the deliberate fool, in Plautus and Shakespeare, or in comedy and tragedy draws on a long history of productivity that is still active and alive in recent instantiations on stages, in sitcoms on TV, in comic strips in the newspaper, in sketches or playing of roles on the radio, and in other sorts of text and performance.

V.ii.   An epilogue: The type of the professional fool figure

Due to its manifestations in comedy from antiquity to the Renaissance, the deliberate fool, which performs folly, while he can rely on utmost cleverness, is a hybrid of the wise, the trickster, and the clown. These are three figures all linked to the act of creation, about which Arthur Koestler wrote in his profound book in the mid-20th century. He lists the Jester, the Sage, and the Artist, which are specialized in using their creative activity for humour, discovery, or art.[1207]

> The first is intended to make us laugh; the second to make us understand; the third to make us marvel. The logical pattern of the creative process is the same in all three cases; it consists in the discovery of hidden similarities.[1208]

They all three take their audience on a journey to the essence of human nature, while they apply different perspectives and instruments to generate the path to the invisible.

Comedy takes a similar path, belonging to the realm of art, written by an artist and produced by artists on stage. Its illusionary craft and play with deceit as well as identity invite the features of all three models to take part in the illumination of comedy's discourse. It is not surprising that playwrights have chosen to have figures enter the comic stage that show a mixture of all three concepts, resulting in a self-conscious, cleverly deceiving, astute, and playful type Plautus chooses for his protagonist in intrigue comedies. In terms of Plautus' *servus callidus*, the figure stands at the centre of New Comedy's nucleus of deceit and illusion, from where he stimulates the intricacies by advancing comedy's plot with nearly impossible endeavours. The Artist turns into the *architectus* and the poet of the comic discourse, who marvels the spectator with his spontaneous machinations in confrontation with a threatening and desperate situation. Concerning qualities of a sage and a jester, witty insight and folly escapades complement his performance. Improvisation, a creative activity, connects the Jester or Clown with the Artist, while the Sage is also expected to react to his surroundings and posed questions with his wise advice and enlightening answers extempore. To fulfil that expectation, they become commentators and observers of life. The three characters need to possess knowledge of rhetoric and how to work with language's artificiality in addition to the flexibility to construct something 'new' and effective for their customers. Certainly the Sage and the Jester share a tendency to speak their minds as they cannot keep from remarking on their milieu. With all these skills, the comic hero grants the audience the facility to understand, to marvel at, and to laugh by his complex concept, enabling the artist and playwright of comedy to cast light on the process of creativity when he can juggle with opposites as well as intersections among all three models all looking from outside on the object of interest.

In light of the findings made in the prior chapters, New Comedy, more certainly Plautine intrigue comedies know the comic hero as a jesting trickster, who bears a model for following deceiving protagonists and a prototypical foundation for the professional fool in Shakespeare's comedy. Reducing their concept to its core functionality, the type of the deliberate fool figure, a swirl of the Jester, Trickster, and Artist, recommends itself as a *signum* of comedy, directed to serving comedy's coherence and its principles: *ridiculum*, carnivalesque, and utopian nature. This underlying paradox pattern allows the type to be most

---

1207 Koestler (1964), 27: The Sage is placed in the middle by Koestler, "flanked by the Jester and the Artist on opposite sides." The initial capital letters are Koestler's writing and are pursued to underline the model.
1208 *Ibid.*, 27.

supportive for comedy's schema since the type's *paradox* parallels the binary structure of oppositions and incongruity in comedy including the literal and the metaphorical, the fantastic and the real, or the impossible and possible.[1209] In a Nietzschean context, the figure images and avails himself of the world's "eternal contradiction", which means that "the ground of being stands in contradiction to what it grounds".[1210]

In the play text, the paradox pattern originates from several juxtapositions in the deliberate fool such as the all-license bears the paradox between immunity and constant unruliness and between the usually lower-class figure and his freedom how to behave towards superiors. He outlives his boisterousness in an agon of wit, wherein the loyal, sympathetic slave or servant can compete, ridicule, rule, and even exceed some superiors but still remains the servant. His social status and the stereotypical characteristics are juxtaposed with his triumphant, exaggerating, and exposing manner as he can create for himself a superior identity, playing a role in a role. In other words, negative superlatives confront ideals in dramatic and non-dramatic (con)texts. Collision happens in how his cleverness and wisdom is criss-crossed with folly, irrationality, and contradictory turns. His verbal 'experiments' are a rich source of these compounds of sense and nonsense and the incongruity of what is said and meant. Manifold voices come together in a two-faced speaker that can give sharp and sophisticated conclusions, and/or wallows in his jesting and clownish side, sometimes losing himself in nonsense, while he combines both poles. He delivers spectacle and refinement in comedy combining elements of popular and elite. The figure is constructed out of incongruous pairs, allowing the laughable to enter and following the carnivalesque in its duality, the impulse to the inversion of order.

From a sociological perspective, the figure causing topsy-turvy conditions typically stems from the lowest classes and from despised groups like "[…] foreigners, slaves, members of the 'lower classes' (almost inevitably treated as comic figures in literature up to and including Dickens)"[1211]; he is stereotyped as unattractive.

> Both Cicero and Francis Bacon gave deformity a high place on their lists of causes for laughter. The princes of the Renaissance collected midgets, hunchbacks, monsters, and Blackamoors for their merriment. […] We have met the same phenomenon […] in our attitude towards the bodily deformities imputed the caricaturist to his victim.[1212]

The fascinating element arises from the deviation of the normal, the appreciated, the accepted, which is seen as a defect of nature. It can give rise to laughter in a context that allows the comic and not pity, disgust or another non-comic emotion. Thus, the type is commonly of low rank, a deformed and/or abnormal appearance including a motley coat, a coxcomb, and other insignia of the medieval and Renaissance fool, showing a disposition to drinking, lechery, and food, tending towards the sphere of *luxuria* and spreading a certain seductive influence, furthermore a 'rebellious' nature, a sovereign performance, and a defiance of convention, which makes him live the carnivalesque in comedy.

He images and reflects sin or vice or generally, the ugly for the audience as they can perceive him as a mirror of human failure and folly, which insinuates the character of learning and links the comic discourse to the principle of *prodesse et delectare*. His framework is grounded on the four features manifesting the carnivalesque and determining the perception

---

1209 Cf. Salingar (1974), 100.
1210 Porter (2000), 52. James Porter is here concerned with Nietzsche's account on *das Ur-eine*.
1211 Koestler (1964), 75.
1212 *Ibid*., 74.

of the carnivalesque world: familiarity or inverting hierarchical structures, eccentricity or the dominance of the lower bodily *stratum*, mésalliance or mixing of high and low, and profanation or the debasement of the sacred and ideal. As an inhabitant and manager of the carnivalesque, the type is aware of comic discourse meandering between harmony and conflict, which fluctuation manifests mainly in the two universal dualities of mind vs. body and individual vs. society, beneath which comedy's issues of love, desire, rationality, class restrictions, hierarchy, generational conflict, and changes of identity can be subsumed. With his advantage of awareness, the professional fool can use that meandering for his constructions of the laughable, while his comments visualize this underlying sub-level with its categories to the spectator. Comedy profits from the type's function since he helps the discourse to unfold its aesthetically effective potential beyond (mere) imitation.

That temporary destabilization of order and cracking of closed categories in comedy is embraced for the limitation of stage and theatrical performance, wherein the deliberate fool figure can move and act under the protection of his all-license that is not mentioned explicitly in Plautus' comedies as it is termed for Shakespeare's professional fool, a relative to the court fool. The all-license can be seen as relic and heritage from laughing culture as practised in religious festivals like Saturnalia and the Feast of Fools. The genre comedy can be listed among the facetious and farcical excesses and deviations from the routine life, all its limitations, and rules. In analogy to the Middle Ages' occasions and places for lust and obscenity, the fool figure moves in a grey zone, wherein he appears as a counterexample, a vice figure that promotes self-knowledge and the possibilities of refinement for the spectator. Simultaneously, he meets the audience's demand for ribaldry and boisterous laughter. In his variety of registers, tone, and topics in addition to his outsider status, he can be appealing for all social strata in the audience. Theatregoers in Shakespeare's time were probably attracted to go when they knew that the comedy featured a professional jester, a guarantee of hilarious moments, especially if the role was played by William Kempe or Robert Armin.

The role is constructed as a carrier of sympathy, a servant fooling around and making jokes. While Plautus' clever slave behaves altruistically and allies with his young master to win the girl and defuse any potential of conflict with the father, Shakespeare's wise fool serves the young generation or lovers by spreading merriment without taking a central part in the play's ending. The heroine can fend for herself. Nevertheless, both heroine and fool, which exhibit a symmetrical structure, are self-conscious figures as they occupy a special, intermediate position between stage and audience, where they can cross the limited space of stage, entering front-of-house. The more they live outside the conventional system, the more clearly the manifestation can be identified as the immune mediator.

The type takes advantage of a license to comment on all the issues circling around in the comic discourse, which can easily be put as a freedom of speech. His exclusive position sometimes resembles and is even stylized as that of a poet or director of the play, turning his comments in a poet's or director's marginalia, an impression that is enhanced in Plautus' comedies in the clever slave's sequences of asides. The distance between the type and the audience is smaller than it seems to be since they share the ability to observe and are linked through laughter. When a person laughs, he cannot only be distinguished as the one laughing but automatically reveals himself as an observer and evaluator of the situation that caused the laughter.[1213] Thus, 'laughter' embraces the person who observes, evaluates what he sees as funny, laughs and secondly, the person observed, evaluated, and laughed at. Though, in case of the deliberate fool, who knows that he is being observed and guides the spectator to

---

[1213] Schwind (2000), 333, closely referring to a passage in Karlheinz Stierle's article in Warning (1976), 372.

the precise evaluation that what he perceives is laughable; there is an overlapping of the observed and the observing since the fool demonstrates the laughable in his behaviour, in others, and in the spectator. Here, Feste's remark about the picture "we three assess" springs to mind, establishing a sequence of questioning and fooling as whoever sees the picture, identifies himself to be the ass.

As long as all sorts of misbehaviour of the type can be accepted as harmless and funny, his immunity hand in hand with the utopian nature of comedy frees him from severe punishment. Thus, license can confirm the utopia that comedy relies on. The license arises from the exclusive position outside society and its inability to pose a real threat to the social order. In addition, immunity from punishment is part of Saturnalia, a culturally accepted deviation from reality. Finally, permission to produce and destroy illusion by words, props, and deeds fosters and visualizes comedy's creative grounds.

The fool's outsider status, his licensed profession, and skills affect his relationship to and attitude towards others regardless of their class. Getting the better of a social superior if only in words seems to be his aim. The agon is nourished by the gullibility of the master, the (hidden) dominance of the fool in communication, the fool's defiance of orders, and the master's or the other's need to ask the fool for help, explanation, or advice. A dialogue turns into a showcase of ripostes or an opportunity for the agon of wit, which delights the audience with an entertaining, farcical but innocuous game.

Without restrictions but with his fondness for 'sports', the type can thus promise the audience amusement by his antics and by presenting folly in the ugly mask he wears and urging his audience to perceive folly in themselves. In his *refugium* of utopian stage, he can outlive his excessive corruption of words and matter, inventing *fabulae*, abusing proverbial structures, constructing joke texts, and hence, producing the laughable. One main instrument he uses to succeed is his "modicum of originality—the ability to break away from the stereotyped routines of thought."[1214] Against all odds and rationality, he violates expectations, changes and directs a situation's atmosphere, and draws the spectators' attention by his often unexpected misbehaviour, which can be an illogical reaction, an irrelevant association or a presumably unpromising bet. Here, language constitutes his most versatile and elusive tool and his means to getting a laugh, ascending to the extremes of miscommunication, when he ignores cooperation and determines the direction and aim of the conversation, where his skills rival those of the trickster. A dialogue becomes the manipulated course to his punchlines and ridiculous revelations. In Koestler's words, the producer of the laughable draws upon "*originality* or unexpectedness; *emphasis* through selection, exaggeration and simplification; and economy or *implicitness* which calls for extrapolation, interpolation and transposition."[1215] A prominent method combining those means has been described as coding, which includes a twofold arrangement of sense and nonsense: assumed nonsense is unveiled as sense and assumed sense is disclosed as mere nonsense.

To use Foakes' words,

[t]he Fool is a channel for many of the play's ironies and multiple perspectives, which leave no value fixed, and no character unscathed. What seems wisdom from one point of view is folly from another.[1216]

1214 Koestler (1964), 91.
1215 *Ibid.*, 91. These are Koestler's three "criteria of the humorist's technique".
1216 Foakes (1997), 58. He speaks of Lear's Fool.

The type has a strategy although he often seems like a personified madhouse singing, coding, jumping around. He appears to be unpredictable; still, he is tactical, prepares his punchlines and knows how to manipulate the direction of the discourse. Throwing scripts around and arranging them newly reveals to be his play with rules. What seems to be static and irreversible turns out to be flexible as the empirical world gets overlapped with a second 'reality' or even a third when the fool opens up frames of illusions, filling in utopian quality. The addressee automatically searches for a consensus by comparing and processing the given information. Unravelling the fool's codes can yield him or her epistemic value. Watching the fool's play urges the spectator to dig deeper into the relations and polarities of scripts, which might even cause him to question, reconsider, and restructure his knowledge of that scripts or their clusters newly. It can be said that in a sceptical and satirical tone, when Shakespeare's professional fool expresses a Lucianic spirit, he provokes such processes, maybe providing a grander impact than only laughing faces. The type can advance to a speaking channel of a sceptical force for the poet and the audience.

The fool uses verbal constructions as playthings, whereby he can infuse folly into comedy, and bring opaque errors in the discourse to the fore. As the poet and as the Sage, the fool figure knows how to use language and its artificiality for his purpose, while he foregrounds kernel points comedy relies upon; words can submit truth and lie or construct and destruct images. His verbal acrobatics are not accidental products as it is the case for the natural fool but follow a strategy of supplying moments of *ridiculum* as well as insight into the sublevel of the discourse as a mediator tends to do. Herein, he seems not to be limited but can turn to an array of themes and dramatic techniques, colouring the figure with multiple voices and a mixture of different registers. The trickster must be able to change his appearance, his tone, and role as the Plautine shape-shifter does. The *servus callidus* excels in his sudden turns and ideas to transform from an anti-hero announcing mythological hyperboles, to a *servus ludens* indulging in silly behaviour and irrationality, and back to an *architectus*, who concocts brilliant plans impromptu. After the prototype and like the tricking heroine, the metamorphosed professional fool employs a similar flexibility when the figure jumps between registers, presents stories, personae, and themes out of nowhere and freely helps himself to the means of irony and ambiguity. The professional fool herein belongs to the catalogue of comic stereotypes embodying, fostering, and/or drawing upon the species of the ugly as does the parasite, the *kolax*, the bomolochus, the eiron, the clever slave, the Vice, the zanni, and all other similarly functioning figures.

The type's habit of discarding seriousness, linearity, and sustainability opens up boundaries, evoking the Dionysian vision and the inherent ability to indulge in ecstasy and affirming the utopian all-license. Seriousness and earnestness seems to be the type's natural enemy and that of comedy. In his praising of Aristophanes, Ben Jonson writes about the nature and genius of laughter:

> Of which Aristophanes affords an ample harvest, having not only outgone Plautus or any other in that kind, but expressed all the mods and figures of what is ridiculous, oddly. In short, as vinegar is not accounted good until the wine be corrupted, so jests that are true and natural seldom raise laughter with the beast, the multitude. They love nothing that is right and proper. The farther it runs from reason or possibility with them, the better it is.[1217]

1217 Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, Vol.7, 591, lines 1884-89.

Everything else following "equity, truth, perspicuity, and candour" (*Disc.*, 1895) is 'boring'. 'Puritan' doctrine, pedagogical policy, and catalogues of plain maxims foregrounding conventional dominance over life does not fit comedy's style, specifically not a comedy written and performed for the public. If strict teachers and figures blocking the laughable enter the stage, the ridicule is turned on them. The type's *paradox* evades all these enemies of comedy as its incongruity and duality invite constant collisions of categories, double layers, inversions, and nothing one-dimensional, clear-cut, and simple.

For the sake of the laughable, he plays with expectation as he fulfils it but in the next moment, violates it. Thus, in his distanced position, he can derive the matter from its normal, expected context and exposes it to view through his upside-down perception. In hindsight to Freud and Bergson,

> [...] the essence of the joke is that something formal is attacked by something informal, something organised and controlled, by something vital, energetic, an upsurge of life for Bergson, of libido for Freud. The common denominator underlying both approaches is the joke seen as an attack on control.[1218]

His miscommunication allows him to stylize his speech to a comic and witty deviation from 'normal'. He upends hierarchical structures, which is made vivid in themes of punishment or fear and contrasting triumph, verbal abuse, and exposure of superiors. The type is a creator of masks, illusions, and hilarious constructs on stage and beyond, whereby he can enter the stage in a self-fashioning manner, altering identities and perspectives. His enrichments of the comic discourse indicate the three general types of oppositions: "actual vs. non-actual, normal vs. abnormal, and possible vs. impossible".[1219] In the concrete, he realizes clusters of scripts, while playing the fool, providing fantastic constructs, using the magical 'if', coming up with neologisms, inventing authorities, caricaturing idols, assigning roles, and exhausting his creative space for thematic configurations for himself and others.

This thesis has argued that the type of the *professional* fool figure constructed on the *paradox* appears as the *signum* of comedy due to its functionality. No other figure supports comedy's schema and consists of his major principles as essentially. As stated in Berry's conclusion, "[i]f laughter is the heart of comedy, and incongruity at the heart of laughter, any disguise offers a simple and satisfying formula for both."[1220] More precisely, the fool is playing and the fool is a play, whereby he satisfies the human fascination with folly, change of identities, and playing in all its facets. His ability to assume roles and form identities are placed in the theatrical space of illusion, deceit, and transformation, where they are a foil to reality. He avails himself of masking and exposure, which processes embrace dramatic traditions of cross-dressing, plots of intrigues and deceit, and the spectrum from ignorance to *anagnorisis*. As a figure producing and perceiving incongruities, he comes close to an ironist on stage who observes the illusion he is part of while being observed and observing or being imaged and imaging become intermingled in the infinite matrix of construction and destruction. Irony as an aesthetic principle proclaims that there is nothing fixed, valid, closed, nor absolute. This openness and uncertainty matches the deliberate fool's perspective and usage of language and performance. The figure perceiving incongruity stands at an ironic distance to his role, its

---

1218 Douglas (1975), 95. She delimits correctly that an attack on morality or moral bias is not the key to every joke.
1219 Raskin (1985), 107-110 and 113-14. And see ch. II.i.
1220 Berry (1984), 81.

convention, the stereotype, his speech acts balancing between truth and lie or reality and fiction, and his 'con-textual' and contemporary self.[1221]

Comedy's stage—as he underlines and understands it—is an upside-down version of the real world, a utopia, where imagination is a crucial factor; 'reality' is revealed as something fleeting and can be misleading. Comedy's world is not absolute nor closed for this figure, who understands the comic cosmos as shaking knowledge, truth, and existence. Truth et al. depend on perspective. The fool alters his perspective and that of the audience both deliberately and spontaneously; he can add *ridiculum* to make the audience experience the layers of illusions and disillusions with laughter. Thereby, the prototype and the professional fool open up the level of dramatic action for the audience so they can perceive and enjoy the conflicts and antitheses in human nature and human failure. Hence, the type selects, brings focus to, and expands a semantic scope for looking on comedy's error in pragma and discourse. Supporting comedy's coherence and its three major principles, he functions for comedy's aesthetically effective construction and its experience. Such utility and centrality to comedy's schema mark the type as an available entity for reception and thus, can be termed a productive cultural entity, which is attested by the type's century-long tradition and the myriad metamorphoses across genres, centuries, and cultures.

No other figure offers such an intense experience of comedy. He embodies and reflects the species of the ugly to the audience, producing laughter that generates more laughter as he asserts and pushes himself in comic creation as a profoundly witty jester in the system of playing. The paradoxical pairing of wisdom and folly realized in a single figure is the trademark of the professional fool and outlines a vast playground for creativity, wherein specific thematic configurations can be set and realized for the risible. There is hardly any restriction on the fool's use of themes enhancing its flexibility. The combination of wisdom and folly opens up an enormous semantic scope for the instantiation of the type's concept. This and the formerly mentioned functions can be identified as the major reasons for the type's productivity, making him versatile and suitable for drama and other genres in every century, while he retains his aesthetically effective construction based upon the paradox pattern. As a cultural construct the professional fool remains successful in the aesthetic consciousness and processes of cultural production, wherein it is motivated by the natural drive 'laughter', eliciting the human capacity for laughter.

As a productive entity, the fool figure's continuous metamorphosis happens in interspaces of imitation, which are filled with the transfer and transformation of incongruous pairs of clusters of scripts; the paradox pattern travels through cultural systems and time as an autonomous element in the aesthetic consciousness, losing its autonomy only in its manifestation. For the reader, the spectator, the producer, the artist, transfer and metamorphosis stand in immediate connection with merging of horizons, intertextual connections, Barthesian reading, or text as "a cosmological matter", of which a selection can be thought as imaged in the aesthetic consciousness.[1222] In this active multipart net the fool metamorphoses to conform to the taste of time, adapts to its environment, fuses with other types, changes its appearance and name, but remains a productive aesthetic entity in the cultural identity of laughter.

This thesis closes with words taken from Edward Hubler to underline the type's scope of productivity and his being the *signum* of comedy: "[t]he comic muse looks everywhere; the

---

1221 Cf. de Man (³2002), 163–184 and *Id*. (2014), esp. 147-151. And on postmodernism and irony, see Claire Colebrook, *Irony*, London/New York: Routledge, 2004, 153ff.
1222 Eco (1983), 20. Umberto Eco here refers to writing a novel.

whole world is her province". When these sentences are applied to the 'employee' of the comic muse, the professional fool, they can be paraphrased to 'the professional fool figure looks everywhere and nowhere; all words and non-words are his material; the whole stage and the world beyond is his province'.[1223]

1223 Edward Hubler, 'The Range of Shakespeare's Comedy', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15 (1964): 55-66, 58.

Appendix:

Index rerum

190, 199, 214, 220, 228, 244, 254, 277, 303, 316, 332, 335

stereotype, stereotypical 32, 83, 88, 159, 171, 196-198, 212, 336

strategy 38, 62-64, 127, 142, 149, 156, 177, 198, 202, 209-215, 224-226, 231, 234, 237, 244, 261, 272, 290, 334

strategic 66, 149, 151, 189, 218, 226, 238

superiority theories 56

T

time and space 4

Tractatus Coislinianus 49, 85, 128

tragedy, tragic 15, 24, 28, 32, 42-47, 54-55, 61, 71, 85, 89, 114, 122-126, 143, 154-156, 160, 174-176, 188, 281, 308-312, 317-321, 324, 329

tragicomoedia 15, 31, 127, 155

trickster 21, 25, 40, 47-48, 70, 77-79, 83-85, 88-109, 114-117, 124, 136-141, 145-152, 165, 175, 197, 200, 217-222, 233, 239, 244, 251-255, 262-263, 270, 280-286, 292, 295, 306-308, 313, 317, 320, 324-325, 330, 333-334

truth

truth and lie 11, 32, 36, 41, 48-53, 65-70, 95, 102, 106-111, 124, 147-150, 156-160, 172, 193, 198, 202, 210-213, 246-248, 262-265, 274-277, 283-284, 288, 300-304, 309-319, 324-326, 334-336

U

universality, universal 5, 23, 30-31, 36, 60, 79-80, 89-91, 103, 284

utopia 43, 66, 69-78, 112, 135-137, 142, 157, 172-177, 181, 207, 215-217, 220, 240, 248, 286, 308-310, 313, 316, 324, 327, 333, 336

V

Vice 41-42, 83, 90-96, 100-103, 306-308, 313, 317, 326, 334

virgo 235, 251-255, 262-264, 280-284, 288-289, 324

virtue 92, 96

W

wisdom, wise 1, 21, 26, 32, 39-41, 93, 101-102, 106, 197-198, 202-205, 210, 216, 219, 243, 258, 261, 266-273, 277-278, 282-284, 299-304, 311-312, 326, 331-333, 336

wise fool 1, 19-22, 27, 37-41, 58, 83, 88, 92-97, 101, 104, 108, 137, 222, 225, 249-253, 264-285, 292, 297-306, 310, 322-332

wit 1, 29, 52-54, 74, 77, 80-86, 99, 102-106, 110-111, 123, 134, 138-151, 175, 197, 200, 205, 211-219, 226, 240-254, 258, 261-303, 311-315, 325-326, 331-333

Z

zanni 23, 80, 96-101, 249, 334

Index locorum

Cited Latin passages in English translation

English translations are given from the relevant Latin passages of Plautus' plays, cited in the thesis and presented in alphabetical and ascending order. Translations, notes, and italics are taken from the cited editions by Paul Nixon and Wolfgang de Melo.[1224]

Bacchides

188-90

>   PIST. (*eagerly*) And well, well, of course?
>   CH. That's what I wanted to ask you.
>   PIST. How can I know?
>   CH. None better.
>   PIST. Why, how so?

193-4

>   CH. His love is life to a lover: if she's away, he's lost; if she's there, his cash is lost, he himself being—a poor good-for-nothing fool.

229-33

>   CH. It's my look out, this business of the exchequer. […] I'll machinate some machinations to-day for transferring part of the said gold to my lovesick young master.

361-2

>   CH. I suppose he'll change my name for me from Chrysalus to Crossalus on the spot.[1225]

640

>   CH. Here is a man (*patting his chest*) that is worth his weight in gold: here is a man who ought to have a gold statue set up for him.

641

>   CH. Why, I've done a double deed to-day, been graced with double spoils.

651-60

>   CH. There is nothing more worthless than a servant without brains: he's got to have a precious powerful intellect: whenever a scheme is needed, let him produce it from his own intellect. Not a soul can be worth anything, unless he knows how to be good and bad both. He must be a rascal among rascals, rob robbers, steal what he can. A chap that's worth anything, a chap

---

1224 Titus Maccius Plautus, *Amphitryon, The Comedy of Asses, The Pot of Gold, The Two Bacchises, The Captives*, Vol. I, transl. by Paul Nixon, Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, repr. 1997; Titus Maccius Plautus, *Casina, The Casket Comedy, Curculio, Epidicus, The Two Menaechmuses*, Vol. II, transl. by Paul Nixon, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press et al., repr. 1988; Titus Maccius Plautus, *The Merchant, The Braggart Soldier, The Gost, The Persian*, Vol. III, ed. and transl. by Wolfgang de Melo, Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2011; Titus Maccius Plautus, *The Little Carthaginian, Pseudolus, The Rope*, Vol. IV, ed. and transl. by Wolfgang de Melo, Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2012.
1225 De Melo on *Bacch.* 361-2: *Crucisalus*, lit. "cross-jumper".

with a fine intellect, has to be able to change his skin. He must be good with the good and bad with the bad; whatever the situation calls for, that he's got to be.

709-12

CH. I'll train my catapult on the old fellow for the two hundred first. If I shatter the tower and outworks with the said catapult, the next minute I'll plunge straight through the gate into the ancient and time-worn town: in case I capture it, you two can carry off gold to your lady friends by the basketful […].

762

CH. […] what I'm afraid of is that I can't carry it out.

816-21

CH. (*sneeringly*) He whom the gods love dies young, while he has his strength and senses and wits. If any god loved this fellow, (*indicating Nicobulus*) it's more than ten years, more than twenty years ago, he ought to have died. He ambles along encumbering the earth, absolutely witless and senseless already, worth about as much as a mushroom—rotten one.

925-49

CH. (*bumptiously*) The two sons of Atreus have the name of having done a mighty deed when Priam's paternal city, Pergamum, "fortified by hand divine," was laid low by 'em after ten years, and they with weapons, horses, and army and warriors, of renown and a thousand ships to help 'em. That wasn't enough to raise a blister on their feet, compared with the way I'll take my master by storm, without a fleet and without an army and all that host of soldiers. Now before the old chap appears, I feel like raising a dirge for him till he comes out. (*wailing*) O Troy, O paternal city, O Pergamum! O ancient Priam, thy day is past! Thou shalt be badly, badly beaten—out of four hundred golden sovereigns. Ah yes, these tablets here, (*showing them*) sealed and signed, which I bear, are no tablets, but a horse sent by the Greeks—a wooden horse.[1226] Moreover, the words herein inscribed are the soldiers within this horse, soldiers armed to the teeth and full of fight. Thus has my scheme progressed up till now. Aye, and this horse will proceed to assail not a stronghold, but a strong-box. The wreck, ruin, and rape of the old man's gold will this horse prove to-day. This silly old man of ours—I dub him Ilium, I certainly do. The Captain is Menelaus, I Agamemnon: I am likewise Laertian Ulysses: Mnesilochus is Alexander, who will be the destruction of his native city; he is the one that carried off Helen, on account of whom I now besiege Ilium. At that Ilium Ulysses, so they say, was a bold, bad man, just as I am now.

988ª-994

CH. What's the use of my staying with you?
NI. I wish it, so that you may know what is written here.
CH. Not for me—I don't wish to know.
NI. Never mind; stay here.

1226 Our Epius is Pistoclerus: from his hands were they taken. Mnesilochus is Sinon the abandoned. Behold him! not lying at Achilles' tomb, but on a couch; he has a Bacchis with him; that one of old had a fire, to give the signal,—but this Sinon is burning himself. I am Ulysses whose counsel directs it all.

CH. What's the use?

NI. (*angry*) Silence! do what I tell you.

CH. (*apparently reluctant*) Stay I will.

NI. (*opening tablets*) Well, well! What tiny letters.

CH. (*innocently*) Yes, for a man with poor eyes; they're big enough, of your sight is good enough, though.

NI. Well then, pay attention.

CH. I don't want to, I tell you.

NI. But I want you to, I tell you.

CH. What's the use?

NI. See here now, you do what I order.

CH. (*after reflection, impartially*) It's right for your own servant to serve you as you see it fit, sir.

999-1027: only Chrysalus' lines

CH. That's an impudent letter, impudent from the very beginning.

There's nothing of that I didn't say to him, sir.

Just the very same words I said to him a while ago, sir.

Is that written there?

Not even one, by heaven, if you're wise!

1061-1065

CH. (*drawing back*) No indeed, I won't take it. So you can look further for some one to carry it.

I don't want it trusted to me.

Indeed I won't take it.

I don't want money put in my charge, I say. (*pause*) At least, appoint some one to watch me.

Epidicus

92-99

EPI. For let the old man find out he was fooled, and he will strip my dorsal regions with a stick. (*pausing*) Oh well, be on your guard, my lad. (*after a moment's thought, disgustedly*) "Oh well"—oh hell! It's no use! This head of mine is absolutely addled. You good-for-nothing, Epidicus! (*pausing*) Why should I enjoy abusing myself? (*answering in another tone*) Because you leave yourself in the lurch. What shall I do? Do you ask *me*? Why, you're the man that before this used to lend counsel to other folks.

194-96

EPI. Come on, Epidicus, come, put yourself in trim—bundle your cloak on your neck (*doing so*) and act as if you have been hunting the man all over the city. Now or never!

224-25

> EPI. The Sky-light—according to the way the womenfolk name their garments.[1227]
>
> PER. Eh? She wore a sky-light?
>
> EPI. What's so remarkable in that, sir?

226-33

> EPI. As if lots of wenches weren't parading the streets with whole estates on their backs. But when the taxes are levied the men say they can't pay; the heavier tax levied by these wenches, —that can be paid all right. (*scornfully*) What are they at, sir, those women that invent new names for garments every year? The Looseknit tunic, the Closeknit tunic, the Linenblue, […]— and not a kernel of sense in all of it.

234-35

> EPI. They've even taken the name of a dog, sir.
>
> PER. How?
>
> EPI. Calling an article the Laconian.[1228] (*profoundly*) It is terms like these that bring husbands to bankruptcy.

664-65

> EPI. Master shan't throw it up to me that he was challenged to a foot race.

671

> PER. The number of ways that fellow has made a fool of me to-day, and of you too! […]

680-84

> EPI. (*to Periphanes, stepping out*) Why look for me? Why trouble yourself? Why bother this gentleman? Behold me, sir? Have I run off? Am I away from home? Have I kept out of your sight? I am not on my knees to you, either. You want to tie me up? Here, here are my hands! (*holding them out*) You have straps; I saw you buy them. Why so backward now? Bind me.

688-89

> EPI. Just so, by Jove, at my wish, and not at yours, are you to bind these hands to-day.

Miles gloriosus

167-8

> PAL. That's why this old man has commanded that my fellow slaves' ankles should be broken. But he's made an exception of me;

269

> PAL. I'll go sniffing like a hunting dog […].

1227 De Melo on *Epid*. 224: *Impluuiata* refers to a moiré dress […], but looks as if it came from *impluuium* 'basin'.

1228 Nixon on *Epid*. 234: Both a kind of dog and a kind of tunic.

813

PAL. What great chaos I'm causing what great machinations I'm mobilizing!

1132-36

PAL. Now I need Acroteleutium to come to me or her maid or Pleusicles. O Jupiter! How Timeliness is supporting me throughout! I can see the people I most wished to see coming out together from next door.

Mostellaria

229-30

PHILO. If my father has to be sold, he'll be sold much rather than that I ever let you be poor or beg while I'm alive.

378-81

PHILO. What should I do? On his arrival, my father will find me drunk here now, wretch that I am, [...] It's a wretched business [...]. In just the same way I'm asking what to do, wretch that I am.

391

TR. You just go in and take these things away quickly.

416-7

TR. [...] I shall bring it about that the mess we've created here will actually end in clear and calm weather [...].

425

TR. Give me the key, go inside, and lock the door.

427-8

TR. I'll play a comedy for the old man today, while he's alive and present [...].

665

TR. (*aside*) I've heard your best lie is one that's served up piping hot.

742-3

SIMO Then there's a trashing in prospect for your hide, then the place where fetters are worn away, at last the cross.

780-82

TR. [...] mule drivers have pack mules, whereas I have pack humans. They're beasts of great burden: whatever you load onto them, they carry it.

832-40

TR. Can you see the fresco where one crow is making fun of two vultures?

TH. No, I can't

TR. But I can: the crow is standing between the two vultures and is pecking at the two in turn. Please look in my direction so that you can see the crow. Do you see it now?

TH. I really can't spot any crow there.

TR. But since you can't see the crow, look in your direction, toward the two of you, to see if you can spot the vultures.

TH. To have done with you, I can't see any painted bird here at all.

TR. Well, well, I'll stop now, I make allowances for you: you're too old to see clearly.

1102-19

TH. Then get up and come to me. There's something I want to discuss with you.

TR. No, I'll give my advice like this, from here. I'm much cleverer sitting. Besides, advice from holy places is more reliable.

TH. Get up, stop fooling around. Look me in the face.

TR. Okay.

[…]

TR. What's wrong with you?

TH. You've tricked me.

TR. What's the matter now?

TH. You've blown my nose properly.

TR. Do look and see if I've done a good job: is the snot still flowing?

[…]

TH. You will: I'll have fire and brushwood put around you in a moment, you hangman.

TR. Don't do that: I generally taste better boiled than roasted.

TH. I'll make an example of you.

TR. Because you approve of me you want others to copy me?

TH. Tell me: what sort of son did I leave when I left this place?

TR. One with feet, hands, with fingers, ears, eyes, and lips.

TH. I'm asking you about something different.

TR. Then I'm giving you a reply about something different now.

1178-9

TR. (*to Theopropides*) […] As if I wouldn't commit some other offense as clearly as tomorrow; then you'll be able to punish me properly for both, this one and that one.

Poenulus

279-80

MIL. I'm here to serve you.

AGO. But I wish the cook would serve you up.

MIL. Really, master, you're making fun of me.

AGO. I for one have all this learned from you.

292-4

AGO. But do look, I've never rubbed my head with her admiringly.

MIL. Then I'll run somewhere to a pond or a lake and get some mire.
AGO. What's that necessary for?
MIL. I'll tell you: so that I can rub her head and yours admiringly.

578-81

MIL. Have you got my instructions in mind now?
COLL. Beautifully.
MIL. Do make sure you're smart. […] Just make sure that you have your words memorized for this trick.
COLL. Yes, I have them better memorized than tragic or comic actors do.

603-04

COLL. Goodness, what sly people!
AGO. Yes, I taught them.
MIL. Who taught you in turn?

920-21

MIL. […] if I were to call him out in front of the house, it would be stupidity of I were to repeat again the same things here which you've just heard.

Pseudolus

23-24

PSEU. I think these letters are trying to have babies; they're climbing all over each other.
CAL. Are you cracking your usual jokes now?

27-30

CAL. Why are you insulting a charming letter written on charming tablets by a charming hand?
PSEU. Really, I ask you, have chickens got hands? Surely a chicken wrote this one.

32-33

PSEU. Give me your sole attention.
CAL. My soul isn't here.
PSEU. Then summon it.
CAL. No, *I* shall be quiet, *you* summon it from there from the wax […].

78-79

PSEU. What should I do for you?
CAL. Dear me!
PSEU. "Dear me"? Don't spare that: I'll give it to you.

388

PSEU. I don't want it to be repeated twice over, our plays are quite long enough as it is.

395-405

> PSEU. What are you going to do now after being so generous with promises to master's son? Where are they? Not a drop of certain counsel is ready for you, […]. You have neither a starting point for beginning your web nor fixed limits for finishing it. Yet just as a poet, when he takes writing tablets, looks for something that doesn't exist anywhere, but finds it nonetheless and makes likely what is a lie, I shall now become a poet: even though the twenty minas don't exist anywhere, I'll find them nonetheless.

469-75

> SIMO. Please open the portals of your ears, Pseudolus, so that my words can go where I want them to.
> PSEU. Go on, say anything you like, even if I'm angry with you.
> SIMO. You, a slave, are angry with me, your master?
> PSEU. Does that seem so strange to you?
> SIMO. Heavens, the way you say it I need to be on my guard against you in your anger; and you're planning to beat me in another way than the one I usually employ with you. […]

508-12

> PSEU. […] You will give me the money, I'll take it from you.
> […] Now I'm telling you to be on your guard against me.
> SIMO […] if you take it away, you'll have accomplished a great and amazing deed.

562-72

> PSEU. It's my suspicion now that you suspect that I'm promising such great deeds in order to entertain you while I'm bringing this play to an end, and that I'm not going to do what I'd said I would. I won't go back on my word. And as far as I know, I don't know anything certain yet about how I'll do this, except that it will happen: a man who comes onstage ought to bring something newfound in a new way. If he can't do this, he should give place to the one who can. I wish to withdraw inside for a short time while I marshal my tricks in my heart.

573-73[a]

> PSEU. But I'll soon come out, I won't waste your time. The flute player will entertain you here in the meantime.

590-91

> PSEU. I ought to do great deeds that bring me great and long renown afterward.

669-70

> PSEU. Opportunity herself couldn't have come more opportunely than the opportuneness of the arrival of this letter.

680-86

> PSEU. [When we know that someone's plan was successful, we declare him a smart man,] but stupid the one whose plan was unsuccessful. In our stupidity we don't know how we deceive

ourselves when we keenly demand to get something, as if we could know what was going to be to our advantage. We let go of certainties while chasing after uncertainties; and in the midst of toil and pain it so happens that death creeps up on us in the meantime.

720-21

 PSEU. This play is being staged for the sake of the spectators. Those who were present already know; I'll tell you two later.

764-65

PSEU. Now I'll go to the forum and heap my instructions onto Simia, what he should do so as not to waver, so that he may carry this trick off cleverly.

908-08[a]

PSEU. Aren't I an idiot since I'm talking about this to myself alone?

940

SIMI. A man who reminds another about what that man remembers well makes the man remembering it forgetful.

References

Editions of Primary Sources

BARSBY (1986)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Bacchides*. Ed. with transl. and commentary by John BARSBY. Warminster et al.: Aris & Philipps et al., 1986.

BARSBY (1999)   Terentius Afer, Publius. *Eunuchus*. John BARSBY (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

BEHLER (1963)   Schlegel, Friedrich von. *Philosophische Lehrjahre (1796-1806). Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*. Ernst BEHLER (ed.). Vol. 18. München et al.: Schöningh, 1963.

BEVINGTON (2012)   Jonson, Ben. *Discoveries. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson.* Vol. 7. David BEVINGTON et al. (eds.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

BLACK (1846)   Schlegel, Augustus William. *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature.* Transl. by John Black. London: Bohn, 1846.

BLACKMORE (2004)   Hugo, Victor. *The Essential Victor Hugo*. New translations with an introduction and notes by E.H. and A.M. BLACKMORE. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

BRADY/WIMSATT (1977)   Johnson, Samuel. *Selected Poetry and Prose*. Frank BRADY and W.K. WIMSATT (eds.). Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1977.

BYWATER (1909)   Aristotle. *On the Art of Poetry*. Transl. by Ingram BYWATER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

CROFT (1967)   Sir Elyot, Thomas. *The Book Named the Governor* (1531). Henry Herbert Stephen CROFT (ed.). New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

CUNLIFFE (1906)   Gascoigne, George. *Supposes*. John W. CUNLIFFE (ed.). Boston/London: D.C. Heath & Co., 1906.

DE MAN (2014)   DE MAN, Paul. *The Paul de Man Notebooks*. Martin McQillan (ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.

DE MELO (2011)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *The Merchant, The Braggart Soldier, The Ghost, The Persian*. Vol. III. Ed. and transl. by Wolfgang DE MELO. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2011.

DE MELO (2012)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *The Little Carthaginian, Pseudolus, The Rope*. Vol. IV. Ed. and transl. by Wolfgang DE MELO. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2012.

DUSINBERRE (2006)   Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Juliet DUSINBERRE (ed.). London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

DYSON (repr. 1949)   Pope, Alexander and Samuel Johnson. *Poetry & Prose. With Essays by Johnson, Coleridge, Hazlitt*. Henry V. DYSON (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, repr. 1949.

ECO (2005)   ECO, Umberto. *The Name of the Rose*. Transl. from the Italian by William Weaver. London et al.: Vintage, 2005.

ELAM (2008)   Shakespeare, William. *Twelfth Night, or What You Will.* Keir Elam (ed.). London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2008.

FEUILLERAT (1963)   Sidney, Philip. *The Defence of Poesie*. 1595. Albert FEUILLERAT (ed.). *The Prose Works of Sir Philip Sidney*. Vol. III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

FOAKES (1997)   Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. Reginald Anthony FOAKES (ed.). London: Black Publishers, 1997.

FRANK (2009)   Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft. Schriften zur Ästhetik und Naturphilosophie*. Manfred FRANK (ed.). Frankfurt a.M.: Deutscher Klassiker-Verlag, 2009.

FYFE (1973)   Aristotle. *The Poetics*. Transl. by William Hamilton Fyfe. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

GROENING et al.   GROENING, Matt, James L. Brooks (Writers), and Chuck Sheetz (Director). 'The Daughter also Rises' (Television series episode). *The Simpsons*. Season 23. Episode 13. First aired 12 February, 2012. USA, 20th Century Fox Television.

HALLIWELL (1995)   Aristotle. *The Poetics*. Ed. and transl. by Stephen HALLIWELL. Cambridge, Mass. et al.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

HARRIS-MCCOY (2012)   HARRIS-MCCOY, Daniel E. *Artemidorus' Oneirocritica. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2012.

HARRIS/WIDGER   Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). Vol. I based on the 2nd Edition (Books I. and II. of 4). Release date: January 6, 2004 [EBook #10615] at Project Gutenberg. Produced by Steve HARRIS and David WIDGER. URL= http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/10615/pg10615-images.html (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.

HIBBARD (1969)   Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. George Richard HIBBARD (ed.). Harmondsworth et al.: Penguin Books, 1969.

HIBBARD (1998)   Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. George Richard HIBBARD (ed.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1998.

HODGDON (2010)   Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Barbara HODGDON (ed.). London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010.

HONIGMANN (²2006)   Shakespeare, William. *Othello.* Ernst A. J. HONIGMANN (ed.). London et al.: Thomson Learning, ²2006.

HUGHES (1994)   Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus*. Alan HUGHES (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

ISHERWOOD (1983)   Baudelaire, Charles. 'My heart laid bare'. *Intimate Journals*. Transl. by Christopher ISHERWOOD. San Francisco: City Lights, 1983.

KENNEDY (1991)   Aristotle. *On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Newly transl. with intr., notes and append. by George A. KENNEDY. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

LAUTER (1964)   Donatus, Aelius. 'A Fragment on Comedy and Tragedy'. Transl. by George Miltz. *Theories of Comedy*. Paul LAUTER (ed.). New York: Anchor Books, 1964. 27-32.

LLORCA (2007)   De Sevilla, Isidoro. *Étymologies. XVIII. De bello et ludis*. Ed. and transl. by Josefa Cantó LLORCA. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007.

MILLER (1979)   Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly*. Transl. with an intro. and comm. by Clarence H. MILLER. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1979.

MUIR (2008)   Shakespeare, William. *Troilus and Cressida*. Kenneth MUIR (ed.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, reiss. 2008.

NIXON (1965)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *The Little Carthaginian, Pseudolus, The Rope*. Vol. IV. Paul NIXON (ed.). Cambridge, Mass. et al.: Harvard University Press et al., 1965.

NIXON (1988)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Casina, The Casket Comedy, Curculio, Epidicus, The Two Menaechmuses*. Vol. II. Transl. by Paul NIXON. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press et al., repr. 1988.

NIXON (1997)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Amphitryon, The Comedy of Asses, The Pot of Gold, The Two Bacchises, The Captives*. Vol. I. Transl. by Paul NIXON. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, repr. 1997.

OLIVER (1984)   Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Harold J. OLIVER (ed.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1982.

PIGMAN (2000)   Gascoigne, George. *A hundreth sundrie flowres*. George W. PIGMAN (ed.). Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press, 2000.

RHODES (1988)   Thucydides. *History II*. Ed. with translation and commentary by Peter J. RHODES. Warminster: Aris & Philipps, 1988.

SCHAFER (2002)   Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Elizabeth SCHAFER (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

SCHMITT (2008)   Aristoteles. *Poetik*. Ed., transl. and with notes by Arbogast SCHMITT. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008.

SONNENSCHEIN (²1966)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Mostellaria*. Edward A. SONNENSCHEIN (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, ²1966.

THOMPSON/TAYLOR (³2016) Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. THOMPSON, Ann and TAYLOR, Neil (eds.). London et al.: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, ³2016.

VAUGHAN (²2006)   Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest.* Alden T. VAUGHAN and Virginia Mason VAUGHAN (eds.). London: Arden Shakespeare, ²2006.

WEIS (2012)   Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. René WEIS (ed.). London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2012.

WILLCOCK (1987)   Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Pseudolus*. Malcolm M. WILLCOCK (ed.). Bristol et al: Bristol Classical Press, 1987.

YATES/IRBY (1964)   Borges, Jorge Luis. *Labyrinths. Selected Stories and other Writings*. Donald A. YATES and James E. IRBY (eds.). New York: New Directions, 1964.

Dictionaries, Encyclopaedias, and Similar Devices

DNP   *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. 15 vols.* Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.). Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler. URL= http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/cluster/New%20Pauly%20Online?s.num=0 (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.

LILY   LILY, William. *Lily's Grammar of Latin in English*. Hedwig Gwosdek (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

LODGE (1963)   LODGE, Gonzales. *Lexicon Plautinum*. Vol. I. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1963.

LSJ   LIDDELL, Henry George (ed.), Henry Stuart Jones, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

OED   *Oxford English Dictionary*. 20 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, ²1989. URL= http://www.oed.com/.

OLD   *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Peter G. W. Glare (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, ²2012.

TILLEY   TILLEY, Morris Palmer. *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. A Collection of the Proverbs Found in English Literature and the Dictionaries of the Period*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.

Research

ADORNO (1998)   ADORNO, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie*. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Band 7. Rolf Tiedemann (ed.). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.

ADORNO (2002)   ADORNO, Theodor W. *Aesthetic Theory*. Gretel Adorno and Rolf Tiedemannn (eds.). London/New York: Continuum, 2002.

ALLARDYCE (1963)   ALLARDYCE, Nicoll. *The World of Harlequin. A Critical Study of the Commedia dell'Arte*. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.

ANDERSON (2005)   ANDERSON, Linda. *A Place in the Story. Servants and Service in Shakespeare's Plays*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2005.

ANDERSON (1993)   ANDERSON, William S. *Barbarian Play. Plautus' Roman Comedy*. Toronto et al.: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

ANDRÉ (1994)   ANDRÉ, Jean-Marie. *Griechische Feste, römische Spiele*. *Die Freizeitkultur der Antike*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1994.

ANGUS (2016)   ANGUS, Bill. *Metadrama and the Informer in Shakespeare and Jonson*. Edingburgh: Edingburgh University Press, 2016.

ANZ (1998)   ANZ, Thomas. *Literatur und Lust. Glück und Unglück beim Lesen.* München: C.H. Beck, 1998.

ASSMANN/CZAPLICKA (1995)   ASSMANN, Jan and John CZAPLICKA. 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity'. *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125-133.

ATTARDO (1994)   ATTARDO, Salvatore. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.

ATTARDO (2001)   ATTARDO, Salvatore. *Humorous Texts. A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. Berlin et al.: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001.

ATTARDO et al. (2002)   ATTARDO, Salvatore et al. 'Script oppositions and logical mechanisms: Modeling incongruities and their resolutions'. *Humor* 15.1 (2002): 3–46.

BAKHTIN (1968)   BAKTHIN, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1968.

BAKHTIN (1984)   BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Transl. by Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington et al.: Indiana University Press, 1984 (repr. 2002).

BAKHTIN (1995)   BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Rabelais und seine Welt. Volkskultur als Gegenkultur*. Renate Lachmann (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1995.

BALDWIN (1944)   BALDWIN, Thomas W. *William Shakspere's small Latine and lesse Greeke*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944.

BALZTER (2013)   BALZTER, Stefan. *Wo ist der Witz? Techniken zur Komikerzeugung in Literatur und Musik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2013.

BARASCH (2007)   BARASCH, Frances K. 'Harlequin/Harlotry in *Henry IV, Part One*'. *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & his Contemporaries. Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*. Michele Marrapodi (ed.). Hampshire/Burlington: Ashgate, 2007. 27-37.

BARBER (1970)   BARBER, Lester E. Barber. '*The Tempest* and New Comedy'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 21.3 (1970): 207-211.

BARTHES (1975)   BARTHES, Roland. *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris, 1973). Transl. by Richard Miller. *The Pleasure of the Text*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.

BATE (1993)   BATE, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

BATE (2019)   BATE, Jonathan. *How the Classics made Shakespeare.* Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2019.

BAUCH (2003)   BAUCH, Marc. *The American Musical*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 2003.

BEARE (²1955)   BEARE, William. *The Roman Stage. A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic*. London: Methuen, ²1955.

BEIER (2014)   BEIER, Benjamin V. 'The Art of Persuasion and Shakespeare's Two Iagos'. *Studies in Philology* 111.1 (2014): 34-64.

BELKE/LEDER (2006)   BELKE, Benno and Helmut LEDER. 'Annahmen eines Modells der ästhetischen Erfahrung aus kognitionspsychologischer Perspektive'. *Ästhetische Erfahrung: Gegenstände, Konzepte, Geschichtlichkeit*. Sonderforschungsbereich 626 (ed.). Berlin 2006.

BERGSON (1940)   BERGSON, Henri. *Le Rire: Essai sur la signification du comique*. Paris: Presses univérsitaires de France, 1940.

BERGSON (2003)   BERGSON, Henri. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic.* Translated by Cloudesley Brereton and Fred Rothwell. Ebook #4352. Release date August, 2003. URL= http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4352/4352-h/4352-h.htm (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.

BERRY (1980)   BERRY, Edward I. 'Rosalynde and Rosalind'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31.1 (1980): 42-52.

BERRY (1984)   BERRY, Edward I. *Shakespeare's Comic Rites*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

BERRY (1972)   BERRY, Ralph. *Shakespeare's Comedies. Explorations in Form*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.

BLOOM (²1997)   BLOOM, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, ²1997.

BLUME (2001)   BLUME, Horst-Dieter. s.v. Künstlerische Wettbewerbe (skenikoi agones). *DNP* XI (2001) 491-499.

BOAS (1914)   BOAS, Frederick S. *University Drama in the Tudor Age*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1914.

BOERNER BECKMANN (1978)   BOERNER BECKMAN, Margaret. 'The Figure of Rosalind In *As You Like It'*. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29.1 (1978): 44-51.

BRADBROOK (1986)   BRADBROOK, Muriel C. 'Virtue is the True Nobility. A Study of the Structure of *All's Well that Ends Well'*. *William Shakespeare. Comedies and Romances*. Ed. with an introd. by Harold Bloom. New York et al.: Chelsea House, 1986. 55-67.

BRADEN (2010a)   BRADEN, Gordon. 'The Parasite'. *The Classical Tradition*. Anthony Grafton et al. (eds.). Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010. 688-689.

BRADEN (2010b)   BRADEN, Gordon. 'Shakespeare'. *The Classical Tradition*. Anthony Grafton et al. (eds.). Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010. 881-885.

BREMMER (1997)   BREMMER, Jan. 'Jokes, Jokers and Jokebooks in Ancient Greek Culture'. *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*. *Id.* and Herman Roodenburg (eds.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997. 11-28.

BREMMER/ROODENBURG (1997)   BREMMER, Jan and Herman Roodenburg (eds.). *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.

BREWER (1997)   BREWER, Derek. 'Prose Jest-Books in England'. *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (eds.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997. 90-111.

BRISTOL (1985)   BRISTOL, Michael D. *Carnival and Theater. Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. New York et al.: Methuen, 1985.

BROSS (2017)   BROSS, Martina. *Versions of Hamlet. Poetic Economy on Page and Stage.* Paderborn et al.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2017.

BUBLITZ et al. (2013)   BUBLITZ, Hannelore et al. 'Einleitung'. *Automatismen – Selbst-Technologien*. Hannelore Bublitz et al. (eds.). München: Wilhelm Fink, 2013. 9-16.

BULLOUGH (1957)   BULLOUGH, Geoffrey (ed.). *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. I. Early Comedies, Poems, Romeo and Juliet*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.

BULLOUGH (1963)   BULLOUGH, Geoffrey (ed.). *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. II. The Comedies 1597-1603*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

BUNGARD (2020)   BUNGARD, Christopher. 'Metatheater and Improvisation in Plautus'. *A Companion to Plautus*. George Fredric Franko and Dorota Dutsch (eds.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020. 237-249.

BURKE (1997)   BURKE, Peter. 'Frontiers of the Comic in Early Modern Italy, *c*. 1350-1750'. *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (eds.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997. 61-75.

BURNETT (2008)   BURNETT, Anne Pippin. *Pindar*. London: Cristol Classical Press, 2008.

BURROW (2013)   BURROW, Colin. *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2013.

CHARNEY (1988)   CHARNEY, Maurice. *Hamlet's Fictions*. New York et al.: Routledge, 1988.

CARROLL (1985)   CARROLL, William C. *The Metamorphoses of Shakespearean Comedy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.

CARROLL (1996)   CARROLL, Clare. 'English Literature in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries'. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Jill Kraye (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 246-268.

CAVE (1979)   CAVE, Terence. *The Cornucopian Text. Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

CHAPMAN (1983)   CHAPMAN, G.A.H. 'Some Notes in Dramatic Illusion'. *American Journal of Philology* 104.1 (1983): 1-23.

CIONI (2004)   CIONI, Fernando. 'Shakespeare's Italian intertexts: *The Taming of the/a Shrew*'. *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*. Michelle Marrapodi (ed.). Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2004. 118-130.

CONDREN (2012)   CONDREN, Conal. 'Satire and Definition'. *Humor* 25.4 (2012): 375-399.

COOPER (1922)   COOPER, Lane. *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy. With an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the Tractatus Coislinianus*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922.

DECKER (2001)   DECKER, Wolfgang. s.v. Sportfeste. *DNP* XI (2001) 847-855.

DE MAN (³2002)   DE MAN, Paul. *Aesthetic Ideology*. Andrzej Warminski (ed.). Minneapolis (et al.): University of Minnesota Press, ³2002.

DEVRIES (1998)   DEVRIES, David N. 'The Vice Figure in Middle English Morality Plays'. *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History*. Vicki K. Janik (ed.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998. 471-493.

DIEWALD (2010)   DIEWALD, Gabriele. 'Dialogrollen-Person-Identität'. *Constructing Identity in Interpersonal Communication*. Minna Palander-Collin et al. (eds.). Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2010. 15-36.

DISTELRATH   DISTELRATH, Götz (Konstanz). 'Saturnalia'. *Brill's New Pauly*. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.). URL= http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1102380 (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.

DOBROV (2001)   DOBROV, Gregory W. *Figures of Play. Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2001.

DODDS (1951)   DODDS, Eric R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1951.

DÖPP (1993)   DÖPP, Siegmar. 'Saturnalien und lateinische Literatur'. *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1993. 145–177.

DORAN (1954)   DORAN, Madeleine. *Endeavors of Art. A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954.

DOUGLAS (1968)   DOUGLAS, Mary. 'The Social Control of Cognition: Some Factors on Joke Perception'. *Man* 3.3 (1968): 361-376.

DOUGLAS (1975)   DOUGLAS, Mary. *Implicit Meanings*. London et al.: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

DOWLING (2011)   DOWLING, William C. *Ricœur on Time and Narrative*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 2011.

DUCKWORTH (1952)   DUCKWORTH, George E. *The Nature of Roman Comedy. A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.

DUSINBERRE (2003)   DUSINBERRE, Juliet. 'Pancakes and a Date for 'As You like It''. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.4 (2003): 371-405.

DUTSCH (2014)   DUTSCH, Dorota. 'The Beginnings: Philosophy in Roman Literature before 155 B.C.'. *The Philosophizing Muse. The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry*. Myrto Garani and David Konstan (eds.). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. 1-25.

ECO (1983)   ECO, Umberto. *Reflections on The Name of the Rose*. Transl. by William Weaver. London: Secker & Warburg, 1983.

ECO (1984)   ECO, Umberto. 'The Frames of Comic 'Freedom''. *Carnival!*. Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.). Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1984. 1-9.

ECO (1990)   ECO, Umberto. *The Limits of Interpretation.* Bloomington et al.: Indiana University Press, 1990.

ECO (2007)   ECO, Umberto (ed.). *Die Geschichte der Häßlichkeit*. München: Carl Hanser Verlag, 2007.

ELLSWORTH (1972)   ELLSWORTH, James Dennis. *Agôn. Studies in the Use of a Word*. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1972.

FAAS (1986)   FAAS, Ekbert. *Shakespeare's Poetics*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

FANTHAM (1972)   FANTHAM, Elaine. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

FANTHAM (2004)   FANTHAM, Elaine. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

FARRAR (2014)   FARRAR, Ryan. '*As You Like It*: The Thin Line Between Legitimate Utopia and Compensatory Vacation'. *Utopian Studies* 25.2 (2014): 359-383.

FECHNER (1876)   FECHNER, Gustav Theodor. *Vorschule der Aesthetik. 2 Bände*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1876.

FIGUEROA-DORREGO/   FIGUEROA-DORREGO, Jorge and Cristina LARKIN-GALIÑANES, *A Source
LARKIN-GALIÑANES (2009)   Book of Literary and Philosophical Writings about Humour and Laughter. The Seventy Five Essential Texts from Antiquity to Modern Times.* With a Forword by Victor Raskin. Lewiston et al.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009.

FONTAINE (2010)   FONTAINE, Michael. *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2010.

FORTI-LEWIS (1998)   FORTI-LEWIS, Angelica. '*Commedia dell'Arte'. Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History. A bio-bibliographical Sourcebook*. Vicki K. Janik (ed.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998. 146-154.

FOX (1997)   FOX, Alistair. *The English Renaissance. Identity and Representation in Elizabethan England.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.

FRAENKEL (1922)   FRAENKEL, Eduard. *Plautinisches im Plautus*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922.

FRAENKEL (1960)   FRAENKEL, Eduard. *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*. Transl. by F. Munari. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1960.

FRAENKEL (2007)   FRAENKEL, Eduard. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Transl. Tomas Drevikovsky and Frances Muecke. New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 2007.

FRANKO (2020)	FRANKO, George Fredric. 'Plautus in Early Modern England'. *A Companion to Plautus*. *Id*. and Dorota Dutsch (eds.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020. 445-459.
FREUD (1987)	FREUD, Sigmund. *'Psychopathische Personen auf der Bühne'. Sigmund Freud*: *Gesammelte Werke. Nachtragsband: Texte aus den Jahren 1885 bis 1938*. Angela Richards (ed.). Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer, 1987. 655-661.
FREUD ([8]2006)	FREUD, Sigmund. *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten. Der Humor*. Introd. by Peter Gay. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, [8]2006.
FREYBURGER	FREYBURGER, Gérard (Mulhouse). 'Ludi'. *Der Neue Pauly*. Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider (Antike), and Manfred Landfester (Rezeptions- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte) (eds.). URL= http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_dnp_e711310 (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.
FRIEDBERG (1990)	FRIEDBERG, Anne. 'A denial of difference: Theories of cinematic identification'. *Psychoanalysis and Cinema*. Elizabeth Ann Kaplan (ed.). New York: Routledge, 1990. 36-45.
FRY (2012)	FRY, Paul H. *The Theory of Literature*. New Haven et al.: Yale University Press, 2012.
FRY JR. (1987)	FRY, William F. 'Humor and Paradox'. *American Behavioral Scientist* 30.1 (1987): 42-71.
FRYE (1957)	FRYE, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.
FRYE (1986)	FRYE, Northrop. 'Making Nature afraid'. *William Shakespeare. Comedies and Romances*. Ed. with an introd. by Harold Bloom. New York et al.: Chelsea House, 1986. 177-198.
FUHRMANN (1976)	FUHRMANN, Manfred. 'Lizenzen und Tabus des Lachens'. *Das Komische*. Wolfgang Preisendanz and Rainer Warning (eds.). München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976. 65-101.
FUHRMANN (1999)	FUHRMANN, Manfred. *Die Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1999.
GADAMER (2010)	GADAMER, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode*. *Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. *Gesammelte Werke.* Band 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, [7]2010.
GADAMER (2013)	GADAMER, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2013.
GARAND (2009)	GARAND, Dominique. 'Misunderstanding. A Typology as Performance'. *Common Knowledge* 15.3 (2009): 472-500.
GARBER (2004)	GARBER, Marjorie. *Shakespeare After All*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2004.
GELZER (1960)	GELZER, Thomas. *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der Attischen Alten Komödie*. München: C.H. Beck, 1960.

GHOSE (2008) GHOSE, Indira. *Shakespeare and Laughter. A Cultural History*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2008.

GILDENHARD/ZISSOS (2007) GILDENHARD, Ingo and ZISSOS, Andrew. 'Barbarian variations. Tereus, Procne and Philomela in Ovid (*Met*. 6.412–674) and Beyond'. *Dictynna* 4 (2007): 1–21.

GLASGOW (1995) GLASGOW, Rupert D.V. *Madness, Masks, and Laughter. An Essay on Comedy*. Cranbury, NJ et al.: Associated University Presses, 1995.

GÖHLER (2021) GÖHLER, Jonas. 'Erotik des Schreckens: Procne und Philomela'. *Ovid-Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung*. Melanie Möller (ed.). Berlin: J.B. Metzler, 2021. 440-442.

GOLDSMITH (1958) GOLDSMITH, Robert Hillis. *Wise Fools in Shakespeare*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1958.

GONZALES (2011) GONZALES, Francisco J. 'The Hermeneutics of Madness: Poet and Philosopher in Plato's *Ion* and *Phaedrus*'. *Plato and the Poets*. Pierre Destrée and Fritz-Gregor Herrmann (eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2011. 93-110.

GOODMAN (1978) GOODMAN, Nelson. *Ways of Worldmaking*. Indianapolis, Ind. et al: Hackett, 1978.

GRAF (1997) GRAF, Fritz. 'Cicero, Plautus, and Roman Laughter'. *A Cultural History of Humour. From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (eds.). Oxford: Polity, 1997. 29-39.

GRAY (2006) GRAY, Jonathan. *Watching with The Simpsons. Television, Parody, and Intertextuality*. New York/London: Routledge, 2006.

GREINER GREINER, Bernhard (Tübingen RWG). 'Comedy'. *Brill's New Pauly*. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.). URL= http://dx.doi.org.ubproxy.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1409960 (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.

GRIFFITH (2007) GRIFFITH, Mark. ''Telling the tale': a performing tradition from Homer to pantomime'. *Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*. Marianne McDonald (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 13- 35.

GRICE ([4]2002) GRICE, Herbert Paul. 'Logic and Conversation'. *The Discourse Reader*. Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.). London/New York: Routledge, [4]2002. 76-88.

GUREWITCH (1975) GUREWITCH, Morton. *Comedy. The Irrational Vision.* Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1975.

GURR (1987) GURR, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London.* Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

HABERMAS (1983) HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1983.

HABERMAS (2001)	HABERMAS, Jürgen. 'Universalpragmatische Grundlagen der Kommunikation'. *Sprache, Sprechakt, Kommunikation. Sprachtheoretische Positionen des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Sybille Krämer (ed.). Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2001. 74-93.
HALLER (2002)	HALLER, Miriam. *Das Fest der Zeichen. Schreibweisen des Festes im modernen Drama*. Köln et al.: Böhlau, 2002.
HALLIK (2007)	HALLIK, Sibylle. *Sententia und Proverbium. Begriffsgeschichte und Texttheorie in Antike und Mittelalter. Band 9. Studien zur Literatur und Gesellschaft des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*. Ulrich Ernst et al. (eds.). Köln et al.: Böhlau Verlag, 2007.
HANSON (1955)	HANSON, John Arthur. 'The Glorious Military'. *Roman Drama*. Thomas A. Dorey and Donald R. Dudley (eds.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965. 51-85.
HAPPÉ (1979)	HAPPÉ, Peter. 'The Vice: A Checklist and An Annotated Bibliography'. *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 22 (1979): 17-35.
HARDIN (2007a)	HARDIN, Richard F. 'Encountering Plautus in the Renaissance: A Humanist Debate on Comedy'. *Renaissance Quarterly* 60 (2007): 789-818.
HARDIN (2007b)	HARDIN, Richard F. 'The Renaissance of Plautine Comedy and the Varieties of Luck in Shakespeare and Other Plotters'. *Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2007): 143-156.
HARDIN (2018)	HARDIN, Richard F. *Plautus and the English Renaissance of Comedy.* Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2018.
HARDWICK (2003)	HARDWICK, Lorna (ed.). *Reception Studies*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2003.
HARROLD (1970)	HARROLD, William E. 'Shakespeare's use of *Mostellaria* in *The Taming of the Shrew*'. *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West* (1970): 188-194.
HARSH (1955)	HARSH, Philip Whaley. 'The Intriguing Slave in Greek Comedy'. *TAPA* 86 (1955): 135-142.
HENSCHEID (1997)	HENSCHEID, Eckhard. 'Humor. Ein ewiges Trauerspiel'. *Kulturgeschichte der Mißverständnisse. Studien zum Geistesleben*. Eckhard Henscheid et al. (eds.). Stuttgart: Reclam, 1997. 51-67.
HORLACHER (2003)	HORLACHER, Stefan. s.v. Nonsense. *HWRh* VI (2003) 301–307.
HORLACHER (2009)	HORLACHER, Stefan. 'A Short Introduction to Theories of Humour, the Comic, and Laughter'. *Gender and Laughter—Comic Affirmation and Subversion in Traditional and Modern Media.* Gaby Pailer et al. (eds.). Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2009. 17-47.
HORNBACK (2009)	HORNBACK, Robert. *The English Clown Tradition from the Middle Ages to Shakespeare*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2009.
HORNBY (1986)	HORNBY, Richard. *Drama, Metadrama, and Perception*. London/Toronto: Associated University Press, 1986.

HUBBARD (1991)   HUBBARD, Thomas K. *The Mask of Comedy. Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*. Ithaca et al.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

HUBLER (1964)   HUBLER, Edward. 'The Range of Shakespeare's Comedy'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15 (1964): 55-66.

HUGILL (1980)   HUGILL, Beryl. *Bring on the Clowns*. Newton Abbot/London: David & Charles, 1980.

HUIZINGA (repr. 2002)   HUIZINGA, Johan Huizinga. *Homo ludens. A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. London: Routledge, 1949 (repr. 2002).

HUTCHEON (1985)   HUTCHEON, Linda. *A Theory of Parody. The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms.* New York/London: Routledge, 1985.

HUTSON (2007)   HUTSON, Lorna. *The Invention of Suspicion. Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2007.

ISER (1980)   ISER, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore et al.: John Hopkins University Press, 1980.

JACKSON (2005)   JACKSON, MacDonald Pairman. 'Francis Meres and the Cultural Contexts of Shakespeare's Rival Poet Sonnets'. *The Review of English Studies* 56.224 (2005): 224-246.

JACOBSON (1997)   JACOBSON, Howard. *Seriously Funny. From the Ridiculous to the Sublime*. Harmondsworth: Viking, 1997.

JAKOBI (1996)   JAKOBI, Rainer. *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

JANIK (1998)   JANIK, Vicki K. (ed.). *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History. A bio-bibliographical Sourcebook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998.

JANIK (1998)   JANIK, Del Ivan. 'The American Circus Clown'. *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History. A bio-bibliographical Sourcebook*. Vicki K. Janik (ed.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998. 136-145.

JAUß (²1979)   JAUß, Hans Robert. 'Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft'. *Rezeptionsästhetik*. Rainer Warning (ed.). München: Fink, ²1979. 126-162.

JENKINS (1975)   JENKINS, Harold. 'Hamlet and the fishmonger'. *Deutsche Shakespeare – Gesellschaft West Jahrbuch*. Hermann Heuer (ed.), Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1975. 109-20.

JENSEN (1996)   JENSEN, Kristian. 'Reform of Latin and Latin Teaching'. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Jill Kraye (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 63-81.

JONES (2010)   JONES, Christopher P. *New Heroes in Antiquity. From Achilles to Antinoos*. Cambridge, Mass./ London: Harvard University Press, 2010.

JOSHEL	JOSHEL, Sandra R. 'Slavery and Roman Literary Culture'. *The Cambridge World History of Slavery* (online). Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 214-240. Cambridge Histories Online. URL= http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521840668 (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.
JOSIPOVICI (2016)	JOSIPOVICI, Gabriel. *Hamlet. Fold on Fold*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2016.
JUNG (2010)	JUNG, Carl G. 'On the Psychology of the Trickster Figure'. *Four Archetypes*. *The Collected Works*. Vol. 9, pt. 1. Transl. by Richard Francis Carrington Hull. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010.
KASTAN (1985)	KASTAN, David Scott. *'All's Well That Ends Well* and the Limits of Comedy'. *English Literary History* 52 (1985): 575-89.
KERN (1980)	KERN, Edith G. *The Absolute Comic.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
KIDD (2014)	KIDD, Stephen E. *Nonsense and Meaning in Ancient Greek Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
KIMBROUGH (1964)	KIMBROUGH, Robert. 'The Problem of Thersites'. *Modern Language Review* 59.2 (1964): 173-6.
KINDT (2011)	KINDT, Tom. *Literatur und Komik. Zur Theorie literarischer Komik und zur deutschen Komödie im 18. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011.
KLICHE (2001)	KLICHE, Dieter. s.v. Häßlich. *ÄGB* III (2001) 25-66.
KLOSS (2001)	KLOSS, Gerrit. *Erscheinungsformen komischen Sprechens bei Aristophanes*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
KNOX (1955)	KNOX, Bernard. '*The Tempest* and the Ancient Comic Tradition'. *English Stage Comedy.* William K. Wimsatt (ed.). New York: Ams Print, 1965. 52-73.
KOESTLER (1949)	KOESTLER, Arthur. *Insight and Outlook. An Inquiry into the Common Foundations of Science, Art and Social Ethics*. London: Macmillan, 1949.
KOESTLER (1964)	KOESTLER, Arthur. *The Act of Creation*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
LAMB (2013)	LAMB, Julian. 'Sense and Sententiousness: Wittgenstein, Milton, Shakespeare'. *Wittgenstein Reading*. Sascha Bru et al. (eds.). Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 55-73.
LAROQUE (²2006)	LAROQUE, François. 'Shakespeare's Festive Comedies'. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. The Comedies*. Vol. III. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (eds.). Oxford et al.: Blackwell Publishing, ²2006. 23-46.
LASER (1987)	LASER, Siegfried. *Sport und Spiel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

LAUPICHLER (2002)	LAUPICHLER, Astrid. *Lachen und Weinen: tragikomisch-karnevaleske Entwicklungsräume*. Münster et al.: LIT, 2002.
LEDER et al. (2004)	LEDER, Helmut et al. 'A model of aesthetic appreciation and aesthetic judgements'. *British Journal of Psychology* 95.4 (2004): 489-508.
LEVIN (1959)	LEVIN, Harry. *The Question of Hamlet.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
LINDLEY (1996)	LINDLEY, Arthur. *Hyperion and the Hobbyhorse. Studies in Carnivalesque Subversion*. Newark/London: Associated University Press, 1996.
LOWRY (1991)	LOWRY, Eddie R. *Thersites. A Study in Comic Shame*. New York/London: Garland Publishing, 1991.
MAGUIRE (2014)	MAGUIRE, Laurie. *Othello: Language and Writing*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014.
MARTIN (2007)	MARTIN, Richard P. 'Ancient theatre and performance culture'. *Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*. Marianne McDonald (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 36-54.
MARX (2014)	MARX, Peter W. 'Das Komische'. *Hamlet-Handbuch. Stoffe, Aneignungen, Deutungen.* Peter W. Marx (ed.). Stuttgart/Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 2014. 41-44.
MATUS (1995)	MATUS, Jill L. *Unstable Bodies. Victorian Representations of Sexuality and Maternity*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1995.
MAURACH (1988)	MAURACH, Gregor. *Der Poenulus des Plautus*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1988.
MCCARTHY (2000)	MCCARTHY, Kathleen. *Slaves, Master, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000.
METZGER (1993)	METZGER, Werner. s.v. Narr. *Lexikon des Mittelalters VI* (1993) 1023-1026.
MILLER (1990)	MILLER, Dean A. 'Indo-European "Bad Death" and Trifunctional Revenants'. *Incognita* 1.2 (1990): 143-82.
MILLER (2000)	MILLER, Dean A. *The Epic Hero*. Baltimore et al.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
MILLS (2001)	MILLS, Margaret A. 'The Gender of the Trick, Female Tricksters and Male Narrators'. *Asian Folklore Studies* 60 (2001): 237-258.
MILWARD (1990)	MILWARD, Peter. *The Medieval Dimension in Shakespeare's Plays*. Lewiston, N.Y. et al.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.
MIOLA (1994)	MIOLA, Robert. *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy. The Influence of Plautus and Terence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
MIOLA (2000)	MIOLA, Robert. *Shakespeare's Reading*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2000.

MIOLA (2010)	MIOLA, Robert. 'Comedy and the Comic'. *The Classical Tradition*. Anthony Grafton et al. (eds.). Cambridge, Mass./London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010. 217-225.
MIOLA (2018)	MIOLA, Robert. 'Encountering the Past I: Shakespeare's Reception of Classical Comedy'. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Comedy.* Heather Hirschfeld (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. 36-54.
MITTELL (2001)	MITTELL, Jason. 'Cartoon Realism: Genre Mixing and the Cultural Life of *The Simpsons*'. *The Velvet Light Trap* 47 (2001): 15-28.
MITTELL (2004)	MITTELL, Jason. *Genre and Television. From Cop Shows to Cartoons in American Culture*. New York/London: Routledge, 2004.
MOOKERJEE (2013)	MOOKERJEE, Robin. *Transgressive Fiction. The New Satiric Tradition*. Basingstoke et al.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
MORREALL (2013)	MORREALL, John. 'Philosophy of Humour'. *The Standford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2013 Edition). Edward N. Zalta (ed.). URL= http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/humor/ (accessed January 05, 2022) Website.
MÜLLER (1913)	MÜLLER, Albert. 'Die Schimpfwörter in der Römischen Komödie'. *Philologus* 72 (1913): 492-502.
MÜLLER (1995)	MÜLLER, Marika. *Die Ironie. Kulturgeschichte und Textgestalt*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1995.
MURRAY/ LIVINGSTONE (1947)	MURRAY, Gilbert and Richard Winn LIVINGSTONE (eds.). *The Legacy of Greece*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947,
NERVEGNA (2013)	NERVEGNA, Sebastiana. *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
NESTLE (²1975)	NESTLE, Wilhelm. *Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Sokrates*. Stuttgart: Alfred Körner Verlag, ²1975.
NIETZSCHE (1994)	NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. *Die Geburt der Tragödie*. Manfred Landfester (ed.). Frankfurt a.M./ Leipzig: Insel Verlag, 1994.
NIKLAUS (1956)	NIKLAUS, Thelma. *Harlequin or the Rise and Fall of a Bergamask Rogue*. New York: Braziller, 1956.
NUTTALL (2007)	NUTTALL, Austin D. *Shakespeare the Thinker.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
OAKLEY (1985)	OAKLEY, Stephen P. 'Single Combat in the Roman Republic'. *The Classical Quarterly* 35.2 (1985): 392-410.
OESTERREICH (2014)	OESTERREICH, Peter L. 'Polypersonalität. Das *grand arcanum* starker autoinvenienter Subjektivität'. *Wege moderner Rhetorikforschung. Klassische Fundamente und interdisziplinäre Entwicklung*. Gert Ueding and Gregor Kalivoda (eds.). Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2014. 75-88.
O'GORMAN (2000)	O'GORMAN, Ellen. *Irony and Misreading in the Annals of Tacitus*, Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

OPITZ-TROTMAN (2012)   OPITZ-TROTMAN, George. 'Staging Vice and Acting Evil: Theatre and Anti-Theatre in Early Modern England'. *The Church and Literature*. Peter Clarke and Charlotte Methuen (eds.). Woodbridge et al.: Boydell Press, 2012. 156-169.

ORNSTEIN (1986)   ORNSTEIN, Robert. *Shakespeare's Comedies. From Roman Farce to Romantic Mystery*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986.

OTTO (2003)   OTTO, Dirk. s.v. Utopie. *HWRh* IX (2003) Sp. 982-997.

PAGLIA (1990)   PAGLIA, Camille. *Sexual Personae*, *Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*. London/New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

PARKER (2001)   PARKER, Holt. 'Crucially Funny, or Tranio on the Couch: The *servus callidus* and Jokes about Torture'. *Oxford Readings in Menander, Plautus and Terence*. Erich Segal (ed.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2001. 127-137.

PHILLIPS (1998)   PHILLIPS, James. 'Zanni'. *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History. A bio-biographical Sourcebook*. Vicki K. Janik (ed.). Westport, CT et al.: Greenwood Press, 1998. 508-512.

PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE (²1962)   PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, Arthur W. *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*. Rev. by Thomas Bertram Lonsdale Webster. Oxford et al.: Clarendon Press, ²1962.

PLETT (1983)   PLETT, Heinrich F. 'The Place and Function of Style in Renaissance Poetics'. *Renaissance Eloquence*. James J. Murphy (ed.). Berkeley et al.: University of California, 1983. 356-375.

POLLARD (2017a)   POLLARD, Tanya. *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages.* Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2017.

POLLARD (2017b)   POLLARD, Tanya. 'Genre: Comedy and Tragedy'. *The Routledge Research Companion to Shakespeare and Classical Literature.* Sean Keilen and Nick Moschovakis (eds.). London/New York: Routledge, 2017. 42-56.

PORTER (2000)   PORTER, James I. *The Invention of Dionysus. An Essay on The Birth of Tragedy*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.

POSTLEWAIT/DAVIS (2003)   POSTLEWAIT, Thomas and Tracy C. DAVIS. 'Theatricality: An Introduction'. *Theatricality*. Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait (eds.). New York et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 1-39.

PREISS (2014)   PREISS, Richard. *Clowning and Authorship in Early Modern Theatre*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

PRENTKI (2012)   PRENTKI, Tim. *The Fool in European Theatre. Stages of Folly*. Basingstoke et al.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

PRESCOTT (1920)   PRESCOTT, Henry W. 'Inorganic Rôles in Roman Comedy'. *Classical Philology* 15.3 (1920): 245-281.

PRESCOTT (1929)   PRESCOTT, Henry W. 'The Comedy of Errors'. *Classical Philology* 24.1 (1929): 32-41.

PYLE (1948)   PYLE, Fitzroy. '"Twelfth Night, "King Lear", and "Arcadia"'. *MLR* 43.4 (1948): 449-55.

RADIN (1956) RADIN, Paul. *The Trickster. A Study in American Indian Mythology.* With commentaries by Karl Kerényi and Carl G. Jung. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.

RASKIN (1985) RASKIN, Victor. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht et al.: D. Reidel, 1985.

REI (1998) REI, Annalisa. 'Villains, Wives, and Slaves in the Comedies of Plautus'. *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture. Differential Equations*. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan (eds.). London et al.: Routledge, 1998. 92-108.

REIBETANZ (1977) REIBETANZ, John. *The Lear World*. *A Study of King Lear in its Dramatic Context*. Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

RICHARDS/RICHARDS (1990) RICHARDS, Kenneth and Laura RICHARDS. *The Commedia dell'Arte: A Documentary History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

RIEHLE (1990) RIEHLE, Wolfgang. *Shakespeare, Plautus and the Humanist Tradition*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1990.

ROTHMAN (1982) ROTHMAN, William. *Hitchcock. The Murderous Gaze*. Cambridge, Mass. et al.: Harvard University Press, 1982.

ROSE (2008) ROSE, Charles Brian. 'Forging Identity in the Roman Republic: Trojan Ancestry and Veristic Portraiture'. *Role Models in the Roman World. Identity and Assimilation*. Sinclair Bell (ed.). Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 2008. 97-131.

ROSENBLOOM (2014) ROSENBLOOM, David. 'The Politics of Comic Athens'. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014. 297-320.

ROSENKRANZ (²2015) ROSENKRANZ, Karl. *Ästhetik des Häßlichen*. Dieter Kliche (ed.). Stuttgart: Reclam, ²2015.

RUEGG (1968) RUEGG, August. 'Homerisches und Unhomerisches in Shakespeares *Troilus and Cressida*'. *Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft –West* (1968): 28-42.

RÜPKE (2004) RÜPKE, Jörg. 'Roman Religion'. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*. Harriet I. Flower (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 179-196.

RUSSEL-BROWN (1992) RUSSELL-BROWN, John. 'Multiplicity of Meaning in the Last Moments of Hamlet'. *Connotations* 2.1 (1992): 16-33.

RUSTEN (2011) RUSTEN, Jeffrey (ed.). *The Birth of Greek Comedy*. *Texts, Documents, and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486 – 280*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2011.

RUSTEN (2014) RUSTEN, Jeffrey. 'In Search of the Essence of Old Comedy: from Aristotle's *Poetics* to Zieliński, Cornford, and beyond'. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014. 33-49.

RUTHERFORD (2012) RUTHERFORD, Richard B. *Greek Tragic Style. Form, Language and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

SALINGAR (1974)   SALINGAR, Leo. *Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy*. London/New York et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

SALINGAR (1986)   SALINGAR, Leo. *Dramatic Form in Shakespeare and the Jacobeans*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

SCHADE (2015)   SCHADE, Leah D. *Creation-Crisis Preaching. Ecology, Theology, and the Pulpit*. St. Louis: Charlice Press, 2015.

SCHALKWYK (2005)   SCHALKWYK, David. 'Love and Service in *Twelfth Night* and the Sonnets'. *SQ* 56.1 (2005): 76-100.

SCHALKWYK (2008)   SCHALKWYK, David. *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

SCHECKNER (2009)   SCHECKNER, Peter. 'Renegades in the Literature of War: From Homer to Heller'. *War, Literature & Arts* 21 (2009): 197-205.

SCHMITT (2009)   SCHMITT, Arbogast. 'Achill-ein Held'. *Merkur* 63.724 (2009): 860-70.

SCHULZ (1971)   SCHULZ, Volker. *Studien zum Komischen in Shakespeares Komödien*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.

SCHWIND (2000)   SCHWIND, Klaus. s.v. Komisch. *ÄGB* III (2000) 332-384.

SCULLION (2014)   SCULLION, Scott. 'Religion and the Gods in Greek Comedy'. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.). Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014. 340-355.

SEGAL (1968)   SEGAL, Erich. *Roman Laughter. The Comedy of Plautus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

SEGAL (1981)   SEGAL, Erich. *Scholarship on Plautus 1965-1976*. *The Classical World* 74.7. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University, 1981.

SEGAL (1996)   SEGAL, Erich (ed.). *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 1996.

SEIDENSTICKER (2005)   SEIDENSTICKER, Bernd. *Über das Vergnügen an tragischen Gegenständen. Studien zum antiken Drama*. Jens Holzhausen (ed.). München/Leipzig: Saur, 2005.

SEIDENSTICKER (2010)   SEIDENSTICKER, Bernd. *Das antike Theater*. München: C.H. Beck, 2010.

SHICKMAN (1991)   SHICKMAN, Allan R. 'The Fool's Mirror in *King Lear*'. *English Literary Renaissance* 21.1 (1991): 75-86.

SILK (2000)   SILK, Michael Stephen. *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*. New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 2000.

SILK et al. (2014)   SILK, Michael Stephen et al. *The Classical Tradition. Art, Literature, Thought.* Chichester et al.: Wiley, 2014.

SIMPSON (1955)   SIMPSON, Percy. *Studies in Elizabethan Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

SLATER (1985)   SLATER, Niall W. *Plautus in Performance. The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.

SLATER (²2000)   SLATER, Niall W. *Plautus in Performance. The Theatre of the Mind*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, ²2000.

SMITH (1923)   SMITH, George C. Moore. *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

SNYDER (1979)   SNYDER, Susan. *The Comic Matrix of Shakespeare's Tragedies. Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Othello, and King Lear.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979.

SOULE (2000)   SOULE, Lesley Wade. *Actor as Anti-Character, Dionysus, the Devil, and the Boy Rosalind*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000.

SOUTHWORTH (1998)   SOUTHWORTH, John. *Fools and Jesters at the English Court*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998.

SPIVACK (³1968)   SPIVACK, Bernard. *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. The History of A Metaphor in Relation to his Major Villains*. New York/London: Columbia University Press, ³1968.

SPRANGER (1961)   SPRANGER, Peter P. *Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1961.

SRIGLEY (2000)   SRIGLEY, Michael. *The Probe of Doubt. Scepticism and Illusion in Shakespeare's Plays*. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000.

STACE (1968)   STACE, C. 'The Slaves of Plautus'. *Greece & Rome* 15.1 (1968): 64-77.

STARKS-ESTES (2014)   STARKS-ESTES, Lisa S. *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Plays. Transforming Ovid*. Basingstoke et al.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

STECKEL (2015)   STECKEL, Sita. 'Wissensgeschichten. Zugänge, Probleme und Potentiale in der Erforschung mittelalterlicher Wissenskulturen'. *Akademische Wissenskulturen. Praktiken des Lehrens und Forschens vom Mittelalter bis zur Moderne*. Martin Kintzinger and Sita Steckel (eds.). Basel: Schwabe, 2015. 9-58.

STIERLE (1976)   STIERLE, Karlheinz. 'Komik der Handlung, der Sprachhandlung, der Komödie'. *Das Komische*. Wolfgang Preisendanz und Rainer Warning (eds.). München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976. 237-267.

STOTT (2005)   STOTT, Andrew McConnell. *Comedy*. New York et al.: Routledge, 2005.

STROSETZKI (2003)   STROSETZKI, Christoph. *Einführung in die Spanische und Lateinamerikanische Literaturwissenschaft*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2003.

STUART (2012)   STUART, Roberta. *Plautus and Roman Slavery*. Malden, MA et al.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

STÜRNER (2020)   STÜRNER, Ferdinand. 'The *Servus Callidus* in Charge'. *A Companion to Plautus*. George Fredric Franko and Dorota Dutsch (eds.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2020. 135-149.

STYAN (1975)   STYAN, John L. *Drama, Stage and Audience*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

SÜSS (1969)	SÜSS, Wilhelm. *Lachen, Komik und Witz in der Antike*. Zürich/Stuttgart: Artemis, 1969.
SVENDSEN (1971)	SVENDSEN, James Thomas. *Goats and Monkeys. A Study of the Animal Imagery in Plautus*. Diss., Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, 1971.
TALADOIRE (1956)	TALADOIRE, Barthélémy. *Essai sur le Comique de Plaute*. Monaco: L'Imprimerie Nationale de Monaco, 1956.
TALBOT VAN DEN BERG (1975)	TALBOT VAN DEN BERG, Kent. 'Theatrical Fiction and the Reality of Love in *As You like It*'. *PMLA* 90.5 (1975): 885-893.
TANASE (2014)	TANASE, Iuliana. 'The Italian *Commedia* and the Fashioning of the Shakespearean Fool'. *Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance. Appropriation, Transformation, Opposition*. Michele Marrapodi (ed.). London/New York: Routledge, 2014. 215-234.
TEAGUE (1994)	TEAGUE, Frances (ed.). *Acting Funny. Comic Theory and Practice in Shakespeare's Plays*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994.
TEICHERT (2000)	TEICHERT, Dieter. *Personen und Identitäten*. Berlin et al.: de Gruyter, 2000.
TEUBER (1989)	TEUBER, Bernhard. *Sprache, Körper, Traum: Zur karnevalesken Tradition in der romanischen Literatur aus früher Zeit*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989.
THOMSON (2004)	THOMSON, Peter. 'Clowns, Fools and Knaves: Stages in the Evolution of Acting'. *The Cambridge History of British Theatre*. Vol. I. Jane Milling and Peter Thomson (eds.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 407-23.
TILLEY (1924)	TILLEY, Morris P. 'Pun and Proverb as Aids to Unexplained Shakespearean Jests'. *Studies in Philology* 21.3 (1924): 492-5.
TILLYARD (1949)	TILLYARD, Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall. *Shakespeare's Problem Plays*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949.
TITCHENER (1915)	TITCHENER, Edward B. *A Beginner's Psychology*. New York: Macmillan Press, 1915.
TURNBULL (2000)	TURNBULL, David. *Masons, Tricksters and Cartographers. Comparative Studies in the Sociology of Scientific and Indigenous Knowledge*. Amsterdam et al.: Hardwood Academic Publishers, 2000.
VEALE et al. (2006)	VEALE, Tony et al. 'The cognitive mechanisms of adversarial humor'. *Humor* 19.3 (2006): 305-359.
VERNANT (1982)	VERNANT, Jean-Pierre. 'La belle mort et le cadavre outrage'. *La mort, les morts dans la societés anciennes*. Gherardo Gnoli (ed.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
VERSNEL (1993)	VERSNEL, Hendrik S. 'Two carnivalesque princes: Augustus and Claudius and the ambiguity of Saturnalian imagery'. *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*. Siegmar Döpp (ed.). Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1993. 99-122.

VICKERS (1983)   VICKERS, Brian. '"The Power of Persuasion": Images of the Orator, Elyot to Shakespeare'. *Renaissance Eloquence*. James J. Murphy (ed.). Berkeley et al.: University of Illinois Press, 1983. 411-435.

VIDEBÆK (1996)   VIDEBÆK, Bente A. *The Stage Clown in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Westport, Conn./London: Greenwood Press, 1996.

VINCE (1984)   VINCE, Ronald W. *Renaissance Theatre. A Historiographical Handbook*. Westport, Conn./London: Greenwood Press, 1984.

WARNER (2009)   WARNER, Marina. 'Mirror-Readings: An Afterword'. *Recognition. The Poetics of Narrative*. Philip F. Kennedy and Marilyn Lawrence (eds.). New York et al.: Peter Lang, 2009. 227-234.

WARNING (1976)   WARNING, Rainer. 'Elemente einer Pragmasemiotik der Komödie'. *Das Komische*. Wolfgang Preisendanz und Rainer Warning (eds.). München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976. 279-333.

WATSON (1983)   WATSON, Alan. 'Roman Slave Law and Romanist Ideology'. *Phoenix* 37.1 (1983): 53-65.

WEIMANN (1970)   WEIMANN, Robert. 'Das "Lachen mit dem Publikum". Die beiden Veroneser und die volkstümliche Komödientradition'. *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 106 (1970): 85-99.

WEIMANN (1978)   WEIMANN, Robert. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre. Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*. Robert Schwartz (ed.). Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

WEISSE (1966)   WEISSE, Christian Hermann. *System der Aesthetik als Wissenschaft von der Idee der Schönheit*. Bd. I (Leipzig 1830). Hildesheim: Olms, 1966.

WELLERSHOFF (1976)   WELLERSHOFF, Dieter. 'Die Irrealität der Komödie als utopischer Schein'. *Das Komische*. Wolfgang Preisendanz and Rainer Warning (eds.). München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976. 379-383.

WELSFORD (1935)   WELSFORD, Enid. *The Fool. His Social and Literary History*. London: Faber and Faber, 1935.

WESTERKAMP (2007)   WESTERKAMP, Dirk. 'Laughter, Catharsis, and the Patristic Conception of Embodied Logos'. *Embodiment in Cognition and Culture*. John Michael Krois et al. (eds.). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007. 221-242.

WESTERMANN (1955)   WESTERMANN, William L. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1955.

WHITLEY (1988)   WHITLEY, James. 'Early States and Hero Cults: A Re-Appraisal'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988): 173-182.

WILES (1987)   WILES, David. *Shakespeare's Clown, Actor and Text in the Elizabethan Playhouse*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

WILLEFORD (1969)   WILLEFORD, William. *The Fool and his Scepter. A Study in Clowns and Jesters and their Audience*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

WILKINS (2000)   WILKINS, John. *The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2000.

WILSON (1962)   WILSON, John Dover. *Shakespeare's Happy Comedies*. London: Faber and Faber, 1962.

WINE (2003)   WINE, Kathleen. '*Theatrum Mundi*: An Overview'. *Theatrum Mundi. Studies in Honor of Ronald W. Tobin*. Claire L. Carlin and Kathleen Wine (eds.). Charlottesville: Rockwood Press, 2003. 6-22.

WIRTH (1999)   WIRTH, Uwe. *Diskursive Dummheit. Abduktion und Komik als Grenzphänomene des Verstehens*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1999.

WIRTH (2017)   WIRTH, Uwe. 'Ironie'. *Komik*. *Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*. Uwe Wirth (ed.). Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2017. 16-21.

WRENHAVEN (2013)   WRENHAVEN, Kelly. 'A Comedy of Errors: the Comic Slave in Greek Art'. *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greek Comic Drama*. Ben Akrigg and Rob Tordoff (eds.). Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 124-143.

WRIGHT (1926)   WRIGHT, Louis B. 'Will Kemp and the *commedia dell'arte*'. *Modern Language Notes* 41.8 (1926): 516-20.

ZAGAGI (1980)   ZAGAGi, Netta. *Tradition and Originality in Plautus. Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980.

ZILLMANN (1994)   ZILLMANN, Dolf. 'Mechanism of emotional involvement with drama'. *Poetics* 23.1 (1994): 33-51.

ZILLMANN (1998)   ZILLMANN, Dolf. 'The Psychology of the Appeal of Portrayals of Violence'. *Why we watch. The Attractions of Violent Entertainment*. Jeffrey Goldstein (ed.). New York et al.: Oxford University Press, 1998. 179-211.

ZIMBARDO (1990)   ZIMBARDO, Rose A. 'The King and The Fool: *King Lear* as Self-Deconstructing Text'. *Criticism* 32.1 (1990): 1-29.

ZIMMERMANN (2006)   ZIMMERMANN, Bernhard. *Die Griechische Komödie*. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Antike, 2006.

ZWIERLEIN (1991)   ZWIERLEIN, Otto. *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus III. Pseudolus*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1991.