

ROMAN DRAMA

Frederic Will, Ph.D.

Contents

Week 6 Plautus (254 B.C.-184 B.C.)

Week 7 Seneca (4 B.C.-65 A.D.)

Plautus (254 B.C.-184 B.C.)

Differences among genres. We have looked at examples of epic and historical imagination in Roman literature, and found that in certain cases the two imaginations overlap, as between Virgil and Livy, both of whom are driven to sanctify the origins of the Roman State. When it comes to Roman drama, however, we tap another vein of literary expression, that of popular amusement.

Origins of Roman drama. Early Roman drama acquired its impulse from the influence of the Greek dramatist Menander (341 B.C.-290 B.C.), who was the perfect expression of the urbane creations of the Hellenistic period; if it is true that the Greeks, in being conquered by the Romans in the second century B.C., at the same time conquered the Romans—through superior creativity—then the earliest expression of that reverse conquest might be the comedies of Plautus, which take off from the Greek. It should be added, though, that there is fragmentary evidence that Roman comedy existed long before Plautus—perhaps several centuries earlier—though all we have left is references to plays; also that the ludic/often raw/often phallic quality of the comedy of Plautus belongs to a long tradition of Roman popular culture, of jongleurs in the streets, nude public dancing, flute concerts in public.

Roman drama as popular entertainment. Be that as it may, we inherit in Plautus a fully developed comic tradition which played an important role in the public entertainment of the Romans. This role unfolded regularly at the *ludi*, religious festivals honoring Jupiter, and held annually in September, starting in 366 B.C. At those *ludi*, where chariot races, boxing, and dancing were performed, plays of Plautus were regular centerpieces. Of that centrality it should be noted that these plays were performed *without a theater* until 55 B.C., so that the face to face quality of actors and spectators contributed directness. Plautus himself, born in the countryside (Umbria), and raised to a modest background, got his earliest job as a stage carpenter, which was not only the bridge to his exposure to Greek dramatic works, but his baptism of fire in the nitty gritty of stage presentation.

Plautus' opus. Of Plautus' fifty two plays there remain twenty, all comedies, and all more or less cut from the same cloth; the same stock of characters; the same plot developments; the same license—a lot of joking about the gods, which aroused criticism in many quarters, and squared off against the 'religious devotional' purpose of the *ludi*; the same referential background of cultural anxiety—the 2nd Punic War (218-201 B.C.) sustained a high anxiety level in Rome. The stockpile of familiar character types—remarkably similar to those bursting forth in Italian *commedia del'arte*, already in the Renaissance heralding developments in seventeenth European theater—shares with the sharp dialogue the joyful energy of these plays.

Stock characters in Plautus. A mild example of the repartee in these plays can be found in the brief excerpt below, from Plautus' *Captivi*. (That mini excerpt will remind us already of the texture of those Shakespeare comedies, like *Measure for Measure*, which dazzle us still with their wordplay.) The stock characters who enact the formulae of these plays are numerous: the *adulescens*, a love struck young man; the *senex*, an old man, perhaps the father of the *adulescens*, often a competitor with his son for the love of a younger woman; the *leno*, or whoremaster, often in charge of a young lovely who is the interest of the *adulescens*; the *miles gloriosus*, or braggardly soldier, who totally lacks self-awareness; the *parasitus*, who sponges off the leading characters; and so on into minor characters like the whoremistress or the virgin, who is typically without personality, except beauty, and is the love object of the major male population. With this kind of cast—whose behavior, costuming, language are pretty consistent from one play to the next—Plautus constructs witty variations on themes of misunderstanding, happy endings for love, and cranky obstructionism—which will arouse the emotions we expect today from a good old sitcom. It will only add to the effect if we complete the description: each play has virtually the same setting, as well as characters; that setting is an

urban street with an exit out onto a thoroughfare through which characters enter and depart; the trigger to action is usually an act of eavesdropping by which a generative rumor starts things going.

SCENE II. Enter, from his house, HEGIO and a SLAVE.

HEG. Now, give attention you, if you please. Those two captives whom I purchased yesterday of the Quaestors out of the spoil, put upon them chains of light weight; take off those greater ones with which they are bound. Permit them to walk, if they wish, out of doors, or if indoors, but so that they are watched with the greatest care. A captive at liberty is like a bird that's wild; if opportunity is once given for escaping, 'tis enough; after that, you can never catch him.

SLAVE. Doubtless we all are free men more willingly than we live the life of slaves.

HEG. You, indeed, don't seem to think so.

SLAVE. If I have nothing to give, should you like me to give myself to flight?

HEG. If you do so give yourself, I shall at once have something to be giving to you.

SLAVE. I'll make myself just like the wild bird you were telling of...

History and the epic are hereby left behind as private acts, consummating private visions, while the dramatic imagination, in Rome as elsewhere, is eminently public, and in comedy especially absolutely requires giving public pleasure.

Readings: *Plautus: The Comedies*, Volume I, ed. Slavitt (Baltimore, 1995).

Sharrock, Alison, *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence* (Cambridge, 2009.)

Discussion questions:

Why do Plautus' plays thrive on stock characters? Would it have something to do with his historical moment? In what ways do stock characters serve as useful vehicles of comic art?

Does Plautine comedy feature slapstick and burlesque elements? What kind of audience do you imagine for Plautus's plays?

What kind of use did Shakespeare make, of Plautus' plays? Does the comedy of errors theme seem to you to be of lasting value as a theatrical recourse?

Seneca (4 B.C.-65 A.D.)

Seneca and Plautus. At the conclusion of this week's syllabus you will find a translation of a passage from Seneca's *Oedipus*—exact date unknown—which may at first glance make you doubt whether we are still dealing with Ancient Roman drama. We are. Though the passage yanks its original into strong contemporary diction it is nonetheless a vigorous and honest account of lines from the Roman dramatist and philosopher Seneca. We could hardly be farther in spirit from the comic world of Plautus, which we read in the previous week. We have moved two hundred years into the future, have entered the first half-century of Imperial Roman rule, and have changed genre from robust stock character drama to closet drama playing off against a sophisticated model, the *Oedipus* of the Greek dramatist Sophocles, written in the mid fifth century B.C.

Oedipus the King. Sophocles' play, as you know, concerns a proud, doomed, and irascible Ruler of Thebes, whose land has gone waste as a result—that is the rumor in the kingdom—of unholy actions somewhere in the community. The drive of the tightly compacted play is to find out the cause of the plague on the land, to track it to its individual source—the King himself—and to mete out a dreadful purging punishment to the King. The play is a perfect geometry of beginning, middle, end. Seneca's *Oedipus*, on the other hand, is baroque, digressive, highly rhetorical. Whereas the king's mother, Jocasta, is in Sophocles a cog in the wheels of destiny, who limits her commentaries on the dreadful fate of her son, to various ways of deploring the savage ironies of life, in Seneca's play, as you see above, Jocasta deplures, in the fate of her son, the whole rotten fallenness of the human condition, and does so in extravagantly bitter and melodramatic terms. In the hands of her brilliant British adapter, Ted Hughes, her speech acquires a texture of its own, which brings to the front of the play the hyperbolic intensity of a character who, in Sophocles, is simply a stage in the development of the plot.

The tenor of Seneca's work. The tenor of Seneca's work as a dramatist is epitomized in this example: intense, hyperbolic, rhetorical, and, as we refreshingly begin to think, valuable in its own right and deeply expressive of its own age. (Think of the example of the murder of Agrippina, in Tacitus; think of the fierce personal struggles, and emotional depths, of the main figures in the fight for the succession to Augustus, at just the time of Seneca's life: doesn't the speech of Iocasta belong to the rhetorical modes of the time?)

Seneca and Nero. The dramatist behind *Oedipus*, and eight other tragedies on ancient Greek mythical themes, played a prominent role in the first half of the first century A.D. From Cordoba in Spain, Seneca went as a young man to Rome, to study Rhetoric and Philosophy—in the latter field especially to deepen his understanding of the principles of Stoicism, to which he adhered throughout his life. That Greek philosophy, with its emphasis on control of the passions, but also on the power of the emotions, lay behind the philosophical developments of Seneca's thought. His view was that the misuse of the passions is a sure key to downfall, and that man needs calm and willed self-discipline in order to lead a satisfactory life. This larger perspective, which is deeply embedded in the values of Seneca's literary work, was hard won, for in 'real life' Seneca himself was exposed to the baroque energies of a cultural moment which would not spare the individual. As tutor and advisor to the Emperor Nero—again recall the treatment of Nero in Tacitus—Seneca tried to convince his boss of the importance of self-control, and for a time, but only for a time, succeeded.

Seneca as moralist. In the year 41 A.D. Seneca was accused of complicity in a plot to kill the Emperor, and was sent into exile. It was while in exile on the island of Corsica that Seneca turned inward and began to write seriously, leaving us in the end a remarkably rich collage of texts—one hundred twenty four letters—many of them highly refined philosophical reflection, nine tragedies, and twelve substantial philosophical essays, in which he discusses, with great finesse, issues bearing on desire, anger, and the potentials for global oneness in humanity. It is cruelly ironic that this brilliantly outreaching creator was in the end forced to commit suicide, a dreadful one as the historian Tacitus again tells us, in which repeated vein cuttings and ultimately suffocation by steam were required to do the deed.

*when I carried my sons
I carried them for death I carried them for the
Throne
I carried them for final disaster when I carried my
First son
Did I know what was coming did I know*

*What ropes of blood were twisting together what
Bloody footprints
Were hurrying together in my body
Did I know what past and unfinished reckonings
Were getting flesh again inside me
Did I think that the debts of the past
Were settled before I conceived
I knew the thing in my womb was going to have to
Pay for the whole past
I knew the future was waiting for him like a greedy
God a man-eater in a cave
Was going to ask for everything happiness strength
And finally life
As if no other man existed I carried him for this
For pain and for fear
For hard sharp metal for the cruelty of other men
And his own cruelty
I carried him for disease
For rottenness and dropping to pieces
I carried him for death bones dust I knew*

Readings:

Seneca, *Three Tragedies (Trojan Women; Medea; Phaedra)*, translated and with an introduction by Frederick Ahl (Ithaca, 1986).

Pratt, Norman, *Seneca's Drama* (Chapel Hill, 1983).

Discussion questions:

How does Seneca's Oedipus differ from the Oedipus of Sophocles, in *Oedipus The King*?

What do you see as the connection between Seneca's ethical theory, his Stoicism, and what you are coming to know as his dramatic practice?

Seneca's drama was performed in private readings, rather than on public stages. Can you see why that was an appropriate way to showcase Seneca's work?

The comedies of Plautus are closely related to popular humor and daily entertainments. What larger points—views of life and mankind—do you see Plautus developing through his drama?

How does Seneca's drama reflect the tenor of the age it is written in? Is there melodrama and intensity in both the drama and the age? How do that age, and that melodrama, fit with the Stoic emphasis on calm in Seneca's own world-view?