

ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	LVI.	2020.	pp. 227–245.
--	------	-------	--------------

THE *COMOEDIA TOGATA*, A ‘ROMAN’ LITERARY GENRE?

BY GIUSEPPE EUGENIO RALLO

University of Saint Andrews, United Kingdom
ger6@st-andrews.ac.uk

Abstract: This paper aims to shed fresh light on the *Togata*. By analysing the extant fragments, I will investigate if and in what sense it may be defined as a ‘Roman’ literary genre. I will focus on its ‘Roman-ness’, and I will highlight that it is a complex concept, without the ‘nationalistic’ connotations that one normally gives to the notion. I will demonstrate that the *Togata* is ‘Roman’ because it betrayed an attempt at creating a genre distinguished from the *Palliata*, and it had a widespread ‘Roman’ patina, with settings, names, and stereotypes which one would not find in other contemporary genres, in particular the *Palliata*. At the same time, I will also reflect on the fact that the *Togata* was a multifarious genre, with Latin, Italic, and Greek elements, and I will show that this was, paradoxically, another aspect of its ‘Roman-ness’.

Keywords: *Togata*; Roman comedy; Roman literature, identity, and society in mid-Republican Rome; Multilingualism; Multiculturalism.

The *Togata* has been traditionally defined as a ‘play in a *toga*’, in connection with and in opposition to the Plautine and Terentian *Palliata*, a ‘play in a *pallium*’. Roman *Palliatae* had Greek settings and names, and were adapted from Greek comedies. At the same time, it has been known since Fraenkel¹ that the Roman playwrights, especially Plautus, made several additions and changes to their originals, and introduced references to the Roman world. While the usage of the adjective ‘Roman’ to describe *Palliatae* refers to the culture of Rome, in particular Italy and Magna Graecia, I suggest that ‘Roman’ in the *Togata* had not a cultural and topographical meaning, but rather a ‘political’ one. In this context, I first use the term in the strict sense of ‘associated with the city of Rome’. I begin by focusing on Roman elements in the *Togata*. Second, I highlight the variety of elements typically staged in the *togatae*, such as Latin, Italic, and Greek. Finally, I stress how – if we intend ‘Roman’ as specifically related to the city of Rome – the *Togata* cannot be considered ‘Roman’ as such, because of the overwhelming mixture of several non-Roman elements performed on stage. That is to say, the *Togata* may be defined ‘Roman’ in so far as we consider ‘Roman’ all of those categories (= languages, cultures, and societies) which were ‘politically’ under

¹ Fraenkel 2007, 252–86.

the domination of mid-Republican Rome, and which were portrayed onstage by the Roman playwrights of the *Togata*, of which grammarians transmitted fragments and/or titles of plays, i.e. Titinius, Afranius and Atta.

1. Roman elements

In this section, I will analyse the presence of Roman settings (I), characters (II), and themes (III), in the *Togata*. As I show, the presence of elements specifically associated with the city of Rome is less prevalent than one might expect.

1.I Roman Settings

Indications of a Roman setting are found in the plays' titles: two *togatae*, attributed to Atta and Afranius, are named after the Roman festival of *Megalensia*; another by Afranius after the Roman *Compitalia*. It is reasonable to assume that these plays were set during these festivals, and therefore in Rome². Even though nothing can be said about the plots of these *togatae*, the reference to *Megalensia* and *Compitalia* testifies to a specifically Roman setting.

Indications of a Roman setting can also be found by analysing the title of a play along with the evidence contained within the remains of its text: for instance, Titinius *com.* 60–1 R.³ (*Hortensius*) *in foro aut in curia / Posita potius quam rure apud te in clausa. . . .* (Transl.: “in the *forum* or in the *curia* / located rather than in the countryside among you in an enclosed space...”). The title of this play explicitly confirms its Roman setting. *Hortensius* is, indeed, a name exclusively attested in Rome (see below). Moreover, the joke itself may suggest that Rome is the setting of such a play: *forum* and *curia* are the earliest attested institutions in Rome (see e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 12.24). It must be said that the *forum* does not have a robust Roman identity value, given that it is a term used by Romans also to refer to the equivalent Greek space (the agora), and both *curia* and *forum* are not

² *Megalensia* were first instituted in the City in 193 BCE, and were established in connection to the Pergamene culture to celebrate the Magna Mater (see e.g. Gruen 1990, 5–33; Erskine 2001, 198–224; Satterfield 2012, 373–91; Van Haepereen 2014, 299–321; Rolle 2015, 153–61; Belayche 2016, 45–59), shipped from Asia Minor to Rome in 205 BCE (Liv. 29.14, 34.54 and 36.36). It is not clear if it originally came from Pessinus (Liv. 29.10.5; 11.7), Ida (Ov. *Fast.* 4.263f.) or Pergamum (Varro *L.* 6.15). It was located in the Temple of Victoria until the construction of a sanctuary in the Palatine (Liv. 29.37.2). With regard to *Compitalia*, the title alludes to celebrations of *Lares* (cf. e.g. Laurence 1991, 145–51; Bettini 2012, 173–98), guardian spirits of the Roman houses (see e.g. Pl. *Aul.* 3–9; Ov. *Fast.* 1.139; Juv. 13.233), villages (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.15.3), and roads (Pl. *Merc.* 865).

specifically Roman (cf. e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.119; Vitruvius *De arch.* 5.1.1 and 5.2.1; Liv. 24.24.5–9; Ovid *Met.* 13.197). However, the mention of *curia* and *forum* in a *togata* with such a title suggests that the setting is thereby in Rome.

There is also external evidence for the Roman setting of one *togata*: Varro (Varro *L.* 5.25.8) reports that (...) *puticuli quod putescebant ibi cadavera proiecta, qui locus publicus ultra Esquilias. Itaque eum Afranius puticulos in togata appellat, quod inde suspiciunt per puteos lumen* (Transl. from de Melo 2019, 269: “(...) they are *puticuli* because the dead bodies thrown in *putescebant* ‘used to rot’ there; this public burial place is beyond the Esquiline. Hence Afranius calls it the *puticuli* ‘pit-lights’ in a *togata* play, because from there they look up at the *lumen* ‘light’ through the *putei*”).

Varro identifies something linked to the city of Rome in this unknown *togata*. He explains the etymological meaning of *puticulos*, reflecting on its geographical origin as well as mentioning a public place beyond the Esquiline called *puticulos* by Afranius. It is possible that the setting was Rome, although one cannot exclude the possibility that such a reference to the Esquiline might exist in other contexts. Out of 15, 43, and 12 titles (Titinius, Afranius, and Atta respectively) there are only four *togatae*, for which we can reconstruct that the setting was Rome with some certainty.

1.II Roman names

Over the past years, scholars have discussed Roman nomenclature in general³, but the *Togata* has not been given much attention. Closer analysis suggests that the *Togata* features Roman names used by Roman *gentes*. For instance, *Hortensius* (the title of a *togata* by Titinius) may allude to the *Hortensia gens*, attested in Rome since the fifth century BCE⁴. *Barbatus*, the title of another play of Titinius, might suggest a Roman *cognomen*, although such a title is problematic: manuscripts read e.g. *barratus*, *baratus*, *barnatus*, and *varratus*. Neukirck⁵ proposed *Barbatus* as title, and it could mean ‘vase for water’ (e.g. Varro, *L.* 5.119), and / or ‘a man who did not cut his beard’⁶. However, one cannot exclude that such a title could be an ancient Roman *cognomen*, linked e.g. to the *Scipio* family⁷. Like *Barbatus*,

³ Cf. e.g. Mommsen 1879; Schulze 1904; Rix 1972, 700–58; Panciera 1977, 191–203; Salomies 1987; Salway 1994, 124–145; Prosdocimi 2009, 73–145; Solin 2009, 251–93; Solin 2017, 135–53.

⁴ See e.g. Quintus Hortensius, tribune of the plebs in 422 BCE (Liv. 4.42.3).

⁵ Neukirck 1833, 105.

⁶ Przychocki 1922, 184 ff.

⁷ Solin 2009, 255–8. On Latin *cognomina*, cf. also Kajanto 1965.

*Vopiscus*⁸, the title of a play by Afranius, might allude both to a Roman *praenomen* and to a *cognomen*. Less clear is the reference to *Postuma* in Titin. *com.* 74 R.³. Its meaning could be ‘last-born’ and might have been used as either a Roman female *praenomen* (Varro, *L.* 9.60–1) or *cognomen*⁹. That it could be a *praenomen* is argued by Kajava¹⁰ on the basis of a comparison with the nomenclature *Postuma Cornelia*, used for Sulla’s daughter (Plut. *Sulla* 37.7). Another Roman *praenomen* might be *Spurius* (Titin. *com.* 7 R.³; Ribbeck³ printed *spurcus*; Guardi instead *Spurius*, following Hermann¹¹). As suggested by ancient sources, *Spurius* was attested between Roman *gentes*: there were consuls with that name¹². Other names are also attested in the *Togata*. They were ‘Roman’ but – as testified by epigraphic evidence – they were also attested in other places. For instance, *Caeso* in Titin. *com.* 107 R.³; *Lucius* in Titin. *com.* 179 R.³; *Manius* in Afran. *com.* 211 R.³; *Numerius* in Afran. *com.* 272 R.³; *Paula* in Titin. *com.* 109–110 R.³; *Quintus* (the title of a play by Titinius); *Servius* in Afran. *com.* 95 R.³; *Sextus* in Afran. *com.* 20 R.³; *Titus* in Afran. *com.* 304–5 R.³; *Varus* (a play by Titinius). The *Togata* portrayed characters with Roman names, whose occurrence suggests that these theatrical representations are *togatae* rather than *palliatae*¹³. In fact, one would not find names as such in Terentian and Plautine *palliatae*, in which the names of characters are exclusively Greek, invented and exotic.

1.III Roman Themes

The *Togata* portrayed motifs connected to the city of Rome. For instance, Afranius’ *Deditio* alludes to a Roman topic. *Deditio* was the process according to which people surrendered to the *fides* of Roman people. As Lavan stressed, *deditio* involved “a formal verbal exchange between the Roman commander and representatives of the surrendering community”¹⁴. Livy, for example, enumerates a series of *deditiones*, in which Rome was the protagonist¹⁵. Unfortunately, nothing more can be said about this *togata*, given that the only known fragment (Afran. *com.* 44 R.³) does not itself refer to *deditio*.

⁸ It means ‘one of a pair of twins born alive after the premature birth and death of the other’, as reported by e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 7.10.8 and 47; Non. p. 557.3. Cf. Salomies 1987, 59–60.

⁹ Kajanto 1965, 295; Salomies 1987, 42ff.; Kajava 1994, 111.

¹⁰ Kajava 1994, 181.

¹¹ Guardi 1984, 32.

¹² See also Salomies 1987, 50 f.

¹³ de Melo 2014, 459.

¹⁴ Lavan 2013, 187 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. e.g. Liv. 32.2.5 and 34.35.10. However, there are also cases in which Livy does not mention of *fides* in the *deditio*: cf. e.g. Liv. 1.38.1–2 and 7.31.4.

Like *deditio*, Afranius' *Proditus* may also suggest another Roman matter: *proditio* means 'betrayal' (in war) and alludes to surrendering places and people belonging to Rome to enemies¹⁶ (see Afran. *com.* 274–5 R.³). This can confirm the distinctively Roman military connotation of this *togata*.

Afranius' *Emancipatus* deals with *emancipatio*, i.e. the releasing of a son¹⁷ from the *patria potestas*, which Gaius specified as a Roman matter, focusing on how children cease to be under the authority of their own father through emancipation (Gai. *Inst.* 1.132.1).

It is worth mentioning Afranius' *Libertus*¹⁸ which may explicitly allude to an ex-slave onstage who became free through *manumissio*¹⁹, a "Roman institution, unique in antiquity"²⁰. Indeed, although the Greeks observed such a practice²¹, in the Greek world slaves did not become completely free and the citizen status was not conferred by manumission, as attested by manumission documents from Delphi²². In Roman Italy²³, manumission was instead strictly related to citizenship²⁴, and implied "(...) the award of full civic privileges"²⁵, making the Roman *manumissio* unique²⁶. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine if Afranius alludes to the Roman *manumissio* or to the Greek concept of the term.

The *Togata* also mentioned previous Roman playwrights: Afranius mentions Terence in *com.* 25–29 R.³ (see below), and Pacuvius in *com.* 7 R.³ (see below), but this quotation needs to be clarified. On the one hand, Afranius quotes Terence in the prologue of *Compitalia*, admitting to having joined together his Greek model (Menander) and his Latin one (Terence), and thus engaging in *contaminatio*²⁷. That Terence was mentioned in the prologue of this *togata* could be compared with the previous dramatic tradition. Terence in the prologue of *Andria* (*And.* 13–21) mentions other Roman authors: he declares that not only did he adapt Menander's *Andria*, but that he transferred in Latin some parts of another play (Menander's *Perinthia*). He also suggests that such a 'mingling' was used

¹⁶ About *proditio*, cf. Fuhrmann 1969, 1221–30.

¹⁷ About female emancipation in Rome, see e.g. Cantarella 1987, 135f.

¹⁸ Cf. also Afranius' *Titulus*. The title might refer to the ticket of slaves who are to be sold or let, on the basis of what *titulus* could also mean (Ernout-Meillet, s.v. *titulus*).

¹⁹ Daviault 1980, 231.

²⁰ Gruen 2010, 464.

²¹ See e.g. Calderini 1908; Rädle 1969; Albrecht 1978; Zelnich-Abramovitz 2005.

²² Cf. e.g. Hopkins 1978, 133–71.

²³ See e.g. Hopkins 1978, 115–32.

²⁴ About *manumissio*, cf. e.g. Corbeill 2005, 157–74; Querzoli 2009, 203–20; Woolf 2013, 375–91; on *manumissio* – *civitas Romana*, see e.g. Fraschetti 1982, 97–103; Marcattili 2013/2014, 29–45.

²⁵ Gruen 2010, 465.

²⁶ Gruen 2010, *Ibidem*.

²⁷ Bibliography on *contaminatio* is quoted by Papaioannou 2014 n. 17. See also Manuwald 2011, 150–6.

by Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius – mentioned in *And.* 18²⁸ – and that this was legitimised at that time as “the very literary process of *palliata* composition”²⁹.

The mention of other authors in the prologues is thus already attested in the previous comic tradition. However, what is unique in the *Togata* is the explicit quotation of a Roman author (Pacuvius in Afran. *com.* 7 R.³ – *Auctio*) within a joke told by a character on stage³⁰: *Haut facul, ut ait Pacuuius, femina <una> inuenietur bona* (Transl. from Manuwald 2014, 593: “it is not easy, as Pacuvius says, to find just one good woman”). In this line, an anonymous character reports what Pacuvius presumably highlighted about female figures, arguing that it is difficult to find a woman with good customs, like some women we find in Plautine *palliata*, in which women often act in an incorrect manner, especially from a male point of view (e.g. Pl. *Cas.* 317–30; *Men.* 114–6)³¹.

Not only does the *Togata* mention Roman authors, but it is possible to identify apparent allusions to Roman literary genres, such as *Satura* (the title of Atta’s *togata*) and *planipes* (Atta’s anonymous character).

The meaning of Atta’s reference to *Satura* is unclear because of the various meanings of the word *Satura*, which can denote a noun, in the sense of ‘dish of mixed ingredients’ (Varro *Gram.* 52), and the Roman literary genre of satire, and also an adjective, with the meaning of ‘fat’ woman, who is pregnant (like in Pomponius). It is possible that Atta’s reference to *Satura* was a mention of the homonymous literary genre, and that the play drew attention to its connection with another Roman genre.

The meaning of *planipes* in Atta’s *Aedilicia* is likewise uncertain: see Atta *com.* 1 R.³, *Daturin estis aurum? exultat planipes* (Transl.: “Perhaps you will give gold? The *planipes* exults”). An anonymous character refers to a *planipes*, a term which can allude to a mime actor who performed without wearing the comic *soccus* or the tragic *cothurnus* (Diom. GLK I, p. 490.3ff.). Guardi³² interpreted the term in this way and it is possible to assume that the playwright could thus have alluded to the Roman literary genre (= *planipedia* or *mimus*) equivalent of the Greek μῦθος³³, staged in Rome during the *Ludi Florales* (e.g. Val. Max. 2.10.8; Ov. *Fast.* 5.331–2 and 5.347–54). Even though nothing more can be inferred about the plot of this *togata*, the reference to the *planipes* might testify to

²⁸ Naevius and Plautus are both also mentioned in Ter. *Eun.* 25; Plautus alone is mentioned in Ter. *Ad.* 7 and 9.

²⁹ Cf. e.g. Papaioannou 2014, 33.

³⁰ Cf. Pl. *Curc.* 591–2: Curculio vaguely allude to what an old unknown dramatist wrote about two women being worse than one, but nothing can be said about his identity.

³¹ Cf. e.g. Dutsch 2008, 81–5.

³² Guardi 1984, 173.

³³ On mime in Rome, see e.g. Duckworth 1952, 13–5; Beare 1964, 149–58; Panayotakis 2010, 1–105; Manuwald 2011, 178–83.

the awareness of other Roman literary genres, in a complex process in which “Romans shaped their own values and gained a sense of their distinctiveness”³⁴. However, I argue that a more cautious approach is required before making such an assumption. This is because the term – which literally means ‘flat-foot’, ‘bare-foot’³⁵ – could potentially refer to a character on stage with this characteristic.

The already mentioned *Aedilicia* by Atta gives us an opportunity to reflect on another Roman topic. The title refers to *aediles*, Roman magistrates who cared about *cura urbis*, *cura annonae* and *cura ludorum* (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 13.22.1; Liv. 6.42.12). Regarding the last function, it seems that the authors sold their plays to the aediles³⁶, who became ‘owners’ of them until the end of the performance³⁷. That this *togata* is entitled *Aedilicia* and refers to *planipes* betrays an attempt in defining its ‘Roman-ness’.

Not only does the *Togata* refer to Roman public officers, but also to Roman laws. In Titinius, there are apparent allusions to the *Lex Oppia*, a Roman law introduced so as to restrict the luxury of women in 215 BCE³⁸, especially targeting gold, purple, and the carriages used by matrons, as presumably echoed by e.g. Titin. *com.* 1 and *com.* 140–1 R.³.

The *Togata* thus featured ‘Roman’ elements on stage. However, as I shall demonstrate, the *Togata* reveals also the presence of other elements, such as Latin, Italic, and Greek, which can denote the horizon of the Roman-ness of the *Togata*.

2. Latin Elements

There are elements in the *Togata* which cannot be associated with the city of Rome, but with the region of Latium. Horace (*Ars* 285–91) testifies to the ‘Roman-ness’ of the *Togata* which seems to be conflated with a broader ‘Latin-ness’. I believe that it was not coincidental, in a period in which the preeminence of Rome “encouraged attention to cultural bonds that tied Latium to Rome, while

³⁴ Gruen 1992, 2.

³⁵ In the following passage, Afran. *Inc.* 434 R.³ (*Quis<nam> iste torquens faciem planipedis senis?*) the term is used as an adjective and it means ‘fat-foot’.

³⁶ Ter. *Eun.* 20: (...) *postquam aediles emerunt*; Suet. *Vita Terenti* (p. 28 Reifferscheid = Donatus pp. 4–5 W.) *Andriam cum aedilibus daret* (...). At the same time, it seems that the actor-manager could also buy comedies, as we read in Ter. *Hec.* 9–57, and this would represent a kind of inconsistency between sources, since Terence’s *Eun.* and Suetonius on the one hand, and Terence’s *Hec.* on the other, make different statements. Lucarini 2016, 10–11 makes the point on this.

³⁷ Cf. Lucarini 2016, 16.

³⁸ On *Lex Oppia*, see e.g. Agati Madeira 2004, 87–99; Mastroianni 2006, 590–611; Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 333–4 and 348–9.

legitimizing the supremacy of the latter”³⁹, that the *Togata* included Latium. This literary genre attests to the relations between the City and the Latin local communities, along with their customs and traditions.

2.1 *Toga* as Latin dress

Scholars have traditionally emphasised the ‘Roman-ness’ of the *Togata*, and have re-constructed it as an explicitly ‘Roman’ genre, because of its connection to the *toga*, the typically Roman garment, and the city of Rome. The Romans are depicted as *gens togata*, as reported by e.g. Laberius (42–3 R.³ and 44–5 R.³), Vergil (*Aen.* 1.282), and Propertius (*El.* 4.2.9–12). Roman-ness and the *toga* are thus closely identified. By contrast, ‘forgetting’ the *toga* means ‘forgetting’ Roman identity, as highlighted by Horace *Carm.* 3.5 – Marsus and Apulus, two Romans evoking their old Italian morality as well as forgetting shields, name and toga – and by Athenaeus *Deipn.* 5.213b – he reminds the reader about the decline of Roman morality when the Romans forsook the *toga* to wear *himation* (i.e. *pallium*), the mantle worn by Greeks, who were identified as *gens palliata* (see Pl. *Curc.* 288).

These passages allow us to reflect on the difference between the *toga* as a ‘dress form’, i.e. dress for different occasions worn by people living in a shared geographical and cultural context, without alluding to a precise ‘nationalistic’ identity, as mentioned by Nonius 406. 17 and *toga* as a ‘dress code’, which instead “transmits a clear message to a defined target population about conscious affiliation or identity”⁴⁰. This difference was associated with the use of the *toga* in Rome and in Italy. As Wallace-Hadrill remarked, only in Rome is the *toga* “(...) a marker quite specifically of citizenship”⁴¹, as opposed to a ‘dress form’, which was used elsewhere, as testified by e.g. a surviving statue of a *togatus*, the Arringatore of Florence, an Etruscan magistrate⁴², and a grave relief from the Via Statilia⁴³. The *toga*, as a dress form, was widespread through central Italy, and it thus “seems to be more general Italian phenomenon before it is marked as ‘Roman’”⁴⁴. The *toga* as a ‘dress-form’ as used in Latium was also represented by the authors of the *Togata*, in particular by Titinius: see Titin. *com.* 138–9 R.³

³⁹ Gruen 1992, 29.

⁴⁰ See Wiessner 1983, 257.

⁴¹ Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 51.

⁴² Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 43; cf. also Dohrn 1968; Crawford 1996, 418 ff.; Dench 2005, 278.

⁴³ DAI Neg. 2001.2051. See Stone 1994, 40. Cf. also Rothe 2020, 17–36.

⁴⁴ Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 45.

*tunica et togula obunctula*⁴⁵ / *Adimetur, pannos possidebit fetidos* (Transl.: “a tunic and a perfumed small toga will be taken away, (s)he will hold foul-smelling garments”). Indeed, these lines come from *Veliterna*, whose title presumably refers to *Velitrae*, a Latin colony (see below), and the *toga* belongs then not to Roman people specifically.

2.II Latin settings

Indications of Latin settings are found in the title of the *togatae*, such as e.g. Titinius’ *Setina*. The title suggests that it may be set in the Latin city of *Setia*, and textual evidence seems to confirm that: see Titin. *com.* 106 R.³ (*accede ad sponsum audacter, virgo nulla est talis Setiae*: transl.: “reach courageously the fiancée / be brave, go and talk to the fiancée, no girl is of such a kind in Setia”). This suggests that *Setina* does not (only) refer to ‘a girl coming from Setia’⁴⁶, but also to the physical setting of the play (*togata Setia*), i.e. *Setia*. It is plausible that other titles of plays refer to the *togatae*’s settings. Titinius’ *Veliterna*, for instance, might not refer to *puella Veliterna*, but to the setting of such a *togata*, like *Psaltria sive Ferentinatis* by Titinius. The title was differently handed down⁴⁷. *Psaltria* is a Graecism and *Ferentinatis* is an ethnic name, which means ‘of/from Ferentinum’, and presumably refers to the Latin allied city of Rome. That *Ferentinum* is likely to be the setting of this play is confirmed by Titin. *com.* 85 R.³ (*Ferentinatis populus res Graecas studet* – transl.: “people of Ferentinum love Greek traditions”).

3. Italic elements

In this sub-section, I discuss the Italic elements in the surviving fragments of the *Togata*, focusing on settings and topics. The *Togata* portrayed the Italic peninsula as a whole, and this seems to me not unintentional. Presumably this is reflected by the historical context, in which Italy was in full control by the Romans. The City had impact on Italic centres, just as those centres also had impact on Rome⁴⁸. Consequently, the *Togata* can be seen as reflecting those cultural, social, and political interactions between Rome and Italian communities, which are

⁴⁵ On diminutives in the *togata*, Minarini 1997: 38 ff. On the double diminutive, cf. also Afran. *com.* 386–7 R.³.

⁴⁶ Guardi 1984, 145 and more recently de Melo 2014, 457–9.

⁴⁷ Guardi 1984, 139.

⁴⁸ Scopacasa 2016, 52.

drawn on by Late-Republican authors as ‘models’ by which ‘Roman’ identity can be defined⁴⁹.

3.I Italic settings

Like *Setina*, the title of other *togatae* could also refer to the plays’ settings. Although *Prilia* by Titinius is doubtful⁵⁰, it might allude to *Prilius*, a lake in Etruria (cf. e.g. Cic. *Mil.* 74). It is possible to assume that *Prilia* does not (only) refer to *puella Prilia*, but that it might mean *togata Prilia*; similarly the title of Titinius’ *Insubra*, though unclear⁵¹, could refer to the setting of this play, in northern Italy. Less clear is *Brundisinae* by Afranius, in which it is difficult to define if the title means ‘girls coming from *Brundisium*’, or if it refers to *Brundisium* as a setting. Unfortunately, due to a lack of internal evidence, there is little else that can be postulated on this point. The meaning of *Aquae Caldae* by Atta is likewise difficult to understand: it is not possible to know for sure if the title merely alludes to an anonymous thermal station in Italy, or if it is the setting of this theatrical representation⁵².

3.II Italic motifs

An Italic motif can be found, for example, in Afranius’ *Epistula*, in which an anonymous character mentions the Tyrrhenian sea (*com.* 109 and 112 R.³). This quotation suggests the Italic patina of the *togata*, as does the mention of *Tarentum* in Titin. *com.* 183 R.³; in the latter example, however, it is impossible to infer anything more.

The *Togata* also reflects one of the most important phenomena in the second to first centuries BCE, i.e. bilingualism⁵³ / multilingualism⁵⁴, the ‘literary language’ of Rome and the Italic world. There is evidence to prove this in Titin. *com.* 104 R.³ *qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur: nam Latine nesciunt* (transl. “those who speak in Oscan and Volscian: indeed, they do not know Latin”). In this *togata*, unknown people speak Oscan and Volscian, languages in contact with

⁴⁹ Dench 1995 and 2005.

⁵⁰ Guardì 1984, 133.

⁵¹ Guardì 1984, 131.

⁵² Guardì 1984, 174.

⁵³ Weinreich 1953, 1; Hamers and Blanc 1989, 6–30; Adams 2003, 3–8.

⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. Mullen and James 2012; Mullen 2015.

Latin as others⁵⁵. This hint testifies to the widespread multilingualism in the Italic peninsula, in which there is an interaction between languages with bilingual / multilingual speakers. Different languages seem to suggest the presence of different cultures in the same context⁵⁶. That is to say, Rome was faced with an overwhelming pastiche of communities and languages, and the *Togata* is likely to testify to such a phenomenon.

4. Greek elements

I shall investigate in the following paragraphs the presence of Greek names and terms in the *Togata*, and, in this respect, the relationship between the playwrights of the *Togata* and their Greek and Latin model(s). I aim to link the *Togata* to the complex role played by Greek culture in the construction of Roman identity. The occurrence of Greek names and motifs in the scanty fragments reflects the extent of Greek influence on Roman literature⁵⁷.

4.I Greek terms

Greek names were used in Rome for social rather than ethnical differentiations⁵⁸. The fragments also seem to show this. For instance, *Moschis* in *Afran. com.* 136 R.³ is the name of a courtesan – coming from the Greek Naples⁵⁹ – like *Thais* (a play by *Afran.*), as suggested by a comparison e.g. with Terence's *Eunuchus*. Apart from being the name of a courtesan, *Thais* was also likely to have been the name of slaves in Latium and Campania⁶⁰. That the name of prostitutes⁶¹ and female slaves in the *Togata* is a Greek stereotype demonstrates an attempt at accentuating the idealisation of the character of Roman women. Less reputable women – female sex workers⁶² – cannot be Roman: they are foreigners, and far both from the respect of Roman customs and from the prototype of the perfect Roman matron⁶³.

⁵⁵ Adams 2003, 111–296. On Oscan language, see *Ibidem* 112–159. Cf. also Adams, Janse and Swain 2002.

⁵⁶ Cf. e.g. Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 13 and 67–8; Mullen 2012, 1–35.

⁵⁷ See e.g. Toynbee 1965, 416–34; Rawson 1989, 422–76; Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 17–28.

⁵⁸ Solin 1971, 158.

⁵⁹ See Leigh 2004, 10.

⁶⁰ CIL 01, 02686 (p. 845, 934); CIL 01, 02708 (p. 934, 935).

⁶¹ On the terms used by Plautus and Terence in labeling prostitutes, Fayer 2013, 377–405.

⁶² Strong 2016, 23.

⁶³ Cf. e.g. Balsdon 1962; Cantarella 1987; Dixon 1988; Hemelrijk 1999; Dixon 2001; Cenerini 2009; Strong 2016.

Greek names were not only given to females, but also to males. For instance, Nicasius in Afran. *com.* 189 R.³ is the name of a slave, just like *Pausias* in Afran. *com.* 93–4 R.³. *Pantelius* (Afranius' play doubtful title) seems to be a speaking name, as suggested by its etymology (παντελής -ές, i.e. 'able to do everything'). It might allude to the role played by the character: such a name for a slave is appropriate because of its meaning. However, the term does not necessarily imply that this slave can do whatever he fancies as happens in Plautine *palliata*⁶⁴. This is suggested by Donatus (*ad Ter. Eun.* 57), who reports that in the *Togata* the behaviour of slaves is restricted. They are not represented as cleverer than their masters: *concessum est in palliata poetis comicis seruos dominis sapientiores fingere, quod idem in togata non fere licet* – “comic poets in the *palliata* had the license to represent slaves as wiser than their masters, which is normally not allowed in the *togata*” (transl. from Feeney 2016, 181).

Furthermore, it is possible to highlight the presence of loan-words from Greek⁶⁵ in the *Togata*: some of those, such as e.g. *gubernator*⁶⁶ in Titin. *com.* 127 R.³, *parasitus*⁶⁷ in Titin. *com.* 45, 47, and 99 R.³, *ecastor* in Titin. *com.* 59 and 157 R.³, *mecastor* in Titin. *com.* 74 R.³, *hercle* in Titin. *com.* 32, 105 and 107 R.³, *pol* and *edepol*⁶⁸ in Titin. e.g. *com.* 6, 34/5 and 48, and in Afran. e.g. *com.* 35 and 103 R.³ are terms naturalised in Latin through a process of ‘Romanisation’; others such as e.g. *pompa*⁶⁹ (the title of a play by Afranius), and *perpalaestricos*⁷⁰ in Afran. *com.* 154 R.³, are “a deliberate source of Greek colouring”⁷¹, i.e. words which do not have a Latin equivalent and which the authors used for want of an alternative. The presence of Greek terms in the *Togata* provides an opportunity to comprehend how “the Latin language in virtually all of its varieties was full of Greek loan-words (...) and (...) was heavily Hellenised”⁷². The presence of Graecisms in the *Togata* permits us to make a comparison with the *Palliata*. In both cases, we have to take into account that the Greek is that spoken in Rome and in the Italic peninsula, and that “its connotations are not prestige and education but servile status and frivolity”⁷³.

⁶⁴ See e.g. Duckworth 1952, 249–3; Petrone 1983; McCarthy 2000; Fraenkel 2007, 159–72. More recently, Richlin 2017.

⁶⁵ On the loan-words from Greek into Latin, cf. e.g. Biville 1990 and 1995; Adams 2003.

⁶⁶ Maltby 1985, 111 and 115.

⁶⁷ Maltby 1985, 114.

⁶⁸ Maltby 1985, 115 f.

⁶⁹ Maltby 1985, 119.

⁷⁰ Maltby 1985, 122.

⁷¹ See Maltby 1985, 111.

⁷² Adams 2003, 764.

⁷³ de Melo 2007, 337.

4.II Greek and Latin models

Afranius boasted to adapt original Greek materials, just like the playwrights of the *Palliata*, who ‘contaminated’ Greek plays⁷⁴. In *Compitalia* 25–8 R.³, Afranius alludes to his models: . . . *fateor, sumpsi non ab illo modo, / Sed ut quisque habuit, convenerit quod mihi, / Quod me non posse melius facere credidi, / etiam Latino* (Transl. from McElduff 2013, 218: “I confess it, I have not just taken what I believed I could not write better from that person [Menander], but from whoever seemed to have something suitable, even from a Latin [author]”).

Afranius expressed his indebtedness in style to Menander⁷⁵: such a connection was noticed by ancient authors, such as e.g. Cicero who linked Latin authors to the Greek ones (*De Fin.* 1.7), and Horace (*Ep.* 2.1.57), who noted down *dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro*, and yet by Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.1.4), reporting that Afranius took many things from Menander.

The quotation of Greek models in Afranius sheds fresh light on the Greekness in the *Togata*⁷⁶ and certifies the relation between this literary genre and its direct models⁷⁷. It seems that the playwrights of *Togata* did not compose off impromptu, but that they adapted from Greek plays, such as the New Comedy. Indeed, the aforementioned fragment comes from *Consobrini*, which could echo Menander’s *Ἀνεψιοί*⁷⁸. No other Latin play shares this title, and this could suggest that Afranius could have adapted Menander’s original to his *togata*, as he might have also done in other *togatae*, such as e.g. *Aequales* (cf. e.g. Alexidis’ *Συντρέχοντες*), *Depositum* (cf. Menander’s – and other authors – *Παρακαταθήκη*), and *Incendium* (cf. Menander’s *Ἐμπιπραμένη*).

Returning to Menander’s *Ἀνεψιοί*, it is possible that that this comedy could have been a model for another *togata* by Afranius: this is suggested by *Afran. com.* 348 R.³: *Amentes / Amantes*⁷⁹, *quibus animi non sunt integri, surde audiunt* (Transl.: “Demented / Lovers, whose souls are not whole, hear with difficulty”). In his third edition of comic fragments, Ribbeck suggested to compare this passage with *Ἀνεψιοί* I (= Menander fr. 57 K.-A): *φύσει γάρ ἐστ’ ἔρωσ τοῦ νουθετοῦντος κωφόν· ἅμα δ’ οὐ ράδιον Νεότητα νικᾶν ἐστι καὶ θεὸν λόγῳ* – transl.: “by nature

⁷⁴ Fraenkel 2007, 173–218. However, about the usage of *contaminatio* in *Palliata*, it is worth clarifying that Terence used such a word (see *Andr.* 16; *Heaut.* 17) referring to mixing up bits from different plays, not simply adapting from Greek plays.

⁷⁵ Duckworth 1952, 69.

⁷⁶ See Pociña Perez 1975, 102. More recently, Gaertner 2014, 629.

⁷⁷ Degl’Innocenti Pierini 1991, 245.

⁷⁸ Daviault 1981, 153.

⁷⁹ Ribbeck (R.³) reported *amentes*, although there is more than one manuscript reading *amantes*. Kassel-Austin, apud Menander fr. 57, quoted the Afranius text with *amantes*.

love is deaf to criticism (= to the person who admonishes). Moreover, it is not easy to defeat Youth and a god at the same time with argument”.

Afranius and Menander similarly refer to the effects of Love: in the Afranius text, an anonymous character refers to ‘demented / lovers’ who hear with difficulty because their souls are not whole. In the Menander text, someone discusses young people in love, who tend to be stubborn and hard to reason with, and this particular young person is influenced by a god (Love), described as τοῦ νοθετοῦντος κωφόν. One would need to defeat both ‘youth’ and a god at the same time (ἄμα), in order to change the person’s mind. This is connected to the Afranius text, and allows us to discuss the presence of philosophical issues in the *Togata*. The connection between these two passages is the unwillingness to listen to advice, and this could be related to the effects of a kind of ‘madness of love’⁸⁰, a motif drawn from Greek literature (in particular archaic Greek poetry – cf. e.g. Sappho 31 and Anacreon 428) and philosophy (the use of κωφόν is reminiscent of the black horse of the soul at Plato, *Phdr.* 253e, in a context which concerns ἔρωϛ⁸¹); and also Plautine (e.g. *Pseud.* 21, *Merc.* 870) and Terentian (e.g. *Heaut.* 100) *Palliata*.

With regard to the models, Terence was quoted by Afranius in *com.* 29 R.³: *Terenti numne similem dicent quempiam?* (Transl. from McElduff 2013, 218: “and now they say I am similar to Terence?”). The quotation of a model by an author of *Togata* clarifies themes which Afranius dealt with by reference to Terence. For example, Terence’s and Afranius’ thoughts about the relation between fathers and sons are similar (cf. *Ter. Ad.* 57–58 and *Afran. com.* 33–4 R.³), as are their suggestions regarding human life (cf. *Ter. Heaut.* 77 and *Afran. com.* 289–90 R.³). Children’s education and *humanitas*, elements which seem to suggest the presence of ‘realism’ in Terence’s comedies⁸², also feature in Afranius’ *togatae*.

However, not only was there a connection between *Afranius and Menander (and Terence)*, but between *Afranius and Plautus*. *Euanthius (Fab.* 3.5) underlines the comic *poetare* of Terence, in contrast to Plautus and Afranius, who do not limit their *adfectus*. They both would have elevated parts of their plays to the tragic sublime⁸³, with the use of tragic elements. Apart from this external evidence, internal evidence likewise suggests a connection between Plautine *Palliata* and the playwrights of the *Togata*. Previously, scholars have discussed the Roman-ness of the *Togata* filtered through Plautine *Palliata*⁸⁴, which brought in references to Roman institutions and places. *Magister curiae, quaestor, pretor,*

⁸⁰ On this, Sanders *et al.* 2013.

⁸¹ *Phaedrus* also provides a parallel for νοθετεῖν in connection with erotic desire (see e.g. 234b, and also Plato *Symp.* 183b, and Euripides fr. 340.1 TrGF).

⁸² See e.g. Hunter 1985, 11; Zagagi 1994, 94–5; Fontaine 2014, 538–9.

⁸³ Bianco 2007, 55 ff.

⁸⁴ Cf. Pasquazi Bagnolini 1977, 70 f.; Minarini 1997, 53.

censor are some of the ‘Roman’ characters represented on Plautine stage⁸⁵, although in a Greek context⁸⁶. Like the authors of the *Togata*, Plautus alludes e.g. to the *Lex Oppia* (*Aul.* 167–9, 475–535, *Ep.* 222–235, *Poen.* 210 ff.), the *Aediles* (e.g. *Amph.* 72, *Capit.* 823), and Macedonicus’ Law (*Aul.* 148 and *Cap.* 889). This suggests that there was fluidity in the representation of characters and topics in both Plautine *Palliata* and in the *Togata*.

Some concluding remarks

The extant fragments of the *Togata* highlight the multifaceted process of imitating and assimilating Latin, Italic, and Greek, literature, language(s), and theatre⁸⁷ within the Roman world. The plurality of elements suggests a revolutionary definition of the *Togata* as a ‘Roman’ genre. ‘Roman’ cannot be used as a monolingual and mono-cultural entity (i.e. specifically associated with the city of Rome), but rather it can be interpreted as a multilingual and multicultural category. ‘Roman’ in the *Togata* could thus be regarded as a complex concept removed from overly specific geographical, and cultural connotations. The *Togata* may be substantially defined as a hybrid entity – just like the Italic peninsula in the second to first centuries BCE, in which the Romans were in an ongoing relationship with others⁸⁸, incorporating and transforming the culture of several other civilisations⁸⁹. It is in this wide sense, and not in the narrow sense of ‘specifically associated with the city of Rome’, that the *Togata* may be defined as ‘Roman’.

⁸⁵ Cf. Cacciaglia 1972, 240 f.

⁸⁶ Characters even speak in Greek. Cf. e.g. *Cas.* 728–30; *Cap.* 880-1-2-3; *Most.* 973.

⁸⁷ See Toynbee 1965, 416.

⁸⁸ Syed 2005/2017, 360–371; Gruen 2010, 459–477.

⁸⁹ Dench 2005, 4.

Bibliography

Editions and Commentaries

- Daviault 1981 = Daviault, A.: *Comoedia Togata. Fragments. Texte établi, traduit et annoté*. Paris.
- de Melo 2019 = de Melo, W. D. C.: *Varro: De Lingua latina, Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary (2 vols.)* New York.
- Guardi 1984 = Guardi, T.: *Titinio e Atta. Fabula togata. I frammenti. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*. Milan.
- López López 1983 = López López, A.: *Fabularum togatarum fragmenta (edición crítica)*. Salamanca.
- Ribbeck 1898 = Ribbeck, O.: *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta. Vol. II. Comicum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias fragmenta, tertius curis rec.* Leipzig.

Secondary literature

- Adams, Janse and Swain 2002 = Adams, J.N./Janse, M./Swain, S. (edd.): *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word. Language Contact and the Written Text*. Oxford. New York.
- Adams 2003 = Adams, J. N.: *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge. New York.
- Albrecht 1978 = Albrecht, K.-D.: *Rechtsprobleme in den Freilassungen der Bootier, Phoker, Dorianer, Ost- und Westlokrer: Untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der gemeinschaftlich vorgenommenen Freilassungsakte*. Paderborn.
- Agati Madeira 2004 = Agati Madeira, E.M.: La «lex Oppia» et la condition juridique de la femme dans la Rome républicaine. *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 51, 87–99.
- Baldson 1962 = Baldson, J.P.V.D.: *Roman Women. Their history and habits*. London.
- Beare 1964 = Beare, W.: *The Roman Stage. A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic*. 3rd edn. London.
- Belayche 2016 = Belayche, N.: La «Mater Magna», «Megalè Mètèr»? In: Bonnet, C./Pironti, G./Pirenne Delforge, V. (edd.): *Dieux des Grecs, dieux des Romains: panthéon en dialogue à travers l'histoire et l'historiographie*. Bruxelles, 45–59.
- Bettini 2012 = Bettini, M.: Entre «émique» et «étique»: un exercice sur le «Lar familiaris». In: Payen, P./Scheid-Tissinier, E. (edd.): *Anthropologie de l'Antiquité: anciens objects, nouvelles approches*. Turnhout, 173–98.
- Bianco 2007 = Bianco, M.M.: *Interdum Vocem Comoedia tollit. Paratragedia 'al femminile' nella commedia plautina*. Bologna.
- Biville 1990 = Biville, F.: *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique, I. Introduction et consonantisme*. Louvain. Paris.
- 1995 = Biville, F.: *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique, II. Vocalisme et conclusiens*. Louvain. Paris.
- Cacciaglia 1972 = Cacciaglia, M.: Ricerche sulla fabula togata. *RCCM* 14, 207–245.
- Calderini 1908 = Calderini, A.: *La manomissione e la condizione dei liberti in Grecia*. Milan.
- Cantarella 1987 = Cantarella, E.: *Pandora's Daughters. The role & status of women in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (transl. by M.B. Fant). Baltimore.
- Cenerini 2009 = Cenerini, F.: *La donna romana*. Bologna.
- Corbeill 2005 = Corbeill, A.: Gesture in early Roman law: empty forms or essential formalities? In: Cairns, D.L. (ed.): *Body language in the Greek and Roman world*. Swansea, 157–74.

- Crawford 1996 = Crawford, M.: Italy and Rome from Sulla to Augustus. In: Bowman, A./Champlin, E./Lintott, A. (edd.): *Cambridge Ancient History. The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C. – A.D. 69*. Cambridge, 414–33 and 979–89.
- Degl’Innocenti Pierini 1991 = Degl’Innocenti Pierini, R.: Un prologo polemico di Afranio (Comptalia 25–28 R.³). *Prometheus* 17, 242–246.
- de Melo 2007 = de Melo, W. D. C.: *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence and Beyond*. New York. Oxford.
- 2014 = de Melo, W. D. C.: Plautus’ Dramatic Predecessors and Contemporaries in Rome. In: Fontaine, M./Scafufo, A.C. (edd.): *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Oxford, 447–61.
- Dench 1995 = Dench, E.: *From Barbarians to New Men. Greek, Roman, and Modern perspectives of peoples from the Central Apennines*. Oxford.
- Dench 2005 = Dench, E.: *Romulus’ Asylum. Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford.
- Dixon 1988 = Dixon, S.: *The Roman Mother*. London.
- 2001 = Dixon, S.: *Reading Roman women. Sources, Genres and Real Life*. London.
- Dohrn 1968 = Dohrn, T.: *Der Arringatore. Bronzestatue im Museo Archeologico von Florenz*. Berlin.
- Duckworth 1952 = Duckworth, G. E.: *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Princeton.
- Dutsch 2008 = Dutsch, D.M.: *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy. On Echoes and Voices*. Oxford.
- Erskine 2001 = Erskine, A.: *Troy between Greece and Rome*. Oxford. New York.
- Fayer 2013 = Fayer, C.: *Meretrix. La prostituzione femminile nell’Antica Roma*. Rome.
- Feeney 2016 = Feeney, D.: *Beyond Greek: the Beginnings of Latin Literature*. Cambridge (Massachusetts). London (England).
- Fontaine 2014 = Fontaine, M.: The Terentian Reformation: from Menander to Alexandria. In: Fontaine, M./Scafufo, A.C. (edd.): *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Oxford. New York, 538–554.
- Fraenkel 2007 = Fraenkel, E.: *Plautine Elements in Plautus (Plautinisches im Plautus)* (transl. by T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke). Oxford.
- Fraschetti 1982 = Fraschetti, A.: A proposito di ex-schiavi e della loro integrazione in ambito cittadino a Roma. *Opus: rivista internazionale per la storia economica e sociale dell’antichità = International journal for social and economic history of antiquity*, I, 97–103.
- Fuhrmann 1969 = Fuhrmann, M.: *Proditio. Pauly’s Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplementband 9*, 1221–30.
- Gaertner 2014 = Gaertner, J.F.: Law and Roman Comedy. In: Fontaine, M./Scafufo, A.C. (edd.): *The Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Oxford. New York, 615–33.
- Gruen 1990 = Gruen, E.S.: *Studies in Greek culture and Roman policy*. Leiden. New York.
- 1992 = Gruen, E. S.: *Cultural and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca. New York.
- 2010 = Gruen, E.S.: Romans and Others. In: Rosenstein, N./Morstein-Marx, R. (edd.): *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Oxford, 459–77.
- Kajanto 1965 = Kajanto, I.: *The Latin Cognomina*. Helsinki.
- Kajava 1995 = Kajava, M.: *Roman Female praenomina. Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women*. Rome.
- Hamers and Blanc 1989 = Hamers, J.F./Blanc, M.H.A. (edd.): *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*, revised edn. Cambridge.
- Hemelrijk 1999 = Hemelrijk, E.A.: *Matrona docta. Educated women in the Roman élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. London. New York.
- Hopkins 1978 = Hopkins, K.: *Conquerors and slaves. Sociological studies in Roman History, I*. Cambridge.
- Hunter 1985 = Hunter, R.L.: *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge.

- Laurence 1991 = Laurence, R.: The urban vicus: the spatial organization of power in the Roman city, I. In: Herring, E. (ed.): *The archaeology of power: papers of the fourth conference of Italian Archeology*. London, 145–51.
- Lavan 2013 = Lavan, M.: *Slaves to Rome: Paradigms of Empire in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.
- Leigh 2004 = Leigh, M.: *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford.
- Lucarini 2016 = Lucarini, C.M.: Playwrights, actor-managers, and the Plautinian text in Antiquity. In: Velaza, J. (ed.): *From the protohistory to the history of the text. Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 173. Frankfurt, 9–27.
- Maltby 1985 = Maltby, R.: The distribution of Greek Loan-Words in Terence. *CQ* 35, 110–23.
- Manuwald 2011 = Manuwald, G.: *Roman Republican Theatre*. Cambridge.
- 2014 = Manuwald, G.: Tragedy, Paratragedy, and Roman Comedy. In: Fontaine, M./ Scafuro, A.C. (edd.): *The Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Oxford. New York, 580–598.
- Marcattili 2013–14 = Marcattili, F.: «Libertas» e «Iuppiter liber in Aventino»: schiavitù e integrazione negli anni della seconda guerra punica. *Ostraka: Rivista di Antichità* 22–3, 29–45.
- Mastrososa 2006 = Mastrososa, I. G.: Speeches «pro» and «contra» women in Livy 34, 1–7: Catoian legalism and gendered debates. *Latomus: revue d'études Latines* 65 (3), 590–611.
- McElduff 2013 = McElduff, S.: *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*. New York. London.
- McCarthy 2000 = McCarthy, K.: *Slaves, masters, and the art of authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton. Oxford.
- Minarini 1997 = Minarini, A.: Il linguaggio della togata tra innovazione e tradizione. *BSL* 27, 34–55.
- Mommsen 1879 = Mommsen, T.: *Römische Forschungen*. Berlin.
- Mullen and James 2012 = Mullen, A./James, P. (edd.): *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman worlds*. Cambridge. New York.
- Mullen 2015 = Mullen, A.: *Bilingualism and Multilingualism in the Roman world*. Cambridge.
- Neukirch 1833 = Neukirch, J.H.: *De fabula togata Romanorum*. Lipsiae.
- Pancieria 1977 = Pancieria, S.: Saggi d'indagine sull'onomastica romana. In: Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-T. (ed.): *L'onomastique latine. Actes du Colloque International, 13–15 octobre 1975*. Paris, 191–203.
- Panayotakis 2010 = Panayotakis, C.: *Decimus Laberius. The fragments*. Cambridge, 1–105.
- Papaioannou 2014 = Papaioannou, S. (ed.): *Terence and Interpretation*. Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Pasquazi Bagnolini 1977 = Pasquazi Bagnolini, A.: *Note sulla lingua di Afranio*. Florence.
- Petrone 1983 = Petrone, G.: *Teatro antico e inganno: finzioni plautine*. Palermo.
- Pocchetti 1995 = Pocchetti, P.: Nomi personali, numeri e computo calendariale nell'Italia antica. *AION ling* 17, 237–49.
- Pociña Perez 1975 = Pociña Perez, A.: Lucio Afranio y la evolución de la fabula togata. *Habis* 6, 99–107.
- Prosdocimi 2009 = Prosdocimi, A.: Note sull'onomastica di Roma e dell'Italia Antica. In: Pocchetti, P. (ed.): *L'onomastica dell'Italia Antica: aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classicatori*. Rome, 73–145.
- Przychochi 1922 = Przychochi, G.: De Titinii aetate. In: *Charisteria C. de Morawski septuagenario oblata ab amicis, collegis, discipulis*. Cracoviae, 180–188.
- Querzoli 2009 = Querzoli, S.: Il «beneficium» della «manumissio» nel pensiero di Ulpio Marcello. *Ostraka: Rivista di Antichità* 18 (1), 203–20.
- Rädle 1969 = Rädle, H.: *Untersuchungen zum griechischen Freilassungswesen*. Munich.
- Rix 1972 = Rix, H.: Zum Ursprung des römisch-mittelitalischen Gentilnamensystems. *ANRW* I (2), 700–58.
- Rolle 2015 = Rolle, A.: Ritmi frigi e sensibilità romana: un connubio impossibile? In: Baglioni, I. (ed.): *Ascoltare gli dei / Divos audire: costruzione e percezione della dimensione sonora nelle religioni del Mediterraneo antico*. Rome, 153–61.

- Rothe 2020 = Rothe, U.: *The Toga and Roman Identity*. London. New York.
- Rüpke 2011 = Rüpke, J.: *The Roman calendar from Numa to Constantine: time, history and the Fasti* (transl. by D.M.B. Richardson). Chichester. Malden.
- Salomies 1987 = Salomies, O.: *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namensgebung*. Helsinki.
- Salomies 2009 = Salomies, O.: Nomi personali derivati da numerali a Roma. In: Poccetti, P. (ed.): *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica: aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classificatori*. Rome, 515–31.
- Salway 1994 = Salway, B.: What's in a Name? A survey of Roman onomastic practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700. *JRS* 84, 124–45.
- Sanders et al. 2013 = Sanders, E./Thumiger, C./Carey, C./Lowe, N. (edd.): *Eros in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Sanz 2015 = Sanz, A.-M.: La «deditio»: un acte diplomatique au cœur de la conquête romaine (fin du 3e-fin du 2e siècle avant J.-C). In: Stouder, G./Grass, B./Pittia, S./Ferrary, J.-L./Sanchez, P. (edd.): *La diplomatie romaine sous la République: réflexions sur une pratique: actes des rencontres de Paris (31 octobre – 1 novembre 2013)*. Besançon, 87–105.
- Satterfield 2012 = Satterfield, S.: Intention and exoticism in Magna Mater's introduction into Rome. *Latomus: Revue d'études Latines* 71 (2), 373–91.
- Schulze 1904 = Schulze, W.: *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Berlin.
- Scopacasa 2016 = Scopacasa, R.: Rome's Encroachment on Italy. In: Cooley, A.E. (ed.): *A Companion to Roman Italy*. Chichester. Malden, 35–56.
- Solin 1971 = Solin, H.: *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom I*. Helsinki.
- 2009 = Solin, H.: Sulla nascita del cognome a Roma. In: Poccetti, P. (ed.): *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica: aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classificatori*. Rome, 251–93.
- 2017 = Solin, H.: Zur Entwicklung des römischen Namensystems. In: Haake, M./Harders, A.-C. (edd.): *Politische Kultur und soziale Struktur der Römischen Republik*. Stuttgart, 135–53.
- Stone 1994 = Stone, S.: The Toga. From National to Ceremonial Costume. In: Sebesta, J.L./Bonfante Warren, L. (edd.): *The World of Roman Costume*. Madison, 13–45.
- Strong 2016 = Strong, A.K.: *Prostitutes and Matrons in the Roman World*. New York. Cambridge.
- Syed 2005 = Syed, Y.: Romans and Others. In: Harrison, S. (ed.): *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Malden. Oxford, 360–371.
- Toynbee 1965 = Toynbee, A.: *Hannibal's Legacy: the Hannibalic War's effects on Roman Life*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- Van Haepere 2014 = Van Haepere, F.: Les prêtresses de « Mater Magna » dans le monde romain occidental. In: Urso, G. (ed.): *Sacerdos: figure del sacro nella società romana: atti del convegno internazionale*. Pisa, 299–321.
- Wallace-Hadrill 2008 = Wallace-Hadrill, A.: *Rome's cultural revolution*. Cambridge.
- Weinreich 1953 = Weinreich, U.: *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. New York.
- Wiessner 1983 = Wiessner, P.: Style and Social Information in Kalahari San Projectile Points. *American Antiquity* 48, 53–76.
- Woolf 2013 = Woolf, J.G.: «In iure cessio» und «manumission vindicta»: Überlegungen zu zwei archaischen Rechtsgeschäften. In: Armgardt, M./Klinck, F./Reichard, I. (edd.): *Liber amicorum Christoph Krampe zum 70*. Berlin, 375–91.
- Zagagi 1994 = Zagagi, N.: *The Comedy of Menander*. London.
- Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005 = Zelnick-Abramovitz, R.: *Not wholly free: The concept of manumission and the status of manumitted slaves in the ancient Greek world*. Leiden. Boston.