What's in a Name? Through Comic Titles to Caecilius Statius*

EMILIA A. BARBIERO

ABSTRACT

This article takes a novel approach to fragmentary Roman comic playwright Caecilius Statius by exploring the titles attested for his comedies. Informed by Genette's theory on the title qua paratext, it argues that titles are distinct artifacts of Caecilius' dramatic production designed to circulate without the texts they label and, consequently, it treats them as legitimate objects of interpretation in and of themselves. Analysis of ten titles in both Greek and Latin reveals that Caecilius Statius' titles are polysemous, bilingual and profoundly meaningful in their engagement with the genre of New Comedy and with translation as a social and cultural phenomenon of middle republican Rome. But given that the titles of Roman comedy are largely uninvestigated by scholarship, this piece begins by arguing for their author-*ity, setting forth the evidence for comic titles' origins, function and transmission. In so doing, it demonstrates the* palliata*'s textuality and challenges the* communis opinio *regarding comic scripts' passage from stage to page. A Supplementary Appendix available online* (10.1017/S0075435824000285) *presents the evidence for the titles of Caecilius' plays.*

Keywords: Caecilius Statius; Roman comedy; title; paratext; translation; doubles

I INTRODUCTION

For modern critics of Roman Comedy, Caecilius Statius is the one that got away. Of this poet who is ranked first amongst Rome's comic playwrights by republican literary critic Volcacius Sedigitus[1] as well as by Cicero,[2] and whose plots were considered best in class by Varro,[3] only 280 fragments survive.[4] Although Aulus Gellius preserves some longer excerpts of *Plocium*,[5] much of what remains of Caecilius Statius are single lines, some even incomplete — very little material indeed through which to glimpse the work of a purported comic genius whose *floruit* between Plautus and Terence makes him

* This article was born at a conference on fragmentary Roman comedy held at Princeton University in June 2022. I am grateful to the organisers for getting me to think about Caecilius Statius. Great thanks are also owed to the *Journal*'s referees, whose comments improved this paper tremendously, as well as to Michael Dewar and David Levene. All translations are my own.

[1] Gell., *NA* 15.24.

[2] Cic., *Opt. Gen.* 2.

[3] Varro, *Sat. Men.* 399B.

[4] I cite the fragments from Ribbeck (marked as R^3), but see also Guardì 1974 and the new Loeb by Maltby and Slater (2022) which replaces Warmington 1935.

[5] Aulus Gellius compares Menander's *Plokion* to Caecilius' *Plocium* at Gell., *NA* 2.23. On this *synkrisis*, see Traina 1974²: 41–53; Negri 1990; Riedweg 1993; McElduff 2013: 179–82.

JRS 114 (2024), pp. 1–25.
doi:10.1017/S0075435824000285

particularly tantalising.[6] Is Caecilian comedy the missing link between Plautus' rowdy plays and the staid drama we get in Terence? According to the *communis opinio*, it is likely to be just that. Most scholarship positions Caecilius in literary terms where he is positioned chronologically, seeing a bit of Plautus (musicality, farce and crude jokes[7]) and a bit of Terence (literary polemics[8] and a tendency towards the sententious[9]) in the fragments.[10] The forty-three titles we have for Caecilius Statius have likewise been used as clues to confirm this intermediate poet's intermediate poetics, principally as these reveal the extent of his fidelity to the Greek model material. They have suggested to critics that Caecilius' translation moves away from the radical Italian freedom of Plautus and towards the Hellenism of Terence. Conte's comments are typical:

> The titles we have, at least, are faithful reproductions of the titles of the Greek originals, sometimes literal reproductions. … The figure of the slave, moreover, is absent from the titles;[11] in Plautus the enthusiasm for this character prevailed even in the titles (*Pseudolus*) and frequently altered the shape of the Greek original to give itself more room. We have, then, the impression that Caecilius respected the models somewhat more [than Plautus did].[12]

Such a comparative method is well established in the discourse on fragmentary Roman comedy,[13] but it is inherently problematic. For by employing what has survived of this genre to understand the traces of what has not, we risk artificially turning the latter into the former and thereby making Caecilius Statius more Plautine or more Terentian than he ever actually was. We are also thereby inclined towards an all-too-neat teleological narrative of the *palliata* as a genre which becomes increasingly decorous, increasingly 'Greek' and increasingly Terentian as the decades wear on. It is time for a different approach.

This article does something new by exploring Caecilius Statius' work without seeking to place it on a sliding scale between Plautus and Terence, Italian and Greek. But this is not its only novelty. Even if I make occasional use of the fragments, I propose to look at Caecilius primarily through his titles. My discussion is informed by Genette's work on paratexts, those extra-textual materials (titles, prefaces, epilogues) which frame texts and from this liminal position seek to control our reading of them. So Genette: 'this fringe [of the text], always the conveyor of a commentary that is authorial or more or less legitimated by the author, constitutes a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*: a privileged place of pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that … is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it'.[14] Laden thus with meaning, titles are open to literary

[6] Jerome, likely relying on Suetonius' *De poetis*, gives Caecilius' *floruit* in 179 and his death in 168 B.C. (Jer., *Ab Abr.* 1838, p. 138b Helm). The playwright's lifetime is therefore usually put between *c.* 230/20 and 168/7 B.C. Camilloni 1957 reviews the evidence for Caecilius' biography.

[7] So (e.g.) Conte 1994: 67: 'the calm Menandrian monologue [in *Plokion*] has been converted [in *Plocium*] into a farcical aria, a *canticum*. From other comparisons we know that Caecilius did not refrain from even stronger writing, giving jokes and coarse humor to Menander's restrained [married] couples'.

[8] Porphyry reports that a Caecilius accused Menander of having rewritten an entire play of Antiphanes' into his own *Deisidaimon* (Porph. ap. Euseb., *Praep. evang.* 10.3.13 [465d]). Although earlier scholars identified this figure as the Augustan literary critic Caecilius of Calacte, more recent criticism suggests Caecilius Statius, who would have made the accusation in a literary-critical prologue such as Terence's are; see Goldberg 2005: 49.

[9] See Cipriani 2010.

[10] A minority position sees Caecilius as upholding the traditional style of the *palliata* as it is exemplified by Plautus, the original hypothesis of Wright 1974.

[11] And yet among Caecilius Statius' titles is a *Dauus*, a typical slave name; see, e.g., Hor., *Ars P.* 237 and Hor., *Sat.* 2.7.

[12] Conte 1994: 66.

[13] So the classic study of Wright 1974.

[14] Genette 1997: 2, an English translation of Genette 1987. See also Genette and Maclean 1991. On the Roman paratext generally (if not the title specifically), see Jansen 2014.

interpretation, and offer us a viable way into a fragmentary author like Caecilius Statius. After all, titles are the sole element of this playwright's output that remains completely intact.[15] Let me explain what I mean.

The title's main job is to act as an indexical marker by which a text may be conveniently identified, whether physically (e.g. on a tag hanging off a papyrus roll) or notionally (i.e. in speech or in writing). The title is therefore the only ancient paratext meant to exist with *or without* the text it designates,[16] necessarily outreaching that text as an object of circulation among a much broader audience in its two forms of reception, accompanied and alone. Consider, for instance, Lucian's naughty librophile whose misuse of the book rolls he collects includes reading only their titles (*The Ignorant Book-Collector*, 18):

> Πῶς δὲ οὐ κἀκεῖνο αἰσχρόν, εἴ τις ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἔχοντά σε βιβλίον ἰδών—ἀεὶ δέ τι πάντως ἔχεις—ἔροιτο οὗτινος ἢ ῥήτορος ἢ συγγραφέως ἢ ποιητοῦ ἐστι, σὺ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς εἰδὼς πρᾴως εἴποις τοῦτό γε· εἶτα, ὡς φιλεῖ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐν συνουσίᾳ προχωρεῖν εἰς μῆκος λόγων, ὁ μὲν ἐπαινοῖ τι ἢ αἰτιῷτο τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων, σὺ δὲ ἀποροίης καὶ μηδὲν ἔχοις εἰπεῖν; οὐκ εὔξῃ τότε χανεῖν σοι τὴν γῆν, κατὰ σεαυτοῦ ὁ Βελλεροφόντης περιφέρων τὸ βιβλίον.
>
> How shameful would this be if, having seen you holding a book in your hand (obviously you always have one), someone should ask whose it is — which orator or historian or poet — and you, having gleaned this from the title, should easily reply to this; and then if (such things in chatting often spin themselves out to some length) he should either praise or criticise something of its contents, and you should be dumbstruck and not have anything to say? Wouldn't you then pray for the earth to swallow you up because of your own fault, you Bellerophon carrying your book around?

While not every *Titelleser* becomes a *Leser*, then, every *Leser* begins as a *Titelleser*.[17] And naturally so, because titles come first — spatially and therefore also chronologically: whether in a library catalogue, in conversation or on the page, a title precedes its text.[18] We shall see that authors capitalise on this precedence, employing the title as a *porte d'entrée* which not only introduces a text but generates expectations about it, constructs for it an audience and influences its reception.

In short: while it is quite certain that Caecilius never intended his work to be encountered in the form of single lines broken off from their dramatic context, he certainly *did* intend his titles to enjoy an independent existence (precisely as we have them!), and to *mean something* in that form. Accordingly, I treat these paratexts as distinct artifacts of his production and therefore as legitimate objects of interpretation in and of themselves. And they are fascinating things that repay close consideration, even without the plays they label. This article argues that Caecilius Statius' titles are polysemous, bilingual and profoundly meaningful in their engagement with the genre of Roman comedy and with translation as a social and cultural phenomenon of middle republican Rome, yielding concrete insight into this comic poet. But my investigation requires considerable groundwork before proceeding to the interpretation of Caecilius'

[15] That is, on the level of individual titles. I am not suggesting that we have a complete list of Caecilius' titles, nor that a complete list would somehow function as a meaningful whole.

[16] One possible ancient exception are the *hypotheses* of Greek drama and oratory which both circulated alone and were attached to manuscripts of texts. Unlike titles, however, *hypotheses* are not authorial and postdate the texts they excerpt. And yet there are various modern paratexts designed to circulate alone which both originate with the author and are contemporaneous to the text's initial publication: interviews with the author, abstracts and even dust jackets are conceived of as separate from the text to which they relate.

[17] Weinrich 1976: 196.

[18] The title may even precede the text in composition; see Plin., *Ep.* 5.6.42. The *subscriptio* is an exception; see below, Section II.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

titles. For the titles of Roman comedy are largely unexplored, and we know little about their origins, function and transmission. Accordingly, setting out this essential information is another objective of my article and the task to which we will turn after some preliminary remarks on the title and titular inscriptions in antiquity.

II ANCIENT TITLES

In antiquity, titular inscriptions regularly included a text's title as well as its author's name,[19] and could by the Roman period be found in five places around and on a papyrus roll: (1) on the *sillybon* (*index* in Latin), a small tag hanging off the roll,[20] (2) on the recto at the text's beginning, (3) on the recto at the text's end (the *subscriptio*), (4) on the verso, an inscription visible when the roll was closed (a position called κατὰ τὸν κρόταφον) and (5) between texts inscribed on the same roll (so-called intertitles).[21] These inscriptions are not mutually exclusive and often coexist, which in some instances led to titular variation — i.e. the existence of more than one title for the same text.[22] This matter is further complicated by the widespread practice of identifying literary works by their opening words (the incipit) rather than by or in addition to an authorial title.[23] Some of the ancient titles we have are in fact thought to be the products of an editorial process of selection between various titular contenders,[24] a problem to which we will return. For now, I want to emphasise the title's materiality. This element is fundamentally literary, not only in its role as a bibliographical marker which aided in the organisation of texts, but in the title's very origin as something physically written onto the text or on a tag attached to it.[25] This status is made manifest in the Greek and Latin words for 'title', ἐπίγραμμα/ἐπιγραφή and *inscriptio/titulus*, which all point to epigraphy.[26] It should come as no surprise, then, that the birth of the title in the ancient world happens in the wake of increased textualisation and the spread of literacy.

Titles were first employed in fifth-century Athens for dramatic texts,[27] a development in which the agonistic context played an important role. Plays in competition need to be clearly identified, distinguished from one another and organised post performance. They also needed to spark the audience's interest before they were staged. Indeed, Sommerstein has argued that this was the title's main duty, serving as an advertisement which was announced ahead of the dramatic festivals, likely at the *proagon*: 'Greek play

[19] A titular inscription could even contain a work's dedicatee: see Cic., *Att.* 16.11.4 with Fioretti 2015: 194–5.
[20] On the creation and use of *indices*, see Cic. *Att.* 4.4 and 4.8 with Caroli 2007: 28–40, who also discusses the Greek word's spelling (is it *sillybon? sillybos? sittybos?*).
[21] See Schironi 2010: 41–53; Fioretti 2015: 193.
[22] Titular inscriptions for the same text can therefore differ in content, but also in origin and in purpose. So, for instance, whereas inscriptions κατὰ τὸν κρόταφον allowed for easy identification of a closed roll sitting on a shelf and often appear in a second hand, likely inscribed by a book's owner, the *subscriptio*, which was visible only once a reader reached the end of the roll, appears to have functioned as an authorial *sphragis* of sorts. On the latter, see Schironi 2015: 83–4.
[23] The incipit emerged contemporaneously to the birth of the title itself: see e.g. Cé 2022: 417–20 on two fifth-century ostraka inscribed with the opening lines of epic poems. On Greek incipits, see Castelli 2020: 88–91. On Latin incipits, see Borgo 2007. Was the function of the incipit to distinguish homonymous texts? Some have thought as much; thus Schröder 1999: 11–12; Castelli 2020: 32. On titular homonymy in ancient comedy, see below, Section VI.
[24] See Fioretti 2015: 195–6.
[25] See especially the comments at Fioretti 2015: 197.
[26] On *titulus*' close association to epigraphy, see Castelli 2016.
[27] Our first notice of a title is in Herodotus: the historian refers to Phrynicus' *Sack of Miletus* by title at Hdt. 6.21, but Castelli 2020: 150 n. 343 wonders if this was the play's official title or just a description of its contents. On dramatic titles, see Kaimio 2000; Sommerstein 2010; Castelli 2020. Castelli gives a review of the *status quaestionis* at 98–151 with bibliography at 100 n. 215.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

titles, then, were primarily designed for advance publicity — sometimes to *inform* the audience about the content of the play, and sometimes to *keep them guessing*, often wrongly, not only before the performance but for some time after it had begun'.[28] This dynamic is especially evident in the titles of Old Comedy: unfettered by convention, comic playwrights invented wildly creative titles to tantalise the audience (what could a play titled 'Frogs' possibly be about?),[29] although Euripides was also clever with titles, employing them to generate expectations that would be defeated in the course of the play.[30] That is, in Classical Athens dramatic titles were strategically employed as a means of arousing the audience's interest in a text's *future* realisation. Titles anticipated their texts by no less than several days and circulated alone, selected to have an effect *in that form*.

As a literary apparatus integral to the text's success, the title enjoyed a prominence in Greek theatre unparalleled in other ancient genres. As much is reflected in the papyrological record where theatrical texts are the only works whose titular inscriptions are found to contain the title preceding the author's name, rather than the conventional author+title form.[31] Such a close affiliation of plays and titles appears, moreover, to have contributed to an overall stability of the latter (even if we know that some variation did occur, in both tragedy and comedy[32]), and thus the *author*-ity of those titles transmitted to us: most titles we have for Attic drama (thanks in no small part to the Athenian festival inscriptions) appear to be the real, original deal — the very titles chosen by playwrights which were considered inseparable from the plays they labelled.[33] A similar dynamic is detectable in Roman drama, to which we now turn.

III TITLES OF AND IN ROMAN COMEDIES

The title in Roman literature has received considerably less critical attention than Greek titles have.[34] In 1943, Daly reviewed the evidence for republican titulature but left out both oratory and drama;[35] this was followed by Horsfall's 1981 article which does the same for titles between Cicero and Suetonius.[36] Schröder's 1999 monograph *Titel und Text* is more comprehensive in its coverage, but nevertheless treats Roman comedy only briefly[37] and, in any case, like her predecessors, Schröder declines to engage in the sort of interpretive work which I do here.[38] There is, then, no real discourse to speak of — neither in terms of understanding Latin titles *qua* meaningful paratexts (even if individual attempts to do so have yielded interesting results[39]) nor on the titles of Roman comedy specifically.[40] In fact, when these are discussed, their existence (their

[28] Sommerstein 2010: 25.
[29] On this point, see Schröder 1999: 37–9; Castelli 2020: 117–18.
[30] See Sommerstein 2010: 22–3.
[31] See Schironi 2010: 63–5.
[32] See Castelli 2020: 128–49.
[33] Sommerstein 2010 12–13. See also Barbiero 2023: 197 n. 2.
[34] Schröder 1999: 9–10 reviews the discourse on Greek titles, to which now should be added Prodi 2016; 2019; Caroli 2007; Castelli 2020.
[35] Daly 1943.
[36] Horsfall 1981.
[37] Roman comedy is discussed at Schröder 1999: 38–9.
[38] See, too, Ballester 1990, which seeks to establish a methodology for interpreting titles, even if it itself engages in no such study and nor was one subsequently published.
[39] Krebs 2015 explores titles in republican historiography and Breed 2018: 60–2 considers the title *Collyra* for Lucilius' Book 16 (reported by the scholiast Porphyrio ad Hor., *Carm.* 1.22.10).
[40] Some preliminary comments on the title in Roman comedy appear in Barbiero 2023: 193–5 and 197–200. I elaborate on those here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

invention, transmission and authenticity) is taken for granted,[41] with one important exception: Fontaine has repeatedly expressed scepticism about the authenticity of Plautine titles that are in Latin, arguing that these are 'later accretions of grammarians, revival producers or simple misunderstandings of the text'.[42] Consonant with his hypothesis about the Hellenic character of Plautine comedy, Fontaine argues that Plautus gave all his plays Greek titles. *Curculio* was called *Gorgylio*, *Pseudolus* is actually *Pseudylus*, etc. I will have more to say later about the assumption implicit in Fontaine's position, an assumption resembling that operative in Conte's comments quoted above, i.e., that a Greek title designates a Greek-ish play. For the time being, Fontaine's argument underscores the difficulty associated with studying the titulature of Roman comedies. Can we confidently attribute the plays' titles to their playwrights?

For Terentian comedy, there can be no doubt about the titles' *author*-ity. Terence names the play's title in each of his six prologues which, further, have never been impugned as anything but authentically Terentian. But the genesis, performance and means of preservation of Roman comedy before Terence are hotly debated, and the notion of the title as a literary artifact open to interpretation would be excluded (even if its proponents have never taken up the question) by the theory that the texts we have are not scripts but transcripts, the collaborative products of repeated stagings of improvised performances based on a Mediterranean comic *koine* rather than on specific source texts.[43] After all, such ephemeral performances do not have authors, nor do they belong to the sort of textualised milieu which we have seen to be inseparable from the title's inception. In this model, the plays were born on street corners, and later coopted into state festivals. While such performances would inevitably need to be referred to by titles (whether by the performers themselves or by the spectators), these would be ad hoc and subject to change, making the titles we have inventions of later criticism when unstable recordings of oral theatre turned into literature. This picture of 'early Roman comedy',[44] however, fails to convince for various reasons. Not least of these is chronology, since the history of the *palliata* is more of a continuum than this popular model admits. Only twenty-five years *at the most* separate the last of Plautus' performances from Terence's first performance in 166,[45] whereas Caecilius Statius, who is reported to have died in 168 or 167 B.C., overlapped in his lifetime with both playwrights. In fact, Caecilius Statius and Terence were regarded by the ancients themselves not as hailing from different generations but rather as poetic colleagues: Ambivius Turpio (a so-called theatrical impresario and *prologus* for Terence)[46] claims in *Hecyra* to have previously acted in Caecilius' plays, performances in the course of which he was driven off stage or barely kept the audience's attention, just as had (allegedly) happened in previous attempts to stage Terence's *Hecyra*. And in another anecdote, we hear that Terence read his *Andria* to Caecilius Statius.[47] Even if this interaction between the two poets is likely

[41] Consider the recent comments of Bartholomä 2019: 229: 'Numerous titles of Greek New Comedy, such as Apollodorus' *Epidikazomene* … or Menander's *Epitrepontes* … indicate comic plots centred on legal matters. The fact that none of the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence bears a law-related title may lead to the assumption that the Roman playwrights left out any legal content in their adaptations.'

[42] Fontaine 2014: 418–20. Arguments as to the original titles of individual plays are also made in Fontaine 2010: *passim*.

[43] This hypothesis finds its most complete expression in Marshall 2006. It has been recently taken up and elaborated upon from a socio-cultural perspective in Richlin 2017.

[44] Thus does Richlin 2017: 494 call the titles and extant fragments of Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Plautus, Ennius and Caecilius Statius.

[45] If *Pseudolus* of 191 B.C. was Plautus' last play, which it probably was not: Cicero tells us that Plautus died in 184 B.C. (Cic., *Brut.* 60), and credible allusions to events of the early 180s such as the Bacchanalian affair in *Casina* suggest that Plautus' career continued into that decade. The gap between Plautus and Terence is thus likely closer to twenty years than twenty-five.

[46] On the impresario figure, see Manuwald 2011: 80–5.

[47] Reported at Suet./Donat., *Vita Ter.* 3.

apocryphal,[48] what matters to us is that Caecilius Statius was considered a contemporary of Terence in antiquity. These facts make it untenable to posit such a radically different cultural milieu for Terence (literary, learned, textual, Greek) and his predecessors (oral, fluid, improvisatory, Italian). Further still, we find evidence within the plays themselves that they came into existence as text, composed by a single playwright and based on another text in Greek. As much is clear from the portrait of script-based playmaking cast into Plautus' plays[49] as well as the presence of literary allusion which is suggestive of a learned culture of reading,[50] and the very close, even *verbum pro verbo* translation we can observe mixed with free adaptation of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* in Plautus' *Bacchides*.[51]

Likewise do titles tell us something important about Roman comedy by presenting the scripts they label as distinct literary artifacts destined to exist within a textualised culture. The plays demonstrate such an understanding of other literature, too; consider the reference to Euripides' *Alkmene* by the tragedy's title in *Rudens*, for instance, or that to Aristarchus' *Achilles* at the start of the *Poenulus*.[52] Into the same category fall the titular citations of Greek models in Plautus' six didascalic notices.[53] Not incidentally, these sites of literary self-consciousness also give us the Latin comedies' titles. These are our earliest titles in Latin[54] and the earliest unequivocal proof of authorial titulature in all of ancient drama. I print here only the passage from *Casina* (*Cas.* 29–34[55]), as we call this play; *Casina* is clearly an allographic title to which we will return below. The remaining five didascalic references may be found in the Supplementary Appendix.

aures uociuae si sunt, animum aduortite:
comoediai nomen dare uobis uolo.
Kleroumenoi uocatur haec comoedia
graece, latine Sortientes. Diphilus
hanc graece scripsit, postid rursum denuo
latine Plautus cum latranti nomine.

If your ears are open, pay attention:
I want to give you the comedy's title.
This comedy is called *Kleroumenoi*
in Greek, in Latin *Sortientes*. Diphilus

[48] *Pace* Reggiani 1977.
[49] Barbiero 2023.
[50] Cf. the allusions to Greek tragedy in *Rudens* explored by Sharrock 2009: 204–19 or those to Sappho in *Curculio* and *Miles Gloriosus* discerned by Marzullo 1994: 234 n. 4; Radif 2005; Traill 2005: 532; Fontaine 2010: 192–7. For engagement with Greek epic in *Bacchides*, see Barbiero 2018.
[51] Plautus follows his Menandrian model verbatim at *Bacch.* 496–9 (= *DE* 14–17), which proves he was working from a text and not a vague notion of a comic plot.
[52] Plaut., *Rud.* 86; Plaut., *Poen.* 1. Critics have argued that Plautus is referring to Latin translations of Greek tragedies, not the Greek tragedies themselves; thus Slater 2014: 112; Jocelyn 1967: 6–7, 161. I must dissent. We have no evidence of a Latin version of the *Alkmene* by any poet which would predate the *Rudens*, nor is the evidence unequivocal for Ennius' *Achilles*. And anyway, why would Plautus refer to Euripides' tragedies specifically, by title, if he meant different plays altogether?
[53] On these references, see Barbiero 2023: 15, 84–5, 160, 192–3 and 198–200.
[54] We do, however, have some other traces of titulature from the middle republican period. Using the term ἐπιγραφή for 'title' for the first time, Polybius tells us (3.9.1–3) that Fabius Pictor's work of Roman history had a title; see further Castelli 2020: 312. According to Dorandi 1984: 189, Lucil. 736 W (*praeterito tepido glutinator glutino*) refers to the making of *sillyba*, and Aulus Gellius (*NA* 1.25.17) reports that the second-century grammarian Aurelius Opilius gave one of his works the title *Musae*. On Opilius' *Pinax*, see below.
[55] *Casina*'s prologue contains material from a later revival. See further Arnott 2002: 25 n. 4. While there is no consensus about what belongs to the Plautine prologue and what to the revival version, the resemblance of *Casina*'s didascalic notation to other such statements, undoubtedly Plautine, illustrate that these verses are original to the play. See further Chiarini 1981.

wrote it in Greek, after that, again, later,
Plautus with a barking name [wrote it] in Latin.

A fragment of Naevius, long presumed to be from the prologue, also gives a title, although it is unclear whether the poet is giving the title of his own comedy, that of his Greek source or a title common to both (Naevius 1 R^3):

Acontizomenos fabula est prime bona.

Acontizomenos is a super excellent play.

Together with the evidence from Terence, these passages indicate that authorial titulature was the rule in Roman comedy, irrespective of whether a title's placement in the prologue was the exception (as it seems to be in Plautus) or the rule (as it is in Terence). Why would a playwright give a title to just some of his comedies and not all of them? We can only speculate as to the reason he might choose to emphasise a particular title by advertising it at the beginning of a performance, but there appears at any rate to have been another method of dissemination whereby all titles would have been made known to the audience, including those not announced in the prologue. Donatus informs us that titles were broadcast before the performance together with the names of the dramatists, a claim also made by Pollux.[56] And however they were announced, comic titles circulated as unaccompanied indexical markers immediately, recognisable to an audience contemporary to the plays' composition. So in Plautus' *Bacchides*, *Epidicus* is cited by title (Plaut., *Bacch.* 213–15), and Terence knows and names the Roman comedies composed by his literary predecessors by their titles (Ter., *Eun.* 25–6; Ter., *Ad.* 6–7).

Terence's prologues are our last pieces of evidence for comic titles for several decades. The titles reappear at the end of the second century B.C. in the literature that grows up around comedy starting with the work of the first Roman philologists like Aelius Stilo, whose research was foundational for subsequent generations of Plautine scholars including Volcacius Sedigitus. These authors commented on comic texts and considered questions of literary history, using titles widely in their work and thereby demonstrating these indexical markers' importance. Titles were themselves worked on, figuring prominently in discussions about Plautine authenticity and organised into indices;[57] Aurelius Opilius' *Pinax*, for instance, seems to have been an acrostic work in verse composed of lists of Plautus' titles.[58] Such material forms the basis of the sources which preserve the titles and fragments of Caecilius Statius, a tertiary tradition we will take up shortly.

Broadcast before the performance, announced in the prologue, employed indexically and featured prominently in the secondary and tertiary literature, titles were an important thing in Roman comedy, which in view of our preceding discussion should come as no surprise. For the title is an important thing in drama *tout court*, taking on an integral role in a play's afterlife as text as well as in various ways before and during its performance. Indeed, the title's immediate effects — i.e., those which condition the text's reception — would have been as valuable to republican comic playwrights as they were to those of fifth-century Athens. Granted that the circumstances of Roman drama's

[56] Donat., *de Comoedia* 8.1 and Pollux 4.88. Some critics have doubted this claim; see Ritschl 1845: 301–4 and more recently Moore 2012: 20, who argues that the presence of titles in the Plautine and Terentian prologues would make such an announcement redundant. But comedy is often deliberately redundant, and besides we are then left with the problem of how titles not mentioned in the prologues were broadcast.

[57] Aulus Gellius informs us that no fewer than 130 plays circulated under Plautus' name in antiquity (Gell., *NA* 3.3). Although Gellius attributes this to plagiarism (Plautus retouched the work of old poets) and a case of mistaken identity (many Plautine plays were actually *Plautinian*, the work of an otherwise unknown poet called Plautius), modern critics have thought that Plautus' name was used to confer value upon scripts by less popular comic playwrights. See, e.g., Gunderson 2015: 19.

[58] See, e.g., Courtney 1993: 96.

production and performance are different from those of Attic drama; but even with the agonistic context missing,[59] poets would nevertheless have been motivated to publicise their plays for commercial success since they sold their scripts for profit. Although we do not know exactly how this worked, it seems that poets turned a higher profit for a successful performance. So Plautine plays may have commanded a higher price tag than those written by other authors, if the veritable industry impersonating the playwright's authorship is any indication.[60] This points us to yet another of the title's functions, *viz.* its ability to mark ownership of a text. (Recall that titular inscriptions often included the author's name, a composition reproduced in the Plautine didascalic references, which assert Plautus' authorship together with the plays' titles.) Castelli has shown that this impulse is behind the title's earliest antecedents,[61] and literary ownership was doubtlessly a major concern for republican playwrights, too: as much is indicated by the phenomenon of Plautine impersonation as well as by the prologues of Terence, which seek to defend the poet against accusations of *furtum*.[62]

In the title, then, republican comic playwrights found a tool which addressed two major literary priorities by allowing them to garner an audience and to stamp their compositions as their own. Even if we are missing anything like the Athenian festival inscriptions to guarantee them, this prominence gives us strong grounds for assuming the *author*-ity of those titles that have been transmitted to us. The title of a Roman comedy was not an accessory to the text, but an indispensable component of it both pre- and post-performance, and was occasionally even announced in the course of the play itself. We will return to this question of authenticity, but need first to trace the path of the scripts and the titles that labelled them as these moved from a living performance tradition into the studies of Rome's first philologists. In what state did readers like Stilo find the texts of comedy? The matter is again complicated by ongoing debates, in this instance about the vicissitudes Roman comedies endured (*or did not*) before the end of the second century B.C.

As the general critical consensus would have it, Roman comedies did not circulate widely after their initial performance. It is assumed that these scripts remained in the possession of theatre professionals who had purchased them from their authors.[63] In this period, they are envisioned to have existed more as collaborative Google Docs than as PDFs, as it were, undergoing considerable change via interpolations and/or the introduction of new material invented by actors in subsequent revivals.[64] Only once under the mantle of philological study is Roman comedy thought to have fossilised into the form in which we now know it, compiled into scholarly editions accessible to the reading public.[65] This reconstruction, otherwise entirely conjectural, would appear to be

[59] *Aliter* Horsfall 1976: 83 and 86.

[60] Gell., *NA* 3.3.1–13. Consider, too, Terence's massive payday for the *Eunuchus*: see Suet./Donat., *Vita Ter.* 2 with Parker 1996: 591–2.

[61] Castelli 2020: 92–7.

[62] So, too, does this role of the title substantiate the textuality of Roman comedy. For if these plays originated as the collaborative work of a cottage industry, surely authorship and plagiarism would not have been of any concern.

[63] The communis opinio is summarised by Manuwald 2011: 120.

[64] This hypothesis is synthesised by Deufert 2002: 29–43, who accepts the hypothesis of Zwierlein 1990-2 that the 'interpolations' in Plautus can be traced to a single interpolator. The position of Marshall 2006 is fundamentally the same, even if Marshall makes a different argument for the origin of such changes, emphasising, rather, the variants introduced by repeated performances and the innovations of actors.

[65] So Manuwald 2011: 120. And yet according to Zetzel 2018: 27–30, the earliest Roman philologists did not compile Hellenistic-style editions, which problematises this widely held belief advanced first by Leo 1897: 5–8 and taken up as orthodoxy by later scholars like Questa 1984: 23–129 and Deufert 2002: 44–62. If Zetzel is right, who redacted comic scripts into books? One conclusion we could draw (although admittedly not the only one) is that the genre was already circulating in some accessible material form that made such redaction unnecessary at the end of the second century.

substantiated by Terence in the prologue to *Eunuchus*. The playwright claims to have not been previously acquainted with comedies by Naevius and Plautus titled *Colax*, plays from which he has been accused of stealing two characters (*Eun.* 19–34). Of this passage, Deufert declares that '[d]araus ist zu schließen, daß deren Komödien nicht in einer Buchausgabe verbreitet waren, die Kenntnis der Stücke vielmehr ein Nachforschen in den Unterlagen der Schauspieldirektoren erfordert hätte'[66] — and thereby falls right into Terence's trap. For the playwright's claim is patently disingenuous, part of a rhetorical strategy designed to defend him from the *uetus poeta*'s allegation of *furtum* — if we believe that the feud between these two poets was even real; Sharrock has suggested that the literary spat was invented by Terence for the purposes of espousing his comic aesthetic.[67] Either way, Terence was clearly familiar with his comic predecessors' work. Not only does he cite Plautine plots elsewhere as precedent for his practice of *contaminatio* and replicate the corpus' tropes and characters (commented upon already in antiquity, by Donatus[68]), but he even quotes two lines from *Trinummus*' prologue (Plaut., *Trin.* 16–17) in the prologue to *Adelphoe* (Ter., *Ad.* 22–3).[69] Such close, manifestly literary engagement suggests that the texts of previous playwrights like Plautus were neither amorphous nor inaccessible in the 160s, but that they had already taken on sufficient textual stability so as to be quotable and were, further, in circulation, available to consult before philological work on them had begun — and apparently not just by theatre professionals, either. For if Terence employs literary quotation, it must be the case that at least a portion of his audience was capable of recognising it. What would be the point of a quotation otherwise?

Let me be clear. The fact of textual engagement with and even quotation of comic scripts neither excludes the possibility that these preserve traces of improvisation in (re)-performance nor that they encourage the same through the inclusion of elastic gags and the like. It does, however, speak against the notion that Roman comedies were entirely fluid texts before the work of second-century scholars, and supports the contention that from the time of their performance they were bibliographically identified as specific plays composed by specific authors with specific titles. The same set of circumstances also suggests that by the time they reached the hands of the first Roman philologists, comedies (and their titles) had not substantively changed from their original form. Let us now finally get to Caecilius Statius' titles and to the last hurdle in comic titles' transmission.

IV CAECILIUS STATIUS' TITLES

The forty-three titles we have for Caecilius Statius are the following:[70]

> *Aethrio, Andria, Androgynus, Asotus, Carine, Chalcia, Chrysium, Dardanus, Dauus, Demandati, Ephesio, Epiclerus, Epistathmus, Epistula, Exhautuhestos, Exul, Fallacia, Gamus, Harpazomene, Hymnis, Subditiuus uel Hypobolimaeus, Hypobolimaeus Chaerestratus, Hypobolimaeus Rastraria, Hypobolimaeus Aeschinus, Imbrii, Meretrix, Nauclerus, Nothus Nicasio, Obolostates uel Fenerator, Pausimachus, Philumena, Plocium,*

[66] Deufert 2002: 27.
[67] Sharrock 2009: 77–83.
[68] See, e.g., Donat., *Comm. in Ter. Eun.* 432 and 694.
[69] The quotation is explained away by Deufert 2002: 28 with n. 60 as the work of an interpolator who inserted it into *Trinummus* from *Adelphoe*. It must be, however, that Terence is engaging directly with Plautus, although why he quotes these lines in particular remains to be explained.
[70] For details on these titles' transmission, see the Supplementary Appendix.

Polumeni, Portitor, Progamus, Pugil, Symbolum, Synaristosae, Synephebi, Syracusii, Titthe, Triumphus, Venator

None of these titles is preserved in the fragments. All are transmitted by our sources for the fragments which include Cicero and Aulus Gellius as well as lexicographers like Festus and especially Nonius, who transmits more of Caecilius Statius' titles than any other source. This fact potentially complicates our study since such authors did not reference our playwright's texts directly but instead relied on indices, compendia and commentaries — those scholarly products of the late second century B.C. discussed above.[71] Did comic titles reach this tertiary tradition altered by their circuitous route from the middle republican period? This is a possibility, and at least in one case a verifiable reality. The text we know as *Casina* was called *Sortientes* by Plautus, as is made clear by the didascalic reference at *Cas.* 29–34, cited above. We can trace the change to within 150 years of the comedy's composition, for Varro already calls it *Casina*.[72] This date, as well as the play's new title itself, suggest that *Sortientes* became *Casina* in a performative context rather than a bibliographical one: in the revivals of Roman comedy that occurred throughout the late Republic (a period to which *Casina*'s own prologue in part attests), we can well imagine spectators calling this play by its most memorable character rather than its authorial title, a title that made it into the edition of Plautus used by Varro.[73] There is a second instance of this same sort of titular change which is attested to by Fulgentius: the late-antique grammarian calls *Vidularia* 'Cacistus', after the fisherman character who presumably found the travel bag which gives this now-fragmentary play its original title.[74] But the fact that our other sources for *Vidularia* get its title right (lines from this play are quoted by the usual suspects, including Nonius and Priscian[75]) should give us pause: perhaps the lexicographers are more careful than we give them credit for, and *Sortientes*/*Casina* is the exception rather than the rule.

When considering the titles of Caecilius Statius, then, we must remain cognisant of the possibility that we are dealing with a title that is an artifact of a play's reception rather than the invention of its author (an interesting sort of artifact *per se*, if not my focus here). And yet it seems safe to proceed on the assumption that many if not most of the titles we have for Roman comedy made it unscathed into the indirect tradition, and not just those named in the prologues. For if occurrence in a comic text were the only factor to ensure a title's correct transmission, surely this would be true for *Casina*, too. We can, moreover, verify the accurate preservation of two Plautine titles which we do not get in the prologues from the mid 160s into the imperial period: in a letter to Fronto, Marcus Aurelius refers to Plautus' *Colax*, a title that appears at Ter., *Ad.* 6–7. This Terentian passage also substantiates the citation of Plautus' *Commorientes* in Gellius and Priscian.[76] For the Caecilian titles specifically, much of our evidence is later, and most of it comes from the lexicographers. But why should we accept the authenticity of a Caecilian line reported by Festus or Nonius but entirely reject the title they attribute to it — especially given

[71] On Nonius' use of this tradition, see Lindsay 1901. On Verrius Flaccus', see Nettleship 1880 and Glinister 2007: 21. The same is also likely true of authors like Varro (thus Piras 2015: 66 n. 30) and Cicero (thus Čulík-Baird 2022: 161).

[72] Varro, *Ling.* 7.104 and 106.

[73] The tendency to call a play after one of its main characters is observable throughout ancient drama, and accounts for some titular variation. For instance, Menander's *Misoumenos* is sometimes referred to as 'Thrasonides' after the soldier who starred in it. See Nervegna 2013: 95.

[74] Fulg. 116, 10 Helm. Did *Vidularia* circulate as 'Cacistus' in some ancient Plautine editions, or was this a nickname? Either way, what has come down to us is the comedy's authorial title (as attested by the play's prologue, Plaut., *Vid.* 6–7; see the Supplementary Appendix), despite the existence of an alternative title.

[75] For these testimonia, see Monda 2004.

[76] Prisc., *Inst.* II.280.19.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that they relied on the same source for both? Granted that these authors sometimes get the details wrong: they misattribute lines[77] and do occasionally get titles confused; e.g., Varro's *Logistoricus* is cited by Nonius under five slightly different titles.[78] We have seen, however, that dramatic titles were different. These were an integral element of the play which served to designate it, to advertise it and to guard it from misattribution, and not only from the playwrights' point of view: in the secondary tradition upon which the tertiary depends, titles were compiled into indices and debated. And in the tertiary tradition, titles are cited almost without exception along with comic fragments.[79] That is, *comic titles were the objects of critical scrutiny themselves* (recall that Opilius' *Pinax* was composed entirely of Plautine titles!), increasing the likelihood that these were accurately preserved through the various stages of comedy's ancient reception. But what about their subsequent transmission down to us? As is the case for so much ancient literary material, the attestation of Caecilius' titles is by no means perfect. While some titles are well attested and pose little difficulty, others are outright problematic.[80] I avoid the latter in my analysis, and make note of variant readings or conjectures wherever applicable. Details are laid out in the Supplementary Appendix.

Complete certainty as to the titles' authenticity lies beyond our grasp. And yet an absolutist sceptical approach which excludes the study of all titles because some may not be authentically authorial is too intellectually ambitious. We have more to gain by positing *author*-ity and proceeding with interpretation than we do from assuming that all the titles we have are, like *Casina*, products of the plays' reception, or have been mangled beyond recognition in transmission. Sommerstein puts it perfectly when he remarks that 'once the data [i.e. the titles of Greek drama] were roused from their sleep in the archives and got into the hands of scholars, they were liable to be edited and adjusted, and in some cases this has almost certainly happened, *but the onus of proof must always be on whoever alleges that it has*.'[81] Let us see, then, what Caecilius Statius does with titles, and what his titles can do.

V BILINGUAL PLAY WITH TITLES

What's in the title of a play? Quite a lot, despite Lessing's opinion that Plautus gave his comedies insignificant titles.[82] As Genette has taught us, the title is always a message: titles are designed not just to designate texts, but also to manage our relationship with them, enticing us from the threshold to come in and, once we have, influencing our understanding of what follows. That is, the title is very much an interpretive key designed to guide our reception of the titled text. This function explains why in Roman comedy we find titles mentioned in the prologue, where theatrical induction happens. The *prologus* seeks to both grab our attention and to focus it — whether on a theme, a character, an object or a scene of the play to follow. And whichever element of the text is chosen as titular becomes *ipso facto* invested with significance. Let us suppose that

[77] e.g. Plaut., *Cas.* 823 is misattributed to *Mercator* at Non., p. 98.22 M. = 140 L.
[78] See Lindsay 1901: 109.
[79] Paulus Diaconus' eighth-century epitome of Festus' *De uerborum significatu* sometimes leaves out Caecilius' titles. See, e.g., Fest., p. 454.8–11 L. and Paul. Fest., p. 455.18–21 L.
[80] *Exhautuhestos*, which appears only once in Donatus (Donat., *ad Ter. Ad.* 668), is especially difficult: the title is a conjecture made by Spengel 1829 and would represent a transliteration of the Greek phrase ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἑστώς (literally, 'a man relying entirely on himself', and thus the description of an excessively self-confident man) based on the analogy of Terence's title *Heauton Timoroumenos*.
[81] Sommerstein 2010: 13. Emphasis mine.
[82] *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* XXI, 27. In fact, Lessing was praising Plautus: the critic had an aversion to meaningful titles, proclaiming in the same work that 'the title is truly a trifling matter' (416).

Plautus' *Pseudolus* were called *Calidorus* instead. How would our understanding of this comedy change? It seems obvious that the *adulescens* would become the subject of more analysis than he is. Currently, we mostly ignore him because nothing tells us he is important. But if Calidorus were the title character, spectators, readers and critics alike would be incited to ask *why*. And if we were to put our minds to it, we could come up with any number of interesting observations. For example, we might conclude that the hypothetical *Calidorus* is a play that highlights the irony of a genre featuring slaves who act out as if they were free but for the benefit of their masters. The play *is* actually about attaining Calidorus' wish (possession of Phoenicium) and concludes with an ending that is happy really only for him. But Plautus has told us that the comedy is about the suitably named Pseudolus, training all eyes on this crafty slave translated from Greek to Latin who lies (ψεύδω) and cheats (*dolus*) his way through the plot. Crucially, that much is evident *even to those who have not watched or read the comedy*, since *Pseudolus* signifies very well even without its play — at least for anyone acquainted with the genre of Roman comedy: this speaking name (the masculine ending leaves no doubt that Pseudolus is a male character) can belong to no one but a slave who, one would reasonably assume, does in this play what slaves do in all of Plautus' plays (lies and cheats!).

There is likewise much one could do with the list of forty-three playless titles we have for Caecilius Statius. For instance, we might explore the poet's apparent interest in thingliness. Four of Caecilius' plays were titled after everyday objects: *Epistula* ('The Letter'), *Hypobolimaeus Rastraria* ('The Changeling/Play about the Hoe'), *Plocium* ('The Necklace') and *Symbolum* ('The Seal') draw our attention to stage properties and place in the spotlight these objects which exist simultaneously in the theatrical world and in the real world. *Plocium* asks us to focus on a necklace, taking note of its appearance and transfer from character to character, or perhaps to realise that it does not appear on stage at all and to wonder *why*. *Epistula* and *Symbolum* invite us to look for writing and, further, suggest documentary mischief, a type of comic ruse that features prominently in the Plautine corpus and which we find mentioned in the fragments of Caecilius' *Synephebi*.[83] The titles, however, highlight a notable difference between Caecilius Statius and his predecessor Plautus in, at the very least, the titular presentation of such plays that revolve around the deceptive power of writing. While Plautus prefers to emphasise the tricksters in his titles,[84] Caecilius Statius' titles seem to accentuate the physical medium of textual tricks. The potential effects of privileging objects over their agents are manifold, posing questions about the order of subjectivity, for instance, and the role of the physical in everyday human existence. In particular, *Symbolum* encourages us to contemplate the notion of documentary authority by putting at centre stage a thing employed to embody its owner via text, a mechanism Rome was becoming ever more reliant upon in the administration of its burgeoning empire. The same author-guaranteeing object (a seal) raises issues of originality most relevant to the poetics of any translator-poet.

These thing-titles also point us towards a remarkable transparency in Caecilius' titular corpus. Many of his comedies bear titles that imply a plot type, preparing the audience for what is to come or, conversely, setting up a horizon of expectations that will be later defeated. This is true of Caecilius' multiple *hypobolimaeus* plays titled after the suppositious child motif, to which we will return. Caecilius Statius' titles are also strongly conventional in their evocation of stock comic roles: *Epiclerus* ('The Heiress'),

[83] Caecilius Statius 203–4 R³.

[84] *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Persa* and *Pseudolus* are titled after textual tricksters (the Persian of *Persa* delivers the forgery), whereas *Trinummus* is titled for the miserly pay that the actor is to receive for his role in the (ultimately failed) deception. *Bacchides*' title refers to the ruse's objective, the two sisters named Bacchis with whom both the play's *adulescentes* are sexually involved.

Harpazomene ('The Abducted Girl'), *Nauclerus* ('The Skipper'), *Obolostates uel Fenerator* ('The Moneylender'), *Meretrix* ('The Prostitute'), *Titthe* ('The Wetnurse'), *Portitor* ('The Customs Officer') and *Synephebi* ('The Comrades in Youth') were all plays titled after recognisable characters of the genre, not only generating reasonable assumptions about the comic storyline (e.g. *Epiclerus* must have featured a conflict over an heiress) but also gesturing towards character studies and inviting the spectators to ponder how the character(s) mentioned in the play's title would measure up to others in the genre. Will the eponymous *meretrix* be *bona* or *mala*? I would add, too, that the high percentage of female names amongst Caecilius Statius' titles may be significant. Women account for almost one-third of Caecilius' titular characters — ten out of thirty-five. A special interest in gender is in fact suggested by the tantalising comment of an anonymous scholiast[85] on Horace (Comm. Cruq. ad Hor. *Ars. P.*, 236–9):[86]

> Pythias persona comica in comoedia Caecilii[87] quae inducitur per astutias accipere argentum a Simone domino suo in dotem filiae.
>
> Pythias is a comic character in a comedy of Caecilius; she is brought on to the stage as a person who gets, by a crafty trick, some money from her master Simo for the daughter's dowry.

Such a female-centred plot fits in nicely with the preponderance of female titles attested for the poet and may have even found its way into Terence, whose titles betray a similar interest in women.[88] Is it a coincidence that Caecilius' girl-saving slave-heroine is called Pythias, just like *Eunuchus*' *ancilla* who so righteously expresses another girl's traumatic experience during a rape?

Caecilius' titles thus present us with much food for thought and there are many possible avenues of inquiry in studying them. My interest here, however, lies in discerning what the playwright is doing with language in his titles, and how these engage with translation as a literary and cultural phenomenon. In that vein, I want to return to the idea that Greek titles of Roman comedies indicate Greek-ish plays. This is a commonly held view. Take what Manuwald says:

> Most of the titles of Caecilius' comedies are Greek, like those of Naevius and Terence, but unlike those of Plautus. … A large number of titles found in Caecilius are also attested in Menander; several recall those of Philemon and some those of other writers of Greek New Comedy; a very few may relate to writers of Middle Comedy; some do not have a known Greek equivalent. If this distribution of titles reflects the selection of models, this may indicate a tendency towards a more Hellenic, Menandrean outlook on comedy; in contrast to Naevius and Plautus, extant fragments exhibit only few Roman allusions.[89]

This logic, which has been used on Terentian comedy, too,[90] is imprecise and faulty. Does 'Hellenic' mean more faithful in translation of the Greek source text, or just more Greek in the play's tone and content? These attributes do not necessarily coincide, and the latter is outright problematic since our idea of what is 'Italian' and what is 'Hellenic'

[85] This is the Commentator Cruquianus, whose notes (for all their mystery) Zetzel 2009 considers 'unique and unquestionably ancient material'.
[86] Cf. Ps. Acro ad Hor. *Ars P.* 238.
[87] Orelli's widely accepted conjecture for 'Lucilius', who did not write comedies. See Orelli 1850³: ad loc. 'Lucilius' also appears for 'Caecilius' in the attestations for *Aethrio* and *Androgynus*; see further the Supplementary Appendix.
[88] Terence titled two of his six plays after women (*Andria* and *Hecyra*). Of Plautus' twenty-one *fabulae Varronianae*, there is only *Bacchides*.
[89] Manuwald 2011: 235.
[90] Cf., e.g., Ballester 1990: 136 on Terence generally and Brown 2013: 18 on *Heauton Timoroumenos* specifically.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relies on speculative reconstructions of lost plays and thus what we *think* Greek new comedies were like.[91] Another wrinkle in this relates to the correspondence, or lack thereof, between the source text's title and that of its translation. A Greek title does not automatically mean a title identical to that of a comedy's model, for Roman comic playwrights often invented their own Greek titles: there are no known Greek equivalents for Caecilius' *Symbolum* or *Chrysium*, for example. And on the other hand, Latin titles can be entirely new inventions, but they can also be simple translations of Greek titles. Whereas *Meretrix* seems to be unparalleled in Greek New Comedy, Maltby and Slater list four Greek plays titled after exiles, any of which might stand behind Caecilius Statius' *Exul*.[92] Even if we can speculate on what the difference is between these various Greek and Latin title types, there is little we can say for certain about what they mean for the lost Caecilian plays' relationship to their lost models. On the matter of Greek and Latin titulature in Roman comedy, we can only confidently assert the following: (1) the act of changing the title of one's source text in its Latin translation is an appropriative move;[93] (2) a Greek title identical to that of the translation's model could indicate fidelity but could also, by antiphrasis and with a powerful *paraprosdokian* effect, designate a comedy with a high degree of Roman originality; and (3) since it was possible to change the model's title to something else entirely in its translation, the retention of a Greek title (whether left in Greek or translated into Latin) is not a mechanical move but a purposeful one. We shall see that Caecilius uses this last strategy with fascinating results.

In this final section of my article, I, too, seek to understand how Caecilius' titles relate to translation and to the problem of originality it poses, but not by trying to discern what titles signify about a comedy's equivalence to or divergence from the model. I am interested, rather, in a dimension of meaning in the titulature of Caecilius' comedies that goes beyond this, connotative effects which arise out of titles' dual existence. As identifiers of plays in Latin performed at Rome which, however, are set in Greece and originate as Greek comedies performed at Athens, the titles of Roman comedy are (like its plays) markedly double, and it will emerge that such doubleness manifests itself in various ways throughout Caecilius' attested titles and is echoed in some of the surviving fragments, too. These in fact demonstrate that our playwright could be quite metaliterary; several of the fragments explicitly refer to the play as a play and manifest various sorts of reflexiveness.[94] However, the connotative effects of Caecilius' titles are operative irrespective of the lost comedies' content. As we saw above, titles are paratexts designed to circulate alone and thus to signify independently of the texts they label. Of course, my reading of any given title's effect can be countered by the usual objection: how can we be *sure* that the playwright intended for his titles to be interpreted as such? The fact is that we cannot ever have complete confidence on this question (even if there are hints of authorial intent, as I argue below), and as a result the readings presented in what follows will remain ultimately unfalsifiable. But my discussion nevertheless shows us what the Caecilian titles can do by parsing out their interpretive *possibilities* in the mind of an ancient spectator, thereby telling us something both significant and interesting about this playwright's comedy.

We will start with the most basic of effects in Caecilius' *Chalcia*, titled after an Athenian bronze workers' festival and based on Menander's play of the same title, *Chalkeia* (Χάλκεια). That is, *si uera lectio*: *Chalcia* is Spengel's conjecture for (*in*) *Calcis*, the

[91] Fontaine's notion of Plautine comedy as 'Greek' is more nuanced than this, pertaining to the plays' literary sophistication as well as their inclusion of word play that requires knowledge of Greek. While I am sympathetic to Fontaine's approach, I disagree that Greek titles necessarily convey this Greekness.

[92] See n. 4.

[93] See further Barbiero 2023: 198–9.

[94] So, e.g., Caecilius Statius 266 R^3 which refers to the play by the article of clothing that is metonymic of the genre, the Greek *pallium*: saepe est etiam sup palliolo sordido sapientia.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading transmitted by all the manuscripts.[95] For its original Greek audience, *Chalceia* highlighted a twofold overlap in the dramatic setting, emphasising that Menander's play was not only (as were most Greek new comedies) doubly Athenian in its real-world and theatrical locations but that it was also doubly festive: *Chalkeia* was both performed during a festival (albeit not the Chalkeia itself) and its title suggests that it depicted events that somehow related to a festival, too. Perhaps the plot revolved around the aftermath of a drunken festival rape or actually took place during the Chalkeia. Or maybe the play ended with the Chalkeia's celebration. It is impossible to know for sure how this festival figured in the play's plot, but its title tells us that Menander wanted his audience to think of the festival, wherever it was located in theatrical time. Such a blurring of the line between 'here' on stage and 'here' off stage makes the comic world into a mirror that reflects back upon the audience a portrait of itself — both generally, as Athenians, but also specifically *in this very moment* at the present festival. *Chalcia*, however, would work differently as the title for a Roman comedy. Through the Greek title's retention, the disruption of the original play's alignment (a disruption entirely typical of the genre) would be accentuated: the festival in the title of the Roman version is something that happens 'there' rather than 'here'. Paradoxically, then, titular equivalence emphasises difference, since what was local in Menander's play would now be foreign in Caecilius', and accordingly the onstage world would go from a *speculum vitae* to a display of Rome's new sphere of colonial influence (although Athens was not officially conquered until the mid-second century, Rome was already meddling in Greek affairs). Further, the real-world performance setting at Rome is likewise a festive one, which would allow for a comparison of like with like, on stage and off: how does Roman festival behaviour compare to that of the Greeks? But there is more. Whereas an ancient Athenian would immediately have understood *Chalkeia* as referring to a religious holiday and thus would have been equipped to formulate assumptions about this comedy's plot before watching it, the average Roman theatre-goer would likely not have known enough about Greek religion to recognise in this title a minor Athenian festival. Such a spectator would have had to wait until *Chalcia* was staged to understand the meaning of its title; indeed, this exotic title might have generated curiosity and interest.

A similar dynamic is at play in Caecilius' *Imbri* ('The Imbrians') and his *Syracusii* ('The Syracusans').[96] Use of these titles to identify comedies performed at Rome instead of in Greece entails a reorientation of geographical perspective and a switch in the ethnonyms' meaning, for they now refer to foreign peoples instead of to fellow Greeks. *Syracusii* is especially striking as the title for a Roman comedy in that it functions as macro allusion to recent history. An ancient audience could not but have connected this title to Rome's epic siege of Syracuse in 213–211 B.C., a protracted battle which had occurred only twenty-five years or so before the play's performance and in which members of Caecilius' original audience could easily have been personally involved. Spectators may have been soldiers in the campaign or potentially even inhabitants of that city, making them the unfortunate title characters of a play whose translation was tinged with tragic meaning (at least from their perspective). Was this fundamentally

[95] See the Supplementary Appendix. *Chalcia* is the most probable of all alternatives. There is no precedent for new comedies titled after cities (Chalkis, a city in Euboea), nor after birds or fish (χαλκίς, an unknown bird or migratory fish) — and in any case, we need a plural noun. The Latin title *Calcei* ('shoes') would be a viable contender if in Roman comedy everyone did not wear the *soccus*. Simply put, an Athenian festival (τὰ χαλκεῖα, sc. ἱερά) seems most likely as the title for a Roman comedy: these plays are almost always set at Athens, and the incidents of their prehistory often transpire at festivals. In fact, Plautus' *Poenulus* and *Pseudolus* take place on or around festival days.

[96] Although reasonably well attested, there are some variants for *Imbri*, including *umbris*, *inimbris*, *infoebis*, *himbris* and *inphoebis*. See further the Supplementary Appendix.

Roman meaning of a Greek title reflected in the comedy itself? One of the fragments of *Syracusii* suggests that it may have been (Caecilius Statius 218–19 R³):

hic amet,
familiae fame perbitant, ager autem stet sentibus.

Let him love,
let his family perish from hunger, let his land stand thick with thornbush.

The speaker here must have been referring to someone whose pursuit of comic pleasure was leading them to neglect their duties. But to an audience member who knew about, had witnessed or perhaps had even experienced the siege at Syracuse, this line could have had another, very real resonance. We hear from Livy about the terrible hunger suffered by inhabitants of Syracuse upon its fall, and Diodorus claims that some Syracusans were even forced to sell themselves into slavery, just so as to be able to eat.[97]

Syracusii thus pithily encapsulates imperialism, both cultural and military, referring simultaneously to a Greek play made Roman and to a Greek city and Greek people made Roman. It also gestures towards a Roman city made Greek. The victory over Syracuse was especially memorable for the plunder brought back to Rome by Marcellus and paraded around during his *ouatio*. Plutarch tells us that the spoils of this victory decorated the Roman cityscape, completely transforming it.[98] The city's inhabitants were thereby introduced to the pleasures of art, and were themselves changed, too: Livy traces the beginning of Rome's decline into dissolution to the importation of Marcellus' victory spoils.[99] How much more significant, then, is *Syracusii* via its designation of a comedy performed in a civic space adorned by the splendours stolen from the very people its title refers to? Further still, as the translation of a Greek text, Caecilius' *fabula palliata* is a product of Rome's large-scale cultural acquisition, and the theatrical spectatorship it implies is yet another feature of the moral corruption which was this acquisition's corollary. After all, the Romans had learned about the pleasure of theatre from the Greeks (or so the story went), and there is even a potential connection to the city of Syracuse specifically. The Sicilian city was an important artistic centre with one of the biggest theatres in the Greek world, and its Hellenic luxuries were apparently hard to resist, even for Roman war heroes. An official investigation of the Senate was conducted in response to reports that Scipio Africanus was being excessively self-indulgent in Syracuse while in his winter quarters there.[100] These allegations came from Cato, who, as quaestor in 204 B.C., accompanied Scipio to Sicily where he observed the general Greek-ing out in Syracuse through 'a childish addiction to palaestras and theatres, as if he were not commander of an army, but master of a festival'.[101]

Another Caecilian title which is the same as its original but also dramatically different is *Hymnis* ('The Singer'). Whereas the title of the Greek play, Menander's *Hymnis*, conveys only its titular character's profession (she must have been a *hetaira*), as the title to a Roman comedy *Hymnis* becomes a speaking name (or, a 'singing name'!) if, as seems likely, Caecilius used the girl as a singer of the *cantica* he would have added to his Greek model in translation.[102] But we can go a bit further still. In Latin there is an overlap of titular girl and play created by the feminine gender of *fabula*, the word with which titles of Roman comedies like *Cistellaria* and *Carbonaria* implicitly agree. *Hymnis* thus

[97] Livy 26.30.9–10; Diod. Sic. 26.20.
[98] Plut., *Vit. Marc.* 21.1–2.
[99] Livy 25.40.1–3.
[100] See Livy 29. 20–22.
[101] Plut., *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 3.7 See also Livy 29.19.10–13.
[102] Which we know he did: of the three iambic passages from Menander's *Plokion* set out by Gellius at *NA* 2.23, the Roman translator has turned one into song.

self-referentially conveys the translation's new musicality, becoming by virtue of its existence in Latin as the title to a Roman comedy the Greek equivalent of *Carmen-aria* — 'the song-play': since all words that end in -ις in Greek are feminine, this suffix can be employed to feminise any word, whether person or thing. Such a coincidence of play and girl would have had significant metatheatrical potential for the Roman comedy, and one wonders if the following fragment from *Hymnis* could have been referring to both girl *and* play — if it did, in fact, refer to Hymnis herself (scholars have thought so but we cannot possibly be sure) (Caecilius Statius 71 R³):

 uide luculentitatem eius et magnificentiam!

Look at her (its?) splendour and magnificence!

Thus Caecilius' Greek titles can be fundamentally *Roman* via double meanings that are created only by their recontextualisation through translation. We could keep going. Take *Pausimachus* ('The Peacemaker'). As the title designating a Roman play about the newly subject Greeks which was, further, performed by slaves whose enslavement may very well have been the result of Roman imperialism, *Pausimachus* becomes, to at least some of the audience, deeply ironic.

This same duality is detectable in several of Caecilius Statius' Latin titles, which recreate the effects we have been looking at in Greek titles. That is, titles in Latin can duplicate the bilingual play produced when Greek titles label comedies in Latin performed at Rome, reversing it by equivocating on the use of a Latin word to title a comedy set in Greece. This is strongly suggestive of authorial intent, i.e., that Caecilius Statius recognised the dynamic we have been studying above, since he seems to be replicating it in titles that must be of his own invention. Such is the case for *Triumphus*. The primary definition of this Latin noun is 'triumph', the procession to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus granted to victorious Roman generals throughout the middle and late republican periods. But Caecilius' title cannot refer to this rite since it must designate a play about Greeks set somewhere in Greece, where the triumph did not exist. If the genre of Roman comedy itself were not enough to assure of us that fact (not a single surviving play is set anywhere but Greece), it is confirmed by one of *Triumphus*' two preserved fragments, which mentions an obviously Greek character called Hierocles (Caecilius Statius 228 R³):

Hierocles hospes est mi adulescens adprobus.

My guest Hierocles is really an excellent young man.

Triumphus, then, must simply mean 'victory', and the comedy may have featured a character recently returned from war. However, as a play performed in Rome during the middle Republic, *Triumphus* cannot shake its reference to such an important institution, especially in view of debates over the triumph which were playing out in the public arena exactly during Caecilius Statius' lifetime. Rome's wars of expansion brought triumphs with ever greater frequency to the city, as well as controversy about the right to hold one. The 190s and 180s saw prominent Roman generals like Fulvius Nobilior, Manlius Vulso and Scipio Asiaticus engaged in bitter battles with their political enemies over the distinction,[103] an issue that even made its way onto the comic stage. In Plautus' *Bacchides*, slave Chrysalus announces his exit from the play with a joke about the triumph which he eschews for its commonness (*Bacch.* 1072–3):

sed, spectatores, uos nunc ne miremini
quod non triumpho: peruolgatum est, nil moror.

[103] See Gruen 1994: 60–5.

> But spectators — don't be shocked
> at the fact that I'm not celebrating a triumph: it's way too common now,
> and I don't care for it.

We might then ask if Caecilius Statius chose *Triumphus* (rather than, say, *Victoria*) in acknowledgement of this very topical debate as well as to equivocate playfully on the cultural identity of the designated comedy. Such teasing is indeed suggested by *Triumphus*' other surviving fragment, which features a glaring Roman allusion in *subcenturiare* (Caecilius Statius 229 R^3):

> nunc meae malitiae, Astutia, opus est subcenturiare.
>
> Now, Cunning, it's necessary to sub in my craftiness.

By naming his comedy *Triumphus*, our playwright at once acknowledges and, I suggest, *deliberately recreates in Latin* the effect of using Greek titles for Roman comedies, a polysemy generated by the genre's fundamentally dual cultural allegiance. This interplay of equivalence and difference reveals the translator's concern with questions of authorship and originality that are central to Roman comedy. How have the Latin playwrights modified their Greek originals? The Caecilian titles implicitly give us an answer to that question, namely that irrespective of the playwright's fidelity to or divergence from his model material, the plays of Greek comedy are transformed simply by virtue of their transposition to Rome. The last set of titles we will consider illustrate this nicely.

Four plays variously titled 'The Changeling' are attributed to Caecilius Statius: *Hypobolimaeus uel Subditiuus* ('The Changeling'), *Hypobolimaeus Chaerestratus* ('The Changeling Chaerestratus'), *Hypobolimaeus Rastraria* ('The Changeling/Play about the Hoe') and *Hypobolimaeus Aeschinus* ('The Changeling Aeschinus').[104] These titles unambiguously point to the suppositious child plot featuring a child 'placed under' a woman as if she had just given birth to it, a trope that was very popular in ancient comedy: De Poli counts eleven Greek comedies that feature *hypobole* in their titles written within 200 years of each other by eight different authors.[105] But Caecilius Statius is (as far as we know) the only playwright to have composed more than one comedy so titled, as well as the only Roman playwright to title a comedy after the motif. In fact, despite the claim at the end of Plautus' *Captiui* that *pueri suppositio* is a hackneyed trope avoided by the foregoing play,[106] only one suppositious child appears in all of surviving Roman comedy, the baby used by Phronesium in Plautus' *Truculentus* to fool her soldier boyfriend. But the changeling's 'titularity' in Caecilius' plays as well as the ancient testimonia suggest a different focus from what we get in *Truculentus*. Caecilius' *hypobolimaeus* plays were not about the mother's deception but were set later, revolving around the changeling child himself and his vicissitudes as an adult.

[104] The count is Ribbeck's (Guardì counts only three, as do Maltby and Slater), and relies on identifying a play titled *Hypobolimaeus* with another called *Subditiuus* as one comedy, on which see further below. Ribbeck seems to be right, since his number is supported by the attestation of different *hypobolimaeus* titles in the same source: so, for instance, Aulus Gellius gives us both *Hypobolimaeus Aeschinus* (*NA* 15.14.1–5) and *Subditiuus* (*NA* 15.9.1). Nonius gives us the most variety, attesting to three of the four *Hypobolimaeus* titles. Even if less critical than an author like Gellius, Nonius is not necessarily less credible in titular transmission, given that he appears to have copied his information directly from his sources without modification, and gets most of his *Hypobolimaeus* titles for Caecilius *from the same sources* — so Lindsay 1901. Thus *Subditiuus* at Non., p. 514.31–32, 515.1 M. = 828 L. is from the glossary source Lindsay calls 'Alph. Adverb', as is *Hypobolimaeus Rastraria* at Non., p. 176.6–8 M. = 259 L. Unless those sources got Caecilius' *Hypobolimaeus* titles wrong, Nonius gives good evidence for these titles in our playwright's corpus. But whether Caecilius composed two, three or four changeling plays, it is this motif's multiplicity that matters. For more details on the transmission of these titles, see the Supplementary Appendix.

[105] De Poli 2021.

[106] Plaut., *Capt.* 1031.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Further, these seem likely to have culminated in the changeling's recognition as someone else's son. Caecilius Statius' *hypobolimaeus* comedies also featured doubles — two sons and two fathers, pairs that were further contrasted via association with country or city.[107] These are all fertile comic motifs, but the changeling is also a fertile metaliterary motif: a suppositious child appropriated by a mother who did not create him is a most fitting image for the kind of appropriation involved in literary translation. A translator makes someone else's play his own, an act which creates a series of doubles mirrored by the doubles in the changeling comedies: two fathers, two sons; two authors, two plays. This is also expressed by the very multiplicity of Caecilius' *hypobolimaeus* comedies, which are doubles of plays about doubles. If the Greek original (or originals) featured doubles, too, the pairs of doubles in the Latin versions of these plays are doubles of those doubles. And there is more. Two of Caecilius Statius' *hypobolimaeus* comedies and one additional play may bear titles that are themselves double, a literal duplicity which would metapoetically gesture towards translation and the dynamic it entails. Let us have a look.

In all genres and periods of Greek drama we find double or alternative titles separated by ἤ. These likely originated in the plays' bibliographical *Nachleben*, products of the titular variation discussed above.[108] The double title likewise occurs in every theatrical genre of Roman drama.[109] Horsfall considers them to be 'of great antiquity' but nevertheless identical in origin to their Greek cousins.[110] However, there is another, more likely explanation — at least for two of Caecilius Statius' three double titles. *Hypobolimaeus uel Subditiuus* and *Obolostates uel Fenerator*, both comprised of a Greek title followed by its translation into Latin, are, I suggest, the products of (and thereby reveal) an ancient tendency to treat the titles of Roman comedies as equally renderable in both languages. Consider Plautus' didascalic references, which set forth the Greek and Latin titles side by side like alternative titles for the same play (e.g. *Sortientes* and *Kleroumenoi*). Even comedies whose prologues do not contain the title's translation are occasionally referred to in the opposite language: Festus refers to *Mostellaria* as *Phasma*,[111] and Cicero calls Terence's *Heauton Timoroumenos Ipse se Poeniens*.[112] The same phenomenon must be behind the title for *Poenulus* (in use already by Varro's time[113]): this comedy is actually called *Carchedonius*, as per the prologue (Plaut., *Poen.* 53–5; see the Supplementary Appendix), a title which has been translated into Latin and turned into a diminutive.[114] Admittedly, for Caecilius' titles we tread on shakier textual

[107] See especially the descriptions of these *hypobolimaeus* plots at Varro, *Rust.* 2.11.11, Cic., *Rosc. Am.* 46 and Schol. Gronov., *ad Cic. Rosc. Am.* 46, as well as Caecilius Statius 77 and 82 R³. Quint., *Inst.* 1.10.18 is about Menander's play, likewise titled after the motif and considered a likely candidate for at least one of Caecilius' source texts.

[108] See Sommerstein 2010: 17. Sommerstein's appendix lists alternative titles in tragedy, satyr-play and comedy. For such titles in dithyramb, see Prodi 2019: 504–7.

[109] There is one such title attested for Plautus (*Caecus uel Praedones*), and three examples among the tragedies of Accius (*Philocteta siue Philocteta Lemnius, Stasiastae siue Tropaeum Liberi* and *Minos siue Minotaurus*). There is also one Accian *praetexta* with a double title, *Aeneadae seu Decius*, on which see Manuwald 2001: 200. The double titles of other ancient works across various genres result from the modern editorial decision that ancient sources are referring to and/or quoting the same text under different titles. Thus, for instance, Titinius' play *Psaltria siue Ferentinatis*, on which see Lindsay 1901: 109. On a similar phenomenon in Caecilius Statius' titles, see below.

[110] Horsfall 1981: 104. So, too, Ballester 1990: 147–8.

[111] Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* p. 158–394 L.

[112] Cic., *Tusc.* 3.65.

[113] Varro, *Ling.* 7.69.

[114] Some have argued that this play's original Latin title was *Patruus* (it is marked as such both in Lindsay's OCT and in Ernout's Budé), but that seems to me very unlikely based on the Latin: we would have to read *Patruus* as the subject of another implied *uocatur* rather than an adjective agreeing with Plautus, and this in an already elliptical sentence which requires us to supply a verb like *uertit* (I see no need to posit a lacuna between 53 and 54 as argued, e.g., by Gratwick 1973: 78 n. 6).

grounds. Neither *Hypobolimaeus uel Subditiuus* nor *Obolostates uel Fenerator* is actually attested as such in our literary sources; both double titles are the invention of modern editors who considered it unlikely that the playwright would have composed two comedies with the same title, one in Greek and the other in Latin.[115]

More puzzling still is Caecilius' third double title. *Hypobolimaeus Rastraria is* actually attested as such, even if its transmission is somewhat vexed.[116] This title is Caecilius' only title with the characteristically Roman *-aria* ending that disappears from *palliata* titles after him, and, *si uera lectio*, would pair two different titles to make an unparseable whole whose parts work only as appositives. Does *Hypobolimaeus Rastraria* result from the same tendency to treat the source text's title as a de facto equivalent for a play's Latin title? If so, is *Hypobolimaeus* Caecilius' source text and *Rastraria* the title of his translation? Here the changeling child in Greek would be juxtaposed with a thingly title in Latin, creating a face-off of actors which might be inviting us to ask whose agency is dominant in the play so titled. While the *hypobolimaeus*' role in the plot is clear enough, we can only guess at the drag-hoe's function. Was this tool somehow involved in the play's recognition scene, or does it refer to the countryside association of one of the sets of doubles?

Once again, absolute certainty as to these titles' *author*-ity eludes us. But at the very least, we can confidently say that Caecilius Statius gave his translations titles which he knew would be set side by side with and/or interchanged with their Greek and/or Latin equivalents. And this relation is itself productive of meaning. Take *Hypobolimaeus uel Subditiuus*. As we have seen above, *Hypobolimaeus* means something markedly different as the title for a Latin play, taking on a metaliterary significance that is absent from the Greek comedies so titled. As much is in fact reflected in this title's Latin translation, *Subditiuus*, which is not an exact equivalent for *Hypobolimaeus*. For *Subditiuus* means not just 'suppositious', but also 'counterfeit' or 'copy'; Quintilian uses this same metaphor to describe how the *ueteres grammatici* would remove wrongly attributed books from the canon.[117] *Subditiuus* is, further, a very comic word, used as such (e.g.) in Plautus' *Amphitruo* of the fake versions of both Amphitruo and his slave Sosia.[118] If in fact attributable to the playwright, the second part of *Hypobolimaeus uel Subditiuus* is much like *Triumphus* in that it verbally enacts the polysemy of Greek titles once these are recontextualised through the process of translation. When it functions as the title of a comedy turned into Latin for performance at Rome, *Hypobolimaeus* takes on a new, additional meaning present in *Subditiuus*, which hints that the Roman comedy is a 'fake' version of the model upon which it is based. The self-deprecation involved in implying the inferiority of the Latin version of a Greek play would be a typically comic move, similar to what Plautus is doing when he claims to have translated Greek plays into barbarian.[119] Caecilius Statius, that is, seems to have been alive to the way that

[115] And yet the titular attestations yield some evidence in favour of this hypothesis. The only author to cite *Hypobolimaeus uel Subditiuus* by both its titles (separately) rather than just its Greek or its Latin form is Nonius, and the lexicographer used two *distinct* sources for these quotations: the fragment from the play Nonius calls '*Hypobolimaeus*' at Non., pp. 178.14, 16–17 M. = 261–2 L. is taken from the source Lindsay calls 'Alph. Verb', whereas the fragment from '*Subditiuus*' at Non., p. 514.31–32, 515.1 M. = 828 L. is from 'Alph. Adverb'. See Lindsay 1901: 57, 30. This increases the probability that the two titles refer to the same play, with each of Nonius' sources referring to it by a different title. Further on these titles' attestation, see the Appendix. There is also papyrological evidence, maybe: Kleve 1996 claims to read *Caęcị[li / Stati /] Ọbọlọṣ[tates / sive / Fa]ẹnẹ[rator]*in the *subscriptio* of a badly damaged Herculaneum papyrus that he suggests originally contained the text of half of the comedy (*PHerc.* 78). But the traces are minimal and the reading has been challenged by other scholars; see Ammirati 2015 and especially Breuer 2021.

[116] Variants include *Hypob Rastraria*, *Hypoboli Rastraria* and *Hipobolimaeo Trastrabria*; see further the Supplementary Appendix.

[117] Quint., *Inst.* 1.4.3.

[118] Plaut., *Amph.* 497–8, 828–9. The same word is used in *Pseudolus* to describe an act of impersonation at Plaut., *Pseud.* 752.

[119] Plaut., *Asin.* 11, *Trin.* 19.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

translation problematised his authorship, and we can observe this dramatist simultaneously acknowledging his literary reliance and pointing out the transformation it entails in his titles.

VI CONCLUSION

In our study of the Caecilian titles, we have seen double meanings and also double titles which may refer to those double meanings. And there are yet more doubles to be found, in the Caecilian corpus but elsewhere in Roman comedy, too. The titulature of the *palliata*, a genre whose plots are populated by so many doubles, is itself filled with doubles. There are doubles within the titles themselves: *Bacchides*, *Menaechmi*, *Synephebi*, *Imbri*. If based on Alexis' *Syrakosios* ('The Syracusan'),[120] Caecilius' *Syracusii* would be a title turned double from the singular in its model, perhaps yet another acknowledgment of the doubling that occurs when a Greek play is made into Latin for performance at Rome: upon Caecilius' act of translation, Alexis' *Syrakosios* would become literally double. As we have just seen, there were multiple Greek changeling plays with much overlap in their titles: four called *Hypobolimaios* by Philemon, Menander, Alexis and Eudoxus, two called *Pseudypobolimaios* by Kratinos Minor and Krobylos and one called *Hypoballomenai* by Epinikos whose plural cannot be coincidental. Such homonymy poses an interesting problem since, as we have seen, one of the title's basic duties is to distinguish works of literature from one another. Yet Terence can identify two different *Colax* comedies as well as name their authors, and he himself may have chosen to give one of his comedies the very same title as a Caecilian comedy (*Andria*), in spite of his apparent obsession with proclaiming his plays' novelty.[121] My own sense is that homonymy in comic titulature goes back to doubles — to the plots of this genre as well as its fundamental conventionality. That is, identical titles reflect all the doubling involved in plays based on the same set of characters (albeit with different names) engaged in the same plots again and again — plays that are themselves double as translations of Greek texts. But there is also an element of agonism involved, since two plays with the same title demand to be compared.[122] Are some comic titles that simply replicate their model's title, whether in Latin or in Greek, an invitation to compare the source text with its Latin version rather than an indication of fidelity in translation?

Even if many such questions persist and are likely to remain unanswerable, I hope to have shown that there is nevertheless much to be gained from the titles in general and those of Roman comedy specifically. Caecilius Statius' titles have taught us something that is not evident in the fragments, *viz.* that he was a poet alive to the complex dynamics of literary translation, and that he worked through them (inter alia?) via titulature. It turns out, then, that despite what Shakespeare (and Lessing!) thought, there is quite a lot in a name.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The supplementary material for this article can be found at 10.1017/S0075435824000285

[120] So Ribbeck 1898³: 81, but we cannot possibly know for certain.
[121] *Si uera lectio*: the MSS read *Andrea*. See further the Supplementary Appendix.
[122] On this point, see Castelli 2020: 33.

New York University
emilia.barbiero@nyu.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ammirati, S. 2015: *Sul libro latino antico. Ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche (premessa di Mario Capasso, prefazione di Guglielmo Cavallo)*, Rome.
Arnott, W. G. 2002: 'Diphilus' Κληρούμενοι and Plautus' *Casina*', in R. Raffaelli and A. Tontini (eds), *Lecturae Sarsinates VI. Casina (Sarsina, 28 settembre, 2002)*, Urbino, 23–44.
Ballester, X. 1990: 'La titulación de las obras en la literatura romana', *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 24, 135–56.
Barbiero, E. A. 2018: 'Myth, letters and the poetics of ancestry in Plautus' *Bacchides*', *Ramus* 47.1, 1–25.
Barbiero, E. A. 2023: *Letters in Plautus: Writing Between the Lines*, Cambridge.
Bartholomä, A. 2019: 'Legal laughter', in M. T. Dinter (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*, Cambridge, 229–40.
Borgo, A. 2007: 'Quando il libro si presenta da sè: *Arma virumque* e i titoli delle opera antiche', *Aevum* 81, 133–47.
Breed, B. 2018: 'Lucilius' books', in Breed, Wallace and Keitel 2018, 57–79.
Breed, B. W., Wallace, R. and Keitel, E. (eds) 2018: *Lucilius and Satire in Second-Century BC Rome*, Cambridge.
Breuer, B. 2021: 'PHerc.78: Ein Prosatext', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 51, 121–52.
Brown, P. 2013: 'Terence and Greek new comedy', in A. Augoustakis and A. Traill (eds), *A Companion to Terence*, Malden, MA, 16–32.
Camilloni, M. T. 1957: 'Una ricostruzione della biografia di Cecilio Stazio', *Maia* 9, 115–43.
Caroli, M. 2007: *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio*, Bari.
Castelli, E. 2016: '*Titulus:* Un contributo alla storia della parola nel mondo romano', *TYCHE* 31, 52–73.
Castelli, E. 2020: *La nascita del titolo nella letteratura greca: Dall'epica arcaica alla prosa di età classica*, Berlin.
Cè, M. 2022: 'The secondary incipit of the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 9.39): quotation, translation, and adaptation in the ancient reception of Homer', *Classical Philology* 117.3, 411–37.
Chiarini, G. 1981: 'Per la storia dell'esegesi plautina I. I versi didascalici della "Casina" (prol.29–34)', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 31, 119–53.
Cipriani, M. 2010: '*Homo homini deus*: La malinconica sentenziosità di Cecilio Stazio', *Philologia Antiqua* 3, 117–59.
Conte, G. B. 1994: *Latin Literature: A History,* Translated by J. Solodow, Revised by D. Fowler and G. Most, Baltimore.
Courtney, E. (ed.) 1993: *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.
Čulík-Baird, H. 2022: *Cicero and the Early Latin Poets*, Cambridge.
Daly, L. W. 1943: 'The entitulature of pre-Ciceronian writings', in *Classical Studies in Honor of W.A. Oldfather*, Urbana, 20–38.
De Poli, M. 2021: 'Un ὑποβολιμαῖος in famiglia. La commedia di Menandro nel suo contesto', *Frammenti sulla scena* 2, 365–79.
Deufert, M. 2002: *Textgeschichte und Rezeption der plautinischen Komödien im Altertum*, Berlin.
Dorandi, T. 1984: '*Sillyboi*', *Scrittura e civilità* 8, 185–99.
Fioretti, P. 2015: 'Sul paratesto nel libro manoscritto (con qualche riflessione sui "titoli" in età antica)', in L. Del Corso, F. DeVivo and A. Stramaglia (eds), *Papyrologica Florentina XLIV: Nel segno del testo; Edizioni, materiali e studi per Oronzo Pecere*, Florence, 179–202.
Fontaine, M. 2010: *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*, Oxford.
Fontaine, M. 2014: 'The reception of Greek comedy in Rome', in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*, Cambridge, 404–23.
Genette, G. 1987: *Seuils*, Paris.
Genette, G. 1997: *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation. Trans. Jane E. Lewin*, Cambridge.
Genette, G. and M. Maclean 1991: 'Introduction to the paratext', *New Literary History* 22.2, 261–72.

Glinister, F. 2007: 'Constructing the past', in F. Glinister, C. Woods, J. A. North and M. H. Crawford (eds), *Verrius, Festus & Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship and Society*, London, 11–32.
Goldberg, S. M. 2005: *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*, Cambridge.
Gratwick, A. S. 1973: 'Titus Maccius Plautus', *Classical Quarterly* 23, 78–84.
Gruen, E. S. 1994: 'The "fall" of the Scipios', in I. Malkin and Z. W. Rubinsohn (eds), *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz*, Leiden, 59–90.
Guardì, T. (ed.) 1974: *Cecilio Stazio. I frammenti*, Palermo.
Gunderson, E. 2015: *Laughing Awry: Plautus and Tragicomedy*, Oxford.
Horsfall, N. 1976: 'The collegium poetarum', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 23, 79–95.
Horsfall, N. 1981: 'Some problems of titulature in Roman literary history', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 28, 103–14.
Jansen, L. (ed.) 2014: *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers*, Cambridge.
Jocelyn, H. D. (ed.) 1967: *The Tragedies of Ennius*, Cambridge.
Kaimio, M. 2000: 'Tragic titles in comic disguises', in J. Styka (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Literary Theory and Criticism*, Classica Cracoviensia V, Kraków, 53–69.
Kleve, K. 1996: 'How to read an illegible papyrus: towards an edition of PHerc. 78, Caecilius Statius, *Obolostates sive Faenerator*', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 26, 5–14.
Krebs, C. B. 2015: 'The buried tradition of programmatic titulature among Republican historians: Polybius' Πραγματεία, Asellio's *Res Gestae*, and Sisenna's redefinition of *Historiae*', *American Journal of Philology* 136.3, 503–24.
Leo, F. 1897: *Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik*, Berlin.
Lindsay, W. M. 1901: *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*, Oxford.
Maltby, R. and Slater, N. W. (eds) 2022: *Fragmentary Republican Latin, Volume VI: Livius Andronicus. Naevius. Caecilius*, Cambridge, MA.
Manuwald, G. 2001: *Fabulae Praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*, Munich.
Manuwald, G. 2011: *Roman Republican Theatre*, Cambridge.
Marshall, C. W. 2006: *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*, Cambridge.
Marzullo, B. 1994: 'Plaut. *Mil.* 1246s', *Museum Criticum* 29, 233–6.
McElduff, S. 2013: *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*, London.
Monda, S. (ed.) 2004: *Vidularia et deperditarum fabularum fragmenta. Editio plautina Sarsinatis* 21, Urbino.
Moore, T. J. 2012: *Music in Roman Comedy*, Cambridge.
Negri, A. M. 1990: 'Il *Plocium* di Menandro e di Cecilio', *Dioniso* 60, 54–7.
Nervegna, S. 2013: *Menander in Antiquity: The Contexts of Reception*, Cambridge.
Nettleship, H. 1880: 'Verrius Flaccus. I', *Americal Journal of Philology* 1.3, 253–70.
Orelli, J. (ed.) 1850[3]: *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, Turin.
Parker, H. 1996: 'Plautus vs. Terence: audience and popularity re-examined', *American Journal of Philology* 117.4, 585–617.
Piras, G. 2015: '*Cum poeticis multis uerbis magis delecter quam utar*: poetic citations and etymological enquiry in Varro's *De lingua Latina*', in D. J. Butterfield (ed.), *Varro Varius: The Polymath of the Roman World*, Cambridge, 51–70.
Prodi, E. E. 2016: 'Titles and markers of poem-end in the papyri of Greek choral lyric', in T. Derda, A. Łatjar, and J. Urbanik (eds), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology: Warsaw, 29 July–3 August 2013*, Warsaw, 1137–84.
Prodi, E. E. 2019: 'Poem-titles in Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides', in B. Currie and I. Rutherford (eds), *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization, and Paratext*, Leiden, 462–515.
Questa, C. 1984: *Numeri innumeri. Ricerche sui cantica e la tradizione manoscritta di Plauto*, Rome.
Radif, L. 2005: 'Il bellum sapphicum nel *Curculio*', *Maia* 57, 19–23.
Reggiani, R. 1977: 'Sulla morte di Cecilio Stazio: Una messa a punto del problema', *Prometheus* 3, 69–74.
Ribbeck, O. (ed.) 1898[3]: *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta. Vol. 2, Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias fragmenta. Tertiis curis recognovit,* Leipzig.
Richlin, A. 2017: *Slave Theater in the Roman Republic: Plautus and Popular Comedy*, Cambridge.
Riedweg, C. 1993: 'Menander in Rom: Beobachtungen zu Caecilius Statius *Plocium* fr. I (136–53 Guardì)', in Slater and Zimmermann 1993, 133–59.
Ritschl, F. 1845: *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz I*, Leipzig.

Schironi, F. 2010: *To Mega Biblion: Book-Ends, End-Titles, and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry*, Durham, NC.
Schröder, B. J. 1999: *Titel und Text: Zur Entwicklung lateinischer Gedichtüberschriften*, Berlin.
Sharrock, A. R. 2009: *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*, Cambridge.
Slater, N. W. 2014: 'Gods on high, gods down low: Romanizing epiphany', in I. N. Perysinakis and E. Karakasis (eds), *Plautine Trends: Studies in Plautine Comedy and its Reception*, Berlin, 105–26.
Slater, N. W. and B. Zimmermann (eds) 1993: *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*, Stuttgart.
Sommerstein, A. H. 2010: *The Tangled Ways of Zeus: And Other Studies in and around Greek Tragedy*, Oxford.
Spengel, L. 1829: *Caii Caecilii Statii Comici poeteae deperditarum fabularum fragmenta*, Munich.
Traill, A. E. 2005: 'Acroteleutium's sapphic infatuation (*Miles* 1216–83)', *Classical Quarterly* 55.2, 518–33.
Traina, A. 1974²: *Vortit barbare. Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone. Seconda edizione riveduta e aggiornata*, Rome.
Warmington, E. H. (ed.) 1935: *Remains of Old Latin, Volume I: Ennius and Caecilius*, Cambridge, MA.
Weinrich, H. 1976: *Sprache in Texte*, Stuttgart.
Wright, J. 1974: *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata*, Rome.
Zetzel, J. E. G. 2009: Review of A. Kalinina, *Der Horazkommentar des Pomponius Porphyrio*, 2007, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2009-02-06. https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009.02.06/
Zetzel, J. E. G. 2018: *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology, 200 BCE–800 CE*, Oxford.
Zwierlein, O. 1990–2: *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus*, Vols. I–IV, Stuttgart.