

A black rectangular label with a white double-line border. The text is centered in white, serif, all-caps font.

THE
UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

The University of Chicago

FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

BEAUMARCHAIS AND PLAUTUS

THE SOURCES OF THE BARBIER DE SÉVILLE

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY, DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES

BY

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE JONES

CHICAGO

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

1908

BEAUMARCHAIS AND PLAUTUS

LE BARBIER DE SÉVILLE

On the title page of Reinhardstoettner's monumental work on the imitations of Plautus in the dramatic literature of Europe might well be written the warning: *lasciate ogni speranza*, 'abandon all hope' of finding a play of which the plot was not first conceived by Plautus. Be prepared to find that Falstaff strutted about and Scapin played his tricks in the days of Scipio Africanus, that Shakspeare and Molière, together with nearly every other writer of plays since the middle ages, have all been to a greater or less extent, plagiarists of Plautus.

In many cases there has been direct, unmistakable imitation of a whole play of Plautus, such as the *Clizia* of Macchiavelli, imitated from the *Casina*; Shakspeare's *Comedy of Errors*, from the *Menae-chmi*; Molière's *Avare*, from the *Aulularia*, and Lessing's *Der Schatz*, from the *Trinummus*. Often a single scene from Plautus has furnished a later playwright with material for a whole comedy, as in the case of Regnard, whose *Sérénade* is nothing but an amplification of the second scene of the fourth act of the *Pseudolus*.

Plautus, it appears, is the *chef* who first discovered the art of concocting a Latin comedy. To the old Roman *satura* he added the 'attic salt' of Menander and Diphilus and thus produced a dish fit for Roman senators. Then for centuries the secret of comedy making was lost, until, with the Renaissance, the Latin authors were resurrected and the playwrights of the sixteenth century jumbled together scenes and characters from Plautus to form the *olla podrida* of Italian comedy. Their example was followed by all the playwrights of Europe, each adding to his Plautine model the flavor of his own individuality and nationality.

In the history of French dramatic literature, the influence of Seneca in tragedy, and of Plautus in comedy, is to be reckoned with from the very start. In the middle of the sixteenth century, there took place, mainly through the influence of the members of the

Pleiade, that break in the history of the indigenous French drama which was marked by the waning popularity of the moralities and mystery plays and the introduction of classical models. In 1567, De Baïf gave a representation of the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, under the title of *Le Brave*, in the Hotel de Guise, before the King. Close upon De Baïf came Larivey with half a dozen plays imitated from Plautus. In the seventeenth century, Rotrou, Corneille, and Moliere all drew upon Plautus, as also did Regnard at the very close of the century.

During the first half of the eighteenth century, in spite of some isolated attempts at imitation by Destouches, the tradition that Plautus should be the model for comedy was practically disregarded. Classical tragedy had long since passed away and its mourners were consoling themselves with the *comédie larmoyante*, Molière and Regnard, with their frank imitations of Plautus, were gone and *mari-vaudage* held the stage. Just before the Revolution, however, a comedy appeared of which the hero was the traditional valet of comedy, the evolutionized slave of the Plautine play, arrived at the last degree of ingenuity and insolence, the witty, resourceful, impudent Figaro. Once more the echo of the ironical laugh of Plautus was heard, as Beaumarchais, after uttering his gibes at the nobility, through the mouth of Figaro, turned to the audience with a mocking *nunc plaudite*. Soon after, both Plautus and the *ancien régime* were driven off the stage by the stern tragedy of the French Revolution.

It is strange that Reinhardstoettner, in his search for borrowings from Plautus, should have failed to notice the striking resemblance between the Figaro comedies of Beaumarchais and certain plays of Plautus, a resemblance which was remarked upon by Naudet in his edition of Plautus published in 1831. In his introduction to the *Casina*, Naudet calls attention to the striking similarity in plot between this play and the *Mariage de Figaro*. Somewhat later Marc-Monnier in his *Aïeux de Figaro*, traces the evolution of the modern valet of comedy and remarks, in regard to the hero of the *Casina* "mais il est épris d'une esclave de sa femme, d'une Casina, sur laquelle il réclamerait volontiers les droits du seigneur. A cet effet, il veut la marier à l'esclave Olympion. Il s'agit en un mot d'un Almaviva de l'ancienne Rome amoureux d'une Suzanne." Nisard in his *Théâtre des Latins* is the first to

call attention to the resemblance between the *Miles Gloriosus* and the *Barbier de Séville*.

"Pyrgopolinices réunit la fatuité à la jactance militaire. Son rare mérite ne l'empêche pas d'être trompé par une jeune fille qu'il a enlevée et qu'il tient sous clef comme nos tuteurs. L'évasion de la jeune fille est secondée par un amant et surtout par l'esclave Palaestrion, un des plus dignes ancêtres de Figaro."

It is true that Reinhardstoettner admits that there is a general resemblance in character between Figaro and the intriguing slave of Latin comedy, but no attempt is made to show that Beaumarchais imitated any particular play of Plautus. He agrees with Sommer, a French translator of Plautus, in refusing to consider the serenade scene at the beginning of the *Barbier de Séville* as an imitation of the first three scenes of the *Curculio*. He regards as equally far-fetched a comparison made by Sainte-Beuve between a passage describing Suzanne and a sentence from the *Truculentus* of Plautus. Thus Reinhardstoettner, who has arraigned nearly every playwright of every country and of every time as an imitator of Plautus, is inclined to be lenient toward Beaumarchais, whose name occurs only three times in his *index plagiariorum*.

While this striking similarity between the two above mentioned plays of Plautus and those of Beaumarchais has thus been remarked by several editors and students of Plautus, by none of them has it been suggested that Beaumarchais deliberately took Plautus as his model, the similarity in plot has been treated as accidental rather than intentional. Yet there is no reason why Beaumarchais, following the example of other dramatic authors, should not have taken Plautus as his model. The real question to be decided is whether the similarity in plot and detail is sufficient to warrant this assumption. When this is once settled, the motives and the circumstances which led Beaumarchais to seek this source for his comedies can easily be explained.

Before entering upon a detailed comparison between the *Miles Gloriosus* and the *Barbier de Séville*, it is necessary to understand clearly what is meant by a working over or imitation of a Plautine comedy. Sometimes the mere substitution of French names of characters and places and the translation of ancient conditions of life into modern terms, such as substituting a valet for a slave, was sufficient to produce a play which was listened to by persons

fairly well acquainted with Greek and Latin authors with no suspicion that they were listening to a disguised Latin comedy. But often the playwright was not content with a mere translation, he left out several scenes, sometimes a whole act, added a character which was not found in the original, invented incidents and local hits; in fact, merely used the Latin play as a framework on which to hang his own invention. Sometimes he even went further and combined two plays of Plautus to form one, as in the case of Shakspeare, who took the well-worn "twin" plot from the *Menaechmi* of Plautus and combined with it the plot of the *Amphitryon* in his *Comedy of Errors*.

In comparing the *Barbier de Seville* with the *Miles Gloriosus* it is true that there is nothing in the *Barbier* which corresponds to the first act of the *Miles*, that in which the braggart soldier boasts of his military prowess, but if the French play be compared with the remaining four acts of the Latin play, it is easy to see the resemblance which struck Nisard. The plot of the *Miles* is as follows: A young Athenian, Pleusides by name, has fallen in love with a young slave girl named Philocomasium. While the young Athenian was away on an embassy, the soldier, Pyrgopolinices, kidnapped the girl and carried her off to Ephesus. Palaestriion, the slave of Pleusides, set out to announce this news to his master, but on his way was captured by pirates and brought to Ephesus where he serves the soldier as his slave. The Athenian, to whom Palaestriion has contrived to send word what has happened, comes to Ephesus and lodges in the house of a bachelor friend, Periplecomenes, whose house adjoins that of the soldier. This neighbor very obligingly makes an opening from his house into the room occupied by the Athenian girl in the soldier's house. By this means the two lovers are enabled to have frequent interviews. The soldier's slave, Sceledrus, while hunting for a stray monkey on the neighbor's roof, sees the two lovers in the court below. The slave, Palaestrio, makes the Athenian girl pass back to her room by means of the secret opening and then reappear before the eyes of Sceledrus, who is thus made to believe that he has seen her twin sister. Now comes the turn of the soldier to be duped. The bachelor friend finds a courtesan who is to act the part of his wife and pretend to have fallen in love with the soldier. The latter, flattered by her attentions, is now anxious to get rid of the Athenian girl and con-

sents to send her home to her mother. The lover enters the soldier's house, disguised as a ship captain, and aided in every possible way by the unsuspecting soldier, succeeds in carrying off his mistress. As soon as they are gone, the bachelor friend with his servants, falls upon the soldier, beats him with clubs and accuses him of having seduced his wife. The soldier perceives too late that he has been the unwitting instrument of the girl's escape with her lover.

In the *Barbier de Séville*, as in the *Miles Gloriosus*, the valet or servant meets his former master in a town remote from the one in which they have formerly known each other. Figaro informs his master, the Count Almaviva, that Bartholo has carried off Rosine from Madrid, where the Count had seen her and fallen in love with her. Almaviva decides to try to carry her off and marry her and Figaro promises to assist him. Bartholo is informed by Bazile, Rosine's music master, that the Count Almaviva is in town, evidently in search of Rosine. In spite of all Bartholo's precautions the Count succeeds in entering the guardian's house twice, first in the disguise of a soldier and later as a pretended pupil of Bazile, who claims that he has been sent to give a lesson to Rosine as a substitute for his master who is ill. Bazile now appears and is mystified at finding his pretended substitute there in his place. Then occurs the famous "allez vous coucher" scene in which Bazile is made the butt of ridicule of the whole company. Bartholo now appeals to Rosine's jealousy by pretending that Almaviva has betrayed her, and Rosine herself informs Bartholo of the plot to carry her off that night. Almaviva and Figaro now enter the house by means of a ladder. Rosine quickly becomes reconciled to the Count and is preparing to flee, when Figaro announces that the ladder has been removed by Bartholo. The notary, who has been sent for by Bartholo to marry himself and Rosine, now, in Bartholo's absence, marries Rosine to the Count Almaviva, believing him to be Bartholo, who now arrives with some police officers to arrest Figaro and his master. The police are now informed by Almaviva of Bartholo's design to gain possession of his ward's dowry by marrying her and they soundly reprimand him. The play ends exactly as does the *Miles Gloriosus*, with the guardian's confession that he has been outwitted and has himself been the instrument of his own undoing.

It is evident from this cursory comparison of the two plays

that several episodes of the *Miles* do not appear in the *Barbier de Séville*. The entire first act of the *Miles* which has been the source of innumerable "boastful soldier" plays, is entirely omitted in the French play, as is also the episode of the lost monkey and the hole in the wall connecting the two houses which serves to help carry on the intrigue in the Latin play. However, these are unimportant episodes in the Latin play. In all their essential elements the two plays have the same plot. Master and man meet each other in a town far from the place where they once lived. The master learns that the young lady with whom he is in love has been forcibly abducted by her guardian, who intends to force her to marry him. Just as the slave Palaestrius has become a member of the household of the enemy, i.e., of the soldier, so has Figaro become attached to Bartholo's house as his barber, which gives him access to the house and enables him to aid the Count, his former master, more effectually. In the Latin play, the lover in disguise, enters the house of the soldier and carries on a conversation with the young girl under the very eyes of her guardian. Beaumarchais makes his hero enter the house twice, each time in a different disguise. In order to facilitate this Plautus adopts the device of making the *Puer* or slave drunk. Beaumarchais makes Figaro, in his character of apothecary and barber, resort to drugs to gain entrance to Bartholo's house—he gives a narcotic to L'Éveillé and a sternutatory to the aged La Jeunesse who is perhaps the *Puer* of Plautus reincarnated. Finally, in both plays, it is the guardian who unwittingly aids in the escape of his ward. Bartholo himself, like the soldier, has only himself to blame for the escape of the lovers. "Et moi qui leur ai enlevé l'échelle pour que le mariage fût plus sûr."

The number of principal characters is the same in both comedies. The guardian, in the one play, is a boastful soldier, in the other, an avaricious doctor. The ward, in both plays, is a pretended *ingénue*. The lover is of high rank, but unresourceful, depending almost wholly upon his valet to get him out of difficulties. The valet is the real hero, both in Plautus and Beaumarchais. To this conventional quartet is added a fifth character, that of the *niais*, or simpleton. In the *Miles* this part is played by the slave Sceledrus whose duty it is to guard Philocomasium, in the *Barbier*, it is Bazile, the music master, who is stupid and easily imposed upon, while in the ordinary *Tuteur à clef* comedy, it

is the guardian himself who is easily duped. Another characteristic which the two comedies have in common is that the heroine plays her part unaided by any serving maid who may act the role of *confidante*. Philocomasium, it is true, consults with the courtesan, but she does not depend upon her to any extent. Rosine, too, acts her part entirely without feminine aid, even that of a duenna.

The officers of the police who fall upon the guardian in the *Barbier de Séville* are paralleled by the servants of Periplecomenes in the Latin play, who inflict summary punishment on the soldier—with blows instead of warrants.

When it comes to the question of verbal resemblances, the *Barbier de Séville* is full of expressions which certainly suggest a close acquaintance on the part of Beaumarchais with the Latin play. The description of the soldier Pyrgopolinices, *gloriosus, impudens, plenus injurii atque adulteri* [M.G., II-1.] is closely paralleled by the description of Doctor Bartholo—*Brutal, avare, amoureux et jaloux* [B. S., I-4]. So also just as the slave girl Philocomasium is said to hate the soldier, *neque pejus quemquam odisse quam istunc militem* [M. G., II-1.] Rosine cherishes toward her guardian, a mortal hatred, "*Sa pupille, qui la hait à la mort*"—B. S., I-4. The description, too, which Plautus gives of the slave Sceledrus, *homo haud magni pretii, glaucomam ob oculos objiciemus*, M. G., II-1. must have suggested to Beaumarchais the description of Bazile, "*Un pauvre hère, et dont il sera facile de venir à bout*," B. S., I-6. The sentiments in regard to women, uttered by the bachelor Periplecomenes in his famous diatribe against married life seem to have been utilized by Beaumarchais with reference to Rosine. Woman, according to Periplecomenes—"Domi habet os, linguam, perfidiam, malitiam," and half a dozen other vices, which are summed up in Figaro's cynical remark: "Oh ces femmes! voulez vous donner de l'adresse à la plus ingénue? enfermez—la."

Another case of similarity of expression under like circumstances is found in the outburst of Periplecomenes against the slave Sceledrus, who, while hunting on the roof for a pet monkey, has looked down into the neighbor's court and discovered Philocomasium and her lover together. "*Mihi quidem jam arbitri vicini sunt meae quid fiat domi*," exclaims the old man, just as Bartholo breaks out into imprecations when he discovers that Figaro has

had an interview with Rosine. "Ah! malédiction! l'enragé, le scélerat corsaire de Figaro: *"et personne à l'antichambre! on arrive à cet appartement comme à la place d'armes."*

The scene in the Latin play in which the soldier permits the lover, in the disguise of a ship captain, to enter his house, is very much like the corresponding scene in the French play Philocomasium, with a cleverness of acting which reminds one strongly of Rosine, pretends to regret her separation from the soldier and makes a pretence of fainting away in order to get an opportunity to prompt her lover as to the part he is to play. The soldier orders water to be brought, but his suspicions are aroused, as is shown by his remark, "*capita inter se nimis nexa hisce habent.*" M. G., IV-8. In the *Barbier de Séville*, Rosine on a similar occasion gives as an excuse for her agitation, "*le pied m'a tourné,*" and Bartholo, who like the soldier, is suspicious of the actions of the two lovers, reproaches Figaro, who is shaving him, for trying to put himself between him and them in order to conceal their manoeuvres. "Il me semble que vous le fassiez exprès de vous approcher et de vous mettre devant moi pour m'empêcher de voir." B. S., III-4.

The most striking verbal resemblance between the two plays, however, is that of the '*left eye*.' The lover of Philocomasium has entered the soldier's house in the disguise of a ship master to carry the girl home to her mother. The soldier notices that the pretended sailor has a bandage over the left eye and asks him suddenly, "*Quid factum tuo oculo? at laevum dico?*"—M. G., IV-7. In the *Barbier de Séville*, Figaro, in order to keep Bartholo from seeing the two lovers as they talk together, pretends that he has something in his eye and calls upon Bartholo to help him remove it.

Bartholo—Qu'est-ce que c'est?

Figaro—Je ne sais ce qui m'est entré dans l'oeil.

Bartholo—Ne frottez donc pas.

Figaro—C'est le gauche.—B. S., III-12.

It is certainly a striking coincidence that the '*left eye*' should be mentioned in both plays and under similar circumstances. There seems to be no especial significance attached to the use of the expression in the *Barbier*, it may then be simply a reminiscence of Plautus. The scene in which this expression is used is that one in the *Barbier* which most of all resembles the scene of the disguised lover in the *Miles Gloriosus*. It is used in close connection with the remark

made by Bartholo that Figaro hinders him from seeing the two lovers who are talking with each other, just as the soldier, in the Latin play has his suspicions aroused by a similar manoeuvre on the part of the lovers.

Finally, may not an expression which Palaestrión uses in regard to the soldier have suggested to Beaumarchais the title, *Barbier de Séville*. The slave Palaestrión, who like Figaro, has by his stratagems, got the better of the soldier and enabled his master to succeed in carrying off Philocomasium, remarks at the end of the play, that he has *deruncinavit*, i.e., *shaved* the soldier, figuratively, of course, just as Figaro both literally and figuratively '*shaved*' Doctor Bartholo.

If the close relationship between the *Barbier* and the *Miles* still seems doubtful, let French names be substituted for Latin ones. Let the soldier, Pyrgopolinices be divested of his sword and provided with a doctor's lancet and we have the Doctor Bartholo, who probably killed more persons in his lifetime by means of his drugs than did the soldier, Pyrgopolinices, who boasted that he had killed,

Centum in Cilicia

Et quinquaginta, Centum in Cryplaolathronia.

Triginta Sardis, sexaginta Macedones.

Give Philocomasium the name of Rosine, put her behind a balconied window in Seville and she will be able to outwit her guardian with the same success and without even the aid of a serving maid. As for Pleusides and Palaestrión, master and man, they are as precious a pair of rascals in Plautus as in Beaumarchais. From the *Miles Gloriosus*—the earliest *guardian and ward* play in Latin literature to the latest *guardian and ward* play in French literature there is more difference in time than difference in plot. [See note 2.]

From this consideration of the two plays it is evident that there is reason to believe that the *Barbier de Séville* may have been modeled upon the *Miles Gloriosus*. That a '*guardian and ward*' comedy of the approved conventional type could easily be evolved from this play, is shown in the case of Cailhava, a contemporary of Beaumarchais, who in 1765 brought out a play entitled *Le Tuteur Dupé*, which is by the express avowal of the author an imitation of the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus. This play was afterward put upon

the stage again in 1773. That the piece obtained sufficient success to be well known to playgoers and consequently to Beaumarchais, is shown by the fact that it is favorably mentioned by Grimm, in his *Correspondance Littéraire* who declares that it has the merit of being *gaie*. It is, therefore, perfectly possible that Beaumarchais, who up to this time had been an unsuccessful playwright, a mere imitator of Diderot, seeing the success which Cailhava had obtained from his adaptation of the *Miles*, should conceive the idea of trying his hand also at working over a Latin play. The *Barbier de Séville* was first composed toward the end of the year 1773 as a comic opera, having almost nothing of the character which it finally assumed. The *Barbier de Séville*, in its final form, that with which we are familiar, made its first appearance at the Comédie Française, February 23, 1775—just two years after the revival of Cailhava's *Tuteur Dupé* and resembles it closely in character.

In the preface to the *Tuteur Dupé*, Cailhava describes his method of procedure in adapting the Latin play to modern conditions, so as to make of it the conventional 'guardian and ward comedy'. The description is interesting as showing the liberties he took with the Latin original. The first act of the *Miles* he does not use at all, his guardian has nothing of the boastful soldier in his makeup, he is simply plain Monsieur Richard. The episode of the lost monkey is entirely dispensed with also. However, the device of the door connecting the two houses, which in Plautus is not mentioned until the middle of the piece, and then plays a very unimportant part in the play, is announced in Cailhava's play in the first scene of the first act. "Dans le Poète Latin," says Cailhava in the preface to his play, "la ressemblance et la fausse porte n'animent que deux ou trois scènes inutiles. J'ai retourné mon sujet, je me suis replié de façon à les rendre la base de la machine entière. Chez mon maître elles ne servent qu' à tromper un misérable esclave, acteur très subalterne: dans ma comédie servent elles à duper le Héros de la pièce, Ces changements une fois préparés et fondus dans ma tête, je confiai, sans hésiter, à un Valet, tous les fils de l'intrigue, je lui laissai le soin d'en combiner les effets et de manier, à son gré, des ressorts, qui ne sont comiques et décents que dans les mains des Domestiques." This last sentence of Cailhava's is particularly important as indicating a prominent feature of the

Miles, the *Barbier*, and the *Tuteur*, the entrusting all the "threads of the intrigue" to the hands of a valet.

There are many points of resemblance between the *Barbier* and the *Tuteur Dupé* which would naturally arise from imitation of the same model. The lover, aided by the valet, tries to outwit the guardian and carry off the young lady, the guardian himself all the while unconsciously aiding the lover. Cailhava, however, as he expressly states in his preface, has elaborated the incident of the secret door between the two houses which enables the heroine to pass herself off as her own twin sister. This incident, as Cailhava remarks, plays an unimportant part in the comedy of Plautus. The theory that Beaumarchais, having written his comic opera, *Le Barbier de Séville* in 1773, the same year in which Cailhava's *Tuteur Dupé* was put again upon the stage, seeing the success of his contemporary's play, resolved to remodel his play after Plautus—wisely leaving out the secret door device—receives confirmation from the fact that in the *Barbier* there are several passages which resemble passages in the *Tuteur*, notably the one in which Merlin exclaims, "Allons, Merlin, du courage, Les douze mille livres que Damis vous promet font précisément douze mille raisons qui prouvent que M. Richard doit être dupé." T D., I-6. Compare with this the remark of Bazile in the *Barbier*, as he accepts a bribe. "Ce diable d'homme a toujours ses poches pleines d'arguments irrésistibles." B. S., IV-8. Moreover, both plays end with the signing of marriage contracts as the result of mistaken identity. M. Richard believes he is marrying his ward and finds himself united to her aunt, while the lover, as in the *Barbier*, signs the contract which unites him to the young girl.

The device of the *sœurs jumelles* used by both Plautus and Cailhava, while not employed by Beaumarchais to the same extent as by them, seems to be hinted at in the *Barbier*—IV-7—the scene of the two marriage contracts, "C'est que j'ai deux contrats de mariage, monseigneur ne confondons point. voici le vôtre, et c'est ici celui du seigneur Bartholo, avec la señora—Rosine aussi? Les demoiselles, apparemment, sont deux sœurs qui portent le même nom?"

The impression that remains in the mind after reading Cailhava's play with its characters disguised under French names, some of its incidents elaborated and others entirely omitted, is

simply that the author has added another to the long list of 'guardian and ward' comedies which have occupied a prominent place in French literature since the time of Molière. It is doubtful whether one reader in a hundred, even though he were well versed in Latin literature, would suspect that the *Tuteur Dupé* was imitated from the *Miles Gloriosus* if Cailhava himself did not expressly name his model. If Beaumarchais had made the same statement in regard to the *Barbier de Séville*, the reader would find it quite as easy to believe as Cailhava's statement. Why then, did not Beaumarchais, if it were true, state the fact openly? Cailhava mentions Beaumarchais in the preface to his dramatic works, [I., p. 43] "Le Président me signifie nettement qu' on donnera les *Deux Amis* de M. de Beaumarchais," but Beaumarchais nowhere mentions Cailhava. However, in the preface prefixed to the *Barbier de Séville* Beaumarchais admits that he has been accused of plagiarism, he adopts a mocking tone, openly admits that some critics have accused him of strutting about in peacock's feathers, which, if they were stripped from him would show him to be nothing but a "vilain corbeau noir"

It is not strange that the source of the play should not have been patent to everyone at the time of its first representation, when it is remembered that this was the case with a number of similar imitations of Plautus. Regnard's *Sérénade* was not discovered to be an imitation of the *Pseudolus* until the middle of the eighteenth century. Even Reinhardstoettner failed to discover that Rémy Belleau's *Reconnue* was derived from the *Casina* of Plautus, as was recently pointed out in the *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire* [Voldó, 1908]. Examples also of a "concours" or competition by two authors upon a given subject are not lacking. In the spring of 1701 Regnard wrote his *Folies Amoureuses*, a "guardian and ward" comedy, to which the *Barbier de Séville* has often been compared, which it in fact does somewhat resemble, and a few months later Dancourt wrote his *Colin Maillard*, also a "guardian and ward" comedy.

As for Cailhava, he really could have no ground for complaint if Beaumarchais chose to go to the same Latin source as himself, as to the acknowledging that source, he was free to do it or not, as he chose. Molière did not think it necessary to proclaim the Latin source of the *Avare* or the *Amphitryon*. The whole tone of

the preface to the *Barbier de Séville*, already referred to, seems to show that Beaumarchais preferred to meet the charge of plagiarism by adopting an almost impudent "guess if you can" attitude.

The plays of Cailhava and Beaumarchais were the manifestation of a widespread tendency to imitate Plautus and other classical writers, especially Terence, which developed in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Destouches wrote in 1745, *Le Trésor Caché*, based upon the *Trinummus*; later Sedaine wrote an opera, *Amphitryon*, and Cailhava, beside the *Tuteur*, wrote a play based upon the *Menaechmi*. In Germany also this interest in Plautus manifested itself. Lessing's *Der Schatz*, written in 1750, was, like Destouches's *Trésor Caché*, an imitation of the *Trinummus*. Lessing's admiration for Plautus was shared by Herder and Schlegel. The movement finally culminated in the five Plautine comedies written by Lenz, which appeared at Leipzig in 1774. Among these plays was an imitation of the *Miles Gloriosus*, entitled "*Der Grosssprahlerische Offizier*." This play he sent to Goethe at Strassbourg in 1772 for criticism. The latter advised Lenz to modernize the play still more than he had done, with the result that the play was rewritten by Lenz under the title of "*Die Entführungen*." "In dem Dialog des 'grosssprahlerische Offizier' hat Lenz für seine Umarbeitung in *Die Entführungen*, manches gestrichen, zusammen gezogen und verändert," says his biographer.

It is quite possible that Beaumarchais may have had his attention called to the *Miles* and Lenz's imitation of it. In August of 1774 Beaumarchais made a short stay at Frankfort, where in all probability he met Goethe, who had just dramatized the adventures of Beaumarchais in Spain in his play *Clavigo*. The example of Lenz, added to that of Cailhava, must certainly have aroused his interest in the Latin play.

The objection may be made that Beaumarchais, like Shakspeare, was first of all a man of affairs, rather than a student of Latin authors. To a certain extent, this is true. Beaumarchais was, like Shakspeare, a student of human nature rather than of books, but like Shakspeare, he knew his "little Latin," and like Molière he did not scruple to borrow from any source, whatsoever, provided by so doing he could suit the taste of the theater-going public.

Beaumarchais, after all, possessed a fairly extensive knowledge

of the classics. Loménie, one of his biographers, quotes a letter written by Beaumarchais to one of his sisters while he was in Spain. "Suivant l'usage des collèges, on m'avait plus occupé de vers latins que des règles de la versification française." [Loménie, Vol. I., p. 64 and 287] His German biographer, Bettelheim [p. 13], testifies to his ability to translate into French an anthology of Latin authors of his own selection. Lintilhac, his latest biographer, praises the elegance of these same translations and also remarks upon the cleverness with which, in his letters, he used and applied certain Latin quotations to different circumstances of his own life and that of his sisters. It can then be established as certain that a man, who had made Latin verses and selected extracts from Latin authors, must certainly have been able to read his Plautus. Moreover, in the preface to *Figaro* he refers to Molière's borrowings from Plautus, so he must have been conscious of what was apparently an unwritten law that a dramatist must imitate at least two plays from Plautus. Molière had imitated the *Aulularia* and the *Amphitryon*, Regnard the *Mostellaria* and the *Menaechmi*, Cailhava the *Miles Gloriosus* and the *Menaechmi*. Why should not he imitate the *Miles Gloriosus* and the *Casina*? [See note 1.]

Before summing up all that has just been said in regard to the connection between the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus and the *Barbier de Séville* of Beaumarchais, it is necessary to admit, first of all, that we have no direct statement anywhere, on the part of Beaumarchais himself or his contemporaries that this was the case, but as has been shown above, similar cases of imitation have occurred without avowal on the part of the author or detection on the part of the public. The evidence which has been brought forward in favor of the assumption that the *Barbier* was at least suggested by the *Miles* resolves itself into five arguments.

First, the similarity in plot has been shown.

Second, a sufficient number of verbal resemblances have been found to indicate that Beaumarchais was acquainted with the Latin original.

Third, the fact that Cailhava, by imitating Plautus, had produced a successful play, might very easily suggest to Beaumarchais, who hitherto had written nothing but unsuccessful plays, that he go to the same source for his inspiration.

Fourth, the literary tradition handed down by Molière in regard

to imitating Plautus would be accepted as his own particular bequest by Beaumarchais, who claimed to be the direct heir of Molière.

Fifth, it may be asked whether it was mere chance that the only two plays produced by Beaumarchais which were in any way successful are those which it is reasonable to suppose were imitated from Plautus, for, as will be shown later the *Mariage de Figaro* bears a strong resemblance to the *Casina* of Plautus. Witty as Beaumarchais is in his *Mémoires*, in all his comedies, except the two above mentioned, he is flat and insipid. It is only when he is inspired by Plautus with that contagious gayety which seems to emanate from the master that he attains the goal he had set to restore French comedy to the "*gaieté*" it possessed in the days of Molière.

Each one of the biographers of Beaumarchais has his theory as to the source of the *Barbier de Séville*, for not one of them seems to have doubted that it was based upon some other *tuteur à clef* comedy.

Loménie points out some points of resemblance with Fatouville's *Précaution Inutile*, played at the Théâtre des Italiens in 1692, a source which would seem to be plainly indicated by the subtitle of the *Barbier*. He rather inclines to the opinion that the first version of the play which was written as a comic opera in 1772, is due to Spanish influence. "C'est le souvenir de ces *tonadillas* qui paraît avoir donné naissance au *Barbier de Séville*, composé d'abord pour faire valoir des airs espagnols que le voyageur avait apporté de Madrid et qu'il arrangeait à la française." Loménie, 451-2.

In answer to this theory it may be said that the *Barbier* does resemble the *Précaution Inutile*, just as any *tuteur à clef* comedy resembles another, as Beaumarchais himself says in the preface to the *Barbier de Séville*: "Un vieillard amoureux prétend épouser demain sa pupille: un jeune amant plus adroit le prévient, et ce jour même en fait sa femme, à la barbe et dans la maison du tuteur. Voilà le fond, dont on eût pu faire avec un égal succès une tragédie, une comédie, un drame un opéra *et caetera*." As to Spanish influence, however much the Spanish airs which he heard in Spain may have been used in the first edition of the *Barbier*, which was practically nothing but a comic opera of which the manuscript is not preserved, except in fragments, and which differs radically from the

Barbier of 1775, the fact remains that in this last *Barbier de Séville* the names of persons and places are Spanish—just enough to give local color—the characters and incidents are thoroughly French. As Morel Fatio has said, “une influence lointaine, à peine saisissable, voilà ce que l’Espagne pourrait réclamer dans le théâtre de Beaumarchais.”

Bettelheim is of the opinion that the *Barbier* is based upon an opera by Panard, *le Conte de Belflor*, which Beaumarchais probably heard when a child, and of which he gives the following brief outline, p. 168:

“Le Conte de Belflor est amoureux de Jacinthe, pupille de Don Cormera, alcalde de Campo Mayor, qui la garde dans le dessein d’en faire son épouse. Le Comte, par un stratagème fort ingénieux s’introduit chez l’alcalde, se découvre à Jacinthe et la fait consentir à se faire enlever. L’alcalde vent courir après le ravisseur mais le corregidor l’arrete, lui déclare qu’il le dépossède de sa charge pour ses malversations et le fait emmener par les alguazils. Après leur départ on célèbre la nqce du comte qui forme le divertissement.”

Here is undoubtedly a play similar in plot to the *Barbier*, but the resemblance between the two, except in its being located in Spain, is not any more striking than that which exists between the *Barbier* and the *Folies Amoureuses* of Regnard, a guardian and ward play, an amateur performance of which was given by one of the sisters of Beaumarchais at the time of his return from Spain, and which must, therefore, have been more fresh in his memory than the *Comte de Belflor*. As for the *audaces* which Figaro utters, Bettelheim finds them in Piron’s *Arlequin Deucalion* and in Favart’s *Ninette à la Cour*. He might also have added the comedies of Marivaux in which Trivelin and other valets utter sayings which are even more audacious than the epigrams of Figaro.

Lintilhac, the latest of the biographers of Beaumarchais, while admitting that he was influenced in composing the *Barbier* by the “guardian and ward” comedies of Molière, namely, the *Ecole des Femmes*, *Ecole des Maris*, *le Sicilien*, as well as by the *Précaution Inutile* of Fatouville, suggests as a possible first sketch of the *Barbier*, a *parade* called *Jean Bête à la Foire*, written by Beaumarchais himself a little while before the *Barbier*, which he considers a first outline of the *Barbier*, the name Bartholo being borrowed

from another farce of this kind. As for the rest of the play, here are the sources indicated by Lintilhac. (p. 225).

"Il prit d'abord son titre d'une nouvelle de Scarron, d'où Molière avait tiré en partie le sujet de *l'Ecole des Femmes* et ou Beaumarchais puisera l'idée d'une des scènes les plus piquantes du *Mariage de Figaro*. Ce titre, *la Précaution inutile*, avait d'ailleurs servi depuis à plusieurs autres auteurs dramatiques. Mais le titre est tout ce qu'il a de commun avec Dorimon, Gallet, Achard, Anseaume, etc. En revanche, il eût pu dire de Molière, comme Racine de Tacite: "J'étais alors si rempli de la lecture de cet excellent comique, qu'il n'y a presque pas un trait e'clatant dans ma pièce dont il ne m'ait donné l'idée. Le canevas est au dénouement près, celui du *Sicilien*, et rappelle en maint endroit ceux de *l'Ecole des Maris* et de *l'Ecole des Femmes*, Les travestis permettant à l'amant d'entretenir ou de faire entretenir de sa passion celle qui en est l'objet, au nez des tuteurs, est un vieux procédé scénique que Molière avait employé, en variant ses effets, dans sept de ses comédies." These comedies being *l'Etourdi*—*Ecole des Maris*, *L'Amour Médecin*, *le Sicilien*, *le Médecin malgré lui*, *le Malade Imaginaire*.

There seems then to be no lack of unanimity among the biographers of Beaumarchais as to the *Barbier's* having been borrowed from some source; there is, on the other hand, a striking lack of unanimity as to the source from which it is borrowed. In plot, it could easily be found to resemble any one of several dozen "guardian and ward" comedies from the time of Molière on. As to names of characters, incidents and phrases, he is convicted of having taken them indiscriminately wherever he found them—the subtitle from Fatonville's play, or from a nouvelle of Scarron. The name *Bartholo* from an anonymous parade, (Lintilhac,) 225, *La Jeunesse* must have been taken from Gresset's *Parrain Magnifique* in which figures prominently an octogenarian valet by that name, the incident of the key from an opera of Sedaine, "*On ne s'avise jamais de tout*," played in September, 1761. The drugging of *L'Éveillé* from *George Dandin*, "Il n'est pas jusqu'au narcotique de *l'Éveillé* dont le sommeil intempestif et obstiné du Colin de George Dandin n'ait pu suggérer la recette." Lintilhac, 227 From the *Précaution Inutile* is taken the following phrase:

Arlequin—*Il n'a qu'un défaut, c'est qu'il est amoureux*, which is paralleled exactly in the *Barbier de Séville*.

Rosine—*Il est amoureux*, et vous appelez cela un défaut?

It is even probable that he borrowed from Virgil in the celebrated description of *Calomine*, "Vous voyez la calomnie se dresser, siffler, s'enfler, grandir à vue d'oeil. Elle s'élance, s'étend son, vol. B. S., II-8., which is an almost literal translation of

Extemplo Libyae magnas it Fama per urbes,
Parva metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras.

No wonder that Augusto Vitu in his preface to the *Barbier* calls it a remarkable piece of "marqueterie."

It almost seems as if Beaumarchais had deliberately set to work to compose this piece of "marqueterie" as a literary *tour de force*, taking a bit here and a bit there from every "guardian and ward" comedy with which he was acquainted, acknowledging by his subtitle his indebtedness to the *Précaution Inutile*, and in the preface, pleading guilty to the charge that his comedy was indebted to Sedaine's opera by acknowledging that it is, "*On ne s'avise jamais de tout.*"

Neither of these statements in the preface is inconsistent with the theory which has just been advanced, that the *Barbier* is modeled upon the *Miles of Plautus* and was suggested to Beaumarchais by the recently performed adaptation of this play by Cailhava. The resemblance between the two plays which has already been pointed out would indicate that Beaumarchais chose out of the numerous "guardian and ward" plots at his disposal, the plot furnished by the *Miles*, suggested by the recent performance of Cailhava's play. Cutting out, instead of enlarging upon the device of the secret door as Cailhava did, he added to it without scruple all the incidents and phrases he chose to from other comedies.

It is not strange that Beaumarchais should not openly confess that his play was an imitation of the same play which had served as Cailhava's model. The latter author, by his French version of the *Miles* had produced a new "guardian and ward" comedy, a plot which every playwright considered common property. Then, too, may not this be the meaning of that mocking reply addressed to his accuser, "*On ne s'avise jamais de tout*—"Yes." Beaumarchais seems to say, "the comedy is borrowed, a name here, a line there, but the principal source, the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus and Cailhava's French adaptation, *Le Tuteur Dupé*, have not yet been guessed, as its source, Truly, '*On ne s'avise jamais de tout.*'"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Loménie—*Beaumarchais et Son Temps* Paris, 1880
 Bettelheim—*Beaumarchais* Frankfurt, 1886
 Lintilhac—*Beaumarchais* Paris, 1887
 Reinhardstoettner—*Plautus-Studien* Leipzig, 1886
 Marc-Monnier—*Les Aïeux de Figaro* Paris, 1868
 Naudet—*Biblioteca Clássica Latina, Plautus* Paris, 1830
 Nisard—*Théâtre des Latins, Plaute.* Paris, 1879
 Fournier—*Beaumarchais, Oeuvres Complètes.* Paris, 1884
 Cailhava—*Théâtre.* Paris, 1781
 Vitu—Préface, *Barbier de Séville, Théâtre de Beaumarchais.* Paris, 1882
 Lénient—*La Comédie au XVIII Siècle.* Paris, 1888
 Larroumet—*Études d'Histoire de Critique Dramatique.* Paris, 1892
 Parfaict Frères—*Histoire du Théâtre Français.* Paris, 1725-49
 Riccoboni—*Histoire du Théâtre Italien.* Paris, 1731
 Grimm—*Correspondance Littéraire* Paris, 1812
 Gruppe—*Lenz, Leben u. Werke.* Berlin, 1861
 Gresset—*Le Parrain Magnifique* Renouard, Paris, 1810
 Toldo—*La Comédie Fr au XVI. Revue d'Hist. Litt* Paris, 1898

NOTES

NOTE 1.—THE MARIAGE DE FIGARO AND THE CASINA

"Jam docti viri notarunt huic haud absimili argumento per actam fuisse in nostrata scena, sub finem proxime superioris saeculi, fabulam de nuptiis Hispalensis cujusdam tonsoris celebratissimi nominatim." In these words Naudet, in his preface to the works of Plautus, calls attention to the resemblance between the *Mariage de Figaro* and the *Casina* of Plautus, as did also, somewhat later, Marc-Monnier, in his *Aïeux de Figaro*.

As in the case of the *Barbier de Séville*, however, neither of these two authors has examined the two plays in detail, to see whether there is enough resemblance between them to warrant the assumption that Beaumarchais took the *Casina* as a model for the *Mariage de Figaro*. It is perfectly possible that Beaumarchais may have taken the hint again from Cailhava, who in the preface to the *Tuteur Dupé*, expressly mentions the *Casina*. It is a curious fact in the history of the drama that the *Miles Gloriosus* and the *Casina* seem to have been linked together. They were both performed in Italy at Court of Ferrara in the sixteenth century when Ercole d'Este resurrected Plautus. They were both transformed into French plays in the sixteenth century, the *Miles* becoming *Le Brave* of De Baïf and the *Casina* *La Reconnue* of Rémy Belleau. Finally in the eighteenth century we have the *Miles Gloriosus*—the *Barbier de Séville*, and, as will be shown later, the *Casina*—the *Mariage de Figaro*.

The marriage of a serving man to a fellow servant girl who is in the employ of the master's wife and with whom the master is in love, and the trick played upon the master who tries to claim *le droit du seigneur*, forms the plot of both the Latin and the French play. As the Latin play opens with a scene between two slaves in which the coarsest invective is indulged in, so the *Mariage* opens with a scene in which Suzanne and Marceline vie with each other in *révérences*, a scene in which the invective is more refined, but

none the less biting. In the Latin play, the ill-tempered wife and the vain and foolish old husband, decide by lot the question as to whether the serving girl shall marry the son's armour bearer, who is devoted to the interests of his young master who is in love with the girl, or the old master's farm superintendent. This scene of the drawing of the lots, which is described in great detail by Plautus, must have been watched with breathless interest by a Neapolitan audience before whom the play was probably first performed, and who evidently were not behind their descendants in their love for lotteries and gambling. Beaumarchais, like Plautus, shows his knowledge of what will suit his audience, by letting the marriage of Figaro be decided in a court and before a judge whose decisions strikingly resemble the decisions arrived at by drawing lots. Indeed, the Judge Bridoisson of Beaumarchais is but another name for the famous Judge Bridoise of Rabelais, who decided his cases by drawing lots. What a lottery scene was to the Neapolitans of the time of Plautus, was a courtroom scene to the Parisians of the eighteenth century

The third important scene in the *Casina* is that in which the master is tricked by a slave who dresses himself in the clothes of the servant girl and administers summary punishment to his infatuated master. This is paralleled in the *Mariage de Figaro* by the masquerade scene "sous les marronniers," in which the Countess is disguised as Suzanne, Suzanne as the Countess and Figaro as the Count. Even the "recognition" scene which is found in the mutilated conclusion of the Latin play, in which Casina is found to be after all of good family and is thus enabled to marry the son of the family, has its counterpart in the "recognition" scene in the *Mariage*, where Figaro is recognized by both his parents.

One of the most dramatic scenes in the Latin play is that in which the terrified maid servant rushes out upon the stage and informs the audience that Casina stands with a drawn sword in her hand, like one mad, threatening all who approach her to adorn her for the marriage ceremony which will unite her to the hated slave, a scene which has been well imitated by Regnard in his *Folies Amoureuses*, which seems to be a "contamination" of the *Miles* with the *Casina*. Nothing like this scene occurs in the *Mariage*, although there may be a suggestion of it in the sub-title, *La Folle Journée*.

Two strongly marked characteristics distinguished the *Casina*

from most of the other plays of Plautus. More than any of them is skeptical and cynical, the gods are openly ridiculed, the old master compares himself to Jupiter and his wife to Juno. Even the institution of marriage, which was one of the most sacred institutions of the Romans, is treated with the utmost levity and cynicism.

A second marked peculiarity of the play is the fact that the hero and heroine do not appear upon the stage, as if to emphasize the fact that this is a marriage in the world of slavery that is to be celebrated.

It is just these two things which render the *Mariage de Figaro* different from all the other plays which preceded it. The marriage of a man servant and a maid servant is the subject of the play, not as subordinate to the marriage of a high-born master and mistress, but as an important event in itself. Secondly, in cynicism Plautus found a worthy successor in Beaumarchais, who, through Figaro, utters those famous tirades against the existing order of things which made Napoléon remark, "*Figaro, C'est la Révolution déjà en action.*"

In trying to show the close analogy between the *Casina* and the *Mariage de Figaro*, a likeness so striking as to certainly suggest conscious imitation of Plautus on the part of Beaumarchais, though perhaps not so close an imitation as in the *Barbier*, it is not claimed, of course, that Beaumarchais did not take characters and incidents from other authors. First of all these other probable sources stands Voltaire's *Droit du Seigneur*, and also a play of Boursault, *Le Mercure Galant*.

Merlin—Non—Monsieur.

Vous prétendriez sur elle avoir droit de seigneur,
Droit de dîme,
Un valet marié dont la femme est jolie
A de justes raison de paraître jaloux.

The character of Suzanne was perhaps suggested by the Pamela Comedies of Goldoni which were written about this time and which owed their vogue to the popularity of Richardson.

As has been suggested by Loménie, one of the probable sources of Chérubin is in *Petit Jean de Saintré*, which had just been republished by the Count de Tressan. The pin with which the Countess fastens the billet doux which she sends to Chérubin must certainly have been suggested by the above mentioned story

NOTE 2.—THE GUARDIAN AND WARD COMEDY

The "guardian and ward" comedy has been popular on the stage of every country of Europe from the beginning of the Renaissance to the time of the first performance of the *Barbier de Séville*. No other comedy plot has surpassed this in popularity, not even the well-worn "twin" plot.

The *Barbier de Séville*, however, ranks as the most famous of all the comedies of this class. It marks the highest development of which this plot was capable and since then it has remained the typical "guardian and ward" play, so perfect, or at least so successful, that no noteworthy attempt has been made since to write another comedy of this kind.

The question may well be asked. How did a plot, which has proved so popular, originate? As to the origin of the equally popular "twin plot" there has never been the shadow of a doubt that the *Menaechmi* of Plautus furnished the model. Fifty or more imitations of which are found in Reinhardtstoettner's list. Next in popularity, according to that list, appears to be the *Miles Gloriosus*, which has almost an equal number of imitations. Shakspeare, with his unerring dramatic instinct, seized upon these two popular themes, the "twins," in the *Comedy of Errors*, and the *Miles Gloriosus*, or "boastful soldier," in the Falstaff plays, particularly in the "Merry Wives of Windsor," where the dénouement, in which the soldier comes to grief at the hands of the injured husbands, bears a striking resemblance to that of the *Miles*.

But there are two sides to this *Miles Gloriosus*, this *soldat fanfaron*. He is also the guardian of a young girl whom he has carried off and who is taken away from him by the lover and his valet. It is these two elements in the play which seem to have given rise to the two kinds of comedy, the *soldat fanfaron* and the *tuteur à clef* plays.

It is difficult to decide just when these two elements in the Latin play became separated. Before the seventeenth century there seems to be no distinctive "guardian and ward" play in French literature, then Molière, with a dramatic instinct as sure as that of Shakspeare, took hold of this plot and on it based his *tuteur à clef* plays. If Molière's *Ecole des Maris*, is imitated from Lope de Vega's *Discreta Inamorada*, as has been claimed, this separation

of the Latin play into the two plots may have taken place first in Spain.

It is a curious fact that in many of these *guardian and ward* plays the barber comes to be associated. A play by Sebastian Mittersnachts, called the *Unglückliche Soldat und Vorwitzige Barbier*, written in 1662, is mentioned by Reinhard Stoettner and probably was a version of the *Miles Gloriosus*.

Equally worthy of remark is also the fact that many of the old farces contain a monologue recited by the valet in which he boasts of his skill as a barber among his other useful accomplishments, such monologues being often associated with the boasts of the soldier and the intrigues of lovers. The earliest of these monologues is that of Maistre Hambrelin found in the collection of farces of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by Picot and Nyrop.

Je sais jouer farces sans rolles
Je suis bon maistre rasenaire
Gens barbier, seigner, veiner.

Scarron in his *Don Japhet d'Arménie*, has a similar monologue. *Don Alphonse*—Jeune comme je suis, Monsieur, je sais tout faire.

Je rase, je blanchis, je couds, je sais saigner;
Je sais noircir le poil, le couper, le peigner;
Je travaille en parfums, je sais la médecine,
J'écris en héroïque aussi bien qu'en burlesque.

Compare with this the speech of Figaro, who is a veritable descendant of the valet qui sait "tout faire."

Also in Regnard's *Folies Amoureuses* is a similar monologue.

Albert—Et quel homme êtes vous?

Crispin—J'ai fait tant de métiers d'après le naturel
Quelque fois honnête homme, quelquefois fripon.

Compare also Trivelin in the *Fausse Suivante* of Marivaux.

Depuis quinze ans que je roule dans le monde
Ami des fripons.

Nor must the monologue of Gil Blas, to whom Beaumarchais is more than once indebted, be omitted in this list. "Après cela, ne voulant plus retourner dans les Asturies, pour éviter toute discussion avec la justice."

In all these monologues the valet "sait tout faire," he makes verses and has difficulties with the officers of justice. Figaro,

with his "Convaincu que l'utile revenu du rasoir est préférable aux vains honneurs de la plume," adds nothing new

A second element in the guardian and ward comedy is the description of obstacles to be overcome by the valet.

Crispin—Moi, comme ingénieur et chef d'artillerie

Pour battre en brèche Albert et l'obliger bientôt

A nous rendre la place ou soutenir l'assault.—I-8.

—*Folies Amoureuses*.

The same idea is found in one of the comedies of Destouches

"Je vais donc avec lui faire *assault de génie*."—*L'Ingrat* II-7

Compare with the elaborate description given in Plautus of the difficulties to be overcome by the slave Palaestrión, and in the Barber of Seville—"Je vais d'un coup de bagnet, endormir la vigilance."

III. The need of money is always emphasized by the valet in Molière, Regnard, Dancourt as well as in Beaumarchais.

L'Etourdi, II-5—Pandolfe—De l'argent, dites vous, ah, voilà l'encolure,

C'est le noeud secret de toute l'aventure.

Ecoles des Femmes—Horace—Vous savez mieux que moi quels que soient mes efforts,

Que l'argent est la *clef* de tous les grands ressorts,

Et que ce doux metal qui frappe tant de têtes

En amour, comme en guerre, avance les conquêtes.

Folies Amoureuses—Eraste—J'aurais pour le succès assez bonne espérance,

Si de quelque argent frais, nous avions le secours.

C'est le *nerf* de la guerre, ainsi que des amours.

—I-7

Colin Maillard, 9—On tiroit une bourse d'abord—C'est pourtant un *meuble* bien nécessaire.

B. S. Figaro, I-5—De l'or, mon Dieu, le l'or: C'est le *nerf* de l'intrigue.

Also is to be compared the *douze mille raisons* in the *Tuteur* of Cailhava.

IV A description of the guardian, conventional in every respect, is found in every one of these comedies. In the comedies

of Molière the character of the guardian really forms the *motif* of the comedy, especially in the *Ecole des Maris*.

La Fontaine, however, in his *Florentin* I-1, has given the real tuteur with all his keys.

Marinette—Chaque porte, outre un nombre infini de ferrures
Sous différent ressorts a quatre ou cinq serrures
Huit on dix cadenas et quinze on vingt verrous.

Regnard, who evidently borrowed this description for his *Folies Amoureuses*, has softened it a little.

Lisette—Il s'arrête, il s'agite, il court sans savoir où,
Toute la nuit il rode

Brutal à toute outrance, avare, dur, hargneux.

Albert—J'ai fait dans mon château, toute la nuit, la ronde.

Beaumarchais has not forgotten this conventional description.

Le comte—Tu dis que la crainte des galants lui fait fermer sa porte?

Figaro—A tout le monde: S'il pouvait la calfeutrer.—B. S., 1-4.

Bartholo—Mais tout cela n'arrivera plus, car je vais faire sceller cette grille.

Rosine—Faites mieux: murez les fenêtres tout d'un coup.—II-4.

The fifth conventional element which always enters into the comedies of this kind is the disguise under which the lover enters the house of the guardian and in the presence of the guardian talks to the young lady without that the latter suspects what they are talking about. This scene in the *Miles* is one of the best of its kind and has furnished a model for innumerable guardian and ward comedies since. The entrance of the lover, disguised as a ship master, "facito ut venias huc ornatu nauclicherico causiam habeas, ferrugineam," IV-5, and the skilful acting done by Philocomasium, who feigns to regret leaving the soldier, has never been surpassed, even by *Rosine*.

Cette situation, dans laquelle des intérêts de coeur se traitent en présence d'un rival, d'un pere, on d'un tuteur, à la faveur d'une fiction qui l'empêchent d'y rien comprendre, est toujours d'un grand effet au théâtre quand la fiction est ingénieuse et vraisemblable."

Le Sicilien, où l'on pourrait encore signaler deux des plus amusantes idées scéniques du *Barbier de Séville*: la conversation, Act I, sons le balcon et celle du troisième entre les deux amoureux au nez du tuteur distrait.—Larroumet *Etudes*, p. 177

The description of the brutal character of the guardian, the difficulties to be overcome in order to outwit him, the versatility of the valet, the disguise, are all found in the *Miles Gloriosus* as in all guardian ward plays—the need of money seems to be a later addition.