# THE ART OF TERENCE

In Memory of

GWILYM ANEURIN TUDOR DAVIES

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF LATIN
IN THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF
SOUTH WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE

# THE ART OF TERENCE

BY

GILBERT NORWOOD, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;
PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF
SOUTH WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE



OXFORD · BASIL · BLACKWELL
MD · CCCC · XXIII

*Printed in Great Britain*

# CONTENTS

# I.

# Introduction

TRADITION relates that an excellent king of Italy, when conducted to the glorious Baptistery at Pisa, turned aside from the columned portal, the pulpit of Niccola Pisano, and the delightful marble panels, exclaiming with outstretched palms: 'Pfui! Show me the echo!' Criticism of Terence has tended strongly towards imitation of that royal tourist. Gracious limpidity of style is the only merit which it is fashionable to attribute to one of the most consummate playwrights in the whole history of the stage. The echo at Pisa is marvellous; so is the Attic charm of Terentian style. But criticism[1] of a dramatist which ignores or misrepresents well-nigh the whole of his superb dramatic achievement is, if possible, more frivolous than the childishness which is blinded to architectural and sculptured magnificence by a beautiful yet accidental oddity. There can be few freaks in the history of criticism more amazing than that which presents Terence as a kind of Plautus for Lower Forms, an industrious apprentice who contrived to write charming Latin and whose only other feat was to provide material for Molière, Chapman and Steele. Molière is a great playwright, undoubtedly; it would be no small credit to Terence, were it his only claim, that he had some share in that vast reputation. But solemnly to compare him with Plautus—Plautus who wrote plays like a blacksmith mending a watch,[2] and to base the comparison upon

[1] To take the first example which comes to hand, Maurice Meyer's *Études sur le Théâtre latin* (Paris, 1847) consists, with the exception of a chapter on the Atellane farce, of three long sections on the parasites, the women, and the slaves in Plautus and Terence. There are a few remarks (most of them misleading) on details of the plots, but nothing about structure or dramatic development. That this kind of 'study' has been the rule will be demonstrated below.

[2] To this condemnation there is one brilliant exception. Nine-

meticulous discussions of sources or metre, even of such important topics as comic vigour or variety of interest, but to ignore meanwhile the immense gulf which separates the two writers, is nothing less than a crime against scholarship and art.

It is the purpose of this essay to demonstrate as accurately and justly as possible the dramatic greatness of Terence. But before entering upon a discussion of his six comedies, we must face two important questions.

First comes the objection: 'Why has this alleged pre-eminence not been realized before? Terence has for many centuries been a favourite author; the purity and sweetness of his diction are as familiar landmarks in discussion and text-books as the pathos of Vergil, the *curiosa felicitas* of Horace, the sonorous dignity of Cicero, and the picturesqueness of Livy. If Terence possesses also mastery of construction and the other virtues appropriate to a dramatic poet, why have these merits not been acclaimed earlier?'[1] There are several reasons. Firstly, the immense majority of Romans did not appreciate good art, particularly such subtle, unforced art as that in question; they preferred Plautus, or gross mimes or (as Terence

tenths of the great mass which still survives from Plautus' work is portentously bad: it would, for example, be difficult to find (or indeed to imagine) a play worse than the *Persa* or the *Stichus*. But one comedy shines forth wonderfully in the wilderness of bad construction, cheap characterization, and at times miraculously stupid dialogue. That exception is the *Mercator*, a really sparkling farce. The *Casina* too has some merit, and a few other plays, no doubt, show patches of excellence. Horace has put part of the case well in the *Ars Poetica* (vv. 270-4):

> at vestri proavi Plautinos et numeros et
> laudavere sales: nimium patienter utrumque
> ne dicam stulte mirati, si modo ego et vos
> scimus inurbanum lepido seponere dicto
> legitimumque sonum digitis callemus et aure,

and has elsewhere (*Epistles* II. i. 176) shrewdly summed up the rest: securus cadat an recto stet fabula talo.

[1] That eloquent and inspiring critic, Dr. J. W. Mackail (*Latin Literature*, p. 23), though allowing Terence 'careful and delicate portraiture of character,' denies him 'dramatic force or con-

complains [1]) tight-rope dancers and gladiators. And this Roman view we moderns have accepted with little examination, thus taking as guides the barbarians who twice rejected Terence's *Hecyra*, possibly the finest masterpiece of high comedy in the world. In the second place, these six works show a serious failing, which, though it need not and does not injure literary charm or dramatic skill, does on a general view lessen the reader's pleasure. That is to

structive power,' and speaks of the 'weakness and flaccidity of the Terentian drama.' Most modern critics seem to agree; at any rate on this subject *tacent: satis damnant*. Prof. S. G. Ashmore, however, in his excellent edition (p. 33) writes: 'All six are remarkable for the art with which the plot is unfolded, through the natural sequence of incidents and play of motives.' And Sellar (*The Roman Poets of the Republic*, p. 212) says: 'His plots are tamer and less varied than those of Plautus, but they are worked out much more carefully and artistically.' Dziatzko-Hauler's edition of the *Phormio* (4th edn., p. 22) remarks: 'Durchdacht und wohlerwogen ist zunächst die Anlage der Terenzischen Stücke.' They also praise (p. 22) 'die Charakteristik der Personen und die Motivierung der Handlung.' But I am acquainted with no work on Terence which has (even in a rudimentary manner) demonstrated his architectonic power. Observe in the long bibliography given by Schanz in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* the complete absence of anything on Terence's skill and development in construction (save in connexion merely with *contaminatio* and his Greek 'originals') together with the presence of dissertations on *Die Eleganz des T. im Gebrauch des Adjectivums* and the like. Leo's magnificent *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (pp. 232-258) does contain some useful scraps, set down in the course of a discussion upon *contaminatio*. Terence has, in fact, suffered grievously from the strange tendency of classical scholars to estimate dramatic works without considering their dramatic quality. Wagner (*Preface* to his edition, p. vi.) supposes that he has given 'all that is most necessary for the complete understanding of a Terentian play'; yet I have detected in the whole of his volume no reference to construction, save a single (mistaken) comment on *Phormio*, v. 740. The ancient critics, with the honourable exception of Donatus, followed the same line. Varro gave to Caecilius the palm in *argumenta*, to Terence only in *ethesin*. Volcacius Sedigitus placed him sixth in his list of comic poets, Plautus second (Aulus Gellius, xv. 24).

[1] *Hecyra*, Prol. I. vv. 4 *sq.*; II. vv. 39-41

say, his subject-matter is amazingly limited: to compare him in this respect with Aristophanes, Shakespeare, or even Molière, would be absurd. Terence's ostensible theme in all his six comedies is the love-entanglements of young men, and though a good deal will be said later concerning the use he made of this traditional framework, it remains true that his writings show far more similarity of topic and even of treatment than can be found in any other poet of his eminence. It is, therefore, not surprising if casual readers regard them as more or less the same play, with 'Chremes' and his like passing palely though volubly through them.

These two facts provide a reply to our first question—they have made it more difficult than it might have been to realize this author's merit. But they have no real bearing thereupon. The second preliminary question is of different urgency. It strikes at the very root. Is Terence original? We may postpone[1] discussion of the story that he received important help[2] in composition from members of the Scipionic circle, since, even if the story is true, the plays themselves remain precisely as admirable and original as ever. What we have to face is the suggestion that all these six comedies are mere translations from Greek. If so, there is no independent value in them at all save excellence of diction; whatever other merit they seem to show should be attributed to Menander, Diphilus and Apollodorus.

It must be confessed that the evidence against his originality is at first sight overwhelming. The *Didascaliae* prefixed to the plays definitely assert *Graeca Menandru* and the like. Terence's own prologues are outspoken in the same sense:—

[1] See below, pp. 132-6.

[2] See *Heautontimorumenos*, *prol.* 24, *Adelphoe*, *prol.* 15-21. Some reports went much further. Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, VII. iii. 10: *Terentium, cuius fabellae, propter elegantiam sermonis, putabantur a C. Laelio scribi.* Quintilian, X. i. 99: *Licet Terentii scripta ad Scipionem Africanum referantur.*

ex integra Graeca integram comoediam
hodie sum acturus Heauton timorumenon.

quam nunc acturi sumus
Menandri Eunuchum . . . .

eas se non negat
personas transtulisse in Eunuchum suam
ex Graeca.

adporto novam
Epidicazomenon quam vocant comoediam
Graeci, Latini Phormionem nominant.

eum hic locum sumpsit sibi
in Adelphos, verbum de verbo expressum extulit.

The prologues to *The Girl of Andros* and *The Mother-in-Law* make similar admissions. From Suetonius we know the verses in which Cicero[1] praises the choice language of Terence's *translations* :—

tu quoque, qui solus lecto sermone, Terenti,
conversum expressumque Latina voce Menandrum
in medium nobis sedatis motibus effers,
quiddam come loquens atque omnia dulcia miscens.

Donatus, finally, writes : *duae ab Apollodoro translatae esse dicuntur comico, Phormio et Hecyra ; quatuor reliquae a Menandro.* The natural conclusion from all this evidence is that the Terentian *corpus* is a mass of translation as close to the originals as the demands of verse permit ; in fact, the poet's own phrase *verbum de verbo expressum*[2]

[1] Suetonius, *Vita Terenti.* The passage is given as in Dziatzko. Leo (*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, p. 253) would read *vocibus* in the third line, and *quidquid* in the fourth. See further Cic. *De Finibus*, I. ii. 4, *fabellas Latinas, ad verbum de Graecis expressas*, etc.

[2] *Adelphoe*, v. 11. Leo (*op. cit.*, p. 246 *n.*) says that this statement 'bedeutet nur : ihr könnt die Szene mit dem Original und mit Plautus vergleichen, und ihr werdet sehen dass sie bei Plautus nicht vorkommt.' This is very hard to accept, though it is supported by Donatus : *Haec approbatio est, de Graeco esse sublatum, non de Plauto ut dixit adversarius.* Fabia (*Introduction* to his edn. of *Eunuchus*, p. 58 *n.*) writes : 'Quoique Terence ait dit, dans le prologue des *Adelphes*, en parlant d'un passage de Diphile, qu'il

(though it applies to one scene only) suggests analogy with (*e.g.*) Dr. A. S. Way's versions of Greek poetry.

How much is to be said on the other side? Comparison with the corresponding plays of Greek New Comedy is almost out of the question: even after the discoveries in Egypt the fragments are still too scanty.[1] Meanwhile, various weighty arguments may be set forth which make it flatly impossible to regard Terence as a mere translator, indeed as less than an independent playwright in all the definitely dramatic aspects of his work.

For, first, were he only a translator, would it not be amazing or incredible that his comedies, when arranged in chronological order, should exhibit a steady advance in technical excellence? The detailed proof of this advance forms the greater part of the present essay. Here it must suffice to state dogmatically, by anticipation, that the sequence—*The Girl of Andros*, *Self-Punishment*, *The Eunuch*, *Phormio*, *The Mother-in-Law*, *The Brothers*—is both the order of composition[2] and a steadily ascending order of dramatic merit; that however definitely the first two plays may be held to surpass the last two in the sunny charm of certain scenes or speeches, they stand far below them, and the intervening works distinctly below them, in mastery of the methods and aims of high comedy.

a traduit *verbum de verbo*, il n'a pas plus connu et pratiqué que les anciens en général ce que nous appelons la traduction littérale.'

[1] Thus, although we now possess considerable portions of Menander's Κόλαξ (Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. III), Koerte (*Menandrea*, Leipzig, 1912) truly remarks (p. 49): *Quomodo fabula processerit ne divinari quidem potest, e Terenti Eunucho nihil fere ad eam restituendam lucramur.* Contrast the interesting and valuable comparison made by Aulus Gellius (II. 23) between the *Plocium* of Menander and that of Caecilius.

[2] The *Hecyra*, when at last given a complete hearing, was produced after the *Adelphoe*, though in the same year (160 B.C.). But as the first version was performed some years before, the position given to it above seems reasonable, particularly as the second unsuccessful production took place just before that of the *Adelphoe*. It is, of course, the position assigned to it in the *Didascalia* (FACTA V.).

There is no greater difference between *Dépit Amoureux* and *Le Misanthrope*, between *Romeo and Juliet* and *Othello*, than between *The Girl of Andros* and *The Brothers*.[1] If, then, Terence is nothing but a borrower, we are to believe that he began by translating comparatively weak comedies, and selected better and better models as he went on. Is this in the least probable? Is it credible? Imagine a brilliant young Russian who should decide to publish translations of Mr. Hardy's novels. Would he begin with *A Laodicean* or *Desperate Remedies*, and work up only by degrees to *The Return of the Native*? Is it not plain that a man in Terence's position would select at once the simplest among the very best of his exemplar's work, and only after repeated successes come to writings of less merit? It is safe to suggest, even without any acquaintance with the publishing trade in Japan, that a Japanese version of *The Merchant of Venice* would precede by a good many years a Japanese *Taming of the Shrew*.[2]

A second argument is to be found in what might seem the least promising quarter—Terence's practice of *contaminatio*, that is, of combining parts of two Greek comedies

[1] I am not aware of any work on Terence which discusses the poet's development from play to play, save the excellent edition of the *Phormio* by Dziatzko-Hauler, where one finds this astounding statement (4th edn., pp. 24 *sq.*): 'Übrigens ist zu beachten, dass eine Entwicklung des Schriftstellers im Verlauf seiner Arbeiten sich kaum erkennen lässt. Zumeist beruht dies ohne Zweifel auf dem Zurückreten der Individualität eines Palliatendichters überhaupt und besonders zur Zeit des Terenz, zugleich aber auch auf der Kürze des Zeitraums, in den seine gesamte literarische Tätigkeit fällt. Jedenfalls können wir keines seiner Lustspiele als eine noch unreife Jugendarbeit bezeichnen oder in Bezug auf die Ausführung hinter die anderen zurückstellen.'

[2] This point scarcely needs elaboration; but an interesting real parallel may be quoted. In the *Observer* for Nov. 7th, 1920, Herr Siegfried Trebitsch relates his experiences as a translator and introducer to Austrian audiences of Mr. Shaw's plays. He began with *The Devil's Disciple*. About the same time Herr Reinhardt brought out *Candida* in Berlin. Other first-rate pieces followed; but the interview makes no mention of *Widowers' Houses* or *The Philanderer*.

to make a new Latin play (let us accept for the moment the form of statement most frequent and damaging to his originality). This extraordinary procedure is not in the least concealed by the poet, who indeed refers[1] to it with some complacency. Now, whatever be the originality of each ingredient in a Terentian 'contaminated' drama, the notion, at any rate the practice, of *contaminatio* itself is a sign of originality, and originality of a marked, indeed perplexing order. We do at any rate know this of Menander, that he was a master of his craft. It may be reasonable, however erroneous, to allege that he was perhaps superficial or immoral. But that his construction was so nerveless and loose that it would admit, and conceivably be improved by, the insertion of a scene or scenes culled from Diphilus, is a great strain on credulity, especially when this eccentric surgery is practised by a foreigner of twenty or thereabouts. The intrusion of Falstaff into *The Duchess of Malfi* would in one sense be welcome, but no translator would attempt it, nor would it be a mark of slavish imitation if he did. The fact is that *contaminatio* by its very nature will, if dispassionately considered, show us how Terence worked. It is already plain that he has his own conception of each plot and insists on following that conception. The structure of the whole may suffer,[2]

[1] *Andria*, 15 *sqq.*; *Heaut.*, 16 *sqq.*; *Adelphoe*, 6 *sqq.*

[2] See below (pp. 31 *sq.*) on the Charinus-Byrria scenes of the *Andria*. Terence's duality method, good in *Self-Punishment*, admirable in *Phormio*, and magnificent in the *Adelphoe*, is in the earliest play seen crudely thrust forward. Leo (*op. cit.* pp. 239-241) gives a useful account of the details, but seems to have only a hazy notion of the reason for the whole insertion. 'Warum er es tat, hat Donat wohl nicht richtig bestimmt; die Handlung war ihm zu dünn, er wollte das Bühnen bild reicher und den Vorgang gedrängter machen; und zu diesem Zweck liess er einen Teil von Menanders Ausführung fallen, um einige Zwischenhandlung und die wechselnden Stimmungen eines pathetischen Liebhabers an die Stelle zusetzen.' A word may be added on the 'crudity' mentioned above. Leo (p. 241 *n.*) writes: 'Doch hat Terenz es so geschickt gemacht, dass man ohne Donats Zeugnis dies alles vielleicht nicht unterscheiden würde.' But one reader at any rate

but what is of course a grave defect from the artistic standpoint is proportionately valuable to the student of Terence's own development, since it forces on his attention the exact shape of the dramatist's purpose.

In the third place, how on the translation-theory are we to explain the fact that Plautus, with exactly the same models, and often[1] no other models, before him, is so different from Terence?[2] It is not generally a wise or winning method of criticism, though it is common, to exalt one writer through the depreciation of another; but in view of the extraordinary eulogies which have been paid to Plautus—eulogies which, it is fair to add, he would have greeted with a shout of laughter and a shambling mass of hirsute bacchiacs—it must be said that he is not merely inferior to Terence, he is not even in the same class. Save for the excellent *Mercator*, and a very few passages in other works, where the sudden change to some crispness of thought or delicacy of writing does suggest that he is really translating, his output is either heavy-footed tedious farce, flat moralizing, or an infantile novelette. How can this kind of literature and the Terentian comedies proceed by the same method from the same source? For the same method it is, so we are given to understand. The Plautine prologues describe Plautus' indebtedness to Greek models precisely as does Terence.

> huic nomen Graece Onagost fabulae;
> Demophilus scripsit, Maccus vortit barbare.[3]

saw the facts before knowing of Donatus' statement (on v. 301): *Has personas Terentius addidit fabulae: nam non sunt apud Menandrum: ne τραγικώτερον fieret, Philumenam spretam relinquere aut sine sponso, Pamphilo aliam ducente.*

[1] Horace (*Epistles* II. i. 58) tells us that Plautus imitated Epicharmus also.

[2] Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* (2nd edn. p. 33 *n.*) does, however, point to two Terentian lines (*Eun.* 801, *Ph.* 976) which occur also in Plautus (*Capt.* 800, *Most.* 655) and to a few passages (mostly from *Heaut.*) which correspond.

[3] *Asinaria, prol.* 10 *sq.*

Cleroumenoe vocatur haec comoedia
Graece, Latine Sortientes. Diphilus
hanc Graece scripsit, postid rusumdenuo
Latine Plautus.[1]

Carchedonios vocatur haec comoedia;
Latine Plautus 'Patruos' Pultiphagonides.[2]

huic Graece nomen est Thensauro fabulae:
Philemo scripsit, Plautus vortit barbare.[3]

Further, two of the extant Latin comedies are derived, according to their *didascaliae*, from one and the same[4] original, Menander's *Adelphoe*. The Terentian 'copy' is the *Adelphoe*; but some readers will find it difficult to guess what comedy of Plautus is involved. Incredible as it appears, that comedy is the *Stichus!* This ludicrous situation should by itself go far to explode the translation theory. Plautus and Terence claim to translate models taken from the same literary family at any rate—if we shrink from the *Adelphoe* plays as an isolated and unintelligible miracle. Then why is there not a strong family likeness between the work of the two Latin playwrights? That each is simply translating is impossible. The natural surmise is that both are innovating.

A fourth argument is to be found in the celebrated verses of Julius Caesar:—

tu quoque, tu in summis, o dimidiate Menander,
poneris, et merito, puri sermonis amator.
lenibus atque utinam scriptis adiuncta foret vis,
comica ut aequato virtus polleret honore
cum Graecis neve hac despectus parte iaceres!
unum hoc maceror ac doleo tibi desse, Terenti.

This judgment, as regards the present topic, is double-

[1] *Casina, prol.* 31 *sqq.*
[2] *Poenulus, prol.* 53 *sq.*
[3] *Trinummus, prol.* 18 *sq.*
[4] F. Schoell, however, believed that Menander wrote two plays called Ἀδελφοί. See Fleckeisen's *Jahrbuch* 119 (1879), p. 44 (quoted by Schanz).

edged. On the one hand, our poet is called a 'half-Menander,'[1] one implication of which phrase is at least this, that Terence has no particular independent value. But the critic proceeds to complain that the limpidity and grace of style are not reinforced by *vis*, and that therefore the Latin poet falls far short of the Greek in one half of a comic dramatist's excellence. Postponing all question as to what precisely Caesar intends by comic force, we can assert at once that this criticism proves beyond doubt that in its author's view Terence was no mere copyist or translator. Had he been so, the comic power of Menander must have shown itself in the Roman plays. In fact, it is precisely this element which could not be spoiled by a translator, while wit and beauty of diction might easily perish in the alembic. The poorest version of Aristophanes, however it mangles the lyrics of the *Birds*, does not omit Prometheus and his umbrella, still less the whole comic conception of Nephelococcygia and its meaning for politics and theology.

In the fifth place, we have the evidence of Donatus, the commentator. It is plainly absurd that, if Terence is translating, the note-writer should stop at certain isolated passages and remark[2]: 'This is a translation of the following words by Menander.' Donatus, moreover, often indicates a divergence of treatment. A noteworthy instance[3] of this is found at the opening of *The Girl of*

[1] This phrase is discussed below, p. 141 *sq.*

[2] *E.g.* on *Andria* 592 (*quid nam audio?*): *Menander enim sic ait*: *τί δή ποτ' ἀκούσω*; on *Eunuchus* 1 (*quid igitur faciam?*): *Menander*: *εἶτα τί ποιήσω*; on *Adelphoe* 43 (*quod fortunatum isti putant*) *Menander*: *ὃ μακάριόν μ', ὅστις γυναῖκ' οὐ λαμβάνω.*

[3] Other changes are: Chremes in Menander's *Eunuchus* was an *adolescens rusticus*; of Antipho, Donatus says: *bene inventa persona est, cui narret Chaerea, ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum*; on *Ad.* 275: *Menander mori illum voluisse fingit, Terentius fugere*; on *Ad.* 938: *Apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur*; on Bacchis' story in *Heeyra*: *in Graeca haec aguntur, non narrantur*; on *Phormio* 91: *Apollodorus tonsorem ipsum nuntium facit, qui dicat se nuper puellae comam ob luctum abstulisse.* See also Legrand, *New Greek Comedy*, Eng. tr., p. 49.

*Andros*. In Menander's *Andria* the preliminary explanation was contained in a monologue of the *senex*, and in his *Perinthia* there was a dialogue between this person and his wife. But Terence offers a conversation between Simo and his freedman Sosia. It is an attractive suggestion[1] 'that Terence, by introducing, in the first scene which he put on the stage, a master and a freedman in a relationship of confidence and gratitude, was rendering veiled thanks to his own former master.'

Finally, if we turn to our poet's prologues, we must reach the same conclusion, though they are no less double-edged in appearance than Caesar's verdict. But the main impression which they convey is that Terence puts himself forward boldly as an innovator: he is the exponent of a new dramatic school:—

> facite aequi sitis, date crescendi copiam,
> novarum qui spectandi faciunt copiam
> sine vitiis.[2]

The very *raison d'être* of these prologues is to bespeak attention for a new enterprise, the challenge of youthful audacity to a stupid tasteless public and pedantic out-of-date rivals. Could anything be more ridiculous if Terence is only staging versions of Greek work known and admired for generations, much of it, moreover, already produced on the Roman stage with applause? It may be observed by the way that the prologue[3] to our text of *The Mother-in-Law* calls the final version 'entirely new.' How can this be, if the earlier version or versions, and the final, are all translations of one original? But we must consider the other side. As we noted earlier, the poet repeatedly speaks of himself as a close copyist—*verbum de verbo expressit*, and the like. By this time, however, we surely see what to make of such statements. He is not telling the truth. He cannot be. If we are to believe all he tells us, his prologues amount to a pair of assertions, that

[1] Leo, *röm. Lit.*, p. 238 *n.*
[2] *Heaut., prol.* 28 *sqq.*
[3] V. 5, *planest pro nova.*

he is a mere translator of well-known work, and that he is a dashing innovator. He is following the stream, and he has his back to the wall. One of these statements must be false,[1] and by this time there can be no doubt which to condemn. Nor is it difficult to see why he offers this pretence of literal fidelity to Menander and the rest: he supposed that he would conciliate critics and audience thereby. The feeling of the Roman public was much the same as the feeling of our own contemporaries: mingled with much ignorance and some disdain was the notion attributed[2] by a modern Terence to Lady Britomart Undershaft. 'After all, nobody can say a word against Greek: it stamps a man at once as an educated gentleman.' What France is in the sphere of dress-making, that Greece was in the sphere of play-making.

Terence uses the Greek New Comedy as a kind of quarry. Often he may translate several consecutive lines, conceivably at times a whole scene. But the architecture of each play is his own. Any existing passages that happen exactly to suit his purpose he feels at liberty to take over with the minimum of alteration demanded by prosody and the difference between Roman and Athenian topography or social custom. But he never allows the drift of a speech or scene to twist him aside from his own object. All the specifically dramatic qualities, all that places him among the great playwrights—all this is Terence and nothing but Terence. He employs the Greek literature before him as Shakespeare employs Plutarch and Holinshed.[3]

[1] Leo, *op. cit.* pp. 220, 246, indicates a manner of reconciling these statements: Terence is throwing over the method which Caecilius had made fashionable, and is going back to that followed by Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius (cp. *Andria, prol.* 18). But Leo rightly rejects this reconciliation: 'Dass er sich auf die Älteren beruft, ist nur eine Waffe im Gefecht; in der Tat weicht die Richtung, die er einschlägt, von der gesamten bisherigen Komödie, Caecilius eingeschlossen, ab.'

[2] Mr. Bernard Shaw, *Major Barbara*, Act I.

[3] The idea put forward in this paragraph is of course not altogether new. See, for example, Sellar (*Roman Poets of the Republic*,

It should be remembered, in the last place, that assertions as to borrowing, adapting, and translating, mean curiously different things in different ages. Horace's statement[1] that Lucilius 'depends entirely' upon Athenian old comedy is by all modern readers allowed to be grossly misleading. The *Argument* to the *Persae* tells us that 'Glaucus in his treatise on the plots of Aeschylus says that the *Persae* is an imitation of Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*[2];

p. 211): 'He was, however, not a mere translator, but rather an adapter from the Greek.' (How this description is to be reconciled with the statement that Terence stands to Menander and others as 'a fine engraver stands to a great painter,' Sellar does not explain; nor how anyone, with no complete work of Menander before him, can venture on such a comparison. It is possible that he is working on an indistinct memory of Parry's excellent remark, *Introduction* to his edition, p. xviii., that Plautus produced 'rude woodcuts' and Terence 'finished line engravings.') See also Professor Ashmore's *Introduction*, p. 32, *e.g.*: 'A certain freedom in verbal rendering and plot construction was necessary to the success of his art.' Schanz (*römische Litteraturgeschichte*, p. 154) writes: 'Dagegen trat Terenz mit der Herrschenden Meinung insofern in Widerstreit, als er nicht bloss Nebersetzer der griechischen Originale sein wollte, sondern sich auch das Recht nahm, Abänderungen an dem Texte vorzunehmen, zu streichen und Zusätze zu machen.' Cp. Leo (*Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, pp. 246 *sqq.*): 'Schon der flüchtige Blick erkannt, dass eine terenzische Komödie von einer plautinischen sehr verschieden ist, auch wenn beide Menander bearbeiten, also die Verschiedenheit nicht aus der Verschiedenheit der Originaldichter herzuleiten ist. Man empfindet auch leicht, dass Terenz einfacher, eindeutiger, attischer ist als Plautus. Das hegt nicht etwa daran, dass er prinzipiell getreuer übersetzte; wir haben beobachtet, dass er seine Vorlagen in seiner weise so frei behandelt wie Plautus. Es liegt daran, dass er seine eigne Kunst ausgebildet hat, in der sich wie in der plautinischen ein eignes Wesen darstellt. Dies kann man auf den Gebieten des Stoffes, der dramatischen Form und der Sprache verfolgen.'

[1] *Sat.* I. iv. 6.

[2] Γλαῦκος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων ἐκ τῶν Φοινισσῶν Φρυνίχου φησὶ τοὺς Πέρσας παραπεποιῆσθαι. It seems clear from the exceptions, which then follow, that by παραπεποιῆσθαι is meant close copying. Thus the Scholiast on *Plutus* 782 remarks; ἔστι δὲ τὸ βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας παρ' ἱπόνοιαν παραποιηθὲν ἐκ τοῦ βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν.

yet not only does Aeschylus expunge the eunuch who uttered the prologue in Phrynichus—far more important than this, he postpones the announcement of the overthrow at Salamis, wherewith the earlier poet began his play. Consider the vicissitudes in the reputation of Pope's *Iliad*. On one illustrious instance of adaptation we may dwell more in detail. Not only is it deeply interesting in itself; so long as we possess no complete work of Menander, Apollodorus, or Diphilus, it is scarcely too much to say that this modern instance is our best guide in the study of Terentian imitation.

Molière was understood to have translated in his *Amphitryon* the *Amphitruo* of Plautus. This is in some sense true. Though, as was to be expected, the wit almost everywhere receives a finer edge,[1] the diction vastly more grace and suppleness, yet the whole plot and nearly all the scenes retain precisely the external shape which Plautus gave them. Moreover, we find now and again close translation as we understand it to-day. The words of Sosia,[2] for instance,

> Et l'on n'y peut dire rien,
> S'il n'était dans la bouteille,

are taken from the original directly: *mira sunt nisi latuit intus illic in illac hirnea.* But observe the discrepancies. First of all, Molière introduces new characters, especially Cleanthis, Sosia's wife, through whom the mystification takes on a quaint development,[3] and the military friends of Amphitryon, the invitation to whom gives rise to that celebrated verdict:—

> Le véritable Amphitryon
> Est l'Amphitryon où l'on dine.

[1] Cf. for example Sosia's reflection after being thrashed by Mercury:

> Que son bonheur est extrême
> De ce que je suis poltron!

[2] Cf. *Amphitryon* I. ii. and *Amphitruo* v. 280.

[3] A close analogy is to be found in the complication added by Shakespeare to the *Menaechmi*.

Secondly, he has practised auto-*contaminatio*, if the expression may be allowed, and, turning his back upon Plautus, has borrowed from a scene of his own *Dom Garcie de Navarre*.[1] But the third change is vastly more momentous; it is the strong tinge of moral consciousness which marks the French work. Plautus, throughout[2] *Amphitruo*, shows a brutal indifference to the feelings of Alcmena and her husband, which makes this possibly the most detestable of his productions. Molière, though following the ramifications of hideously bad taste, yet inserts from time to time apologies for his brace of depraved deities. The Spirit of Night in the Prologue chafes at the duty assigned to her, and pertinently pleads: 'Il faut sans cesse garder le *decorum* de la divinité.' After Mercury has repeatedly thrashed Sosia and reduced him well-nigh to insanity, he gives himself a quaint justification:—

Sous ce traitement
De beaucoup d'actions il a reçu la peine.

An excellent instance of this is the highly adroit and charming observation addressed by Jupiter to Amphitryon at the end:—

C'est moi, dans cette aventure,
Qui, tout dieu que je suis, dois être le jaloux.
Alcmène est toute à toi, quelque soin que j'emploie,
Et ce doit à tes feux être un objet bien doux
De voir que, pour lui plaire, il n'est point d'autre voie
Que de paraître son époux.

But by far the most striking improvement effected by Molière is curiously Terentian in its technical vigour and delicacy, if not in its content. His Jupiter is not content to be accepted by Alcmena simply as Amphitryon. In a faultlessly managed and rather poignant scene[3] the

[1] Cp. *Amphitryon* II. vi. and *Dom Garcie* II. vi.

[2] At the very end, no doubt, Jupiter explains matters to the prince, who expresses himself satisfied (1144 *sq.*—contrast his significant silence in Molière). But so long as he wishes for any sort of self-indulgence, he is a depraved and ruthless scoundrel.

[3] I. iii.

disguised god begs her to see in him a lover as well as a husband. It is a superb stroke of stagecraft, showing the real immorality of Jupiter's conduct at the very moment when he is in his most sincere mood, and bringing out with perfect emphasis and naturalness the character of Alcmena, who refuses to distinguish the lover from the husband: *Je ne sépare point ce qu'unissent les dieux.* In a later passage[1] this situation gives rise to an admirable and touching stroke of wit.

From all the evidence available, it seems to the present writer highly probable that the Terentian 'imitation' of Menander was closely analogous to this 'imitation' of Plautus by Molière, who, while keeping (as regards 'the story') very close to the Roman play, has usually carried the whole idea into a different world of thought and sentiment.

[1] II. vi.: L'époux, Alemène, a commis tout le mal. (See the context.)

II.

# The Girl of Andros

*(ANDRIA)*

Act I.—Simo discusses with his freedman Sosia the disquieting conduct of his son Pamphilus. The youth has been in general charming and well-behaved, but his associates are loose. With them he has frequented the house of a courtesan from the isle of Andros, named Chrysis, who is, however, nothing to him but an acquaintance. Recently she died, and Pamphilus was present at the funeral, watched by his father Simo, who observed with distress the affectionate intimacy between him and a beautiful modest girl, one of the mourners. Since then, Chremes, whose daughter Pamphilus was to marry, has threatened to break off the match, telling Simo that this Andrian girl, Glycerium, is his son's mistress. Simo, unwilling to quarrel with his son, means to test him. He will go on with preparations for the wedding (though in view of Chremes' attitude they will lead to nothing) in order to see whether Pamphilus will leave Glycerium, or refuse and give Simo a sound position for attack. Moreover, Davus, the rascally personal slave of Pamphilus, who must surely in his young master's cause wish to wreck the marriage, will be led to expend all his devices on this sham wedding and have none left for a genuine occasion. Sosia promises to support Simo's plan.

Act II.—Davus comes out, expressing his suspicion that Simo has some plot in hand. Simo informs him that he knows of Pamphilus' entanglement, and threatens the protesting slave with the harshest treatment if he tries to prevent the marriage. Left to himself, Davus deliberates whether he shall support Pamphilus or his father. Glycerium, he explains, is expecting a child by Pamphilus, and the foolish pair have decided not to expose but to

rear it. They assert, further, that Glycerium is a free-born Athenian, who as a baby was shipwrecked on the Andrian coast and adopted by Chrysis' father. Davus walks off to the Market Square to warn Pamphilus about the wedding.

From Glycerium's house enters the handmaid Mysis to fetch the midwife. Seeing Pamphilus approaching in distress, she stays to listen. He has just heard of the proposed wedding and soliloquizes in misery until Mysis comes forward and appeals to him not to ruin her mistress' happiness. He proclaims his loyalty and love for Glycerium, and tells of Chrysis' passionate charge to him on her death-bed that he should protect the girl. Mysis hurries on her errand, warned by Pamphilus to say nothing to Glycerium about the wedding. He enters his father's house.

Act III.—A youth named Charinus enters, accompanied by his slave Byrria, who has just learned from Davus that Pamphilus is to marry Philumena, Chremes' daughter. He is in despair, for he wishes to make her his own wife, and seeing his rival approach determines (despite his valet's jeers) to make an appeal to Pamphilus, who readily promises to do his best for Charinus. Byrria is sent away, and Davus enters in high feather. He reveals that the wedding is a sham : the proof is that no preparations are in hand at either house. Charinus, heartened by the tidings, hurries away to canvas Chremes' friends.

Davus now persuades Pamphilus to profess readiness for the wedding ; in this way he will disarm Simo's suspicion and prevent him from having Glycerium expelled from Athens. There is no fear, he says, that Chremes will after all consent. Pamphilus warns the slave to say nothing about the child to Simo, and, seeing his father approach, turns to face him, encouraged by Davus. Behind the old man Byrria sneaks in. Pamphilus, to Simo's discomfiture, placidly agrees to marry Philumena ; the three go indoors, leaving the indignant Byrria to hurry

off and acquaint Charinus with the supposed treachery of Pamphilus.

Simo comes forth and endeavours in vain to draw from Davus a confession that Pamphilus is in reality distressed by the project; the slave will only 'confess' that the youth is annoyed by the parsimony of Simo's preparations. They are interrupted by the return of Mysis with the midwife, and Simo overhears enough to know of the child and Pamphilus' intention to rear it. But before Davus can invent a counterstroke, Simo's rage is followed by amusement. Davus has begun his stratagems already! This confinement is a pretence to frighten Chremes off. Lesbia, the midwife, comes out, giving directions for the care of the young mother. At this Simo rebukes Davus for the obviousness of his scheme, and the other pretends to agree that the confinement is an imposture, volunteering further the prophecy that a child will soon be exhibited. His master inquires why he did not at once warn Pamphilus. 'Why!' exclaims Davus, 'I am the very person who has brought him into so reasonable a temper.' Simo sends him within and remains, half convinced, but especially cheered by his son's own promise; he determines to beg Chremes to accept the match after all.

Chremes enters and, after vigorously expostulating because of Glycerium, yields to his old friend's entreaty, but asks how he knows that Pamphilus has broken with his mistress. 'Davus told me so,' explains Simo; he calls Davus out and explains to him that the proposed wedding was a trick. The slave pretends admiring surprise, but is thunderstruck on hearing next that the pretence is to become earnest. Chremes retires to make his preparations, and Simo goes within to tell his son the news. Davus has a few moments of disgust and terror at the collapse of his scheme, till Pamphilus descends upon him full of rage. He begs for time to devise some expedient; Pamphilus savagely consents.

Act IV.—Charinus enters, bitterly complaining of shameless double-dealing. To him Pamphilus protests the

purity of his intentions. The other angrily reproaches him, while Pamphilus throws all the blame upon Davus, who offers to renew his efforts. Mysis comes to fetch Pamphilus, whom Glycerium longs to see, having heard of the marriage. The youth passionately affirms his loyalty, and Davus announces that he has hit on a plan. Pamphilus enters Glycerium's house, and Charinus is hustled away by Davus, begging the latter to bring about his marriage with Philumena.

Bidding Mysis await him, Davus hurries into her mistress' house, whence in a moment he brings the baby, which he commands her to lay before Simo's door. But seeing Chremes approach he hastily announces that his plan must be changed; he orders the bewildered girl to follow his cue as circumstances demand. He then retires. The old man, coming to Simo's house to bid Pamphilus fetch his bride, sees the baby on his friend's doorstep, and questions Mysis, who finds to her dismay that Davus is not at hand to prompt her. But he soon appears and to Mysis' consternation also asks whence came the baby. In furious 'asides' he stifles her attempts to remind him of the truth, and by his cross-examination reveals to Chremes that the child belongs to Pamphilus and that Glycerium is a free Athenian, so that his master will be forced by law to marry her. Chremes, thankful for his daughter's narrow escape, at once seeks Simo, while Davus briefly enlightens Mysis.

An elderly stranger arrives, named Crito, who, having heard of Chrysis' death and being her cousin and heir, has come from Andros to take over her property. Learning that Glycerium has not yet found her parents, he wishes he had never sailed to Athens; he must face law-business in a strange city, and is loth to dispossess Glycerium. Mysis takes him in to see her, followed by Davus.

Act V.—Chremes and Simo enter, the former refusing to proceed with the marriage, the latter maintaining that everything Simo has heard is a fiction of persons interested in corrupting Pamphilus. Chremes replies that he has

heard Davus in genuine altercation with Mysis. Simo recollects that Davus has predicted the move in question. The slave suddenly appears from Glycerium's house, uttering (to the amazement of the two old men) consolations over his shoulder, and rubbing his hands at Crito's timely arrival. Simo interrogates him about his visit to Glycerium and is told of Crito, who has brought news that the girl is a free Athenian. Simo calls his slave Dromo and bids him tie Davus up indoors; then in anguish he shouts for Pamphilus. The young man enters in dismay and is reviled by his father; he confesses his love but offers if necessary to discard Glycerium and marry, provided that Simo will believe he has not suborned Crito. The father is persuaded to meet the stranger.

When Crito comes, Chremes recognises him as an old acquaintance. Simo falls upon the Andrian with reproaches for aiding the immoral plot, but Chremes vouches for Crito's character. The latter relates that long ago an Athenian, with whom was a little girl, was wrecked upon the coast of Andros and was entertained by an islander, the father of Chrysis and a relative of Crito. The shipwrecked man was called Phania; he came from Rhamnus, an Attic township. Chremes excitedly asks whether the girl was Phania's daughter. 'No; his brother's.' Chremes exclaims that she is then his own child: Phania was his brother, and was bringing the girl to Chremes, then in Asia. But he knows nothing of the name Glycerium. Pamphilus interposes: he has heard a thousand times from his mistress that her real name is Pasibula. That is the name Chremes has been waiting for. A wedding between her and Pamphilus is at once agreed upon. Davus is released. Charinus enters and begs Pamphilus to use his good offices with Chremes so that he may marry Philumena. The other consents, and all go into the house of Glycerium.

That this comedy is the earliest of the six would be fairly certain from internal[1] evidence, even had we not

[1] That the Prologue mentions malicious attacks is generally

the ancient testimony. It is plainly the work of a brilliant beginner: the Latin is charming, there are excellent speeches, the dialogue is clear and nimble; but the characterization is weak, the construction faulty.[1]

If we turn first to its purely literary qualities we observe some reason for the fact that *The Girl of Andros* is in the eyes of many Terence's most attractive play. At the outset, Simo's narrative to Sosia, describing the amour of Pamphilus and Glycerium, is admirably managed and graceful.[2] The scene beside Chrysis' pyre is something new to Roman literature:—

funus interim
procedit; sequimur; ad sepulchrum venimus;
in ignem impositast; fletur. interea soror
quam dixi ad flammam incessit imprudentius,
satis cum periclo. ibi tum exanimatus Pamphilus
bene dissimulatum amorem et celatum indicat:
adcurrit; mediam mulierem complectitur:
'mea Glycerium,' inquit, 'quid agis? quor te is
perditum?'
tum illa, ut consuetum facile amorem cerneres,
reiecit se in eum flens quam familiariter.[3]

This is the earliest passage in extant European literature to depict—and with what directness and simplicity!—

taken as proof that it was not written for the first performance. But the play may easily have been known and criticised in literary circles before the first production. Cp. *Eunuchus*, vv. 19-24.

[1] Cp. Aristotle, *Poetic* 1450*a*: *οἱ ἐγχειροῦντες ποιεῖν πρότερον δύνανται τῇ λέξει καὶ τοῖς ἤθεσιν ἀκριβοῦν ἢ τὰ πράγματα συνιστάναι.*

[2] Cicero, *De Oratore*, ii. 80, praises this speech as a model of narrative; *e.g.*: *Mores adulescentis ipsius et servilis percontatio, mors Chrysidis, vultus et forma et lamentatio sororis, reliqua pervarie iucundeque narrantur.* That the name neither of author nor of play is given shows how celebrated the passage was in Cicero's time.

[3] 'For us Terence shares with his master the praise of an amenity that is like Elysian speech, equable and ever gracious; like the face of the Andrian's young sister:

"*Adeo modesto, adeo venusto, ut nihil supra.*"'

(Meredith, *Essay on Comedy*, p. 50.)

mutual and honourable love between two unmarried people. Terence, at the opening of his career, has reduced to its narrowest limits what was perhaps the gravest disability of Greek and Roman playwrights. Social conditions seemed to render impossible the love-interest which has played so vast a part in modern literature. An unmarried woman belonged definitely to the reputable or to the disreputable category. In the first case she was practically withdrawn from general society, so that more or less casual and innocent encounters like the first meeting of Juliet and Romeo (though it is somewhat absurd to offer instances) were mostly out of the question. The only chance would occur if the lady took part in some religious celebration; this is what happens in the Second Idyll of Theocritus, for example, and centuries later in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus. And in the other case, since the woman belonged to a definitely degraded class, the affair naturally sank to sordid vice only at times painfully relieved and inspired by some genuine emotion, now on one side now on the other, baffled and broken by the conditions of the woman's life—*il faut vivre* and the rest. This is the point of several heartbreaking vignettes among Lucian's *Erotic Dialogues*.

The immense limitation involved did not trouble Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Aristophanes, each for different reasons. Euripides felt it, but was enabled by his astonishing versatility and resource in some degree to evade it, notably in the *Andromeda*. But by the time Greek New Comedy appeared this difficulty was appreciated in its full power. Menander and his fellows were compelled to evolve a stock female *dramatis persona*, a girl who was of free Athenian parentage (therefore a fit and legal wife for the *jeune premier* and also, therefore, chaste, gentle, and refined) who had, nevertheless, been lost in childhood—whether by theft, shipwreck, or the horrible custom of exposing female infants—and who had in consequence been brought up amid poverty and the resultant social *sans-gêne*, so that she could with ease be encountered by her future

husband. She was thus found at the opening of a typical comedy possessing all the qualities then dramatically desirable—young, beautiful, chaste, unspoiled, but moving in public with something of a courtesan's freedom, herself hovering on the verge of that profession, often indeed actually the mistress of the 'hero,' often again on the point of being sold into vice by the familiar *leno*, and rescued in the critical moment by revelation of her birth and the recovery of her parents.

None of the ancient dramatists (for whatever reasons) seems to have conceived and worked out a mere love-story between mere man and mere woman. Marriage, and even sexual affection, are for them necessarily entwined with, and governed by, social status; if the woman's parents are undiscoverable or not Greek citizens, no course is open but demoralizing irregularity. The discovery at the end, that she is not the daughter of some deceased Milesian or Perinthian, but the offspring of the ridiculous old man who lives next door to us in Athens, is indispensable. All this is now obsolete enough, but we must beware how we smile. It is entirely analogous to the nineteenth century mechanical conception of the marriage ceremony.[1]

This curious convention, then, Terence has adopted like other ancient playwrights. No originality of conception can here be claimed for him, but he has treated the situation with tenderness and beauty. Throughout, the young lovers, however slightly drawn,—Glycerium herself does not appear—attract us powerfully. One vital point is of itself enough to distinguish a work like this from the Restoration comedy of manners: Glycerium is expecting a child. If, amid the bewilderment about sexual ethics which has so often disturbed humanity, a clear criterion of 'morality' is to be found, it lies in the feeling of the

[1] In a novel of Scottish life, Mr. S. R. Crockett (quite seriously, to all seeming) rehabilitates what has appeared to be an erring couple by the timely revelation that their love-making was overheard by a tramp concealed upon a haystack, so that their vows had a witness, and hence by Scottish law they are man and wife.

lovers concerning the possibility of children As elsewhere in Terence, the young pair expect a child with pride, and Pamphilus has determined to rear it—a decision anything but obligatory, and astonishing to Davus[1] for example. Glycerium is, in fact, to all intents and purposes Pamphilus' wife.[2] His love, anxiety, and loyalty towards her are almost the only means which the poet has employed for his characterization. Like the passage quoted above, the other most striking speech[3] of the play is devoted to this effect :—

> o Mysis, Mysis, etiam nunc mihi
> scripta illa dicta sunt in animo Chrysidis
> de Glycerio. iam ferme moriens me vocat :
> accessi ; vos semotae ; nos soli ; incipit
> ' mi Pamphile, huius formam atque aetatem vides,
> nec clam te est, quam illi nunc utraeque inutiles
> et ad pudicitiam et ad rem tutandam sient.
> quod per ego te hanc nunc dextram oro et genium
> tuum,
> per tuam fidem perque huius solitudinem
> te obtestor, ne abs te hanc segreges neu deseras.
> si te in germani fratris dilexi loco
> sive haec te solum semper fecit maxumi
> seu tibi morigera fuit in rebus omnibus,
> te isti virum do, amicum tutorem patrem ;
> bona nostra haec tibi permitto et tuae mando fide.'
> hanc mi in manum dat ; mors continuo ipsam occupat.
> accepi ; acceptam servabo.

Later, when his mistress, hearing of the proposed marriage with Philumena, sends for him in anxious misery, he repeats to this same Mysis his determination in still more vigorous language[4]: he will even, if necessary, defy his father, a proceeding which (for those days) equals in desperate audacity such an act on the part of a daughter in a mid-nineteenth century novel. These speeches are

[1] Vv. 218 *sq.*
[2] Vv. 282-298.
[3] Vv. 146, 216.
[4] Vv. 693-702.

addressed to the waiting-woman because Glycerium cannot be brought upon the stage, and 'interiors' are unknown to 'new' comedy. They are in reality ardent addresses to the beloved herself, and on the same plane as the affectionate words caught by Simo at the funeral of Chrysis.

Concerning the literary excellence of the dialogue, little need be said, since the *Andria* is on this side well-known; moreover quotations hardly do justice to the restrained elegance which obtains everywhere. Such things as the renowned *hinc illae lacrimae*,[1] Byrria's anticipation[2] of a French proverb :—

quaeso edepol, Charine, quoniam non potest id fieri quod vis,
id velis quod possit,

the ejaculation[3] of a harassed schemer, *utinam aut hic surdus aut haec muta facta sit*, Chremes' celebrated apophthegm,[4] *amantium irae amoris integratiost*, the savage jest[5] of Pamphilus :—

satis credo, si advigilaveris,
ex unis geminas mihi conficies nuptias,

are only the brightest points in a shining fabric of silver thread.

If we turn to specifically dramatic virtues, our judgment will be less favourable. The character-drawing is very weak; nor is this criticism met by reminding ourselves that in the comedy of manners one must look not for strongly marked characters, but for types. Sheridan and Wilde, not to mention Congreve or Molière, can show better-drawn figures than any here; Terence himself, in his later work, has done vastly better. All is obvious,

[1] V. 126.

[2] Vv. 305 *sq.* It seems, however, from Donatus' note on v. 805, *ut quimus, aiunt, quando ut volumus non licet*, to be borrowed from a line in the *Plocium* of Caecilius, *vivas ut possis quando nequis ut velis*.

[3] V. 463. This line is taken by M. Anatole France as the motto of his *Comédie de celui qui épousa une femme muette*.

[4] V. 555.

[5] Vv. 673 *sq.*

unarresting. Of the main persons, Simo, Chremes, and Davus are respectively the greatest common measure of all stage fathers, stage fathers-in-law, and stage 'valets' familiar in this *genre*. Pamphilus is marked only by his loyalty to Glycerium; Charinus is a nullity. Almost the only strokes of psychology which cling to the memory are Crito's regrets[1] in connexion with his trip to Athens, and, still more, the delightful glimpses we obtain of the departed Chrysis—a very real and lovable woman; we shall meet and admire her under other names in two later, more masterly, dramas.

The central task of all playwrights is construction or plot. Terence's execution here is, as we said, faulty.[2]

Excellent points are undoubtedly to be found. Simo's change of purpose is an admirably natural and amusing complication, perfectly easy to follow. Having for a purpose of his own urged his son's acceptance of a marriage which as a fact is not to happen, he is so delighted by Pamphilus' feigned eagerness that he takes steps to turn the sham into earnest. The scene in which this development is revealed to Davus affords perfect light comedy, his pretence of awe-struck admiration at Simo's sham preparations giving place to horror when his master jovially expounds the change, then to rage at the reminder[3] that he himself is the 'onlie begetter' of the match; and no reader can be pleased at the youthful writer's drop to current Plautinism[4]:

> quid causaest quin hinc in pistrinum recta proficiscar via?

This, and the stringing-up of Davus near the end, are

[1] Vv. 807-816.

[2] Croiset (*Hist. de la littérature grecque*, III. p. 625) lays his finger on this defect, but expounds it in a manner which seems misleading. After high praise of Terence's 'manière sûre et nette de poser le sujet et d'en conduire le développement,' he adds 'faisons exception pour une partie de l'*Andrienne*, où l'intrigue, quoique comique, est un peu subtile et embrouillée.'

[3] Vv. 595 *sq.* [4] V. 600.

mere concessions to the traditions from which Terence only later freed himself.

Another encumbrance suggests mention of one delightful dexterity. It is well-known that in Greek and Roman comedy indoor life was not easily presented: the scene was invariably (at this date) the street. Whatever conversations were needed, however intimate, must perforce occur in public; Plautus in the *Mostellaria* actually portrays a lady dressing her hair on the pavement, surrounded by 'the mysteries of the toilet.' In virtue of this extraordinary convention, life on the comic stage became as precarious as interesting. If two scoundrels have to concoct a scheme, they confer at the top of their voices on the pavement; whereupon all that is needed for 'construction' is that the hero or his slave should come along by accident, exclaim 'Hem! I will listen to this,' and so frustrate the plot. Terence, as may well be imagined, chafed at this absurdity, and once at least in *The Girl of Andros* he 'hits back' at it in a manner amusing and highly dramatic. Just after Glycerium's baby is born, the midwife comes out and, as usual, shouts her instructions from the doorstep—*nunc primum fac ista ut lavet*[1] and the rest. Simo has already begun to overreach himself with a cunning theory that Glycerium's confinement is a fraud invented by Davus. On hearing Lesbia's remarks he is further convinced. Being, as it appears, less habituated to the theatre than most of the audience, he shrewdly points out to Davus the suspicious absurdity of Lesbia's conduct.[2]

non imperabat coram quid opus facto esset puerperae,
sed postquam egressast illis quae sunt intus clamat de via.
o Dave, itane contemnor abs te? Aut itane tandem idoneus
tibi videor esse, quem tam aperte fallere incipias dolis?
saltem adcurate, ut metui videar certe, si resciverim.

The last three lines, uttered more in aesthetic sorrow than in anger, not only give vital help to the plot; they

[1] V. 483. [2] Vv. 490-4.

are the poet's own trenchant satire on a mortifying stage convention. Like all great artists, Terence has used his very limitations: a method which might seem to induce atrophy in dramatic writing has been transformed into a source of novel and effective construction.

An interesting little study of Terence's nascent art is provided by the climax—what Aristotle has named the *peripeteia* or recoil—that is, here, the arrival of Crito, who unconsciously brings with him the solution of the whole difficulty.[1] In any play or novel it is poor art to base any important change upon some person or fact hitherto entirely unknown or unsuspected: it should be brought about by a character or fact familiar from the outset, but the import of which has not been realized. If, for example, that mysterious person Datchery in *Edwin Drood* is a new character, as many have thought, and not Helena Landless or Drood himself, Dickens must be accused (not for the first time) of mechanical construction. In this first play Terence has not escaped the error in question. Crito, with whose entry the climax begins, is entirely new to us. In the brief scene of his arrival we note the good and the bad rawly contending. The coarse expedient of a new person is thrust upon us, but everything is then done to palliate the offence. Crito is at once made interesting—indeed, as we saw, one of the few interesting people in the whole work—by his alert, friendly and shrewd remarks. 'Has Glycerium found her parents yet? No? What a pity! And in how invidious a light it puts me—law business, accusations of greed, poor Glycerium dispossessed! I wish I had never left home.' But the chief merit is this, that instead of Crito's wandering in simply because the playwright needs him, the best conceivable excuse for his coming, and coming now, is provided, namely Chrysis' death, which has caused the present trouble of Pamphilus and Glycerium (because their love was revealed by her funeral) and which has brought Crito overseas

[1] Donatus (on v. 796) calls him *persona ad catastrophen machinata.*

(because he is her heir). The very fact which has made Crito necessary has also brought him.

One more ingenious point should be indicated before we leave this topic: the laughable little scene[1] of Mysis, Chremes and Davus. Mysis, waiting for Davus, is startled to see him hurrying out of Glycerium's house with the baby, which he bids her lay in front of Simo's door. Just as Davus is about to explain, Chremes is seen approaching 'Here comes the bride's father!' exclaims Davus; 'I throw overboard my original plan.' *Nescio quid narres*, the poor girl falters. Davus sweeps on: 'I'll pretend that I'm coming along from the right, yonder. Be sure you back up my remarks according to circumstances.' Hopeful and pleasant words, truly, for Mysis, finding herself the centre of a plot unexplained, with her mistress's baby lying on the pavement, and an elderly gentleman bearing down upon her to fall a victim to her cunning! When Davus in elaborate surprise asks where the infant comes from, this inexpert conspirator does her best to remind her colleague that he told her himself to put it there. This excellent brief scene may remind us of Molière's *L'Étourdi* (like the *Andria* an extremely early work of its author), the fun of which lies in the imbecile attempts of the 'hero' Lélie to aid Mascarille's machinations (which he does not understand) by intervening at the critical moment, whereby he ruins them one after the other.

But the faults of construction are much more remarkable than these merits. Greatest of all is this, that Charinus and Byrria are dramatically useless.[2] Their action has no effect on the plot; indeed, it is worse than useless. It adds nothing and leads nowhere. Charinus wishes to marry Philumena, daughter of Chremes, and Byrria tries to assist him. The position as portrayed is to us completely uninteresting; it is merely tied on to the main action and

[1] Vv. 721-795. Donatus (on v. 722) remarks: *Haec scena actuosa est: magis enim in gestu quam in oratione est constituta.*

[2] Cf. Leo, pp. 239 *sq.*

could be deleted without loss. Plainly, their efforts ought to have some effect on the fortunes of Glycerium and Pamphilus. For example, when Byrria discovers that Pamphilus, after assuring Charinus that he has no wish to marry Philumena, in a few minutes' time professes to Simo that he welcomes the match, this supposed discovery ought to produce counter-plots of Charinus or his slave which shall (for example) by accident unearth the truth about Glycerium's parentage. Nothing of the kind. Charinus hurries to reproach[1] Pamphilus himself and is at once put in possession of the facts. The discovery of Byrria is a damp squib. At the least, we expect of Charinus that his interests and appeal to Pamphilus should develop the latter's characterization. Here again we are disappointed. So with all the other scenes, save the last, which is not merely useless, but objectionable. After the *éclaircissement* about Glycerium, and the arrangement of her marriage, we have to witness a hurried little anti-climax, which settles the affairs of Charinus and Philumena[2]—a girl whom we have never seen, a youth tedious and null.

But these are not the only needless persons. Sosia's part may be, as we saw, a pious thank-offering made by the dramatic neophyte: he is none the less, on the technical side, a thoroughly amateurish device for helping to convey information to the audience. Simo, instead of delivering a direct unbroken address to the spectators, unburdens himself to his elderly freedman, who interjects 'Hum!' 'Ha!' and the like at intervals, thereafter disappearing with entire abruptness from the play, despite Simo's request that he should aid in the marriage plot.[3] A

[1] In Steele's *Conscious Lovers* the resentment of Charles Myrtle (=Charinus) against young Bevil (=Pamphilus) provides a scene which the author tells us in his *Preface* was his reason for writing the whole. Myrtle challenges Bevil, who vigorously and successfully voices Steele's own objections to duelling.

[2] The passage is in some MSS. amplified by twenty-one additional lines, regarded as spurious by Ritschl (*poetae paulo posteriori tribuit*—Dziatzko) but accepted by Hermann.

[3] Steele's *Conscious Lovers*, which, though largely based on the *Andria*, is an extremely dull affair, nevertheless avoids this

comparison of this introduction with the masterly opening of *Self-Punishment* will at once bring out the crudity[1] of the *Andria* here.

The whole part of Davus himself is otiose, if viewed strictly from the standpoint of construction. That his scenes are in themselves vigorous and amusing is not denied; but so much is true of many scenes in 'revues' of our own day, which have quite literally and openly no plot at all. *The Girl of Andros* undoubtedly has a plot, as truly as *Macbeth* or *Oedipus Tyrannus*, but it is extremely simple. The first stage, the question or difficulty to be solved, is Pamphilus' distress owing to the clash between his own love-affair and his father's wish. The second stage, the climax or peripeteia, is the revelation by Crito that Glycerium is Chremes' daughter. The third stage, the solution or *dénouement*—simplest of all—is the satisfaction both of Pamphilus and of Simo by the marriage of Glycerium. What has Davus to do with this? At the first glance, a great deal[2]; actually, nothing. He is a fly on the wheel. His advice, that his young master should pretend compliance with Simo's plan about Philumena, looks promising; but it produces nothing save, first, Byrria's discovery, which falls miserably flat and has no result, and, secondly, Simo's idea of turning the sham wedding into earnest, which—exciting as it sounds—comes to nothing. His elaborate scaring of Chremes, by means of Mysis and the baby, is of the same type. He does not even reveal to Pamphilus the news and

fault. Old Humphrey (=Sosia) is not only requested to help Sir John Bevil (=Simo) in his plan, but does so. Leo (*op. cit.* p. 239) points out that Terence's weakness here is due to his inserting a character not in Menander. Such purely preliminary characters as Sosia were called *προτατικὰ πρόσωπα*.

[1] It must be owned that similar crudity occurs in *The Tempest*. Much of the conversation in Act I. Sc. ii. between Prospero and Miranda is a mere explanatory address to the audience, badly disguised.

[2] Thus Leo (*op. cit.* p. 239) says of Pamphilus: 'Durch die List des Sklaven Davus und das glückliche Eintreffen eines alten Verwandten der Chrysis entzieht er sich diesem Zwange.'

import of Crito's arrival: the youth was with Glycerium when her kinsman arrived. Davus is organically useless.[1]

There is an awkward little clash between the end of Davus' soliloquy (v. 227) and the first appearance of Pamphilus. Davus ends his soliloquy by remarking[2] that he must go to the Market Square and warn Pamphilus before Simo can spring the news upon him. In a moment the youth enters, exclaiming[3] against the haste with which the wedding is being pressed on, and asking why he has not been warned. This looks as if Davus had not succeeded in anticipating Simo, and the fact is later proved by Pamphilus' words,[4] that Davus does not yet know the bad news. So the slave has not been able to carry out his intention. But such meaningless little hitches should not occur in drama.

Three other passages may be treated more briefly—they all hinge upon Davus, and we have seen that he has no structural value. First, the scene[5] (excellent in itself) where Simo, just as Davus is at his wits' end, suddenly hits on the idea that Glycerium's confinement is a fraud—this scene defies diagnosis. Not only has it no effect on the plot; one cannot say what effect it was even hoped that it would produce. In the first instance, of course, it leads Davus to prophesy[6] that a baby will be brought out into the street. This prophecy is fulfilled, but what his purpose may be we cannot tell, for he changes it at once, and employs the infant to frighten Chremes. This, again, causes Chremes to repudiate the match, but that has no effect, for the difference between him and Simo is submerged by Crito's revelations. Secondly, Davus' adroit

[1] A good parallel is provided by the imp Pug in Ben Jonson's comedy *The Devil is an Ass*. He is continually trying to work mischief, but has no real effect on the action. Critics have censured Jonson for this, quite wrongly. The futility of Pug is the basic idea of the play, as the title hints. Jonson needed no schooling in construction, as that masterpiece of neat machinery, *Volpone*, plainly shows.

[2] Vv. 226 *sq.*

[3] Vv. 236-9.

[4] V. 340.

[5] Vv. 468-480.

[6] V. 507.

little dig[1] at Simo's parsimony invites us to expect that the old man will produce money which will in some way assist the lovers. But this thread, again, is left hanging loose. Thirdly, there is the discovery[2] made by Davus. While Pamphilus is talking to the dejected Charinus, Davus hurries in, announcing with rapture that he brings good tidings. By all canons of dramatic art and the practice of all playwrights, this news should be astonishing and explosive. But it falls miserably flat; all it comes to is that Simo is not laying in a large stock of provisions, and that there is no bustle at Chremes' house. These facts are undoubtedly cogent proofs that the proposed wedding is a sham, if we consider them in the light of cold reason; but that is not enough for drama, especially comedy. Important facts must not only be adequate to their purpose: they must be introduced with what can only be described as a *click*. An examination of Sophocles' dramaturgy, for example, will show that he takes at times quite remarkable pains to secure this, more than once sacrificing verisimilitude. But all dramatists of course follow this principle; indeed it is this 'click' which for many people constitutes the essence of drama—the journalist's 'dramatic event,' at any rate, means this and nothing more. It is certainly a necessary element in dramatic method. To take one of countless instances, it would in real life be natural and satisfactory for the Doge, in the situation as it stands when the curtain rises on the Fourth Act of *The Merchant of Venice*, to announce: 'My lords, I have caused examination to be made of the laws bearing on the case of Antonio and Shylock, and I am advised that plaintiff's claim is illegal and treasonable.' Would this be as good drama as that provided by the poet? It may seem, and it is, cruel to compare work produced by a youth of twenty with a Shakespearian masterpiece. But the important point is that Terence is not yet by any means perfect in the handling of his material.

Nor let it be objected that such minute criticism of

[1] Vv. 448-458. [2] Vv. 338-369.

structure is taking a sledge-hammer to crack a nut, that such light, airy work ought not to be defiled by the coarse groping of pedantic fingers. These investigations are no more criminal than those of botany, and less revolting than those of pathology. They are more novel, that is all. If literary criticism is to advance, we must resolve to study the chemistry of style; and if the criticism of plays is to rise above dilettante journalism, we must consent to employ the microscope upon dramatic structure. It is often implied, and sometimes said, that we spoil works of poetic art by 'trying to understand them instead of enjoying them.' This mischievous and self-destructive nonsense would have left the glorious edifice of a Pindaric ode a mass of tortured prose; it would have left Hamlet's coarse brutality[1] to Ophelia a stupid as well as painful enigma.

[1] See Professor Bradley's masterly examination of this in his *Shakespearean Tragedy*.

III.

# Self-Punishment

(*HEAUTONTIMORUMENOS*).

Act I.—An elderly farmer, named Chremes, converses with his neighbour Menedemus and chides him in friendly language: though Menedemus is over sixty and owns many slaves, he toils on his farm early and late. The other, after a pathetic attempt to snub Chremes, explains that he is punishing himself for barbarity towards his son Clinia, who has been driven off to the wars by his father's reproaches—he had been living with a mistress. Clinia has now been three months from home. Menedemus, repenting his harshness, determined to live hardly until his son's return. Chremes offers comment and sympathy, finally inviting Menedemus, but in vain, to celebrate the Dionysiac festival at his house. On his friend's departure, Chremes sees his own son Clitipho approaching. The youth explains that Clinia has just returned and is now in Chremes' house. Clitipho begs his father to keep this news from Menedemus, since Clinia still fears him. Chremes says nothing of the change in Menedemus, reads his son a lecture on the text of Clinia's morals, and goes into his house. Clitipho soliloquizes on the unfairness of fathers and laments his own plight: he too has a mistress, but, unlike Clinia's Antiphila, she is imperious and extravagant.

Act II.—Clinia and Clitipho converse while awaiting Antiphila, the former anxious as to the effect which his absence may have exercised upon her conduct. Syrus, slave of Clitipho, and Dromo, slave of Clinia, enter. They have been conducting Antiphila and Bacchis from town, but have outstripped them and their train. Dromo's mention of the throng of maid-servants increases Clinia's distress, but it soon appears that this ostentatious retinue belongs to Bacchis, the mistress of Clitipho; Syrus describes

the honest poverty in which he found Antiphila. Clinia is vastly relieved, but Clitipho is aghast to hear that Bacchis is coming: his father knows of Clinia's amour, but nothing of his son's. Syrus explains that he has brought Bacchis so that his young master may secure the money he needs for her. Let them all pretend that Bacchis is the expected mistress of Clinia, and Antiphila one of her retinue. Clitipho agrees with reluctance, and is warned not to betray the imposture by his behaviour towards Bacchis. Antiphila and her companion now enter, conversing about their different ways of life. Clinia and his beloved greet one another with joy, and all enter Chremes' house.

Act III.—Chremes goes to Menedemus at dawn and tells him of Clinia's return. The delighted father is instantly eager to indulge his son, but Chremes warns him that his former severity is in danger of giving place to an equally dangerous complaisance. To drive this advice home, Chremes gives a vivid account of the extravagance of his new guest, Bacchis. Even so, Menedemus yearns to lavish his all upon Clinia, and it is agreed that he shall lay himself open to be swindled by Syrus and the rest. He retires, and Chremes enters into conference with Syrus, who is taken aback by his master's exhortations that he should cheat Menedemus, but improves the occasion by adjuring Chremes to be as indulgent to his own son if need arises. Clitipho comes out and is censured by his father for the liberties which he has taken with Bacchis. Syrus, too, is disgusted with Clitipho for so recklessly disregarding his advice, and induces Chremes to insist on his son's withdrawal for a time—'go for a walk!' Clitipho departs in dudgeon. Chremes inquires about the plot, and Syrus suggests a scheme. Antiphila has been given over to Bacchis by a debtor as pledge for a sum of one thousand drachmae; Syrus will tell Menedemus that Antiphila belongs to a rich and noble Carian family, and will urge him to pay the sum so as to profit by her ransom. Chremes

suggests that Menedemus will refuse; Syrus replies 'So much the better.'

Chremes' wife Sostrata, accompanied by an old nurse, hurries out. She confesses to her husband that the infant girl, whom at her birth he had bidden her destroy, was given by her to a Corinthian woman to be exposed. Chremes greets this revelation with unfeeling raillery, and asks why it is offered now. Sostrata explains that a ring was exposed with the child; this has just been discovered in possession of Antiphila. They go within to investigate, while Syrus ponders gloomily over the failure of his plot. He has just invented another, when Clinia comes forth, announcing with rapture that Antiphila has been found the daughter of Chremes and Sostrata; he can now marry her. Syrus reminds him of Clitipho's situation, which will become desperate if Bacchis is known to be his mistress, not Clinia's. The latter is gradually induced to accept the new plan, which Syrus proudly proclaims a masterpiece. Clinia is to tell Menedemus that he loves Antiphila and would marry her, and that Bacchis is Clitipho's mistress. Menedemus may tell Chremes these facts if he chooses, for Chremes will not believe them, imagining that all this is merely Syrus' plot, hatched in accordance with Chremes' own advice. But Clinia points out that Chremes, if such is his belief, will not give him his daughter. 'No matter,' Syrus answers. 'if the misunderstanding lasts only one day, that will give enough time for obtaining the money Clitipho needs.' It is agreed that Bacchis and retinue shall be transferred to Menedemus' house. She comes forth, and after alarming Syrus by a malicious pretence that she means to desert Clitipho, is appeased by the slave's promise of money and is conducted by Dromo to the house of Menedemus.

Act IV.—Chremes comes forth, lamenting the ruin which now threatens his neighbour if he means to support Bacchis. Syrus explains to him that Clinia has told Menedemus that Bacchis is Clitipho's mistress and that

he has brought her home with him lest Clitipho's father should learn the truth; moreover, Clinia has said he wishes to marry Antiphila, so as to extract money for the celebration and presents. But Chremes refuses his consent to a sham proposal, and bids Syrus evolve some other plan. Syrus agrees, and at once goes back to the debt due to Bacchis, for which Antiphila is the pledge; Chremes must of course pay the thousand drachmae, now that Antiphila is found to be his daughter. Chremes agrees to hand the money to Clitipho (so as to help the idea that he is Bacchis' lover) and goes within to fetch it. Clitipho returns from his walk in disgust, but is mollified by Syrus' news about the money, which he receives from Chremes, and enters Menedemus' house with Syrus. Menedemus comes to Chremes and asks his daughter's hand for Clinia. Chremes convinces him that all he has just been told is merely the plot which Menedemus has expected. Nevertheless, so anxious is Menedemus to indulge his son that he insists on the sham proposal, and the other agrees to pretend that he has accepted it.

Act V.—Menedemus comes from his house full of amusement at Chremes' stupidity. The latter soon appears, expressing wonder at Clitipho's long absence in his neighbour's house. Turning to Menedemus, he is surprised to find him laughing, and still more to hear that Clinia and Dromo have not instantly asked for money on learning of the betrothal, but have simply urged that the wedding should take place to-day. Next Menedemus archly tells how thoroughly the pretence has been maintained that Bacchis is Clitipho's mistress. The 'imposture' has gone to the extreme. Chremes now cannot but see how the case stands and is filled with rage against his son. Agreeing that the marriage of Antiphila and Clinia shall really take place, he insists on disinheriting Clitipho and giving all his goods as his daughter's portion, in order to bring his son to despair. Menedemus speedily returns with Clitipho and Syrus; Chremes sternly denounces his

son's weakness and bids him seek what he needs from his brother-in-law. Clitipho is overwhelmed with shame, and Syrus in vain seeks to take the blame upon himself. The two old men retire, and Syrus tells the youth that surely he cannot be the genuine son of Chremes and Sostrata: they have at once flung him off now that they have recovered their own child. Clitipho is painfully impressed and goes to question his parents. Syrus congratulates himself on this useful invention, and retires. Chremes and Sostrata enter, quarrelling about Clitipho's sudden inquiries. They are followed by the youth himself, and Sostrata with pathetic vehemence assures him that he is their son. Chremes' renewed reproaches complete the reformation of Clitipho. Menedemus enters and reconciles father and son. Clitipho agrees to marry, but strongly objects to the lady whom Sostrata suggests; his own choice, the daughter of one Archonides, is accepted by his parents. He obtains pardon for Syrus, and the play ends.

The prologue of this comedy is particularly interesting. First, we find a curious account[1] of the play's origin:

> ex integra Graeca integram comoediam
> hodie sum acturus Heauton timorumenon:
> duplex quae ex argumento facta est simplici.
> novam esse ostendi et quae esset: nunc qui scripserit
> et quoia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam
> existumarem scire vostrum, id dicerem.
> nam quod rumores distulerunt malivoli,
> multas contaminasse Graecas, dum facit
> paucas Latinas: id esse factum hic non negat,
> neque se pigere et deinde facturum autumat.

That is to say: 'This comedy is not the result of *contaminatio*,[2] but that is not to be taken as a confession that

[1] Dziatzko, however, brackets the third line and altogether omits the three which follow. Of the third line he says *grammaticorum sapientiam redolet*, but I fail to see any justification or point in this; the line differs little from remarks which Terence makes in other prologues.

[2] See Leo, p. 241, *n.* 4.

the poet was wrong in following that practice.' The third line is extremely important. Terence has made his *Self-Punishment* out of the homonymous Menandrian play, but from a 'simple' plot he has evolved a 'double' plot. Here is not only a strong proof of his essential originality—for it is extremely hard to imagine the action of this comedy with one of the love-affairs cut out—more than this, it shows how much store the poet set upon this duality, a consideration which takes us to the foundation of his technique and of his feeling about human life, and which, therefore, we must examine fully when our detailed study of these works is completed.

Secondly, here is to be found the earliest mention of the story that Terence received considerable help in his labours from the brilliant and cultivated circle which clustered round Scipio Africanus Minor. It is dwelt on, emphatically yet equivocally, in the prologue[1] to *The Brothers*; here all we are told is that the *malivolus vetus poeta* (Luscius Lanuvinus) asserts of our author:

> repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse musicum
> amicum ingenio fretum, haud natura sua,

and, as in the later play, no definite rejection or acceptance of the report is offered. Thirdly, there is an excellent description of the Terentian manner; the favourite rough-and-tumble farce will not be exhibited—this is a quiet (*stataria*)[2] drama, marked by *pura oratio* and faultlessness (*sine vitiis*).

In style, this work shows no advance on its predecessor. That, indeed, is not astonishing; the *Girl of Andros* in this respect at any rate is splendidly mature. Individual lines of striking power are not less frequent—the famous sentence[3] of Chremes, *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto*, the words[4] wherein Clitipho voices the mood of count-

[1] *Adelphoe*, 15-21.

[2] 'The French make a critical distinction in *ce qui remue* from *ce qui émeut*—that which agitates from that which touches with emotion.' (Meredith, *Essay on Comedy*, p. 19.)

[3] V. 77.

[4] V. 217.

less youths in all ages, *mihi si unquam filius erit, ne ille facili me utetur patre*, and that expression[1] of consummate knavery, *vera dicendo ut ambos fallam*, which Congreve prefixed to his masterpiece *The Double-Dealer*. Beside these may be set the admirable unconscious joke[2]:

*Chremes.* at ego, si me metuis, mores cave in te esse istos sentiam.
*Clitipho.* quos ?
*Chremes.* si scire vis, ego dicam: gerro, iners, fraus, helluo. ganeo es damnosus: *crede, et nostrum te esse credito.*

As in the *Andria*, one notes the admirably written explanatory speeches: that of Menedemus,[3] where he tells how he gave up his comforts and began to toil once more in expiation to his lost son, and the account[4] given by Syrus of the honourable poverty and unspoiled loyalty in which Antiphila has awaited her lover. Both these narratives are marked by a tone of domestic intimacy—the slaves pulling off old Menedemus' shoes when he comes home, the grimy little maid-of-all-work whose complete want of *chic* so relieves Clinia. Better than all this is the unobtrusive and absolute mastery of the opening scene, where the two elderly neighbours stand amid the farm-implements chatting with unforced charm and point concerning life and its perplexities for old fathers of wayward sons. The quiet sureness of touch is little less than miraculous in so youthful a writer.

A feature which lies between stylistic quality and the strictly dramatic elements is that moralizing which begins in this play to show itself as a characteristic of Terence. It is this, hardly less than his gracious style, which assimilates him, as Pichon[5] observes, to Marivaux. Always excel-

[1] V. 711.
[2] Vv. 1032 *sqq.*
[3] Vv. 121-150.
[4] Vv. 274-307.
[5] *Histoire de la littérature latine*, p. 81: 'Je comparerais volontiers Térence, non à La Chaussée, qui n'est qu'un languissant déclamateur, mais à Marivaux . . . Tous deux ont traité avec bonheur la comédie modérée et discrète; tous deux ont été des psychologues perspicaces, des moralistes souriants et émus.

lently written, always really arresting, it has more than once a place in the plot itself. Of the simpler type is Chremes' reply[1] to his son's shamefaced *emori cupio—prius quaeso disce quid sit vivere*, and later[2]

> quaeris id quod habes, parentes; quod abest non quaeris, patri
> quomodo obsequare et ut serves quod labore invenerit.

This kind of passage is nothing but the usual comment *ex post facto*, though admirably put. Another remark[3] of Chremes is more useful, in that it foreshadows happenings of the play:

> ingenio te esse in liberos leni puto
> et illum obsequentem, si quis recte aut commode
> tractaret. verum nec tu illum satis noveras,
> nec te ille; hoc quod fit, ubi non vere vivitur.
> tu illum nunquam ostendisti quanti penderes,
> nec tibi ille est credere ausus quae est aequom patri.
> quod si esset factum, haec nunquam evenissent tibi.

The whole work is a comment on this—the trouble caused by lack of confidence between father and son, in families where restraint is in the atmosphere, *non vere vivitur*, as his trenchant phrase puts it. Incidentally, too, the interest of Clitipho's position is increased; how will the sagacious Chremes deal with the truth when he knows it? This question is pointed by Chremes himself, so far as an unconscious speaker can do so, when he tells[4] his son, in discussing Clinia, *scitum est periclum ex aliis facere, tibi quod ex usu siet*, and by a conversation[5] between him and Syrus. Finally, Chremes' moralizing on the sound education of a son leads to plot-construction. He explains[6] to Menedemus that he has not revealed to Clinia the change in his father's attitude, lest this knowledge should corrupt the youth; this leads to the singular scheme whereby Menedemus arranges to be swindled. Theories of edu-

[1] V. 971.
[2] Vv. 1039 *sq.*
[3] Vv. 151-7.
[4] V. 210.
[5] Vv. 550-8.
[6] Vv. 436-8, 466-489.

cation have often led to wild results, but rarely to so quaint an outcome as this; Terence certainly 'follows the λόγος whithersoever it leads.'

Separate mention ought to be given to the talk[1] between Bacchis and Antiphila. Not only does it display with unstudied eloquence the characters and lives of the two girls, preparing us for the good fortune which awaits Antiphila and defending or excusing beforehand the selfishness and extravagance of Bacchis; it is even more admirable from a special standpoint of technique. For the dramatist, perhaps even more than for the novelist, it is a problem how he is to fill in his interstices. When the outline of the plot has been duly clothed with minor incidents and dialogue, he must at times ask himself what he is to say while waiting, so to put it. A great writer, of course, shows his power here as elsewhere; many a passage of Shakespeare will rise at once in the reader's mind, chief of them all those marvellous lines[2] uttered by Duncan and Banquo as they ride up to Inverness Castle. But a poet of less mastery will at such places halt the action and intrude matter which (however good in itself) remains clearly intrusive—Mercutio's Queen Mab speech, or the description of Ion's banqueting marquee.[3] The art of Terence is here consummate: though the action slows down, we never forget, in the interest excited by this easy converse, the whole situation which waits to be solved.

The character-drawing is nebulous, as in *The Girl of Andros*: no one stands out as a creation, though all are adequately drawn in the flat. It is, however, a significant advance that the heroine, Antiphila, unlike Glycerium, is brought before us. So attractive is she and so vital to the story, that one finds it hard to realize that she appears in only one brief scene and speaks but thirty-three words all told. That so marked an impression, rudimentary as it is when compared with later work from the same pen, should be produced by such slight means, is a clear proof of genius. None the less, Antiphila is slight, and the

[1] Vv. 381-397. [2] *Macbeth* I. vi. [3] Eur. *Ion* 1141-1165.

rest are slighter. On the other side, a strong sense of rational psychology is present, witness Menedemus' determination to punish himself by voluntary hardships,[1] the naturalness whereby his misery procures its own alleviation when Chremes, urged by pity, reveals the return of Clinia, and the splendidly simple expression of deep feeling—Chremes' *ah! nescis quam doleam*,[2] the poignant groan which escapes his son, *eheu, quam nunc totus displiceo mihi*,[3] which has a tinge of Sophocles' own power, and the noble outburst[4] wherewith Syrus himself throws off the well-worn mask of a 'knavish valet' and reveals for a moment the splendid Terentian *humanitas*:

quae istast pravitas
quaeve amentia est, quod peccavi ego, id obesse huic ?

It is by such passages as these that the genuine high comedy which Terence is rapidly evolving distinguishes itself triumphantly from farce.

Turning finally to 'the soul of the play,'[5] the plot itself, we observe a definite advance beyond the preceding comedy: Terence now fully realizes what genuine construction is. But he has not by any means perfectly succeeded in producing it; side by side with delightful feats of artistry are serious weaknesses; his plot is both defective and redundant.

Many readers will find their chief objection precisely at the point where Syrus stands positively dazzled by his own cleverness—*huic equidem consilio palmam do*.[6] His stratagem is amazingly complicated, and one can scarcely wonder if a slow-witted Roman spectator, improvided with a chart or other aid, found Terence unat-

[1] Horace, *Satires* I. ii. 19-22, takes this as a passage well known to his readers:

Vix credere possis
quam sibi non sit amicus, ita ut pater ille, Terenti
fabula quem miserum gnato vixisse fugato
inducit, non se peius cruciaverat atque hic.

[2] V. 934. [3] V. 1043. [4] Vv. 973 *sq.*
[5] Aristotle, *Poetic* 1450 *a*. [6] V. 709.

tractive. Menedemus is to know that he is not being fooled as Chremes thinks he is, and is to tell Chremes, so as to fool him, that he is not being fooled as he meant to be. On careful reflection, we find that the arrangement does work out logically; but we cannot help feeling that the applause is really due to young Clinia, who follows out this tangle instantly with ease, and baldly replies: 'Yes, but then Chremes will not let me marry his daughter.' What modern auditor would have been so quick in the uptake?

Equally striking is the poorness of the close. Syrus' suggestion that Clitipho is not really the son of Chremes and Sostrata causes the action to start again on a fresh tack for no purpose. No object is secured by this scene; that affecting little passage, where Sostrata with pathetic insistence assures Clitipho that he is her son, forms no bar to this statement. It is an axiom of dramatic construction that every scene should not only be effective in itself, but should contribute to the sequel. This discussion of Clitipho's birth could be omitted without anyone's noticing the deletion; the last reproaches of Chremes and the final reconciliation might be joined on with perfect ease and clearness to the conversation which immediately follows Clitipho's first protest. Another objectionable element is the solution of Clitipho's scrape. He hurriedly agrees to marry; the lady selected is unknown to us, and almost anyone will answer the purpose. Bacchis simply disappears. Very like real Athenian life this may be; dramatically it is huddled and threadbare.

There are a few ragged edges. Syrus, in bringing Bacchis to Chremes' house with Antiphila, has some plan which is obliterated afterwards and which therefore should not have been mentioned; her presence should have been otherwise accounted for. Of Antiphila Syrus says[1] *ad tuam matrem abducetur*, and nothing[2] more comes of that

[1] V. 335.

[2] It is true that the *peripeteia* itself, the discovery that Antiphila is Chremes' daughter, springs entirely from her meeting with Sostrata. But this cannot have been Syrus' aim in bringing the meeting about.

idea. Again, when Chremes is told Syrus' device to extract money from Menedemus—the story of Bacchis' debtor—he suggests that Menedemus will refuse the investment[1]; whereupon the slave replies 'So much the better.'[2] This seems to imply some subtlety whereby the refusal can itself be turned into cash; but the hint is a blind alley. Thirdly, Clinia and Syrus are never told of Menedemus' complete *volte-face* regarding his son's extravagance[3]: yet they calmly transfer Bacchis, who would bankrupt a satrap,[4] to his frugal abode, without a thought as to the kind of welcome they will receive. Finally, whereas Syrus at vv. 671 *sq.* imagines that his plot to gain money through Antiphila is destroyed, at v. 790 *sqq.* he uses the idea after all, though the situation has not changed in the interim. He is justified, but the passages clash awkwardly.

Against these flaws, none of them fundamental like those in the *Andria*, are to be set thoroughly first-rate achievements in construction. The complications arise not (as in the earlier play) because the poet arbitrarily tangles the action, but from the natural demands of the situation. The ludicrous billeting of Bacchis upon Menedemus, the desirability of that transfer, Clinia's reconciliation with his father, and the discovery by Chremes of the relations between the courtesan and his son, are all (however wild and complex) the quite logical outcome of the original facts.

[1] Ladewig (*Beiträge zur Kritik des Terentius*, Neu-Strelitz, 1858) p. 6, rightly agrees with Benfey that this suggestion is irrational.

[2] V. 611: *Optata loquere.* Professor Ashmore remarks: 'Syrus is not pleased. He makes a counterstroke by telling Chremes that he looks for a refusal from Menedemus. Chremes is puzzled accordingly, and our inference is that Syrus means to get the money from Chremes himself.' But surely this is too complicated. Morcover, Syrus is about to explain (*iam scies*, v. 612) to Chremes himself, when they are interrupted by Sostrata.

[3] It will not help if we assume that they have learnt this somehow 'within.' Their talk ought to mention it.

[4] Vv. 452 *sq.*: *Satrapa si siet amator, numquam sufferre eius sumptus queat.*

A few minor dexterities can be appreciated only by reference to stage-conditions. When Menedemus has begged Chremes' assistance in his self-swindling project, the other agrees, but finds a sudden trivial obstacle[1]:

> operam dabo.
> paulum negoti mi obstat: Simus et Crito,
> vicini nostri, hic ambigunt de finibus;
> me cepere arbitrum: ibo ac dicam, ut dixeram
> operam daturum me, hodie non posse eis dare.
> continuo hic adsum.

In a few minutes he returns and proceeds to confer with Syrus. What conceivable value can this little interruption possess? It is not interesting and it leads nowhere. If the curious reader examines the passage he will find the only possible explanation. Terence sets great store by this short soliloquy of Menedemus, and therefore must get Chremes out of the way somehow. Moreover—and this is still more curious—he refuses to get rid of him in the canonical fashion whereby comic characters revolve in a regular orbit between their houses and the pavement. Had he cut out this bit of business with Simus and Crito, Chremes would have had no choice—if his friend's soliloquy was to be retained—but to go in at once and suborn Syrus. We could not have heard their talk had not the old man brought the slave out of doors for that purpose. This,

[1] Vv. 495-511. Ladewig, *op. cit.* p. 5, holds that the absence of Chremes is ridiculously brief, and that therefore in the Greek original Menedemus' soliloquy must have been much longer, containing expressions of delight at Clinia's return, consideration of Chremes' suggested plan, and reflections of the kind which Terence has actually written. But he does not offer at all convincing reasons why Terence so extensively cut down the soliloquy and thus involved himself in absurdity. The fact is that Chremes' absence need not be considered too short. We do not know how long Menedemus remained in silent thought. Nor is Ladewig justified in assuming (p. 4) that Simus and Crito must be *definitely* thought of as living some distance away. Moreover, even if Ladewig is right, he has not accounted for the whole incident of Simus and Crito.

of course, is a frequent device, but the playright is already beginning to revolt, and chooses the less of two evils, that Chremes should be *found* in the street by Syrus and so talk there. That being so, we must first get Chremes away by some other means, if, as we said, Menedemus' reflections are important. Hence, then, and hence only, these phantoms, Simus and Crito. The result of this small investigation makes one eager to look again at the soliloquy :

> di vostram fidem !
> ita conparatam esse hominum naturam omnium,
> aliena ut melius videant et diiudicent
> quam sua ! an eo fit, quia in re nostra aut gaudio
> sumus praepediti nimio aut aegritudine ?
> hic mihi nunc quanto plus sapit quam egomet mihi !

It is only after pondering all the Terentian plays that one fully realizes the feeling behind these lines. But it is at once apparent, from the trouble which he has taken to work the passage in, how the poet has begun to travel beyond the traditional framework of comedy. Already he is less interested in the familiar ' campaign ' to extract forty minae or a slave-girl from suspicious father or *periurus leno* than in the whole fabric of life. And, more in particular, Menedemus' soliloquy, like Clitipho's, brings out excellently the grotesque inconsistency of Chremes.[1]

Another example may be noted of talent at odds with stage-convention. Clinia, in his anxiety to meet Antiphila, comes out of Chremes' house. The dramatist is compelled

[1] Chapman's comedy, *All Fools*, is based on *Self-Punishment*, and it is interesting that his finest passage (IV. i.) is an imitation of this soliloquy :

> O the good God of Gods,
> How blind is pride ! What eagles we are still
> In matters that belong to other men,
> What beetles in our own !

I say ' imitation,' though the English poet is here far more vigorous than the Roman, because the curiously emphatic appeal to the ' good God of Gods ' can best be accounted for as a translation of *di vostram fidem !*—though the Latin phrase is of course idiomatically far more commonplace than the English.

to display him thus, or we should miss everything; but Terence bestows what may be called a curse in dramatic form upon the stage-convention[1]: *etiam caves ne videat forte hic te a patre aliquis exiens?* More remarkable is the quite amusing and natural device whereby the poet gets rid of Clitipho for a time. During the middle of the play, when the interest hangs entirely upon Antiphila, her parentage, and the change in her fortunes, Clitipho would be an encumbrance. Instead of despatching him ignominiously to 'write letters,' as (for example) Sir Arthur Pinero has the hardihood to do to Tanqueray in the midst of Tanqueray's own dinner-party, Terence provides an admirable excuse in Clitipho's incorrect behaviour towards Bacchis, which annoys both Chremes and Syrus for different reasons, and unites them to banish him.

If we inquire what becomes of Menedemus' scheme to have himself swindled, the only money disbursed in the end coming from the sapient Chremes, we light upon the most brilliant characteristic of *Self-Punishment*. Terence has taken the conventional comic *motif*, a rascally slave's trick, to extract from his old master funds to aid his young master's amour; he has then adopted the (if possible) more familiar discovery that the heroine is of free Attic parentage; finally, he has set this discovery not at the close, but in the heart of the action, as he has every right to do, supposing it occurs there (as it does) with complete verisimilitude. The conventional procedure is dislocated. Syrus has to begin his machinations anew.[2] Nor is there a moment to lose. He is only just in time to prevent Clinia from revealing Clitipho's secret by his proposed departure without Bacchis. The playwright has managed this *tour-de-force* with rare skill, but not, as we saw, with ideal success.

[1] V. 235.

[2] Legrand (p. 315) appears completely to reverse the fact: 'Would not Syrus . . . have been completely at a loss but for the recognition of Antiphila?'

Equally admirable is the effect which Terence obtains from employing and interweaving two love-intrigues. A comparison with the *Andria* at this point discloses a notable increase both of deftness and of insight; the poet has advanced from a dull mechanical accumulation to sound and masterly architecture. Charinus has developed into Clinia. The former could be taken bodily out of his play and no one would miss him. The other is vital to *Self-Punishment*; his story and Clitipho's are mutually dependent, not only as affording trenchant moral comments on each other, but dramatically. It is not merely that side by side they form the play, as two gloves make a pair. Each story would fall to pieces without its companion; they are as mutually necessary as one blade of a pair of scissors to the other. This duality we shall find again and again in the later plays. The idea is one of his most splendid dramatic concepts; it is also at the root of his noblest thought about life.

IV.

# The Eunuch

(*EUNUCHUS*)

Act I.—A young man named Phaedria stands near the house of his mistress, the courtesan Thais, complaining to his slave Parmeno of her behaviour. Of late she has been denying him admittance; now she has sent for him. Parmeno gives him sound advice, and he is feeling inclined to break with Thais, whom however he passionately loves, when she comes out and tenderly excuses herself. Years ago, she explains, her mother, a Samian settled in Rhodes, was given by a merchant a little girl stolen from Sunium in Attica by pirates. This child was carefully brought up as Thais' sister. Later Thais came to Athens with a lover and has remained there. Her protector, a military officer, went to Caria and she formed a strong attachment to Phaedria. Meanwhile her mother has died, and Thraso, the soldier, has purchased the foundling as a gift for Thais. But on his return to Athens he has discovered her affair with Phaedria, and will not give the girl up to her, thinking that she will definitely leave him when she has regained her supposed sister. He is, moreover, developing a fancy for the maiden himself. Thais is anxious to receive her, hoping to make a place for herself in Athens by restoring Pamphila to her relatives; therefore she begs Phaedria to allow her to conciliate the soldier Thraso for a while. The youth chafes at this, and mentions the gifts he has brought—an African hand-maid and an eunuch. But Thais prevails on him to leave her for two days and retire to his father's farm. Parmeno is sent to bring the new slaves to her, and Phaedria takes a passionate leave. Thais briefly soliloquizes about her sincere affection for Phaedria, and her hope concerning Pamphila; she believes she has already discovered Pamphila's brother, a young man named Chremes, who has promised to call to-day.

Act II.—Phaedria gives directions to Parmeno, and dejectedly sets out for the farm. The slave is pondering the change wrought in his master by love, when he observes Gnatho, the officer's hanger-on, who is conducting a beautiful girl (Pamphila) to Thais' door. Gnatho discourses on his own up-to-date methods of parasitism, and then begins a sneering conversation with Parmeno, after which he passes into Thais' house with Pamphila. Parmeno turns away and sees Chaerea, Phaedria's younger brother, hurrying along. The youth is in great vexation; he has been following a lovely girl but has lost her. Seeing Parmeno, he begs him to aid his quest. After a rapturous description of the lady, he explains that an old bore kept him in conversation till he lost sight of her; but she turned into 'our street.' Parmeno sees that she must be Pamphila and explains, suggesting that Chaerea should impersonate the eunuch. The youth joyfully agrees; Parmeno is taken aback at this ready acceptance, but is overborne.

Act III.—Thraso, accompanied by Gnatho, arrives to invite Thais to dinner. Parmeno listens with disgust to his vulgar boasting and the flatteries of Gnatho, who urges his patron to excite the jealousy of Thais by affecting an interest in Pamphila. Thais comes out and accepts the invitation. Parmeno brings forward Phaedria's gifts, and the beauty of the supposed eunuch excites general admiration. After gibes between Parmeno and his opponents, Thais, who has given directions to her household about the new arrivals and the reception of Chremes, goes off to dinner with Thraso and Gnatho, while Parmeno retires.

A young man approaches Thais' house. He is Chremes, whom Thais already believes the brother of Pamphila. The hand-maid, Pythias, meets him and sends her fellow-slave Dorias to take him to Thais at Thraso's house.

Antipho, a friend of Chaerea, comes in search of him. A party of youths have arranged to dine together in the Peiraeus, and Chaerea was to make the arrangements,

but at the appointed hour he is missing. Chaerea, in his extraordinary costume, emerges from Thais' house, filled with rapture and triumph, and explains to Antipho that, accepted in his supposed capacity, he has been left alone with the maiden and has taken full advantage of his opportunity. The two prepare to join the dinner-party, Antipho suggesting that Chaerea should change his costume at Antipho's house. The other agrees, and begs his friend to advise him how he may get possession of Pamphila.

Act IV.—Dorias returns, talking of the friction caused at Thraso's dinner by the arrival of Chremes; Thraso, annoyed by Thais' reception of the visitor, urged that Pamphila be sent for, and a quarrel followed. Thais will soon be coming home. Phaedria returns, having found that he cannot endure the two days' separation. While he stands there, Pythias comes out in dismay and rage; the supposed eunuch has outraged Pamphila and disappeared. Phaedria is bewildered by her reproaches, but fetches the real eunuch, Dorus, from his own house, and the explanation is soon discovered. Pythias vows vengeance upon Parmeno, and is persuaded by Dorias to hold her tongue before Thais, mentioning only the disappearance of the eunuch. She sends Dorias in with Thais' jewellery, and turns to receive Chremes, who arrives rather drunk from Thraso's house.

Thais hurries in, filled with indignation against the soldier, who has threatened to come and take back Pamphila by force. She meditates resistance, and calls upon Chremes to help — Pamphila is his sister, whom she will restore to him without reward. The youth expresses his gratitude, and Pythias is sent for the box containing Pamphila's birth tokens. The prospect of battle with Thraso at first unnerves Chremes, but Thais braces up his courage and gives him the box of tokens. Thraso next appears with Gnatho and a battalion of henchmen, whom he disposes for the fray, himself taking a post in the rear. Gnatho asks for the signal to fall on, but Thraso first

calls upon Thais to surrender Pamphila. Chremes steps forward and defies the enemy, proclaiming that the girl is his sister and of free Athenian birth. Haughtily warning Thraso not to molest his friends, he departs to fetch the nurse, Sophrona, who is to see the tokens and identify Pamphila. Thais contemptuously turns her back on Thraso, who dismisses his troops.

Act V.—Thais comes forth reproaching Pythias, who reveals the outrage committed by Chaerea. At this moment, to Pythias' joy, Chaerea shambles in, still wearing his outlandish dress. Antipho's parents were at home, so that he could not change his clothes there; he took to his heels down an alley, and has so made his way home by back-streets. Pythias violently reproaches him, and reveals the fact that Pamphila is free-born. Thais addresses to the young man a rebuke full of simple dignity; Chaerea at once implores her good offices in his aim of marrying Pamphila. She bids him wait for Chremes and the nurse, and they go within.

Pythias waits to receive Chremes and meditates vengeance upon Parmeno. Chremes and the nurse, who has recognized the tokens, arrive and are sent within. Pythias sees Parmeno approaching, but enters the house to witness the identification. Parmeno comes to see how Chaerea has fared, congratulating himself on the salutary insight he is giving his young master into the repellent life of courtesans. Pythias hurries out in pretended consternation. To Parmeno's horror she tells of Chaerea's offence upon a free-born girl, and declares that Chremes has bound Chaerea with intent to inflict a frightful penalty. Parmeno distractedly warns her that no harm must befall Chaerea, and, seeing his old master approach, decides to tell him all, while Pythias retires. Upon the unsuspecting old man Parmeno launches the whole story of Phaedria and Chaerea, and the father rushes indoors to save his son. Pythias returns and loudly derides Parmeno, who has been induced to reveal his own knavery.

Thraso and Gnatho return, the former intending to reconcile himself to Thais at any cost. Chaerea enters from the house in rapture; Pamphila is free-born and betrothed to him; Thais has won the old man's heart and is now to live undisturbed with Phaedria. The latter comes in, having heard the good news from Parmeno, and Thraso, who has overheard all, begs Gnatho by some means to secure him a chance of Thais' society. Phaedria warns Thraso never to show his face in that street again, but Gnatho privately persuades the brothers to put up with his patron; he will be useful as a butt and a source of income. They agree, and Gnatho announces to the soldier that he is to be tolerated, a decision which Thraso attributes to his own social charm.

*The Eunuch* is a strange medley of qualities. Dull and brilliant, immoral and edifying, abjectly Plautine and splendidly Terentian—it is all these by turns. The play marks a faltering in our poet's progress. After the extreme elaboration, the ruthlessly close interweaving of plot-threads, which is the chief note in *Self-Punishment*, he has begun to aim at skilful simplicity of construction. This he is to win later, but the time has not yet arrived. The persistence of Terentian elegance in language, of Terentian psychology side by side with scenes of quasi-Plautine farce and the Plautine combination of architectural simplicity and clumsiness, is a curious and improving study.

His literary brilliance remains undimmed. In the prologue we find the famous *nullumst iam dictum quod non sit dictum prius*[1]; the story[2] related by Thais concerning her connexion with Pamphila is executed with finish and lucidity despite Parmeno's interruptions;

[1] V. 41. St. Jerome, in his comment on *Ecclesiastes* i. 9, tells us that his teacher Donatus, while lecturing on the Terentian passage, uttered the famous exclamation, *Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt!*

[2] Vv. 107-152

Chaerea has a charming clue to the whereabouts of his lost lady: *una haec spes est: ubi ubi est, diu celari non potest*[1]; in the place where we should least have expected it, we happen upon a line[2] borrowed from the thundering Ennius:

> at quem deum! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit.

Gnatho the parasite has at any rate one good joke[3]:

> quantist sapere! nunquam accedo quin abs te abeam doctior.

Similarly, the excellent and witty moralizing which we noted in the preceding comedy is to be enjoyed here also. What could be better than Parmeno's words[4] to Phaedria?

> quae res in se neque consilium neque modum
> habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes.
> in amore haec omnia insunt vitia: iniuriae,
> suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae,
> bellum pax rursum: incerta haec si tu postules
> ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas
> quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias.

This last passage leads us, by way of the noble reproof[5] which Thais administers to the reckless Chaerea, to a feature of more importance, the woman's whole character. She dominates the action throughout—wise, gracious, affectionate, and resourceful. She is a courtesan, but

[1] V. 295.

[2] V. 590. Another interesting reminiscence of Ennius is provided by v. 235, *patria qui abligurrierat bona*; cp. Ennius, *Satires* xvi.: *alterius abligurrias bona.*

[3] V. 791.

[4] Vv. 57-63. Horace paraphrases this passage, *Satires* II. iii. 259-271. Persius (V. 161-174) goes beyond Terence to the Greek 'original,' as Conington and Professor Ashmore point out. Though he borrows phrases from Horace, he gives the original names Chaerestratus, Davus, Chrysis for Phaedria, Parmeno, Thais. With Terence's *cum ratione insanias* compare *Hamlet* II. ii.: 'Though this be madness, yet there is method in't.'

[5] Vv. 864-6.

that is far more a matter of social status than of morals.[1] Towards the end of the play Parmeno congratulates himself on having given Chaerea, by his abominable suggestion, a salutary chance to observe the squalor which underlies the assumed elegance of a *demi-mondaine*.[2] How vulgar and obsolete his gross description sounds after all we have seen and heard of Thais! It is indeed definitely disproved by the care with which she instructs[3] her servants before leaving home for only a few hours. The account given by Chaerea of what passes in her absence, the respect and care which Dorias and the pert *soubrette* Pythias show for her, all indicate an excellent housewife and a sensible mistress. But observe above all her dealings with the various men. With Phaedria she is frankly in love, as he with her; and these facts, impinging on the necessities of her position, produce a touch of that pathos we have already[4] noted as clinging to such liaisons; to his passionate outburst, *O Thais, Thais*[5] and the rest, she can only answer[6]:

> ne crucia te obsecro, anime mi, mi Phaedria,
> non pol, quo quemquam plus amem aut plus diligam,
> eo feci; *sed ita erat res, faciundum fuit.*

His love and reluctance notwithstanding, she contrives his retirement without diminishing his affection. Equally excellent is her treatment of the vulgar, overbearing Thraso. His presents are accepted politely, his invitation with no trace of coquetry; his insults in the 'battle' scene are met with freezing disdain.[7] Her nobility flashes forth instantly when Thraso at dinner suggests that Pamphila be sent for: *Minume gentium! In convivium illam?*[8]

[1] Cp. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Republic*, pp. 215 *sq.*: 'Thais . . . is the most favourable delineation of the Athenian "Hetaera" in ancient literature,' etc.

[2] Vv. 930-940. [3] Vv. 492 *sq.*, 500-6. [4] P. 24.

[5] Vv. 91 *sqq.* Eugraphius is surely wrong when he remarks: *Iteratio nominis accusantis ostendit iracundiam.*

[6] Vv. 95 *sqq.*

[7] *E.g. quaere qui respondeat* (v. 810). [8] Vv. 625 *sq.*

'Not for the world! A girl like her at a drinking party?' It is magnificent: Ἐσωφρόνησεν οὐκ ἔχουσα σωφρονεῖν.[1] Over this brutal soldier, too, her power is at the end made manifest; he returns after his defeat prepared to make any sacrifice of dignity or money if only he may be near her. Chremes brings out another side of Thais; his drunken vacillation is turned to vigour and firmness by her quiet encouragement. Chaerea's outrage calls forth from her, in admirable contrast with the spitfire abuse of Pythias, this noble yet humble rebuke[2]:

non te dignum, Chaerea,
fecisti; nam si ego digna hac contumelia
sum maxume, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen.

This appeal Chaerea at once answers with all the generosity and manliness of which he is capable; with deep respect he begs Thais to act as his *patrona* and aid him in securing the wronged Pamphila as his bride. Finally the enraged father of Phaedria and Chaerea is mollified by her charm—*Thais patri se commendavit*.[3] So we feel that it is natural she should be accepted at the close as the mistress of Phaedria and his alone; she will in fact be as nearly a wife as Athenian law permits. Chaerea's enthusiasm for her is thoroughly deserved[4]:

nil est Thaide hac, frater, tua
dignius quod ametur: ita nostrae omnist fautrix familiae.

She is a splendid creation. To class her with the boisterous harlots of Plautus' *Bacchides* and similar plays, merely because of the manner in which she happens perforce to earn her living, would be an outrage.

This play, however, is named, not after Thais, but after Chaerea in his assumed character. His detestable be-

[1] Eur. *Hippolytus*, 1034.

[2] Vv. 864-6. Donatus calls this *mira accusatio mixta laude et blandimento*. (*Mirus* and *mire* regularly mean in D. 'admirable' etc.)

[3] V. 1039.

[4] Vv. 1051 *sq.*

haviour[1] provides a passage which is the most brilliant and perhaps the most objectionable feature of the whole, though the final scene where Thraso is adopted as a butt and source of income may well be regarded as running it close. It must be confessed openly that here for once[2] Terence presents us with pictures which are or may be deleterious. The objection is not mainly that sexual misconduct is treated with sympathy. It lies herein, that both Chaerea and Phaedria obtain their desires by frankly, casually, and callously using fellow-creatures as mere material. Kant has bidden us always to treat a human being as an end, never as a means only[3]; there lies the condemnation of these elegant youths. Phaedria's relations with Thais are immensely less repellent than the arrangement which he makes with Gnatho to use Thraso's infatuation as a source of revenue. Chaerea's offence it would be easy to misjudge.[4] He does not weakly

[1] Fabia, *Introduction* to his edition of the play, p. 7, has a good remark on the construction at this point. 'Voilà donc Chaeréa auprès de Pamphila. Au moment même où il commet son acte de violence . . . le poète introduit Chrémes . . . c'est-à-dire que la démarche qui doit aboutir à la reconnaissance de Pamphila et la révéler digne d'épouser Chaeréa a lieu juste au moment où se fait le mal qu'elle permettra de réparer.'

[2] One explanation of this feature—found nowhere else in his work—may be that here he is following his Menandrian model more closely than elsewhere. I do not offer this as a disingenuous attempt to save Terence's reputation. It is suggested to me by Fabia (p. 45). 'Dans *l'Eunuque*, en particulier, il n'a rien changé à la donnée essentielle de l'original, il n'a rien ajouté d'important.' Leo, on the other hand (p. 243), thinks that the alterations go much deeper.

[3] *Metaphysic of Morals* (tr. Abbott, 5th ed., p. 47).

[4] Pichon, *Histoire de la littérature latine*, p. 76, speaks of Chaerea's 'franchise' and 'vivacité,' and compares him to Chérubin in Beaumarchais' *Le Mariage de Figaro*. The comparison shows less than Pichon's usual discernment. Beaumarchais himself excellently describes Chérubin in his list of characters. 'Timide à l'excès devant la Comtesse, ailleurs un charmant polisson; un désir inquiet et vague est le fond de son caractère. Il s'élance à la puberté, mais sans projet, sans connoissances et tout entier à

succumb to a sudden impulse of love, but deliberately and skilfully gratifies a physical appetite.[1] When a drama hinges on such principles as these, one is not surprised to find comparisons with English Restoration Comedy forming in one's mind. Chaerea's stratagem is the same essentially as that employed in Wycherley's foul play *The Country Wife*; Thraso's position at the close resembles the end of the first Part of *The Soldier's Fortune*, by Thomas Otway. Still more surprising, possibly, since it cannot be called in any sense needful to the plot, is a raffish succulence of phrase attributed to Chaerea, who does not merely commit a licentious act, but shows himself a professional Lothario.[2] His language, in such things[3] as

chaque événement; enfin il est ce que toute mère, au fond du cœur, voudroit peut-être que fût son fils, quoiqu' elle dût beaucoup en souffrir.' How much of this charming sketch do we observe in Chaerea? See also Fabia's *Introduction* to his edition of the *Eunuchus*, p. 17 *n.* Meyer, *Études sur le Théâtre latin*, p. 141 (Paris, 1847), had already compared Chérubin. These scholars might more reasonably have mentioned Chérubin's later history (see *La Mère Coupable*), though by that time he has changed. Schanz (p. 150) records the delightful fact that Francesco Cherea, the founder of the Commedia dell' Arte, called himself so after the Terentian character.

[1] This condemnation is annulled neither by his extreme youthfulness nor by the reparation through marriage which at a later point he is more than willing to make. As for his age, Pythias (v. 693) puts it at sixteen; in any case he is a mere lad. But something must be allowed for early maturity in Southern Europe; and, however that may be, one can but judge from his way of talking. The second objection, his desire for marriage, must be referred to that wonderful provision of Nature which has often been known to base genuine affection upon an indulgence in the first instance merely physical. (See however Donatus' remark, quoted on p. 63).

[2] Wagner (on v. 604) says, concerning Chaerea's narrative to Antipho: 'We may draw attention to the great modesty with which Terence has treated this delicate subject: not a single word occurs that could be called indecent.' But that is perhaps the worst feature, suggesting that such conduct is more or less normal in a man of honour.

[3] Vv. 296 *sq.*, 318. Cp. also v. 566.

o faciem pulchram! deleo omnis dehinc ex animo mulieres:
taedet cottidianarum harum formarum,

and

color verus, corpus solidum et suci plenum,

reads like a Latin version of Vanbrugh or Farquhar. He can even quote the gods as warrant for his behaviour; while awaiting his opportunity, he gains spiritual fortification from a picture of Jupiter and Danae[1]—*ego hoc homuncio non facerem?* It may perhaps be urged that this excuse has some force; and it is true moreover that the set with which he associates is callously corrupt. When his friend Antipho has heard the story of outrage to the end, he simply remarks[2]: 'Quite so. Meanwhile, what have you done about our dinner-party?'

But no sooner have we sunk to this than we begin to rise. The scene closes with Chaerea's request[3] for his friend's aid in obtaining possession of Pamphila. Already he desires at any rate some kind of human relationship with her, and the moment he learns that she is of Athenian birth, a fact which makes marriage possible, he eagerly protests his desire to take her as his wife.[4] This spirited and attractive outburst is, as we saw, in part due to the admonition of Thais, but it is no flash in the pan; when the match is finally arranged, the youth bursts into a rhapsody of joy.[5] It would be easy for an admirer of Terence to allege[6] that this satisfactory close condones

[1] Vv. 584-591. Wagner well compares Aristophanes, *Clouds* 1079-1082. Donatus (on v. 584) regards this incident as going far to excuse Chaerea: *Bene accedit repente pictura ad hortamenta aggrediendae virginis, ideo quia non ad hoc venerat Chaerea, ut continuo vitiaret puellam, sed ut videret, audiret essetque una: cum nihil amplius cogitaret, ausus incitatusque dum picturam cerneret.* St. Augustine (*Confessions* I. xvi.) naturally cites the passage as both bad morals and bad theology.

[2] V. 607: *Sane hercle ut dicis. Sed interim de symbolis quid actumst?*

[3] Vv. 613 *sq.* [4] Vv. 872-888. [5] Vv. 1031-7.

[6] So Vallat, *Quomodo Menandrum quoad praecipuarum personarum mores Terentius transtulerit*, p. 16.

the licentious rapture of the earlier account given to Antipho, somewhat as Swinburne sought to justify Beaumont and Fletcher's *A King and no King*.[1] But the attempt must fail. Though the upshot of the whole is sound, the early scene is too vigorously detailed for the proposed perspective; still more important, there is no misgiving in it anywhere to prepare us for the sequel: Chaerea's remark about the Danae picture can scarcely be regarded as an exception. Nor do we read any word of compassion for the victim or for the distress which appealed to the slave-girl Pythias.[2] Our view of Phaedria's arrangement about Thraso will be exactly analogous. The plan is proposed to him as the only way to secure funds for satisfying the needs of Thais, who henceforth is to have but one lover. Accordingly we might suggest that Terence here demonstrates the unavoidable evil of the convention which forbids her marriage with Phaedria. The only course open to them is a permanent and affectionate liaison; this means considerable funds, as it is assumed that Thais, being a courtesan, will show the traditional extravagance of her class. These funds must be got, if no other way is open, by the disgusting method described. By this route we should arrive at a most edifying result; public opinion and the law based thereon must be reformed, or natural affection must wade in mire. But it is tolerably plain that in so arguing we should be reading our own ideas into the playwright's language. It is hard to believe that, had he held this view, he would not have voiced it clearly. The last scene remains an ugly blot upon the play.

In construction, as in ethics, the play exhibits an arresting mixture of good and bad qualities. What is the dramatic value of Gnatho's long speech[3] concerning his patent method of parasitism? Why the elaborate discussion of Phaedria's yielding to Thraso for two days so as to further Thais' plan in regard to Pamphila, when

[1] See Sir A. W. Ward's *English Dramatic Literature*, II. p. 677.
[2] E.g. vv. 645 *sq.*, 659.
[3] Vv. 232 *sqq.*

as a fact she is immediately handed over by Thraso without the guarantee which the two days are to supply ?[1] These queries bring us face to face with a far more important feature which includes and in a sense answers them—the dramatic badness of the whole Thraso element. He and his love-affairs, his braggadocio, his hanger-on Gnatho, and all Gnatho's cleverness, speeches, and sneers, are unnecessary.[2] It is of course not in the least to the point that many passages in these scenes may be well written—as a matter of fact they are mostly second-rate—for they ought to help in the great affair, to wit Chaerea's passion for Pamphila and their marriage. If we look into the ostensible reasons for Thraso and his followers, we are astonished to find how useless these worthies prove. Is Thraso needed to introduce Pamphila ? Not at all. She need never have been separated from Thais ; or, if she had been, she could have been brought or sent by someone who scarcely appeared in the play at all. Shakespeare did not think himself bound to insert in *The Merchant of Venice* three or four elaborate scenes about Tubal because Tubal's reports to Shylock concerning Jessica's extravagance are of distinct structural value in strengthening Shylock's ruthlessness against Antonio. Or is the Thraso interest brought in because only so can we secure the withdrawal of Phaedria ? It is no doubt necessary that he should be got out of the way for a time, so that no one may detect the disguised Chaerea ; but that could plainly be effected with a fiftieth part of the

[1] Fabia (*Introduction* to his edition, p. 12) believes that Thais wishes for the two days' grace not only in order to recover Pamphila, but also to establish the parentage of the girl and thus save her definitely from Thraso. But he observes that this point is not plainly put.

[2] Pichon also has noted this (*op. cit.* p. 76) : 'Dans *l'Eunuque*, il ajoute le matamore et le parasite, dont l'action pouvait se passer.' These scenes are, of course, taken from Menander's *Colax*, whereas the rest are based on his *Eunuchus*, as Terence himself says (*Prologue* vv. 30-33), but that fact has clearly no relevance to the discussion.

trouble. Or is the reason to be found in the terms of settlement at the end? There is convenience therein for Phaedria, but no new point for Terence. Another fact in the main plot is that when Chremes calls on Thais he does not find her at home. But there is absolutely no point in this; he recovers his lost sister in precisely the same way as he would have done if Thais had been awaiting him. Again, it may be said that Chaerea's outrage could not have been perpetrated had not Thais been at dinner with the soldier; but that is yet another instance of cracking a nut with a sledge-hammer. Finally, we hear a good deal from first to last about Thraso's supposed *penchant* for Pamphila; but the only influence of this on the main action is that Thais comes home earlier from the party owing to the quarrel over Pamphila. This promptness has no particular outcome.[1]

That is to say, the Thraso scenes in reality affect only one another; they have no genuine influence upon the fortunes of Thais, Pamphila, Phaedria, or Chaerea. They form an underplot. Elsewhere, save in the much slighter instance of Charinus in the *Andria*, Terence follows the constant tradition of classical art, in which subordinate features exist for the sake of the one main effect; any minor dramatic interest is a needed contribution to a perfectly homogeneous plot. Further, the underplot of *The Eunuch* is distinctly Plautine. In the main action we find unmistakably Terentian qualities, and such characteristic details as the passage[2] where the traditional *catus servus* has the plot taken out of his hands, and the trick whereby he is fooled into actually revealing[3] everything to the 'old man' on his own initiative—a laughably complete change

[1] Fabia (p. 14) indicates what appears to be a downright blunder in construction arising from Gnatho's rôle: Chaerea ought not to have lost Pamphila owing to the intervention of the elderly bore, because she herself has to wait in the street while Gnatho makes his long opening speech. But the bore may well have been far more copious even than Gnatho: the impatient lover estimates the delay at a whole hour.

[2] Vv. 376 *sqq.* [3] Vv. 968 *sqq.* This is the *peripeteia.*

from the familiar scenes where the *senex* threatens flogging and the *pistrinum* as a means of eliciting the scandalous truth. In contrast with all this, there is at first sight little in the Thraso passages to distinguish *The Eunuch* from Plautine comedy.

For it seems plain that the great reason for this element is the absurd 'battle'-scene,[1] where Thraso deploys his household troops in front of Thais' door; that is, for example, the sole reason why we have had so repeatedly pressed upon us what otherwise leads nowhere, the soldier's fancy for Pamphila. And when at length we attain to it, the 'battle'-scene is a wretched fiasco—not of course merely for Thraso, but for Terence.[2] His heart was not in this kind of work. Having in an unlucky hour made up his mind to present an elaborate scene of rich farce, he leads up to the 'rally' with much care and then suffers all the chance of knockabout fun to slip through his fingers. Plautus, it need not be said, would have carried things vastly better. If this kind of work is to be done at all, it must be done with relish and *élan*. Terence fails just as Henry James would have failed had he tried to imitate Dickens' narrative of the Eatanswill election, as M. Maeterlinck would fail if he attempted another *Taming of the Shrew*. Both here and elsewhere it is curious to watch the Terentian manner at work upon a Plautine theme. When Thraso first enters,[3] our ears are regaled with that favourite topic, the monstrous vaunts of the *miles gloriosus*; but contrast him with the Pyrgopolinices of Plautus. The brags favoured by Pyrgopolinices are all about his muscles; those of Thraso all concern his wit.

[1] Vv. 771-816.

[2] Fabia (p. 48) writes: 'La scène du siège est une excellente bouffonnerie.' Farce is too often judged with excessive leniency by critics who fear to be regarded as 'pedants' and 'superior persons.' But bad farce and good farce both exist. Fabia could have found first-rate farce, with *coups de bâton* all complete, in the sack-scene of *Les Fourberies de Scapin* (which, however, incurred the censure of Boileau).

[3] Vv. 391 *sqq.*

Both, as it happens, rise to the height of their destiny through elephants; but note the difference. In Plautus[1] we read:

*Ar.* eccum. vel elephanto in India,
quo pacto ei pugno praefregisti bracchium.
*Py.* quid, 'bracchium'?
*Ar.* illud dicere volui, 'femur.'
*Py.* at indiligenter iceram.
*Ar.* pol siquidem
conixus esses, per corium, per viscera
perque os elephanti transmineret bracchium.

Terence relates an exploit of *esprit*[2]:

invidere omnes mihi,
mordere clanculum: ego non flocci pendere:
illi invidere misere; verum unus tamen
impense, elephantis quem Indicis praefecerat.
is ubi molestus magis est, 'quaeso' inquam 'Strato,
eon es ferox, quia habes imperium in beluas?'

Similarly, the drunkenness of Chremes and his timidity when it is proposed that he should face the onslaught of Thraso and his followers, are but slightly sketched, whereas Plautus would have given diffuse details with great *brio*, and the situation is quickly lifted from farce to high comedy by another manifestation of Thais' mastery and good sense.[3] And when the quasi-Plautine passages are done with, we return to the genuine Terence in the excellent scenes[4] where Pythias takes her revenge upon Parmeno. There, as we saw, our poet dexterously turns upside-down the traditional conception of the rascally slave; moreover an equally well-worn *motif*, the deception of the old father,[5] hitherto lacking, is suddenly introduced near the close,

[1] *Miles Gloriosus* vv. 25-30.

[2] Vv. 410-5. Terence has, moreover, departed here from Menander's *Colax*. There the Miles boasts of his drinking feats, which his parasite describes as surpassing those of Alexander.

[3] Vv. 727-770. [4] Vv. 941-1024.

[5] The power of a tradition, to make readers neglect new elements in work which *prima facie* follows the tradition, is well shown by

not as the achievement of Parmeno, but through the trickery of Pythias, and neatly brings about the happy ending instead of the usual confusion and intrigue.

This comedy, then, clearly marks a transition-period in the career of Terence. His gracious style, indeed, is no new development; his psychology is as fine as ever; his splendid conception of the courtesan who guides and invigorates men instead of debasing them is not entirely novel, however far Thais goes beyond the Chrysis who stands behind *The Girl of Andros*. But the poet is also clearly feeling his way towards new ground, and those who watched his attempts with discernment and taste might fear that he was losing his way. While seeking for a greater simplicity of plot, he has merely relaxed that close-knit texture so remarkable in *Self-Punishment*, and has bulked out his comedy, not developed it, by the Thraso-passages which are partly an inadvertent return to the type shown by the Charinus-scenes in *The Girl of Andros*, partly an effort to be superficially, not subtly, amusing, after the manner of Plautus. It is significant, and was in the circumstances dangerous, that *The Eunuch* was a real popular success, owing in all likelihood to the regrettable narrative[1] of Chaerea, but in part also to the sprightliness[2] of the whole. The chief point, however, for the historian of literature, is that Terence is alertly seeking to develop his method; and the last three dramas will show how admirably he avoided the pitfalls which at this moment surrounded him.

the *Periocha* of Sulpicius Apollinaris, who entirely omits the rôle of the *senex*. But he manages to squeeze in the phrase *suadet Parmeno* in connexion with Chaerea's impersonation. The statement is not strictly true, but the detail is traditional, and so must be put in.

[1] Fabia (p. 19) well observes that his mimicry, indicated here and there (vv. 595, 601 *sqq.*), must have doubled the value of his speech.

[2] The vigorous opening seems to have been especially admired by excellent critics. Quintilian quotes the first words, *quid igitur faciam*, several times.

V.

# Phormio

## (*PHORMIO*)

Act I.—A slave named Davus visits his friend Geta, who explains that his master Demipho, father of Antipho, and his master's brother Chremes, father of Phaedria, are both abroad, the former in Cilicia, the latter in Lemnos; both the sons were left in Geta's charge, but speedily got out of hand. Phaedria has fallen in love with a music-girl, Pamphila, but having no funds cannot buy her from the slave-dealer to whom she belongs. Antipho loves a beautiful maiden, Phanium, of poor but respectable position, who has just lost her mother and whose single attendant, the nurse Sophrona, has told him he can win her only by marriage. As she possesses no dowry, Antipho did not dare to risk his father's anger, but the 'parasite' Phormio came to his aid, pretended that Phanium was his kinswoman, and brought a suit against Antipho to compel him by Attic law as her alleged next-of-kin to marry her. The youth purposely lost the case and made Phanium his wife. Geta is in special distress because the two fathers are expected to return shortly.

Antipho and Phaedria lament their ill-fortune; each envies the other. Antipho fears he will be compelled by his father to give up Phanium, Phaedria is miserable because he cannot buy Pamphila. Geta arrives in consternation, announcing that Demipho, Antipho's father, has arrived. The youth loses his nerve and runs away, commending Phanium to the championship of Phaedria and Geta.

Act II.—They pull themselves together and face the old man, who enters full of rage at his son's weakness in submitting to Phormio. First Phaedria does his best to mollify his uncle, then Geta; but with bitter reproaches

Demipho sends Phaedria to fetch his son, and Geta to find Phormio. The old man when alone decides to fetch certain friends to assist him in his interview with Phormio. He goes out.

Phormio and Geta enter. The slave has informed his companion how matters stand, and begs him to save them all. Phormio announces that he has a plan to save Antipho, leave Phanium undisturbed and turn all Demipho's wrath upon Phormio himself. Geta is filled with admiration, but expresses fear for the 'parasite's' safety; the other explains the delights of such a career as his. Demipho returns with three friends as his advisers. Phormio takes the initiative and upbraids Demipho with neglect of his poor but worthy relative—the imaginary father of Phanium—and snobbery in pretending to know nothing of a man who was his second cousin, by name Stilpo (a detail which Phormio remembers only just in time). 'Why,' he asks, 'did not Antipho refute me if my claim was false?' Demipho at length offers five minae if Phormio will take the girl back—the legal dowry which it is Demipho's business to pay if she is really his kinswoman. The other contemptuously refuses; she is now Antipho's wife. After more wrangling the two part, Demipho threatening to turn Phanium out-of-doors, and Phormio warning him of an action if he does so. The old man now turns to his friends. One advises a lawsuit, the second holds that the marriage cannot be annulled, the third recommends further consideration. Demipho in perplexity decides to await the return of his brother Chremes and to follow his advice. Geta is left alone and decides to tell Antipho what has passed.

Act III.—Antipho returns, bitterly reproaching himself for his cowardice in leaving the defence of Phanium to others. Geta tells him how Phormio, Phaedria, and himself have upheld his cause.

Phaedria enters, beseeching the slave-dealer Dorio to give him three days' grace; he will then pay the thirty

minae required for Pamphila; Dorio is obdurate. Antipho and Geta intervene; their entreaties and abuse at length wring a 'concession' from Dorio—the soldier who proposes to buy Pamphila has arranged to pay tomorrow morning; if Phaedria anticipates him with the money, the girl shall be his. The two young men turn to Geta, urging him to find the sum needed. After much grumbling he agrees, and departs to enlist Phormio's aid, bidding Antipho come and console Phanium.

Act IV.—Demipho enters with his newly-returned brother Chremes, and from their conversation it appears that Chremes has had in Lemnos a second wife, who bore him a daughter. His recent journey was taken with the purpose of bringing them to Athens, for both he and Demipho wish to make a match between Antipho and this daughter. But the ladies in Lemnos, tired of waiting, had set out for Athens before his arrival. He is anxious that Demipho should get rid of Phanium, since it is necessary to him that Antipho should marry his daughter; a strange son-in-law might easily make trouble over Chremes' bigamy, which he of course wishes to conceal from his Athenian wife. Demipho promises to assist.

Geta enters, congratulating himself on Phormio's readiness to help him in getting the money for Phaedria; he is pleased to see Chremes, for now he finds two strings to his bow. Antipho enters stealthily and overhears with dismay the conversation between the slave and the old gentlemen. Geta tells them that he has found a remedy for Antipho's misalliance; he has induced Phormio to accept terms. Phormio has explained that he wished at first to marry Phanium himself, but she had no dowry, and he has debts. Therefore he became betrothed to a lady who has a dowry. If Demipho will pay what he needs he will break his engagement and take Phanium; the funds required amount to thirty minae (the sum needed by Phaedria for Pamphila). Demipho is furious at this extortion, but Chremes volunteers to find the money;

he has brought back from Lemnos the rents of his (Athenian) wife's estates there. Demipho sulkily agrees, and the two enter Chremes' house to fetch the money. Antipho comes forward and reviles Geta for launching so dangerous a scheme, but the slave assures him that Phormio will easily find a way to avoid marriage with Phanium. Meanwhile the loan which Phaedria is expecting from friends will come to hand; with this Phormio can repay the sum now to be received from Chremes. Antipho retires, and Demipho prepares, accompanied by Geta, to find Phormio and pay him. Chremes bids him on his return to ask Nausistrata, Chremes' wife, to visit Phanium and make matters as agreeable as may be.

Act V.—When Demipho and Geta have gone, Chremes catches sight of Phanium's nurse, Sophrona, who is distressed by the danger to the girl from Demipho's hostility. To his amazement he recognizes in her his own daughter's nurse. He quickly learns that Antipho is already married to his daughter, and, enjoining secrecy upon Sophrona, follows her to interview Phanium.

Demipho and Geta return from paying Phormio, and Demipho goes to fetch Nausistrata. Geta retires to warn Phanium that she need not fear the supposed purpose of Phormio. Demipho and Nausistrata enter, the lady complaining of the poor revenue Chremes extracts from her estates. Chremes meets them, coming from his visit to Phanium. He is now, of course, eager to let matters stand as they are, but cannot explain to his brother in Nausistrata's presence. He announces in a lame, guilty fashion that he has found Phanium after all to be their relative. Nausistrata is at length got back home, nothing loth, for she likes the girl, and Chremes takes his brother away to explain.

Antipho returns, rejoicing in Phaedria's good fortune, but lamenting his own plight. He is followed by Phormio, who, having received the money from Demipho, paid it to the slave-dealer, and transferred Pamphila to Phaedria,

intends to avoid the old men and drink in peace. Seeing Antipho, he begs him return his brother's earlier championship by standing up for him while he drinks with Phormio. Geta suddenly bursts out upon them in a rapture of delight. Coming to visit Phanium, he found that Sophrona and Chremes were already there. Thus he learned all the news. Antipho is to remain the husband of Phanium, and Geta has been sent to fetch him.

Phormio now sees a way to get money from the old men for Phaedria instead of collecting the proposed loan from friends. Demipho and Chremes approach, calmly announcing that they wish Phanium to remain Antipho's wife, and asking Phormio to repay the thirty minae. He refuses, explaining that he has paid the money away and broken off his other engagement. Demipho bursts into abuse, whereupon Phormio threatens to reveal to Nausistrata Chremes' double life. Chremes is terrified, but his brother counsels courage. Nausistrata must know now; let them tell her themselves and defy Phormio. They fling themselves upon him, and amid the fray Phormio shouts for Nausistrata. She comes out, and is told the whole story. Chremes is utterly abashed and his wife resentful, so that Phormio is able to reveal Phaedria's amour and win full indulgence for him. Demipho obtains Chremes' pardon, and the old bigamist's last humiliation is hearing Phormio invited to dinner by his wife.

In *Phormio* the momentous feature is that Terence's strictly dramatic power has come to maturity. The two later plays will reveal him as far greater in psychology, in radiant and subtle sincerity, in sheer human feeling. Moreover, even as regards technical construction we can pick a few minute holes in this comedy. But here for the first time we discern a certain stately ease in development, a masterly orchestration introducing each person with his special interests, each event with its peculiar contribution, a plot which though complicated is never jumbled, which though it is constantly refreshed by new develop-

ments is free from jerkiness or haste. All the interest,—Antipho's marriage, the intrigue of Phaedria, the bearing of Chremes' bigamy upon the plot,—is skilfully contrived and manipulated so as to converge upon Phormio[1]; and if we ask, as well we may, why Pamphila does not prove to be the daughter of Demipho and thus a *civis Attica* like the best of them, the answer throws a most interesting light upon the value which Terence puts upon Phormio. Were she discovered to be Demipho's daughter, her marriage to Phaedria would instantly commend itself to all parties. As it is, she can only become his mistress, and that the consent of his parents to this arrangement is obtained in the end without effort gives the measure of Phormio's mastery of the situation at the close as elsewhere.[2]

He is an engrossing figure. Terence calls him a *para-*

[1] It is astonishing that Professor R. G. Moulton (*The Ancient Classical Drama*, 2nd ed., pp. 415-7) has been able to make on this comedy a series of excellent and detailed remarks which well-nigh ignore Phormio himself. This is a melancholy but valuable example of the manner in which technical tradition can blind critics to unexpected developments (cp. p. 68. *n.*). Professor Moulton is so full of 'the usual contriving slave' (p. 415) that he actually misleads his reader: 'the slave, possessed of the secret [Chremes' bigamy], has brought about a disclosure to the uncle's wife' (p. 416). This is literally true; but who would guess that the central figure in the disclosure-scene is Phormio?

[2] Molière's *Les Fourberies de Scapin*, which is based upon *Phormio*, is intensely attractive, not only for its own merits, but also as a study in the 'imitation' of one playwright by another. Phormio disappears, or rather Scapin roughly combines him and Geta. And it is especially interesting to observe that Molière does make Zerbinette the lost daughter of Argante. This renders impossible the special triumph described above; hence, we may surmise, the substitution of the richly farcical scene (III. ii.) where Scapin persuades Geronte, one of the fathers, to hide in a sack and then inflicts upon him a series of thrashings supposed to be administered by different ferocious strangers.

Professor Ashmore seems to be in error when he writes (*Introduction*, p. 36) that the *Phormio* is reflected in 'parts of Molière's *Le Mariage Forcé*.' The two plays have nothing in common, save that in Molière's first few lines there is a reminiscence of Terence's opening.

*situs*,[1] and some marks of that profession belong to him, as when he calls himself *homo edax*[2] and discourses to the admiring Geta on the philosophy of dining-out[3]; but even there, what attracts him is less the delicate viands than the sense of power and *savoir-vivre*—he is a scenic Aristippus. Phormio is, in fact, far less a parasite than a συκοφάντης,[4] a subtle and elegant blackmailer, transcending such pantry-stormers as the Artotrogus of the *Captivi* in the same degree as Thais transcends the conventional *meretrix avara*. To all seeming he concocts and administers a swindle on the principle of 'art for art's sake'; though no doubt he often obtains free meals from grateful clients, these benefits suggest 'the sweets of office' much rather than a solitary, or indeed definite, aim of his efforts. Throughout, he acts because of benevolence and professional pride; his last exploit but one is in this respect highly significant. Already he has carried out what was asked of him, as he explains in magnificently concise language; and now he proposes to take a holiday[5]:

> argentum accepi, tradidi lenoni: abduxi mulierem,
> curavi propria ut Phaedria poteretur; nam emissast manu.
> nunc una mihi res etiam restat quae est conficiunda, otium
> ab senibus ad potandum ut habeam; nam aliquod hos sumam dies.

But when he learns Chremes' secret, his instinct for artistic finish at once asserts itself. He really cannot leave Phaedria to put things straight by a mere crude loan. How much better to collect the necessary funds permanently and elegantly from the *senes*! Away goes his scheme

[1] V. 122. [2] V. 335. [3] Vv. 338-345.

[4] Donatus more than once calls him *sycophanta*. Cicero's language (*Pro Caecina*, x.) suits a blackmailer much better than a flatterer: *Nec minus niger, nec minus confidens, quam ille Terentianus est Phormio*. Dziatzko-Hauler, too, remark (p. 79) that he is 'partly a parasite, partly a sycophant' (*i.e.*, of course, συκοφάντης).

[5] Vv. 829-832.

for a holiday, and he turns once more to his task[1] with the quiet sense of high standards appropriate to a Cabinet Minister recalled just as he steps into the Brighton train. From beginning to end Phormio's part is an admirable example of *finish*: witness the manner in which all the action hangs upon him without his needing to shoulder his way into every scene; the exquisite 'fingering' wherewith he manages the most awkward situation or delicate conference: the conciseness, point and precision of his language. To compare the parasites of Plautus with this polished creature is like comparing a game of hunt-the-slipper with a game of chess.[2]

That gracious style, already so often noted, is here exhibited in an even more surprising degree. Striking epigrams, it is true, are not more common, though we find the renowned *quot homines tot sententiae*[3] and a proverbial phrase[4] which is however borrowed from Plautus: *dictum sapienti sat est.* But this play is marked by an even higher level of quiet elegance and by an occasional unforced stroke of even more amusing wit. Davus, red-headed like all comic slaves, is waiting for Geta, when the latter comes out, calling over his shoulder: 'If anybody with red hair inquires for me . . .'[5] Phaedria, whose attentions

[1] Vv. 884-893.

[2] Donatus on v. 315 (the first appearance of Phormio) repeats a story which in some degree tells against the view put forward here. *Adhuc narratur fabula de Terentio et Ambivio ebrio, qui acturus hanc fabulam, oscitans temulenter atque aurem minimo inscalpens digito, hos Terentio pronuntiavit versus: quibus auditis exclamaverit poeta, se talem, cum scriberet, cogitasse parasitum, et ex indignatione, quod eum saturum potumque deprehenderat, delinitus statim sit.* It is possible, no doubt, to be elegantly intoxicated; but one's impression of this scene, as of the others, makes one doubt the anecdote, which, moreover, does not occur in Suetonius' *Vita Terenti* though Suetonius does give a story of similar type and interest—that of Caecilius when he listened to the *Andria*. Donatus, indeed, seems not to appreciate Phormio's methods. On v. 317 he writes: *Nisi a Geta cogatur, modo etiam negotiorum Antiphonis negligens est atque securus.*

[3] V. 454. [4] V. 541. Cp. Plautus, *Persa*, V. 729. [5] V. 51.

to the slave-girl are confined to escorting her home from the music-school, is called her *paedagogus*.[1] At one crisis Antipho in a fury asks Geta what disaster he has caused[2]:

*An.* quid egisti ?
*Ge.* emunxi argento senes.
*An.* satin est id ?
*Ge.* nescio hercle : tantum iussus sum.

When Chremes learns that his nephew, already known to be married, is married to his daughter, he instantly assumes that everyone is like himself: *quid? duasne uxores habet?*[3] Another brilliant stroke is the unanswerable commonsense of Dorio, the slave-dealer: *sic sum ; si placeo, utere*,[4] and what follows. Another is the poignant simplicity of the heartbroken Phaedria[5]:

alius ab oculis meis illam in ignotum abducet locum ? hem :
tum igitur, dum licet dumque adsum, loquimini mecum, Antipho,
contemplamini me . . .
quoquo hinc asportabitur terrarum, certumst persequi
aut perire.

This is exactly the spirit and the central concept of *Manon Lescaut*. The same delicate instrument is capable of greater dexterity than ever. When Davus remarks: 'I suppose the youth fell in love ?' many writers could supply Geta with a neat answer, but no one save Euripides, and perhaps Congreve or Carcinus, could have given him one so finished as *scin quam? quo evadat vide*.[6] The same nimbleness of phrase marks Demipho's explanation, *is qui istanc*;[7] but examples need not be multiplied. That Terence could, when he chose, write also with weightiness of phrase is shown by Geta's outburst[8]:

o Fortuna, o Fors Fortuna, quantis commoditatibus . . .

[1] V. 144. [2] Vv. 682 *sq.* [3] V. 754.
[4] V. 527. [5] Vv. 549-552. [6] V. 111.
[7] V. 618. [8] V. 841.

which reminds one of Tennyson's superb bit of nomenclature, 'The dragon of the great Pendragonship.' Other incidental merits, noted in the earlier plays, are seen here in undiminished power. One instance[1] of excellent moralizing will suffice :

ita sum inritatus, animum ut nequeam ad cogitandum instituere.
quamobrem omnis, quom secundae res sunt maxume, tum maxume
meditari secum oportet, quo pacto advorsam aerumnam ferant :
aut fili peccatum aut uxoris mortem aut morbum filiae ;
communia esse haec, fieri posse, ut ne quid animo sit novum ;
quidquid praeter spem eveniat, omne id deputare esse in lucro.

The personality of Phormio, and linguistic brilliance, form two of the three outstanding merits found in this comedy ; we miss excellence in the parts allotted to women, for though Nausistrata is good, she can scarcely be set beside Chrysis or Thais. The third notable success is the management of the plot ; a comparison of *Phormio* with *Self-Punishment* (not to mention the other two earlier works) reveals a remarkable increase of mastery. Both comedies show much complexity, but whereas the former is so ruthlessly constricted that even a careful reader finds it difficult, the latter is so beautifully conducted that even a spectator could follow it with comfort, save for a very few too-curtly written passages. The different interests of Antipho, Phaedria, Demipho and Chremes, together with Phormio's all-pervading activity and versatile re-adjustments, might seem to promise a hopeless tangle. But each person is introduced with his special problem just when we are ready for him, not before, and just when he is needed ; till then we postpone him but without forgetting him, since the author, in the course of other scenes, gives us brief but sufficient reminders from moment

[1] Vv. 241-6.

to moment. One first-rate instance is provided by the rôle of Chremes. Important as he is, this character does not appear till the Fourth Act, where his bigamy is calmly revealed by the conversation[1] between him and his brother; but we have been steadily prepared for him and his situation. First[2] we learn that he is absent on a trip to Lemnos, no reason being given by Davus, who however in the same breath accounts for Demipho's journey to Cilicia. At the end[3] of the scene occurs a brief reminder of his absence; later,[4] Demipho resolves to await his arrival and advice, while Antipho, hearing this, dreads his uncle's return.[5] The reader will find other examples of this dexterity; for instance, at the close[6] of the important Phaedria scene with the slave-dealer, we are kept in mind of Antipho's trouble by Geta's admonition that he should go and comfort Phanium.

The result of such care and skill is that many curt descriptions of a complex situation puzzle no one. Compare with Syrus' masterpiece in *Self-Punishment*,[7] and the temporary bewilderment into which it throws us, the limpid clearness of Phormio's ultimatum[8]:

si vis mi uxorem dare,
quam despondisti, ducam; sin est ut velis
manere illam apud te, dos hic maneat, Demipho.
nam non est aequom me propter vos decipi,
quom ego vostri honoris causa repudium alterae
remiserim, quae dotis tantundem dabat.

So sure of his success herein is Terence that he relies absolutely upon the power of his audience to follow him with ease. When Antipho upbraids Geta for proposing that Phormio shall be induced by Demipho to marry Phanium himself, the slave points out that there are many ways to postpone the wedding, and adds: *interea amici*

[1] Vv. 572-590.
[2] Vv. 65-8. Cp. Donatus: *Recte tacetur, cur Chremes ierit, et dicitur cur Demipho.*
[3] V. 147. [4] Vv. 460 *sqq.* [5] V. 481.
[6] Vv. 563 *sqq.* [7] Vv. 709-714. [8] Vv. 924-9.

*quod polliciti sunt dabunt.*[1] The poet is confident that we shall understand, remembering Phaedria's explanation[2] nearly two hundred lines before :—

nequeo exorare ut me maneat et cum illo ut mutet fidem
triduom hoc, dum id quod est promissum ab amicis
argentum aufero.

It may be observed in passing that such remarks as that of Chremes,[3]

tu modo filium
fac ut illam ducat, nos quam voluimus,

gain much more effect if the experienced auditor already guesses that the bride whom the brothers wish to expel, and the bride whom they wish to impose, are the same person.

But this confidence has led Terence too far. The plot of *Phormio*, first-rate as it is, shows certain slight defects, not indeed of construction, but of description—the mechanism is itself faultless, but the exposition of it is in places too curt. The characters now and then talk in a way which does indeed correspond accurately to their hopes, suspicions or intentions, but which is hard to grasp at once for anyone who is not, like their creator, inside their heads. Chremes' description[4] of the anxiety caused him by Antipho's marriage is doubtless what he would say in real life; but the playwright should have shown more indulgence to his public. Again, when Antipho returns and asks Geta for news of the meeting between his father, Phaedria, and Geta, one[5] of his questions is *num quid patri subolet?* Of course he does not mean 'Has my father any suspicion that I am married?' But what he does intend is less evident: 'Has he any inkling that my submission to Phormio was a trick?' That we can, and do, comprehend this after a little thought is no reason why Terence should not make it plain at once. The same extraordinary terseness marks Phormio's account[6] of his

[1] V. 703. [2] Vv. 512 *sq.* [3] Vv. 670 *sq.*
[4] Vv. 578-584. [5] V. 474. [6] Vv. 888 *sq.*

new plan: he intends that Chremes shall against his will and without his knowledge give to Phaedria the thirty minae which he (Chremes) has already handed to Phormio; but all that we read (after a mention of Phaedria's money-troubles) is:

> idem hoc argentum, ita ut datumst, ingratiis ei datum erit.

By writing such passages the dramatist pays his audience a subtle compliment which unfortunately they little merited. No doubt he gained the admiration of Laelius and Furius Philus, but the great mass of spectators must for a moment have been left behind. Their powers of seizing a point may be estimated by the artless procedure which Plautus found necessary. To take an instance at random, the stratagem, positively patriarchal in its simplicity, whereby the money in the *Asinaria* is diverted into improper channels, is elaborated, expounded, worked threadbare, and guffawed over, until one begins to wonder if there will be room in the play for anything else. The prologue to *Amphitruo* is a positive curiosity in this kind; its opening passage is possibly unrivalled in all literature for prolixity. Mercury wishes to say that if the Romans expect him to foster their commerce they must give the play a hearing; he succeeds in his task, at the expense of no less than sixteen solid iambic lines! Now, though Plautus is not the most sparkling of poets, he does not execute these melancholy feats from unmixed native ineptitude; a good deal must be laid at the door of his public. It is not hard to see why Terence was never more than the favourite of a coterie, save when he produced *The Eunuch*.

If this extreme fineness of execution makes a few passages of *Phormio* difficult, it results also in exquisite finish at the very edges[1] of the plot, just the place where Sophocles

[1] On v. 740, where Sophrona addresses Chremes as 'Stilpo,' Wagner remarks 'This is one of the weakest points of the whole comedy, as the whole plot would have come to a breakdown if Demipho had mentioned the name of Phanium's father to Chremes.'

himself (even when not compelled by his *data*) has admitted crudities. The finest tendrils are beautifully woven together. Thus, when Chremes informs Sophrona that Stilpo is not his real name, she ejaculates[1]: *istoc pol nos te hic invenire miserae nunquam potuimus.* Nausistrata, learning of her husband's double life, suddenly sees daylight on what has puzzled her before—*haecine erat ea quae nostros minuit fructus vilitas*[2]—and so throws back dramatic interest upon her former complaint[3] to Demipho.

More important features show the same consummate skill. The plot, instead of forming a series of explosions, develops by a natural growth. Chremes' wish to conceal his bigamy serves to maintain Phormio's position as master of the action. When he discovers[4] that Phanium is his daughter, he provides perhaps the best scene of light comedy which Terence ever composed. He has suddenly changed his mind altogether about Antipho's supposed misalliance, but cannot explain to Demipho since his wife is present, and at his own suggestion. Phormio, as we saw, begins his schemes anew with perfect naturalness when he unearths the highly serviceable bigamy. Demipho's pugnacious temperament, in which we have been steadily instructed since his first appearance,[5] induces him in the end to do what he has been yearning to do throughout: he defies[6] Phormio's open attempt at blackmail and so brings about the revelation to Nausistrata which destroys Chremes and sets Phaedria's affair in safety, giving him indeed the unheard-of triumph that instead of being compelled to sue for his father's indulgence he is actually appointed by his mother the arbiter of Chremes'

Phormio (v. 390) in his altercation with Demipho, certainly mentions that name, but Demipho disbelieves the whole story, so that his failure to repeat the name to Chremes is quite credible. Similarly, in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, a premature *éclaircissement* is prevented from arising out of Tiresias' accusations against Oedipus, by the furious incredulity of the latter.

[1] V. 747. [2] V. 1013. [3] Vv. 787-793.

[4] This discovery forms the *peripeteia* of the play.

[5] Vv. 231 *sqq.* [6] Vv. 955 *sqq.*

future[1]: *eius iudicio permitto omnia.* Finally, Terence here employs, not for the first or the last time, the brilliant device of making two difficulties solve one another. Antipho's marriage and Phaedria's love seem each separately doomed to misfortune; but their juxtaposition, so far from increasing trouble, proves the only way in which it can be met. The central fact of the comedy is this, that Chremes' anxiety and consequent desire at all costs to secure Antipho as his son-in-law induce him to pay Phormio as Phanium's dowry the very sum needed to purchase Phaedria's beloved from the slave-dealer. On the other side, Phaedria does his best for Antipho, meeting Antipho's enraged father and concealing from him the part taken by Antipho in the law-suit. Demipho's comment[2] is thoroughly apt: *tradunt operas mutuas.* Despite this co-operation, at no point is there confusion on the one hand or any gap on the other. Antipho's sudden fit of cowardice,[3] which makes him shirk the first interview with his father, leaves the field clear for Phaedria to earn by his championship that succour for his own troubles which Antipho's affair later provides.[4] Conversely, the two interests meet in the scene with Dorio, where the desperation of Phaedria moves Antipho to pity and sympathy, emotions which result in Phormio's aid being summoned with perfect success.[5]

[1] Vv. 1043 *sqq.*

[2] V. 267.

[3] Vv. 216 *sqq.*

[4] Cp. Donatus on v. 269: *Vide quem ad modum iam praestruat ad ea, quae futura sunt, ad adiuvandum amorem Phaedriae.*

[5] Vv. 536 *sqq.*

VI.

# The Mother-in-Law

(*HECYRA*)

Act I.—Philotis, a courtesan, converses with an aged female friend named Syra about the conduct of Pamphilus, who, after assuring his mistress, Bacchis, repeatedly that he will never marry while she lives, has done so. Syra expounds the moral: let Philotis despoil her lovers and eschew all affection. Parmeno, slave of Pamphilus, enters and gossips with Philotis. Pamphilus, he explains, despite his passion for Bacchis, was induced by his father Laches to marry Philumena, daughter of Phidippus, but has been her husband in name only. He is filled with distress and seeks Bacchis' company, but she has denied herself to him. This treatment and the sweet patience shown by his neglected wife have turned his heart to Philumena. Meanwhile a relative's death has caused Laches to send Pamphilus to Imbros, in order to settle his affairs. The young wife was left with her mother-in-law, Sostrata, while Laches lived on his farm. At first the two ladies agreed well enough, but lately Philumena has developed a strong aversion for Sostrata. Finally she made an excuse to visit the house of her own parents, Phidippus and Myrrina. She now refuses to come back, alleging illness; Sostrata, who tried to see her, has not been admitted, and Laches has returned to town for an interview with Phidippus.

Act II.—Laches enters, violently scolding his wife Sostrata for alienating her daughter-in-law: what will Pamphilus say when he returns? His wife answers with patient dignity, defending herself but not blaming Philumena. Phidippus enters, and Laches at once accuses him and his family of unfairness, requesting that Philumena be sent back before Pamphilus returns. The other explains that Philumena cannot bear to live with Laches and

Sostrata if Pamphilus is absent; nor will he compel her to return. Laches sees in this a confirmation of his own charges against his wife, and the two men go off to the Market Square, leaving Sostrata to lament the evil reputation of mothers-in-law and to protest her affection for Philumena.

Act III.—Pamphilus, newly returned from Imbros, enters lamenting, attended by Parmeno; he has but recently conquered his passion for Bacchis, when now he learns from Parmeno that he must choose between his mother and his wife. The slave urges that the cause of the quarrel is probably slight: women, like children, have only rudimentary intellects. The youth is sending Parmeno to announce his arrival, when they hear the sounds of excitement from Phidippus' house. They listen, and it appears that Philumena is seriously ill; the husband's love rises to agony, and he rushes within. Parmeno decides not to follow, lest his interference should bring more censure upon Sostrata. The latter comes forth, having heard the noise, and prays for Philumena's recovery. Parmeno delights her with the news of her son's return, but dissuades her from visiting Philumena; let husband and wife have an explanation undisturbed. Pamphilus comes out in distress, but greets his mother and announces that his wife is a little better. He hurries Sostrata into her own house and sends Parmeno off to help bring his luggage.

Left to himself, the young man breaks into anguished soliloquy. His sudden entry has enabled him to discover that Philumena is in childbirth, and he knows that the infant is none of his. Myrrina has appealed to his generosity. Philumena, she explained, before her marriage suffered violence from some unknown man; that is her reason for leaving Laches' house. Pamphilus alone knows that he is not the child's father; let him keep the secret and do as he will about taking Philumena back; the infant shall be exposed. This appeal has won Pamphilus'

consent, he tells us. But though he loves Philumena, he is determined not to take her back. As he ends, Parmeno approaches, and his master, fearing he may learn the truth, hurriedly sends him off again to meet some imaginary friend of Pamphilus. The slave grumblingly moves off, while Pamphilus, still in wretched perplexity, turns to find Laches and Phidippus at hand. After greetings and inquiries about the errand to Imbros, Laches tells his son that Phidippus has agreed to send Philumena back. Pamphilus, in a courteous and wary answer, explains that as his wife cannot agree with his mother, he must consider the latter rather than the former. Laches urges him not to be too obstinate. The other wretchedly insists, and when Laches continues to press him to receive his wife again, he rushes away. Phidippus retires in a huff, and the harassed father goes home, determined to wreak his vexation upon his wife.

Myrrina enters in despair. Her husband Phidippus has heard the baby's cries and rushed in to see his daughter. In a moment Phidippus comes out, filled with resentment against his wife for concealing Philumena's condition from him. Why should she have done so, since Pamphilus is of course the father? And why has she determined to make away with the child, which would be a bond of friendship between the two families? He begins to understand, he tells her. She objected in the first instance to their daughter's marriage with a man who kept a mistress, and has therefore been scheming since to wreck the marriage. Myrrina faintly protests, but is overborne by the eloquence of her husband, who declares that Pamphilus' slowness to break with Bacchis shows what a steadfast husband he will prove. Myrrina requests him simply to ask the young man whether he will take his wife back or not. Phidippus agrees and goes within to give orders that the baby shall not be removed from the house. Myrrina miserably soliloquizes and mentions that there is no clue to her daughter's ravisher, who snatched her ring on his departure. She fears that Phidippus' determination that

the child shall be reared, may induce Pamphilus after all to break silence.

Act IV.—Sostrata tells her son, in a speech of sad dignity, that she understands how he must blame her for this quarrel. She has heard from Laches that Pamphilus has decided to stand by her, but she refuses to allow this sacrifice. She will retire into the country with his father and leave him free to take Philumena back. Pamphilus protests: how is she to give up her friends and her social habits? Sostrata quietly insists, and is sympathizing with him when Laches steps forward and seconds the plan of his wife, who retires to prepare for her departure. He urges Pamphilus to agree. Phidippus enters and is told by Laches what is proposed. He replies that Sostrata is in no way to blame; his own wife Myrrina is alone responsible. Then he calls upon Pamphilus at any rate to receive the child. Laches is amazed and delighted to hear of this event, but expresses his annoyance at the secrecy about it which Myrrina has kept; Phidippus agrees. Pamphilus does his best to maintain his position without revealing the secret, till Laches, who insists that they should take the boy, grows angry and accuses his son of continuing his connexion with Bacchis: this indeed must be why Philumena left the house. At length Pamphilus once more takes to flight. The two fathers agree that Bacchis must be compelled to give Pamphilus up. Laches sends for her, and Phidippus goes to fetch a nurse for the baby.

Act V.—Bacchis now arrives in some perturbation to talk with Laches. Their conversation begins cautiously on both sides, and after an exchange of compliments, Bacchis requests the old man to come to the point. He does so with an accusation that she is still his son's mistress; she must now give him up. Bacchis declares that she has closed her doors upon Pamphilus since his marriage. Laches is delighted, and begs her to give the same assurance to the ladies. Bacchis, despite her reluctance to face them,

agrees because of her wish to justify Pamphilus, who has deserved well of her. Laches praises her and hints a threat. Phidippus returns, bringing a nurse, and hears with pleasure of Bacchis' purpose; all should now be well. The courtesan stifles her reluctance to face Philumena and goes in to see her. Laches, left to himself, remarks that Bacchis is acting in a way that will advance her own interests.

Parmeno returns, grumbling over his wildgoose chase. Bacchis comes out and bids him fetch Pamphilus with the message that Myrrina has recognized as her daughter's the ring which Pamphilus once gave to Bacchis. Parmeno trudges off again, and she explains that a joyful discovery has been made: Pamphilus is the unknown ravisher of Philumena and hence the child is his.

Pamphilus, accompanied by the mystified Parmeno, hurries in, full of joyous excitement. He and Bacchis greet one another with affectionate delight; she congratulates him upon the charm and breeding of his wife. They agree not to act as people do in comedies, where everyone discovers everything. No one not already in the secret shall be told the facts. Parmeno, who makes various attempts to discover what has happened, is complimented and kept in the dark.

There can be few more curious freaks in the history of criticism than the ancient and the modern opinion concerning this drama. It was twice produced with utter failure. On the first occasion, as the prologue informs us, a combat of boxers and commotion in the theatre stopped the performance; on the second, a rumour of a gladiatorial display dispersed the audience.[1] Only at the third presentation did Rome hear this comedy to its end. That verdict is endorsed by modern critics; one brilliant writer[2] when discussing Terence confines his expression of opinion regarding *The Mother-in-Law* to a brief paren-

[1] *Hecyra* vv. 25-33.
[2] Dr. J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, p. 24.

thesis—'not, it is true, a play which shows the author at his best'; and instances of such an attitude could be given in abundance. Sellar, in his copious *Roman Poets of the Republic*, can find no room for a single comment on this drama. Parry writes: 'This play is not remarkable for any of the spirit which generally appears in Terence's plays,' and proceeds to mild comments on 'the air of restraint' and the 'less interesting' characters therein found. Tempting as it is to refer these extraordinary criticisms to the Victorian blight which brought both drama and popular dramatic taste in England to the lowest point compatible with civilization, we must remember that all other opinion,[1] tacitly or not, has pointed the same way. Most people are prone to confuse comedy with farce. Even so, however, they ought not to find *The Mother-in-Law* less attractive than *All's Well that Ends Well* or (still more to the purpose) the French *comédie larmoyante*, as Beaumarchais called it. But the easy course has been to follow Roman tradition, and look upon a markedly unfarcical comedy as no comedy at all. So it comes about that this play is condemned or ignored in a spirit which, if universally applied, would relegate *Le Misanthrope* to a footnote.

The truth is, that if we look simply at the work Terence has here bequeathed to us, we find the purest and most perfect example of classical high comedy, strictly so called, which dramatic literature can offer from any age or any nation. Euripides, Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Molière, Congreve, Shaw, have all produced comedies or quasi-comedies which surpass this in one or other of the merits which this type of drama can properly exhibit. Euripides is more poignant, Aristophanes more vigorous, Shakespeare more picturesque; Molière makes us smile oftener, Congreve showers epigrams more lavishly, Shaw has a sharper

[1] So, in America, Prof. Ashmore writes in his generally admirable edition of the plays (*Introduction*, p. 33) that this has the 'least merit' of Terence's works. Cicero, fond as he was of our poet, never (I believe) quotes this play.

flavour. But as a picture of a complication in human life involved, relieved, and disentangled by sheer natural humanity, its every detail based upon a psychology truthful, sympathetic, magnificently courageous and presented with gracious mastery, its pervading sense of urgent reasonableness glowing like a limpid atmosphere—in these virtues our neglected play has stood unsurpassed for twenty-one centuries.

Three characteristics rivet the attention: its maturity, its reasonableness, and one simple peculiarity in the handling, which may be dealt with first. It is a peculiarity which the earlier plays might have led us to expect that Terence would sooner or later give to one at least of his works.

It is a woman's play—not feminist, not expounding any special doctrine, but with women as the chief sufferers, the chief actors, the bearers here of the Terentian *humanitas*. Philumena, the neglected loving bride who is never shown to us, but who sways her husband, father and mother quietly and steadily throughout; the two wives, Myrrina and Sostrata; Bacchis, the former mistress of Pamphilus—all these are vividly drawn and supply the motive force from moment to moment. Beside them the men, Laches and Phidippus the fathers, Parmeno the slave, and Pamphilus the young husband, show far less vigorously though their language is vehement enough. The women manage them, but are too wise to let them know it; possibly they are too gentle and single-hearted to realize it themselves. Two, Sostrata and Bacchis, are characters who would do credit to any dramatist in the world's history.

This fact that the *Hecyra* is a woman's play will incidentally help us to understand the neglect which it has suffered. Roman audiences expected the proprieties to be observed. If a woman was a *matrona*, she ought to behave as such. If she was not a *matrona*, things were equally straightforward: she was either a *virgo* or a *meretrix*. The former was the easier; so completely did the 'prunes and prisms'

régime theoretically prevail, that she had simply no characteristics whatever, and was in consequence never exhibited at all. Nor was the other difficult to draw—a jadedly facile person with the mechanical acquisitiveness of a jackdaw and with an incredible *miles* hovering in the background. Give the Roman this, and he knows where he is. But present him with a masterpiece like the *Hecyra* and he is lost. Terence on the threshold of his play brings forward Syra expounding the familiar 'bird-of-prey' theory which all sensible *meretrices* must follow; and the playgoer settles down to his customary repast. Then he is confronted with a *matrona* and a *meretrix* who do not know their business in the least, or only mention it as a prelude to doing something quite different.[1] To make bad worse, there is no *virgo* waiting in the wings to marry the hero as soon as the performance is over; the young woman is a wife before the affair begins, and has already had something of a married career. But we may still fix our hopes upon the comic slave. Alas! Parmeno understands what is expected of him, but he is never given his chance. Never was there a rôle more desperately devoid of what professional slang calls 'fat.' Every time this unhappy satellite enters manfully to perform his duty as a *veterator*, a *versutus servus*, and the rest, he is mercilessly ordered off the stage to make room for the play.[2] Is this endurable? We came here to enjoy ourselves. The aediles ought to be flung into the Tiber! But hark! Someone cries the happy tidings, 'Gladiators!' Exit the audience. Terence has failed ignominiously through giving us real people and natural conduct.[3]

[1] Vv. 277 *sqq.*, 600, 775 *sq.*

[2] Donatus evidently relished this point: he notes it again and again.

[3] This paragraph was written without (so far as the writer is aware) any memory of Pichon's very similar remarks (pp. 81 *sq.*). He sums up thus. 'C'est le renversement de toutes les traditions! Et l'on dirait que l'auteur prend à tâche de souligner toutes ces nouveautés: tous les personnages ont soin de remarquer qu'ils ne sont pas comme les autres. Les spectateurs n'y comprennent

Nor is this the poet's only offence. A great writer of our own time has said that one at least of his novels may attract 'that large and happy section of the reading public which has not yet reached ripeness of years; those to whom marriage is the pilgrim's Eternal City, and not a milestone on the way.'[1] Most comedies of the New Athenian and the Roman type dealt, like most novels, with a love-affair ending in a marriage. Terence for once enters the field so magnificently cultivated by Ibsen, and now positively overrun—more, probably, through his influence than that even of Mr. Hardy—the development of character and emotional experience after marriage. The *jeune premier* is already a husband, the question of the drama is whether he shall take back his wife, and the *peripeteia* is the disclosure of a fact which at length, but suddenly, induces him to do so with joy and relief. Could anything seem less promising to the experienced playgoer reared on *pabulum* like the *Asinaria* and the *Trinummus?* No one proves to be anyone's long-lost relative, there are no *crepundia*, no *leno*, none of the incredible stupidities whereby the persons get at cross-purposes and keep the play alive or at any rate in being. It is, however, interesting to note by the way how Terence here, as elsewhere, uses so much of the conventional scenic happenings as proves useful and natural. Pamphilus commits an intolerable outrage. This is a familiar point in such comedy, but the use made of it is totally new. Instead of bringing about the marriage of the pair concerned, it remains undiscovered till after their wedding, and then creates the whole problem by forcing Philumena to leave her husband's home: it separates instead of uniting. Again, the cunning 'valet' is retained; but the only use made of him is to emphasize the type of work set

plus rien. Ils se fâchent, ils s'en vont, et la pièce tombe.' Donatus, too, in his Argument remarks: *In tota comoedia hoc agitur, ut res novae fiant, nec tamen abhorreant a consuetudine. Inducuntur enim benevolae socrus, verecunda nurus, lenissimus in uxorem maritus et item deditus matri suae, meretrix bona.*

[1] Mr. Thomas Hardy, Preface to *A Laodicean*.

before us, by the fact that, so far from managing or even helping the plot, he has constantly to be driven from the scene or commanded to hold his tongue if he stays.[1] He does, it is true, provide the one farcical passage, when Pamphilus despatches him to meet some imaginary person on the Acropolis[2] and hurriedly gives him the absurd description[3]

magnus, rubicundus, crispus, crassus, caesius,
cadaverosa facie.

The famous 'choleric' father, too, makes his expected bow. But in place of the usual bad-tempered old imbecile whose one function is to be swindled out of the statutory forty minae, we find a man who is naturally angered by an important cause: Laches is quite reasonably incensed by Pamphilus' refusal to take back his wife even when all objections appear to have been removed, and so inevitably suspects Bacchis, which suspicion directly leads to the solution of the whole trouble. Syra, again, expounds the customary view as to a courtesan's *modus vivendi*, and this serves as an excellent foil to the conduct actually adopted by Bacchis, who restores happiness and peace to everyone (save indeed Parmeno) by refusing to follow the recognised lines.

Since the play is a study in married life, Sostrata, Philumena's mother-in-law, is brought into the foreground.[4] Despite the splendour of Bacchis, Terence is well justified in naming his work, after Sostrata, *The Mother-in-Law*. Upon her quiet, patient, wise spirit the whole action

[1] Vv. 359, 409-443, 810, 873-880.

[2] Terence (v. 431) calls it simply *arx*, though no doubt his 'model' mentioned the Acropolis. This is a rather striking instance of his method of excluding definitely non-Roman features.

[3] Vv. 440 *sq.*

[4] When Donatus in his Argument remarks *primae partes sunt Lachetis, secundae Pamphili, tertiae Phidippi, quartae Parmenonis: ac deinceps aliarum personarum, quae his adiunctae sunt*, he is not committing such a terrible lapse as that in the corresponding statement in the Argument to the *Adelphoe*; for he plainly refers to the length of the rôles. Nevertheless the remark, especially as regards Parmeno, is rather ludicrous.

swings. Philumena's departure is attributed by Laches to a quarrel with her, wherein the fault is entirely hers; the refusal of Phidippus' family to admit her when she calls, confirms his suspicion. Pamphilus on his return thinks himself compelled to choose between his mother and his wife; after he has heard of the child and must refuse to take Philumena back without disclosing his reason, he finds an excuse in the supposed quarrel and insists that *pietas* forces him to side with Sostrata. When his mother hears this, she offers to withdraw into the country, and Pamphilus' refusal to grasp this solution persuades Laches that Bacchis' influence must still be sovereign over his son; hence his interview with the courtesan and the happy explanation. Thus, our affection for Pamphilus, our sympathetic amusement at Laches, our delighted admiration of Bacchis, are all dominated by the calm pervasive influence of Sostrata. Her structural value is equalled, nay, if possible surpassed, by her excellence as a character-study. She is a marvel of tender serene strength, dignity which is never pride, patience which is never weakness, sympathy always watchful, wise and unfailing. If Sophocles[1] had composed high comedy, a woman such as this would have been set beside Tecmessa and Deianira. At her first entrance she wins our hearts by her response to the petulant and baseless invective of her husband[2]: 'Why I am accused, Laches, I know not, so may the gods love me and so may it be granted us never to part so long as we live!' Nor will

[1] This is perhaps the best place to mention a feature of the Terentian dramaturgy which did not strike me until I had read Donatus, who mentions it several times: the risk that comedy which is 'high,' 'serious,' 'sentimental,' or *larmoyante*, may improperly pass over into tragedy, and the measures which Terence has taken to avoid the danger. See, for example, Donatus on *Phormio* 5 (*tenui esse oratione et scriptura levi*): *Re vera autem hoc deterior Menandro Terentius iudicabatur, quod minus sublimi oratione uteretur; quod ipsum nunc purgat, dicens in tragoediam altiora transire posse.*

[2] Vv. 206 *sq.*

she defend herself at the expense of her son's wife[1]: 'How do you know, my husband, that her reason for pretending to hate me is not the wish to see more of her own mother?' This affectionate sympathy, which breaks out more plainly when she is alone,[2] brings Sostrata forth instantly at the sound of Philumena's distress; though she has been once repulsed from her neighbour's door, she would again make the attempt did not Parmeno convince her that she will be wise to leave husband and wife uninterrupted. Her last scene, where she announces to Pamphilus her decision to withdraw to the country-house, shows Sostrata at the height of her sure-footed wisdom. When he protests against her quitting friends and social pleasures for his sake, she answers[3]:

nil iam istae res mihi voluptatis ferunt:
dum aetatis tempus tulit, perfuncta satis sum: satias iam tenet
studiorum istorum. haec mihi nunc curast maxima, ut ne quoi mea
longinquitas aetatis obstet mortemve exspectet meam.
hic video me esse invisam immerito; tempust me concedere.
sic optume, ut ego opinor, omnis causas praecidam omnibus:
et me hac suspicione exsolvam et illis morem gessero.
sine me obsecro hoc ecfugere, volgus quod male audit mulierum.

Terence has often written more dazzling lines, but even he has never excelled this magnificent expression of unforced sad dignity, this voice of sheer goodness. Her language is like her heart and brain, her conduct, even (as we may believe) the garments that she wove and wore—plain, humdrum, middle-class, but touched to unobtrusive charm. She wins the triumph of all nobly selfless spirits, that the lesser beings among whom she moves are lit by her radiance. Parmeno, the soul of inquisitiveness,[4] is

[1] Vv. 235 *sq.* [2] Vv. 274-280. [3] Vv. 593-600.
[4] Vv. 873 *sq.*, and *passim*. He confesses it himself, v. 112.

restrained from slinking into the house of Phidippus to learn Philumena's secret by the thought that he may thus compromise his mistress.[1] Pamphilus, in the midst of his longing for Philumena, yet puts his mother at the same height in his regard.[2] And Laches, who at first received her prayer 'So may we grow old together!' with the sneer[3] 'Heaven shield me from mischief!' can at last, when he has listened to his wife's words concerning her retirement, utter language[4] fit to be set beside them :—

> e medio aequom excedere est : postremo nos iam fabula sumus, Pamphile, 'senex atque anus.'

She has won her victory, without waiting for the revelation made by Bacchis and Myrrina. The young African freedman has created a woman such as Browning might have imagined, Thackeray endowed with speech, and Rembrandt painted for a companion to the portrait of his own mother.

The other great figure, as we said, is Bacchis. Terence has wisely and skilfully avoided all overlapping of the two parts. But the instant after Sostrata has finally left the stage, the action begins to receive from Bacchis a pressure which steadily increases till her sunny kindliness pervades the close. She has of course been discussed before, particularly in the conversation[5] between Phidippus and Myrrina, wherein the old man accounts for his wife's design to expose the infant by her objection to Pamphilus' amour. In the earlier scenes we gain glimpses of a woman lovable and strong-willed. Philotis laments[6] to Syra that Pamphilus, after swearing to Bacchis that he would never marry while she lived, has now deserted her. Parmeno's story in the same scene reveals how potent is Bacchis' sway over his master : only with wretched

[1] Vv. 327-335. [2] Vv. 601 *sq.* [3] V. 207.

[4] Vv. 620 *sq.* Thomas, on v. 607, remarks : 'Lachès, touché des paroles de sa femme, lui donne le nom d'*uxor* et non plus celui de *mulier*' (ep. v. 525). Heinsius (*Ad Horatii de Plauto et Terentio iudicium dissertatio*) well says of this passage : *sine motu animi et suavissima voluptate legi non possunt.*

[5] Vv. 536-556. [6] Vv. 58-63.

reluctance did he at length marry Philumena, and he has remained for months her husband only in name. Every day he has visited Bacchis, but with wisdom and good-feeling—what Parmeno chooses to term spite and whimsiness[1]—the courtesan has kept her doors closed. Such are the hints we possess by the time Bacchis enters in some anxiety for her interview[2] with Laches. From this point to the close we move amid ever-increasing interest on an astonishingly high level of dramatic art. These scenes remind one of nothing so much as the renowned *finale* of *A Doll's House*. There is the same utter mastery of dialogue, never strained or shrill but none the less elastic and trenchant; the same handling of a familiar *scène à faire* in a manner entirely novel and arresting without any effect of posturing or rawness. That, unlike Ibsen's work, which has pursued a magnificent career as an inspiration to other dramatists, the Latin masterpiece had no future at all, is simply one more evidence of the normal Roman taste in art; to offer that audience the *Hecyra* was like presenting a schoolboy of twelve with *The Egoist*.

Laches awaits his visitor with a portentous determination to exhibit marvels of tact[3]:—

> videndumst ne minus propter iram hinc impetrem quam possiem,
> aut ne quid faciam plus, quod post me minus fecisse satius sit.

He confronts this magnificent woman, of whose nature he not only knows nothing, but fancies he knows everything, with the threadbare *savoir vivre* of a jaded Minister

[1] V. 159.

[2] Among the reasons offered in the prologue for the failure of this play is *clamor mulierum*. It may well be that the women in the audience were scandalized by the favourable picture of a courtesan in this and the following scenes. Wagner, too, (*Introduction*, p. 4 *n.*) suggests that Bacchis was the unpopular element.

[3] Vv. 729 *sq.* Donatus throughout this scene regards Laches as a *mitis senex* and shows some reason for approving his manner. The reader will judge for himself between this view and that suggested by the present writer.

preparing to receive a strikers' deputation. His first idea is conversational fencing : ' You are wondering, no doubt, why I have sent my man to fetch you.' Bacchis gives him at once an opportunity to realise her temperament by an answer which, without a touch of the expected ' brazenness,' holds a note of defiance backed by candour and dignity :—

> ego pol quoque etiam timida sum, quom venit in mentem quae sim,
> ne nomen mihi quaesti obsiet ; nam mores facile tutor.

These words are almost a translation of what was said above concerning Thais in the *Eunuchus* : only the external fact of her profession can discredit her ; as for her conduct, that she can easily justify.[1] Terence insists on taking every human being on his own merits ; labels are mischievous rubbish in his eyes. We have seen time and again how he loves to take some familiar *dramatis persona* and discover a new character beneath the traditional mask. It is the method followed by Euripides before him, by Ibsen and Shaw after him. But whereas the other three commonly reveal the weakness or evil of some accepted idol, Terence always discloses the strength and righteousness of a recognised ' black sheep.' Bacchis is his noblest achievement in this field.

But we must return to her interview with Laches. He answers her with an involved and pompous warning that her peace depends upon good behaviour ; nor does he omit the ritual phrase ' at my time of life.'[2] The lady thanks him and begs him to come to the point, which he does at

[1] Vallat, *Quomodo Menandrum*, etc., pp. 34 *sq.* exactly reverses this view. His remarks are a good example of that attitude of mind which judges the fruit by the tree : ' Quantum ab istis scortis differt illa meretrix, quae, in Hecyra fabula, amicitiam omnium sibi liberalitate parit, nec cavendum est ne tanti pendatur quanti pudica mulier ; ejus enim dotes infamem, quam degit, vitam obliterare non possunt.' See also Legrand, p. 458.

[2] V. 737.

last with commendable speed, bidding her give up Pamphilus for some more certain protector. She protests that since his marriage she has seen nothing of him. 'How charming of you!'[1] replies the other, and coolly asks her to go in and offer the same assurance to the ladies. It never enters his head that Bacchis has any delicacy of feeling and may find such a confrontation painful. She agrees, though she dreads the task, simply because of her affection for Pamphilus[2]—*meritus de me est, quod queam illi ut commodem*—for Laches' observation, that she will thus free herself of suspicion, has no effect. The old man, remarking that her words have made him her well-wisher, is sending Bacchis within doors with broad hints (such is his sense of the position!) of the harm he will do her should she fail him, when Phidippus enters and learns what Bacchis intends to do. His appearance, be it observed, adds nothing to the progress of events; the scene is devised for the sole purpose of throwing into still stronger light the nature and conduct of the woman. When Phidippus is told that she swears her innocence, he offers the traditional comment[3] *nec pol istae metuont deos neque has respicere deos opinor.* It would scarcely serve to condemn this outright as a brutality; by this time we feel more compassion for people like Phidippus than for people like Bacchis. These are only the words of a man who 'knows how to deal with this type.'

Bacchis repeats her expression of desire to secure Pamphilus' happiness[4]:—

quod si perficio, non paenitet me famae,
solam fecisse id quod aliae meretrices facere fugitant—

and after Phidippus has entered his house, Laches again encourages her, still pointing out the prudence of her course, and with the poignant cry *perii, pudet Philumenae*, she goes within, leaving Laches, who has even now no glimmering of her pain, to rub his hands and expatiate on

[1] V. 753 (*lepida es*).
[2] Vv. 758 *sqq.*
[3] V. 772.
[4] Vv. 775 *sq.*

the good Bacchis is doing herself. In a few minutes she returns and hastily despatches Parmeno with news for Pamphilus which the latter alone will understand; then she relates to us the history of the stolen ring and of its recognition by Philumena's mother. All is now well for Pamphilus, incredibly well. We should add, immensely better than he deserves; but not a hint of this falls from the lips of her 'whom the gods ignore,' as the excellent Phidippus puts it. She is filled with generous delight at his good fortune, and utters over her own lost happiness an epitaph of the most piercing sweetness and dignity, words the most affecting and beautiful that even Terence ever penned[1]:—

ego dum illo licitumst usa sum benigno et lepido et comi,
incommode mihi nuptiis evenit, factum fateor:
at pol me fecisse arbitror, ne id merito mi eveniret.

In a moment she is greeting this man whom she has given up for ever, not because of his father's preachments, but at the moment of his marriage and despite his continued appeals. It is delightful to observe that he at any rate appreciates her to the height: *o Bacchis, o mea Bacchis, servatrix mea!* Then follows a wonderful moment, not of love-making, but of something as charming, as valuable, and a good deal rarer—hearty friendship and admiration on both sides made fervent by memories[2]:—

*Bacchis*: This is splendid news; I am overjoyed.

*Pamphilus*: Your actions convince me of that. You are just as attractive as in the old days; to meet you, to converse with you, to see you enter any company, is an unfailing delight.

*Bacchis*: But what of you? Indeed you have just the same manner and spirit as in the old days. There's not a man walking the earth to-day who excels you in winning speech.

[1] Vv. 837 *sqq.* [2] Vv. 857-862.

Then she compliments him on his wife and delights him by the highest praise a Roman could give a woman, *perliberalis visast*.[1] They agree to share the secret of Pamphilus' child with no fresh hearers, and Bacchis passes from the scene. There is no need to dilate further upon this noble and adorable woman, who thinks herself unfit to address Philumena, and whom Phidippus regards as one upon whom the gods turn their backs. His mention of Heaven may put us in mind of what was proclaimed to men like him: 'Verily the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.'

It has been already remarked that this comedy is filled with splendid reasonableness. This note is to be observed in the style, the moralizing, the construction and character-drawing. Quotations already given have shown this quality on the linguistic side. There is much less wit than usual and the jokes are naturally few. When Parmeno first appears, he tells his fellow-servant: 'If the old man asks for me, say I have gone to the harbour to inquire about Pamphilus' arrival. . . . If he doesn't ask, say nothing, so that I may employ that excuse another time.'[2] This, together with the brief talk between father and son about the Imbrian inheritance, and the description, already given, of Pamphilus' imaginary 'corpse-faced' friend, are perhaps the only passages in the whole play which raise a smile. The moralizing is still excellent. Syra's exclamation[3]:—

> eheu me miseram, quor non aut istaec mihi
> aetas et formast aut tibi haec sententia ?

reminds one of the French proverb *si jeunesse savait . . .* and of Horace's lament.[4] Equally apt is the admonition[5]

> non maxumae sunt maxumas quae interdum iras iniuriae faciunt.

[1] Heinsius (*op. cit.*) well says of this passage: *Nemo sine incredibili ac summa voluptate leget.*

[2] Vv. 76-80. [3] Vv. 74 *sq.* [4] *Odes* IV. x. 7 *sq.*

[5] Vv. 307 *sq.* Donatus perversely describes it as *servilis ratio et sordida.*

Phidippus even finds much that is good and striking about his son-in-law's amour[1]: 'It is natural at his age. But, believe me, the time will come when he will loathe himself.' He discovers in the young man's constancy to the courtesan proof that he will make a good husband.[2] Even when he is unjust to Myrrina, Phidippus has excellent reasons.[3] Laches alone is brutal, when he reviles[4] his wife as the cause of Philumena's departure, but even this outbreak is caused by his wish to be reasonable: he seeks to avoid friction between the families. Later,[5] it must be confessed, after his unsatisfactory conference with his son and Phidippus, he goes home to wreak his vexation on poor Sostrata; but this lapse is discreetly committed, if at all, behind the scenes.

Equally reasonable is the plot. There is complexity, but it causes no confusion or strain in the spectator's mind, despite the novel fact that what puzzles the characters of the play puzzles us also.

Such things as Pamphilus' being really the father of Philumena's child are, of course, regularly kept from the audience, but that her reason for leaving Laches' house should be as deep a mystery to us as to him and all the others, is a distinct innovation. This increases our interest without baffling it. We follow all the cross-purposes with perfect ease. The misunderstandings are absolutely natural as well as affecting—for example, the interview between Sostrata and her son—instead of being mechanically forced upon miraculously stupid people as in Molière's *Sganarelle* and a thousand other comedies. Apart altogether from such triumphs as the portraits of Sostrata and Bacchis, *The Mother-in-Law* should be carefully studied for its steady natural development of action.[6] Thus, when Pamphilus hears the outcry which announces his wife's distress, the affection for her needed by the plot

[1] V. 543. [2] Vv. 554 *sqq.* [3] Vv. 524-565.
[4] Vv. 198 *sqq.* [5] Vv. 513 *sqq.*
[6] *E.g.* Donatus admirably points out, on v. 638 (*accipias puerum*), *mire hoc maxime adiecit, quod maxime recusat Pamphilus, et propter quod uxor quoque non reducitur.*

is strengthened by the plot.[1] Again, since he must hold Philumena at arm's length without disclosing his true reason, he must fall back on the supposed quarrel between her and his mother.[2] This determines Sostrata to retire, and his refusal to accept that solution brings Laches into contact with Bacchis. It is Phidippus who puts this last manœuvre into Laches' head.[3] This, again, comes about because Myrrina, not being able to tell her husband why she has intended to expose the child, is compelled to acquiesce in his theory that she still chafes at Pamphilus' affair with Bacchis.[4] Foolish or almost motiveless concealment of vital knowledge has formed the very backbone of many a bad novel and play; it would be difficult to compute the number of good men and true who have come within sight of the gallows itself in order to 'shield a woman' when three minutes' general sanity would have explained the compromising opera-cloak to the satisfaction of all. It is therefore important to realise the complete naturalness of the secrecies which Terence has here depicted.

An admirable symmetry is provided by the accusations which Laches and Phidippus launch against their respective wives, and it is created without the least derogation from psychological truth or structural sincerity; each husband of course meanwhile represents himself as an indulgent family-man.[5] A far more dexterous stroke is the mode by which the same event—the birth of Philumena's child—makes Laches obstinate in one direction and Pamphilus equally obstinate in the other. It reminds one of that still more striking and elaborate masterpiece of plot-work whereby Oscar Wilde, in *Lady Windermere's Fan*, causes Lord Windermere and his wife, owing to the same occurrence, to change radically, and in opposite directions, their

[1] Vv. 325 *sq.*
[2] Vv. 470 *sqq.*
[3] V. 716.
[4] Vv. 537 *sqq.*, 711 *sqq.*
[5] Vv. 247, 270 *sq.* Donatus on v. 516 draws attention to the fact that Phidippus' scolding of Myrrina balances the conversation between Laches and Sostrata, *et tamen varie et alio modo, ut mores inter se diversos et tamen notos possimus agnoscere.*

views concerning Mrs. Erlynne. Perhaps the most charming feat of artistry comes at the very end, where Bacchis and Pamphilus agree to outrage all comic convention, and, instead of summoning the whole cast to hear the explanation, keep it to themselves: the last scene shows no one but the two friends and the mystified Parmeno. *Placet non fieri hoc itidem ut in comoediis*[1] says Pamphilus openly; it is the voice of Terence himself maliciously insisting upon the originality of his work.

[1] V. 866.

## VII.

# The Brothers

### (*ADELPHOE*)

Act I.—Micio, an elderly bachelor, expresses the anxiety caused him by the youth Aeschinus, who has not been home all night. He explains that his brother Demea has two sons, Aeschinus and Ctesipho, the former of whom Micio has adopted. The youths have received very different treatment, since Demea is a man of austere principles governing Ctesipho by fear, and living with him on the farm; Micio, an easy-going town-dweller, believes in managing Aeschinus by indulgence and by encouraging his confidence. Demea enters, enraged by a fresh escapade of Aeschinus, who has broken into a house, beaten the master and slaves, and carried off a girl whom he loves. The whole town cries shame upon him. What a contrast to his brother, who lives frugally at the farm! Micio is to blame for this. In reply Micio reminds his brother that they would both have acted thus in their young days had they commanded sufficient funds. He urges the raging Demea to stand by their agreement: Aeschinus is Micio's charge and Demea must not interfere. The other chokes down his wrathful distress and departs. Micio confesses to himself that Aeschinus is giving real cause for uneasiness. He has been extremely licentious, and the hopes raised by a suggestion of Aeschinus' own that he should marry have been destroyed by this new freak. Micio goes to seek him.

Act II.—Aeschinus and a slave enter, escorting to Micio's house the slave-girl whom Aeschinus has abducted. They are followed by Sannio the slave-dealer, who loudly protests against the theft and the assault committed by Aeschinus. The youth quietly encourages the girl and, when Sannio becomes more vehement, makes his man beat him. The girl is sent within, and a dispute follows between

Sannio and Aeschinus, who contemptuously offers to pay cost price for the girl: if Sannio is unwilling, then the abductor is prepared to maintain in the courts that she is really a free woman. He goes indoors, and Sannio is anxiously weighing his chances of collecting any money at all, when Syrus, the attendant of Aeschinus, comes out and induces him to accept cost price because Sannio is on the point of making an important voyage to Cyprus. The slave-dealer realizes that he has been caught at an awkward moment and is reduced to entreating Syrus' favour. Ctesipho, Aeschinus' brother, enters in rapturous delight over the abduction. It is he who loves the music-girl; Aeschinus has taken the odium upon himself since Ctesipho has not dared to risk Demea's anger. Aeschinus returns, and Ctesipho salutes him with fervent gratitude. Aeschinus and Syrus take Sannio off to the Market Square to make the payment, leaving Ctesipho to visit his mistress and order preparations for a banquet.

Act III.—Sostrata and her servant Canthara come in, discussing the plight of Pamphila, Sostrata's daughter. The girl is about to be confined, as the result of a rape committed by Aeschinus. At this moment the slave Geta hurries in, burning with sorrow and resentment. He tells Sostrata that Aeschinus has betrayed them: he has now another mistress, whom he has openly carried off. Sostrata is overwhelmed: Aeschinus has been their only stay, the devoted lover of Pamphila, whose child he has promised to lay on Micio's knees; he has sworn to gain Micio's consent to their marriage. She determines to fight, and despatches Geta to fetch their one friend, Hegio, her late husband's intimate. Canthara is sent for the midwife, and Sostrata goes within.

Demea enters in distress, having heard that Ctesipho is implicated in the abduction; if Aeschinus is corrupting his brother, all is lost. Seeing Syrus approach, he listens, and finds that Micio has been told everything and approves. Demea falls upon the slave with reproaches, but Syrus

pretends to share his indignation and draws a flattering comparison between the two 'fathers.' Ctesipho, he adds, is filled with horror at his brother's escapade, and has gone off to the farm. After some badinage, Syrus induces Demea to depart thither also, and goes back into the house. The old man is on the point of setting out when to his delight he sees Hegio, for whom he has a vast respect. Hegio enters accompanied by Geta, who has just explained Aeschinus' relations with Pamphila. He vigorously espouses her cause and announces to Demea that Aeschinus, after wronging Pamphila and eagerly promising marriage, has deserted her for a music-girl. While they talk, Pamphila is heard crying in the pangs of childbirth. Hegio makes a moving appeal to Demea, who at once goes to interview Micio. Geta takes Hegio into Sostrata's house, whence in a moment he returns, assuring her of his unflinching support.

Act IV.—Ctesipho learns from Syrus that Demea has been hurried away to the country, but still fears that his father, finding him absent, will return and spoil his happiness. In a moment Demea is actually seen approaching, and Syrus hustles the young man indoors, promising to set things straight. Demea enters, grumbling that he cannot find Micio, and has moreover heard from a farm-hand that Ctesipho is not at home. He is on the point of entering Micio's house, but Syrus, despite the fact that Ctesipho keeps thrusting his head forth to give whispered instructions, retains his self-possession and reinstates Ctesipho in Demea's eyes by bitter complaints that the youth has thrashed the music-girl and himself. When Demea inquires for Micio, Syrus directs him to a cabinet-maker's shop at the other end of the town. By the time he has withdrawn, Ctesipho has gone to his mistress, so Syrus retires for a snack and a bottle.

Micio and Hegio enter, in full accord. The former agrees to act rightly by Pamphila, explains the abduction, and accompanies Hegio into Sostrata's house.

Aeschinus comes in, utterly miserable. Canthara, on her way to the midwife's, met him and reproached him with his desertion. Loyalty to his brother prevented his explaining, and the evidence looks so black against him that he determines to pull himself together and see Sostrata and Pamphila. He is waiting to be admitted, when Micio comes forth, and to punish him for his past deceit resolves to trick him for a while. He explains who the ladies are and his reason for visiting them: a friend who is next-of-kin to Pamphila proposes to marry her and took Micio to the house as a witness. Aeschinus is in despair. Why should this stranger wish to carry the girl away to Miletus? Micio mentions that the mother has some story of a child born to a man unnamed, who she thinks has a prior claim. The young man vehemently reproaches his 'father' for not supporting this view, and describes the probable distress of the unknown lover. Micio waves all this aside, and asks his 'son' to come away, when he notices that Aeschinus is in tears. In a moment all is candour and affection between them. Micio, after grave censure upon the youth's supineness in allowing matters to drift so long, tells him that he shall marry Pamphila at once. Aeschinus in passionate gratitude determines to make his 'father's' wishes his law for the future. He goes to prepare for the wedding.

Demea returns, disgusted by his fruitless search for Micio, but suddenly meets him on his own threshold, and bursts into a wrathful account of Aeschinus' double-dealing. His brother irritates him by taking this coolly and proposes that the bride and the music-girl shall share his house; finally, he begs Demea to show himself gay at the wedding. Left to himself, Demea laments the ruin of his family, crowned by Micio's lunacy. Syrus, slightly intoxicated, comes out and receives the brunt of Demea's fury. He is about to escape, when a slave calls out to him that Ctesipho needs him indoors. The old man's suspicion is aroused and he bursts into the house. Micio, who has been conferring with Sostrata about the wedding, comes

from her door and is met by his brother, who rushes forth shouting with rage over his discovery of Ctesipho's amour. Micio reads him a lecture, pointing out that they have enough money between them to pay for the escapades of the young men. Demea vows vengeance upon the music-girl and is bantered by his brother, who retires to superintend the wedding arrangements.

Act V.—Demea in a long soliloquy resolves to change his ways. Micio has by indulgence won the hearts of both Ctesipho and Aeschinus, while he, their real father, has no affection from them. He will now adopt his brother's popular method. This new-found urbanity he first practises upon Syrus and Geta. When Aeschinus appears, complaining of the tedious preparations, Demea bids him throw aside all ceremony, knock down the garden-wall between the two houses, and convey Pamphila home at once. Aeschinus joyfully agrees, and in a moment Micio comes to ask why the wall is being destroyed. Demea explains, and suddenly calls upon Micio to marry Sostrata. The other in amazement refuses, but Demea and Aeschinus urge him until he consents. Next he is forced to present Hegio with a farm, then to give Syrus his freedom, to free Syrus' wife, finally to give him a 'loan.' Stupefied with wonder he asks Demea to explain this change in him. His brother points out that Micio's popularity is based on mere indulgence; then, turning to Aeschinus, he offers to be a less rigid but still a sound adviser and friend to the two young men. Aeschinus delightedly accepts, and gains his father's consent to Ctesipho's liaison on condition that it is the last.

This magnificent drama is generally thought the masterpiece of Terence. Whether it is or is not fully equal to *The Mother-in-Law* might well be debated at some length; but if we admit the poet's own career as an element in the question, then his last play must bear away the palm since it reveals the author as envisaging a wider problem than

that presented by its predecessor.[1] Meanwhile it is important to seize a more immediate fact. As the earlier work is a woman's play, so is this a man's play. The unhappy situation of Pamphila, the distress of Sostrata, are depicted with vigour and deep sympathy, but they are only an ingredient in the questions which lie before the men, precisely as in the *Hecyra* the men are subordinate to Sostrata, Bacchis and Philumena. Our subject here is, superficially, the love-affairs of Aeschinus and Ctesipho; fundamentally, it is the question: What should be the relations of father and son? So it comes about that one may wonder who 'the Brothers' are, the young men or the old, or whether perhaps all four are intended. But it very soon grows plain that the precise centre[2] of interest is the clash between the policy of Micio and that of Demea. Nor, of course, is there any jar between the superficial theme and the fundamental; the former, interesting in itself, is the occasion for raising the latter into view. Instead of main plot and underplot, we find one topic with two aspects, the particular and the general, the exciting and the instructive—a theme, though vastly slighter, yet as skilfully managed as that of the *Oresteia* itself.

[1] The edition of Dziatzko-Cauer (Leipzig, 1903) p. 1, points out other interesting developments, though the present writer can by no means agree that no other Terentian play is a 'character-comedy,' or that Demea is the chief person of the *Adelphoe*. 'Die Adelphoe . . . nehmen unter den Lustspielen dieses Dichters dadurch ein besonderes Interesse in Anspruch, dass sie allein aus dem sonst von Terenz gepflegten Genre der Intrigenstücke zum Teil heraustreten und ihrem wesentlichen Inhalte nach den Charakterkomödien zuzurechnen sind. Nur in diesem Lustspiel tritt bei Terenz im Verlauf der Handlung und durch sie eine Entwicklung in der Denk-und Sinnesweise der Hauptperson —diese ist Demea—ein; wie die Schürzung des Knotens, so ist dessen Lösung mit Demeas charakter in die engste verbindung gebracht.'

[2] Donatus in his *Argument* reports certain astonishing views. *In hac primae partes sunt, ut quidam putant, Demeae, ut quidam Syri. Quod si est, ut primas Syrus habeat, secundae Demeae erunt, tertiae Micionis, et sic deinceps. Quamquam etiam sunt, qui putant, primas Micioni dandas, secundas Syro, tertias Demeae.*

If, before examining the psychology and construction, we turn our attention upon the literary quality, we observe precisely the same virtue as in *The Mother-in-Law*—a finished pervasive elegance which gives continual pleasure without at any moment calling attention to itself. Considering the absolutely first-rate style of the whole, there are comparatively few 'quotable passages,' such as Syrus' maxim,[1] *ut homost, ita morem geras*—'You can preach to mites only in terms of cheese'—and Micio's unforgettable phrase,[2] *erubuit: salva res est.* To these may be added Hegio's appeal[3]:—

> sed, Demea, hoc tu facito cum animo cogites:
> quam vos facillume facitis, quam estis maxume
> potentes dites fortunati nobiles,
> tam maxume vos aequo animo aequa noscere
> oportet, si vos voltis perhiberi bonos.

If this suggests the familiar *noblesse oblige*, an equally well-known apophthegm of Shakespeare is recalled by Demea's later words[4]:—

> quid facias? si non ipsa re tibi istuc dolet,
> simulare certe est hominis.

The characterization of the women, though excellent so far as it goes, is clearly subordinate. Canthara's loyalty brings Aeschinus to the door of his beloved at a critical moment.[5] The fine self-respect of Sostrata introduces Hegio.[6] He and the two slaves, Syrus and Geta, are useful but not specially interesting as characters. Hegio does, of course, show dignity and resolution. There is much quiet knowledge of the world, too, in this man, particularly when he reminds Micio how important is tact in dealing with the poor.[7] Syrus is amusing, especially when he parodies Demea's sermon with an 'object-lesson' based on saucepans.[8] Some remains of the traditional stage-valet are to be found. Syrus remembers enough of

[1] V. 431. [2] V. 643. [3] Vv. 500 *sqq.*
[4] Vv. 733 *sq.* [5] Vv. 610-634. [6] Vv. 344-352.
[7] Vv. 605 *sqq.* [8] Vv. 413-431.

this rôle to protect Ctesipho by sending Demea on a wild-goose chase across Athens. Geta provides an extremely curious and characteristically Terentian point. One of the most familiar attractions offered by Roman Comedy was the spectacle of a slave with important news galloping along the street and knocking down all who barred his path.[1] The best example is to be found in the *Curculio*,[2] which it will be well to quote :—

> date viam mihi, noti ignoti, dum ego hic officium meum facio : fugite omnes, abite et de via secedite,
> ne quem in cursu capite aut cubito aut pectore offendam aut genu.
> ita nunc subito propere et celere obiectumst mihi negotium,
> nec usquam quisquamst tam opulentus, qui mi obsistat in via,
> nec strategus nec tyrannus quisquam nec agoranomus nec demarchus nec comarchus nec cum tanta gloria, quin cadat, quin capite sistat in via de semita.

This popular *motif* is in a sense given to Geta ; but instead of mere intrusive rowdyism it is strictly dramatic, however similar the language may be—the faithful retainer longs passionately for vengeance upon those who have ruined the life of his young mistress[3] :—

> me miserum, vix sum animi compos, ita ardeo iracundia.
> nil est quod malim quam illam totam familiam dari mi obviam,
> ut ego hanc iram in eos evomam omnem, dum aegritudo haec est recens.

[1] Cp. *Heaut.* 31 *sq.*, *Eunuchus* 36, and Dio Cassius (xliv. 250) on the uproar after the assassination of Julius Caesar : *αὐτοί τε ἐς φυγὴν ὥρμησαν ᾗ ἕκαστος ἐδύνατο καὶ τοὺς προστυγχάνοντας σφίσιν ἐξέπλησσον τῆς ὁδοῦ.*

[2] Vv. 280 *sqq.* The last word, *semita*, clearly means here 'side-walk' ('the pavement'), a point omitted by Lewis and Short. See also *Trinummus* 481 : *decedam ego illi de via, de semita.*

[3] Vv. 310 *sqq.*

seni animam primum extinguerem ipsi, qui illud produxit scelus ;
tum autem Syrum impulsorem, vah, quibus illum lacerarem modis !
sublimen medium arriperem et capite pronum in terra statuerem,
ut cerebro dispergat viam.
adulescenti ipsi eriperem oculos, post haec praecipitem darem.
ceteros ruerem agerem raperem, tunderem et prosternerem.

A neater example could not be found of the elegance and skill wherewith Terence takes over traditional matter and charges it with dramatic import.

It is, however, to the two pairs of brothers that psychological interest is almost confined. At the threshold of the comedy Micio describes[1] the different systems on which Aeschinus and Ctesipho have been reared : he has treated Aeschinus with indulgence, so that there may be no lack of confidence between them, while Demea has ruled Ctesipho by repression and fear ; this contrast is at once driven home by the conversation which follows between the two 'fathers.' What then is the result of these divergent systems ? The play makes it clear that they have both failed,[2] and the only credit which either can claim is that it has not obliterated natural goodness of heart. Terence has shown with skill and pungency how both youths have been corrupted, though in a different manner.

Ctesipho is secretive, weak, timid, hysterical, and self-indulgent. Dreading the wrath of Demea, he allows

[1] Vv. 46-77.

[2] It is significant that three modern plays based on the *Adelphoe* —Molière's *L'École des Maris*, Shadwell's *Squire of Alsatia*, Cumberland's *Choleric Man*—all end with the triumph of one of the two competing educational theories (that practised by the person who corresponds to Micio). Terence has been far wiser aesthetically and more alive to ethical fact. But it should be added that in Molière the indulgence allowed to Leonor is vastly less than that enjoyed by Aeschinus.

Aeschinus to execute the abduction on his behalf and to risk the grave penalties involved. When the feat is accomplished, he hurries in with a rhapsody[1] of admiration and joy which reveals his amiable affection for Aeschinus no more plainly than his own want of courage and initiative. But amiable he is; Terence never invites us to believe in complete depravity. And in a moment we learn that he has meditated quitting Athens in despair—*pudebat*, as he says.[2] What is this *pudor*?—a sense of honour, bashfulness, self-distrust or self-contempt? It is something of all these: the scales are held very fairly. But the youth cannot be acquitted of that vicious weakness which is not ashamed to profit by conduct in others that it is ashamed to practise itself. His self-indulgence and feebleness inevitably carry him into a meanness which he himself hates[3]:

> quod cum salute eius fiat, ita se defetigarit velim,
> ut triduo hoc perpetuo prorsum e lecto nequeat surgere,

he exclaims, fearing his father may return to interrupt his enjoyment. When, despite the ingenuity of Syrus, Demea does in fact return too soon, Ctesipho falls into a situation as abject as that of the young rake in the *Mostellaria*, bankrupt of expedients and nervously clinging to whatever temporary aid may be found in his slave's lies and address; the scene where he hides behind the door, too timid to show himself, too nervous to carouse at ease within, and jerkily whispering to his contemptuous sentinel, is an effective exposure of his genuine immorality. We see no more of Ctesipho; but later we find Demea, in spite of all, discovering his favourite son's conduct, and at the end his brother exhorting condonation of his amour. Ctesipho is no less nearly ruined than Aeschinus, for all his father's diligence; and only his unspoiled affection warrants Micio's hint[4] that a man may yet be made of him.

[1] Vv. 254-270.
[2] V. 274.
[3] Vv. 519 *sq.*
[4] Vv. 997.

Contrasted with him at almost every point stands Aeschinus: the one characteristic (beyond an affectionate disposition) which they share is precisely that most calculated to wound Micio, who has risked so much to secure his confidence — Aeschinus conceals his amour precisely as does Ctesipho. Micio's treatment has failed to give backbone to its object. Ctesipho's hysterical ejaculations of admiring gratitude are matched by the tears, protestations, and sworn vows which Aeschinus poured forth when he realised the wrong he had committed against Pamphila.[1] The reproach he levels at his brother is even more applicable to himself.[2]

> hoc mihi dolet, nos sero rescisse et rem paene in eum locum
> redisse, ut si omnes cuperent tibi nil possent auxiliarier.

But where this secret is not concerned, he is only too full of confidence. The Sannio-scenes, admirably contrived to exhibit Aeschinus and his brother in contrast, reveal the former as a bully, and of the most objectionable type—the insolent, fastidious, elegant bully. It is not even alleged that the slave-dealer has done any wrong either to Aeschinus, to Ctesipho, or to the music-girl; yet the young man (in a burst of brotherly love) breaks into Sannio's house, beats him and his slaves, and carries the girl off in the middle of the morning. He cares nothing who sees the procession, or what Demea hears[3] of it. Has not his adoptive father a convenient theory that youth will be served, that it matters little what one does, provided always that one is a *vir liberalis* and relates the incident to one's father over the walnuts and wine? Aeschinus is detestable in the abduction-scene, precisely because his manner is perfect. We might take Sannio for a hideous villain, and his oppressor for 'a perfect gentleman' rescuing a poor girl in distress, if we considered his words only. He does not address the plundered tradesman who bawls

[1] Vv. 471 *sqq.*
[2] Vv. 272 *sq.* Cp. vv. 688-695.
[3] Vv. 91 *sqq.*

at his elbow, until he is at leisure; then he does not lay hands on him, but bids his man strike when the nod is given. Aeschinus here is no *vir liberalis* (to quote again the excellent Latin phrase for 'a gentleman') but that odious imitation thereof which Vanbrugh and his peers extol as 'a man of fashion.' Yet he is not callous to the bottom of his soul, like the Restoration 'hero'; Micio's system has not made him hard, but half-baked. At the end of the play he joins in wheedling Micio with an infantile cajolery which suggests the millionaire's spoiled daughter in trans-Atlantic fiction. His instincts are still sound. Throughout, he is deeply in love with Pamphila, and terribly concerned for her anxiety; not for a moment does he waver in his purpose of revealing all (some day) to Micio and marrying his beloved. Again, his affection for Ctesipho is deep, however eccentric the conduct into which it hurries him.

Demea is drawn with at least equal sympathy and discretion, though we may suspect that the dramatist found him the most difficult task of the whole comedy. He must of course be contrasted strongly and illuminatingly with his brother, whose novelty, charm, and educational theory might seem certain to reduce Demea to a mere stage-property. Micio being what he is, must not his opponent show himself the 'choleric' old father, repressing his son's self-indulgence, threatening to trounce slaves, and being constantly deceived just when he congratulates himself on his cunning? Terence has not attempted to avoid this. It is necessary that Demea should go through these motions, and go through them he does. But the poet has not been content with that; Demea is no mere foil to Micio. An excellent lesson in the Terentian manner may be taken by anyone who will go through the lines allotted to this character, observing how each traditional function of the comic *senex* is carried through competently and is yet also invested with breadth, freshness and humanity. In the First Act occurs the statutory outbreak against a dissolute son; but instead of the familiar outcry, 'For sixty years I have toiled and denied myself: now

this scapegrace has spent forty *minae*,' Demea utters a passionate but natural complaint against Aeschinus as a bad man, a bad citizen, a bad son. Almost his first words are *neque legem putat tenere se ullam*.[1] It is the outrage upon Sannio's house, property and person that he resents rather than the supposed amour. He feels bitterly the public reproach, as well he may: *clamant omnes indignissume factum esse . . . in orest omni populo*.[2] But when Micio reminds him of their bargain, that Aeschinus should be in Micio's charge, he contrives to restrain his rage and grief, leaving us and Micio[3] to acknowledge the justice of his complaint. That excellent scene, where Syrus parodies Demea's little sermon on morals, shows the old man as a butt, no doubt, yet we respect him. His sermon is admirable: edifying,[4] ingenious, and brief. It was used a century and more later by another instructor of youth, like Terence a freedman, the excellent father of Horace; and we have that poet's testimony[5] to its value.

In his later interview with Syrus—who gets him out of the way by elaborate directions which recall the itinerary laid down by Launcelot Gobbo for his father—Demea might seem still more normal. So he is; for now is the time when he must be brought as low in the scale as possible,[6] since we are about to observe his opponent Micio at his most splendid moment. Terence even gives us quite a good joke[7] at his expense:

primus sentio mala nostra, primus rescisco omnia;
primus porro obnuntio; aegre solus, si quid fit, fero,

whereat Syrus chuckles:

rideo hunc: primum ait se scire: is solus nescit omnia.

[1] Vv. 85 *sq.* [2] Vv. 91 *sqq.* [3] Vv. 147-153.

[4] Donatus, however, shrewdly observes on v. 418: *Non philosophice*, sed civiliter monet. Non enim dixit, 'hoc bonum,' sed 'hoc laudi est.' Nec 'hoc malum,' sed 'vitio datur.' Ergo ut idiota et comicus pater, non ut sapiens et praeceptor.

[5] *Satires* I. iv. 105-133.

[6] Donatus, however, remarks on v. 578: *Observa Terentianam consuetudinem, in qua inducit non nihil sapere eos, qui falluntur.*

[7] Vv. 546 *sq.*

But why does the subtle poet jog our elbow to drive the joke home? It is not like him. No. It is precisely the heartlessness of that *rideo hunc* which reminds us of Demea's real distress. From this scene onwards he progresses steadily in acuteness and resource. When he confronts[1] Micio with further news of Aeschinus' depravity, almost all the credit of the interview is on his side. At last he falls into that notable soliloquy[2] where he determines to beat Micio at his own game—to secure affection and obedience from all-comers by imitating his brother's *bonhomie* and so win back his sons. In a delightful[3] scene he succeeds. But this play is no light farce. Neither Demea nor Terence is satisfied with turning the tables upon Micio; throughout we have in view, not a theatrical 'hit' but a pungent study of life; the problem, how to manage a son, is never forgotten. Thus at the end we find a solution. This (let us repeat) is emphatically not the triumph of one of the two competing methods as in modern imitations of the *Adelphoe*; neither Micio nor Demea can invite his brother 'to confess my system has succeeded.'[4] But the solution is assigned to Demea as his new idea and purpose, for it is he who has suffered the more acutely. That solution may be obvious to us, but to ancient Romans it was more recondite. Demea will no longer rule by fear, nor will he choose blind indulgence; he will combine the two into wise sympathy[5]:

> si id voltis potius, quae vos propter adulescentiam
> minus videtis, magis impense cupitis, consulitis
> parum,
> haec reprehendere et corrigere me et secundare in loco:
> ecce me, qui id faciam vobis.

[1] Vv. 721 *sqq.* [2] Vv. 855-881.

[3] Incidentally he uses (vv. 952 *sqq.*) against Micio one of the latter's best homilies (vv. 831 *sqq.*).

[4] The words of Manlove (who corresponds to Micio) at the end of Cumberland's *Choleric Man*.

[5] Vv. 992-5. Donatus misunderstands the last scene when he comments on this passage: *Hic ostendit Terentius, magis Demeam simulasse mutatos mores, quam mutavisse.* Legrand (pp. 241, 442) takes the same view.

A splendid old man is this, who so late in life can learn such a lesson, announce his conversion without pettishness, and retain with dignity both the centre of the stage and the mastery of the moral situation.

But the greatest achievement here in character-drawing is undoubtedly Micio. He is no more admirably conceived, it is true, than Bacchis in *The Mother-in-Law*; but his part is far longer and he has to bear a far more varied strain. In that respect he can be compared only with Thais in *The Eunuch*, and her he surpasses in vitality. Micio is beyond question Terence's greatest male character.[1] Consider first how easy it would have been to ruin the portraiture, to produce a mere vulgar leering old man. Readers of Plautus will remember Demaenetus in the *Asinaria*, Nicobulus and Philoxenus in the *Bacchides*, and (still more to the purpose, despite his dignified talk) Periplectomenus in the *Miles Gloriosus*. Or Terence might have descended far lower and approached that *nonpareil* Sir Jolly Jumble, the product of Otway. He has given us instead a dignified gentleman, indulgent to Aeschinus not through laziness—that unavowed root of so much 'tolerance'—but through a genuine original conception of a father's duty. This dignity is the fruit of an honourable spirit. When Hegio reveals to him the relations between Aeschinus and Pamphila, he shows not a trace of loose roguishness, but simple *gravitas*[2]:

> ego in hac re nil reperio quam ob rem lauder tanto opere, Hegio:
> meum officium facio: quod peccatum a nobis ortumst corrigo.

Another familiar Terentian quality is Micio's quiet and consummate knowledge of life. The first lines of the drama

[1] Cp. Pichon, pp. 79 *sq.*: 'Le plus charmant de tous (les pères), c'est Micion: chez Plaute il n'y a que des tyrans on des débauchés; lui est ferme sans être odieux, indulgent sans être vil.' This character was long remembered: Ammianus Marcellinus (xxviii. 4, § 27, quoted by Dziatzko-Cauer) speaks of *soccati Miciones*.

[2] Vv. 592 *sq.*

afford a quaint example[1]: 'it is better to suffer what your wife fears has happened to you, than what your parents fear.' But the finest instance is that exquisite brief sermon[2] he offers to his brother just before Demea's conversion; could anything be better than these gentle, pointed, and witty lines?

> at enim metuas, ne ab re sint tamen
> omissiores paulo. o noster Demea,
> ad omnia alia aetate sapimus rectius;
> solum unum hoc vitium adfert senectus hominibus:
> adtentiores sumus ad rem omnes, quam sat est:
> quod illos sat aetas acuet.

Such a man is able to face facts. Set as he is upon his own theory of education, he makes no attempt to brush aside evidence which goes against it. After Demea's first outbreak, he confesses[3] to us his anxiety about Aeschinus' wild life, anxiety which he has not owned to his brother only lest it should inflame his rage yet further. It is true that one sentence in his soliloquy,

> postremo nuper (credo iam omnium
> taedebat) dixit velle uxorem ducere,

reminds one of the admonition administered to Lord Goring by his father in *An Ideal Husband*: 'It is your duty to get married; you can't be always living for pleasure.' Nevertheless, Micio is sincerely troubled and at once goes to seek the scapegrace. Again, in the midst of his banter, being suddenly asked by the maddened Demea: 'What! Are you content with all this?' he at once replies[4] frankly: 'No. I wish it were otherwise. But as I cannot alter it, I bear it quietly. In this world you cannot expect always to hold a handful of trumps':

> ita vitast hominum, quasi quom ludas tesseris:
> si illud quod maxume opus est iactu non cadit,
> illud quod cecidit forte, id arte ut corrigas.

Nor is this *savoir-vivre* confined to such traditional

[1] Vv. 28-33. [2] Vv. 830-835.
[3] Vv. 141-154. [4] Vv. 737-741.

morality. Later in the play he lays before the ungrateful Demea an extraordinarily good summary of Ibsenism: 'Have patience: I understand you; I was coming to that. There are many signs in men, brother, from which it is easy to conjecture, that when two persons do the same thing, one would be justified in saying, it may prove very hurtful to the one, but not so to the other, from no difference in the thing itself, but in the persons who do it. I see in your sons what makes me confident they will answer our wishes. They have good sense, discretion, modesty enough upon occasion, and love one another entirely; whence 'tis easy to discern in them a noble nature and soul; you may at any time reclaim them.'[1] A dangerous doctrine, no doubt; that is why the world has always tried to insist, with whatever disregard of human experience, on imposing the same rules of conduct upon all. But Micio and Ibsen are undoubtedly in the right, however advisable it may be to offer the young a γενναῖον ψεῦδος proclaiming the contrary. It is no ordinary man who is capable of a view so original and so ably expounded.

Finally, Micio has the credit of by far the most excellent scene—the noble *éclaircissement* between him and Aeschinus, which is equal to anything ever composed in the manner of high comedy. The old man comes suddenly upon the younger as he falters beside Sostrata's door. Aeschinus' secret is known to him, but he will not spare him the ordeal of confession by coming at once to the point; if Aeschinus is ever to become a man, now is the moment. To this end Micio plays a kind of joke[2] upon him—*quor non ludo hunc aliquantisper?*—but what a marvellous joke it is! This supreme artist once again demonstrates his power of

[1] Vv. 820-830. The translation given above is borrowed from the edition of Terence (excepting *Eunuchus*) by Patrick and Prendeville (Dublin, 1829), whose version, though not perfect, is marked by unusual vigour. Donatus unhappily finds the passage marked by *obscurissimus sensus et re et verbis.*

[2] Vv. 639 *sq.*

dramatic conception and execution on two planes at once. Aeschinus is terrified by the alleged arrival from Miletus of a bridegroom for Pamphila, and his attempts to win his father's condemnation of the supposed match, without revealing his own concern in the affair, may provide a laugh if we have nothing else to think of. But what Terence has in mind is the spectacle of a spoiled genteel hobbledehoy growing in ten wonderful minutes to the stature of a man. Still, the occasion for high comedy must no more—must far less—be dragged in than the occasion for farce; and Micio's deception is entirely natural. He sees that the youth must now or never take up life and its responsibility for himself,[1] and he is deeply hurt by Aeschinus' long-continued secrecy[2]:

> tune has pepulisti fores?
> tacet. quor non ludo hunc aliquantisper? melius est,
> quandoquidem hoc nunquam mi ipse voluit dicere.

The scene thus opened continues with consummate power and insight. Micio at every stage assists the unhappy lover without appearing to do so. 'You did not knock? I was wondering what business you had here.' Aeschinus blushes: the first step, and more, is gained.[3] That is manifested by his taking the initiative: 'Pray tell me, father, what concern *you* have with that household.' Then he has to listen, with increasing misery, to Micio's account of his imaginary friend who proposes to marry Pamphila. This of course is Micio's greatest device to force Aeschinus into action and candour. But at first the dazed lover can only utter faltering questions: 'All the way to Miletus?' 'What do the ladies say to this?'

[1] Cp. vv. 670 *sqq.*, 685-695.

[2] Donatus on v. 671 (*auctor his rebus quis est?*) writes: *Iterum obiurgat, quia non interfuit pater. Et agit sic dolens, velut sibi minus amoris praebitum fuerit, Micio, ut se his, quantum amor patiatur, videatur ulcisci, quodque sibi negotium non confiteatur Aeschinus.*

[3] V. 643, *erubuit: salva res est.*

His 'father' aids him again by probing the wound: Sostrata, he says, has some story[1] of another suitor with a more powerful claim, to whom Pamphila has borne a child. At this the other finds courage at last, though not enough. As Micio pretends contemptuous disregard for the unknown lover's right, Aeschinus speaks with an uncompromising trenchancy which we may believe he has never before used to Micio. 'This conduct of yours is harsh, ruthless, and if I may speak more candidly, father, unworthy of a gentleman . . . What do you imagine will be the feelings of that unhappy man whose mistress she has been? It may well be that he is filled with a heart-broken passion for her at this moment, unfortunate that he is! Must he see her torn from his presence, ravished from his gaze? Father, it is an outrage!'[2] The other replies in a manner suited at once to the pretended facts and to his real purpose of stinging Aeschinus into manly frankness by opposition and indirect reproach. 'How do you make that out? Who agreed to the engagement? Who gave the lady? Whom did she marry, and when? Who gave authority to this conduct? Why did he live with a foreign woman?' The measure of Aeschinus' improvement is given by his spirited retort to this deadly attack, but its lack of cogency shows the unsoundness of his position. 'Was a grown-up girl like her to sit waiting at home till a relative came to Athens from Miletus? It was your part to mention that view and insist on it.' Micio drily points out that it would have been absurd to oppose his own friend's claim, which he had come to support; and then presses the whole difficulty to a climax. 'But what has all this to do with us? Let us go.' Aeschinus bursts into tears, and begins to confess: *pater, obsecro, ausculta.* That is enough. The spiritual victory is won, and the excellent old man knows he need not exact a full statement. These first words of despair and shame,

[1] V. 657 *commenta mater est*
[2] Vv. 662-9.

this offer of confession, satisfy him,[1] and with quiet tenderness he begins his lesson :

> Aeschine, audivi omnia
> et scio ; nam te amo : quo magis quae agis curae sunt mihi.

The young man passionately protests his grief for his conduct towards Pamphila and for his secrecy towards Micio, who proceeds to lay his folly before him in language both of severe rebuke and of sympathy. He begins, possibly with a gentle counter-thrust to Aeschinus' own earlier remark, by recognizing that his 'son' has 'the instincts of a gentleman'[2] ; but these are emphatically not enough. Aeschinus has dawdled until he and Pamphila and their child are in terrible straits. Even if he was ashamed to tell Micio the facts to his face, why did he not take measures to let him stumble upon the truth ?— another notable example of the old bachelor's *savoir-vivre*. But severe as his speech very properly is, it ends with the best of comfort : *bono animo es, duces uxorem*.[3] Aeschinus is stupefied with joy and gratitude. After a little charming friendly talk Micio retires, leaving the other to vow that never again will he drift[4] into conduct that would displease his benefactor. So closes this superb scene. The impression made by Micio in later passages falls, on the whole, much below this level ; he banters, sometimes with ribaldry, the deep misery of Demea. Discussion of this conduct, and of the vital reason for it, may conveniently be postponed.

Study of this play's construction[5] will soon bring to

[1] Donatus well quotes *Aeneid* I. 385 *sq.* :

> nec plura querentem
> passa Venus, medio sic interfata dolore est.

[2] V. 683 *sq.* : *ingenium novi tuum liberale*.

[3] V. 696.

[4] V. 711 : *ne inprudens faciam quod nolit*.

[5] Some doubt may perhaps be felt as to which scene provides the *peripeteia* : the explanation between Micio and Aeschinus, or Demea's decision to change his methods. Our choice will naturally depend upon our view of the whole play, and in particular our

light, beside those qualities which we have noted in the earlier works, three momentous and pleasant features.

In his Prologue our playwright carefully describes the origin of a certain scene. 'There is a comedy by Diphilus named *Synapothnescontes*; this Plautus made into his play *Commorientes*. The first act of the Greek version shows a youth robbing a slave-dealer of a courtesan. This passage Plautus entirely omitted, and the present author has taken it over into his *Adelphoe*.' In other words, Terence has inserted[1] into his 'version' of Menander's *Adelphoe* a scene from another work by another dramatist; and an examination of the Latin play will show that the Sannio-passages could be deleted without leaving any serious marks of incompleteness or fracture.[2] Why were they introduced? Since there can be no reasonable doubt that Menander's comedy was structurally sound, to answer this question should provide valuable, because certain, information as to our poet's conception either of his whole work or of some aspect thereof. Nor is the answer hard to find. The Sannio-scenes are employed to bring out the characters both of Aeschinus and of Ctesipho, especially of the former. There is no other possible explanation. The mere facts of Ctesipho's passion for the music-girl and of Aeschinus' abduction are made thoroughly clear in the rest of the drama. Terence has

statement of the 'question' which it sets out to solve. My own view naturally is that Demea's soliloquy gives the *peripeteia*. Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to my discussion of *peripeteia* and plot-construction generally in *Euripides and Shaw, with other Essays* (Methuen, 1921).

[1] And, it is supposed, has displaced a passage of Menander's to make way for the new matter. Dziatzko-Cauer (p. 13) suggest that directly after Micio's departure Sannio came in alone, lamenting his ill-treatment, and hoping to receive payment for the girl before his departure to Cyprus.

[2] It is true that the music-girl would have to be introduced somehow into Micio's house. But that could be contrived, as in Menander's play, by supposing her conveyed there before the action begins. This would have entailed extremely little alteration in Act I.

deliberately emphasized the psychology upon which the mere facts are based. We have here, in short, peculiarly unmistakable evidence that his real subject is not the usual love-story, but rival systems of dealing with youthful sons. It is to be observed that Aeschinus is here (as elsewhere) more important than Ctesipho because Micio's system, being less familiar to the audience than Demea's, calls for closer attention.[1]

The second feature is the exquisite artistry shown in demonstrating the duality or double-sidedness of the plot, beyond comparison the poet's greatest achievement in construction. It is of course plain that Aeschinus and Ctesipho, Micio and Demea, should be, and are, balanced against one another.[2] What calls especially for attention is the skill which is lavished upon the task of contrasting the two old men. Neither is perfectly right, but each has a good deal of human sentiment and experience on his side.

It is imperative, on grounds both moral and aesthetic, that neither should outshine the other. But it is equally imperative that they should not neutralize one another's claims upon our intellectual approval or our emotional sympathy. Terence has met this double need by setting the wisest moments of Demea just where Micio is least attractive, and demonstration of Demea's shortcomings just where his brother's virtues are most conspicuous. The actual zenith of each is attained when the other is not on the stage at all—Micio's interview with Aeschinus, and

[1] The abduction-scene brings up a serious question as to the structural excellence of the play. The difficulty has often been noted that Demea tells Micio about the abduction in the First Act, and that nevertheless the Second Act exhibits it in progress. This has been attributed to the *contaminatio* and the poet's carelessness. But Terence has in reality saved the situation. All that happens in the later scene is the bringing of the girl to Micio's house; all that Demea reports is that Aeschinus has taken her from Sannio. So, too, Hauler and others (see Dziatzko-Hauler's edn., pp. 14 *sq.*).

[2] *Elaboravit Terentius Micionem facere leniter accusantem et inducere Demeam durissime blandientem* (Donatus on v. 685).

Demea's soliloquy. In the early scenes Demea, voicing his familiar doctrine of repression, suffers by contrast with his brother's novel and apparently promising ideas. The close exhibits Demea fully in the ascendant (though his doctrine has been modified by experience), and completely 'sympathetic.' Yet Micio possessed our unquestioning affection and support earlier, in the *éclaircissement* with his 'son.' Observe how this transfer of our sympathy is effected. Micio is at his greatest in that interview; but he is at once to begin his descent so that Demea may rise, and the downward progress is begun in that very scene with a naturalness which creates the liveliest admiration. Aeschinus exclaims[1]:

> di me, pater,
> omnes oderint, ni magis te quam oculos nunc ego amo meos.

Micio answers playfully: *quid? quam illam?* He has stepped down from his dignified plane of a moment ago; and when the youth in confusion replies *aeque*, Micio ironically replies: 'A thousand thanks!' (*perbenigne*). It need hardly be remarked that this banter is entirely natural and pleasant; the point is that Micio has gone back to his normal position of a *lepidus senex*. The movement becomes more definite when in a few minutes' time Demea confronts him with the news about Pamphila. This, to be sure, is no news to Micio, who moreover is aware that matters are assuming a highly satisfactory shape. He is, therefore, justified in receiving Demea's ejaculations with calmness; he is not at all justified in keeping the other in ignorance and torturing the frantic father with amused acceptance of the horrible prospect which he paints. In the middle of this conversation, it is true, Micio speaks with sense and vigour,[2] but goes on to compensate himself by still more infuriating replies, causing Demea actually to believe that he contemplates allowing Aeschinus to live in his house with both a wife and a mistress. By the time

[1] Vv. 700 *sq.* [2] Vv. 737-741.

he withdraws it is not surprising that his brother thinks him insane.[1] When Demea has discovered the truth about Ctesipho, another conversation[2] follows, in much quieter vein. Micio talks excellently, but his wisdom is heavily discounted, first by the fact that he has no answer to Demea's appeal to the principle which Micio has himself quoted earlier—that each should leave the other's son alone—and secondly by the substantial truth of Demea's charge that he has corrupted both the young men.[3] His speeches are excellent, magnificent perhaps; but the result of his theories is a damning argument against him. By the end of this scene, moreover, he has again descended to ribaldry.[4] In the last act he is definitely and amusingly vanquished. Terence throughout is scrupulously fair; there is no scoring of theatrical 'points.' Demea is made just unreasonable enough for us to give Micio just the right amount of credit; Micio is just frivolous enough at the psychological moment to win the needed amount of support for Demea. On the other side, when Micio has our ear, Demea is not too wildly or too absurdly infuriated; when the latter triumphs, Micio is not altogether abashed, as his final *istuc recte*[5] about Ctesipho's liaison shows.

The third structural excellence,[6] though equally striking

[1] V. 761. [2] Vv. 789-854.

[3] V. 793, *communis corruptela nostrum liberum.*

[4] V. 851. [5] V. 997. Cp. Donatus.

[6] Others have considered it a blemish. Leo (*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, p. 245) makes certain interesting remarks: 'Eine Reihe von Einzelheiten erfahren wir durch Donat, kleine Änderungen die Terenz vorgenommen hat, meist um ein Licht der Charakterisierung aufzusetzen; darunter die bedeutendere, dass die Heirat, zu der am Schluss des alten Stückes der alte Micio gezwungen wird, ein Zwang der Lessings gerechten Zorn erregt hat, bei Menander dem Alten von vornherein genehm war; woraus zu schliessen ist, dass Menander diesen Gedanken irgendwie vorbereitet und annehmbar gemacht hatte.' M. Schanz (*Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur*[2], p. 152) also calls the marriage of Micio 'repellent.' The difference of treatment between the Greek playwright and the Roman is deeply interesting, but not in the faintest degree discreditable to Terence. Dziatzko-Cauer (p. 5) rightly say that he has made an 'essential advance' on Menander.

and delightful, may be more briefly dismissed. No dramatic fault is more frequent than the huddled-up 'happy ending.' With the amiable desire to make everyone happy in the last five minutes before the curtain falls, dramatist after dramatist has complacently piled upon the altar of popularity and reduced to fragrant smoke all the human character, probability and construction of events which he has hitherto sedulously created. Hence the precipitate and unlooked-for nuptials of Camillo and Paulina in *The Winter's Tale;* hence the ludicrous suddenness wherewith the Duke in *Twelfth Night* transfers his affections from Olivia to Viola; hence (most monstrous of all) the submission to Rome of the victorious British King at the close of *Cymbeline*. Innumerable lesser playwrights have committed the same offence. Terence wins a triumph, both instructive and exquisitely diverting, at the end of this, his last, play. Everyone is sent home joyful—Syrus with his freedom and that of his wife, and with cash in hand; Hegio receives a hitherto unmentioned farm; even Sostrata suddenly finds a second husband. Yet all this springs, not from the artless Christmas-party instinct, but from a cause severely dramatic. In particular, the marriage which is forced upon Micio not only secures the future of the admirable Sostrata: it is the appropriate application to Micio of his own indulgent methods; it succeeds because his power to refuse requests has long been undermined—again by his own methods; and it withdraws him from that position of irresponsible detachment which is the chief danger of elderly bachelors. This final scene is the legitimate fruit of the whole play, the perfectly sound result of that collision between Micio and Demea which has created and sustained the whole wonderful drama.

VIII.

# Conclusion

HAVING examined the whole work of Terence, we should attempt to form a general appreciation. Three topics seem especially to call for discussion: his place in the history of literature, the development of his dramatic qualities, and the chief ideas of which his comedies are the vehicle.

By the first theme, his place in the history of literature, is not meant an account either of his 'precursors' or of his *fortleben*: the first must fail through scantiness of material,[1] and the second would mean a treatise both mechanical and laborious, for (whatever critics and students may have thought of him) dramatists have with great frequency paid Terence the sincerest form of flattery.[2]

[1] A great deal of diligence and ingenuity has been expended, in particular by German scholars, upon attempts to compare the Terentian plays with the lost or partly lost Greek 'originals.' Donatus does give invaluable help as to a number of details. But it seems hopeless at present to wander beyond the facts which he provides and the minute points which are to be gained from the fragments. For a knowledge of Menander's definitely dramatic qualities, one complete play would be of infinitely more value than a myriad fragments from hundreds of works. Croiset (*Hist. de la litt. grecque*, III. p. 624) rightly remarks: 'Entre tous les mérites de Ménandre, les plus difficiles à apprécier pour nous sont ceux qui se rapportent à la structure même de ses pièces.'

[2] One is tempted, for example, to discuss the comedies of Hroswitha, the accomplished nun of Gandersheim, who in the tenth century undertook to compose dramas which should be edifying imitations of Terence. But the most sympathetic scrutiny reveals scarcely any Terentian features. Nearly all the pieces are beneath serious criticism. Yet it is interesting to observe a distinct improvement in the last two: *Paphnutius* especially has some pungency and briskness. Two first-rate critics have written masterly little articles on Hroswitha—M. Anatole France (*La Vie Littéraire*), who based on *Paphnutius* his own wonderful *Thaïs*, and Mr. A. B. Walkley (*Pastiche and Prejudice*, pp. 227-241).

It is rather the man's own literary life that is here in view. He is an attractive, a tantalizing, almost a mysterious figure. A native of Africa, not a Carthaginian[1] but of Libyan birth, and possibly a mulatto or a quadroon (as Suetonius' description, *mediocri statura, gracili corpore, colore fusco*, might suggest), he was brought in childhood to Rome and became the slave of one Terentius Lucanus, a senator. This excellent man, little dreaming that by his good nature he was conferring a notable benefit upon posterity, gave the lad a sound education, and ultimately his freedom and his own name. Terence enjoyed the intimacy of Scipio Africanus Minor and his circle, especially the amiable Caius Laelius, produced six plays, journeyed to Greece with the intention (it appears) of collecting more works of Menander, and died without returning to Rome, at the age of thirty-one or even less.[2] Such are the only facts of importance at our command; they seem to provide small help towards explaining his achievement in dramatic composition, or the notable circumstance that this African stripling, who learned Latin as a foreign tongue, could use it with an elegance and purity which quickened the coarse-grained Roman language with Attic elasticity and charm.

The story does, however, contain one apparent clue. It was reported in his own day, and later,[3] that to his friend-

[1] Sellar repeatedly calls him a Phoenician, but this is contradicted by his cognomen, Afer.

[2] M. Schanz, *Römische Litteratur geschichte* (1907), p. 134, thinks it certain that he died in 159 B.C. He regards 185 B.C. as approximately the date of his birth; others prefer 190 to 185 B.C. The important fact is that Suetonius (*Vita Terenti*) relates: *post editas sex comoedias, nondum quintum atque vicesimum egressus annum . . . egressus urbe est.* Prof. Ashmore's contention, that 'the *Andria* is too finished a production' to have been the work of a youth of nineteen (185-166 B.C.), is unconvincing. Aristophanes seems to have been only eighteen when he wrote the *Banqueters* and twenty when he wrote the *Acharnians*. Menander in ancient, and von Hofmannsthal in modern, times have been equally precocious.

[3] See the *Vita Terenti, e.g.*: *Non obscura fama est adiutum Terentium in scriptis a Laelio et Scipione, eamque ipse auxit numquam nisi leviter refutare conatus.* Cp. p. 4.

ship with the Scipionic circle Terence owed much of his success. These accomplished young nobles, fond of theatrical displays and imbued with a taste for Greek literature, had a hand in his writings, we are to suppose, and to them a considerable part of the credit (how great is not precisely indicated) must be transferred.[1] We find in the poet's own prologues allusion to this story. The earlier is in *Self-Punishment*[2]:

tum quod malivolus vetus poeta dictitat,
repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse musicam,
amicum ingenio fretum, haud natura sua:
arbitrium vostrum, vostra existumatio
valebit.

The later and more striking occurs in *The Brothers*[3]:

nam quod ita dicunt malivoli, homines nobilis
hunc adiutare adsidueque una scribere:
quod illi maledictum vehemens esse existumant,
eam laudem hic ducit maxumam, quom illis placet,
qui vobis universis et populo placent,
quorum opera in bello, in otio, in negotio
suo quisque tempore usust sine superbia.

Three facts are plain. Firstly, the report has gained wider currency as time advances: in the earlier play Luscius Lanuvinus alone[4] is mentioned (though not by

[1] Those scholars who accept the story have naturally differed as to the extent of Terence's indebtedness. Dr. J. W. Mackail (*Latin Literature*, p. 22) writes: 'The rough drafts of the Terentian comedies were read out to them, and the language and style criticised in minute detail'—a process which he describes later as 'elaborate correction.' This is no doubt as far as any modern scholar would go. Pichon (*Histoire de la litt. latine*, p. 72) stands at the other end of the scale. 'Ce que Térence a dû à ses illustres amis, c'est quelques conseils éclairés d'amateurs spirituels, leur appui pour faire jouer ses œuvres; c'est surtout l'influence vague et générale de ce milieu intelligent.' This amount of 'collaboration' it would of course be absurd to deny.

[2] Vv. 22-6. [3] Vv. 15-21.

[4] It appears from *Heaut.* v. 16, that Luscius Lanuvinus had a party behind him in attacking Terence for his practice of *contaminatio* (see also *Andria* vv. 15-23), but that as regards the *amicorum ingenium* he stood at first alone.

name) as a traducer, whereas in the later work a number of ill-wishers appear. Secondly, the precise wording of the charge is that 'men of high birth are his helpers and constant collaborators.' Thirdly, Terence is careful neither to rebut nor to admit the accusation, and in *The Brothers* remarks that it is no disgrace, but a great credit to himself, that he is 'favoured by' (*placet*) men who 'have won the favour of' (*placent*) the whole nation by their distinguished services; he is appealing dexterously though disingenuously to the principle *laudari a laudato*. The first of these facts is of small importance. Again, that Terence scrupulously avoids denying or accepting the statement, though highly interesting, leads us in fact nowhere; for it suits equally both the truth and the falsity of the charge. Were it false, he would be little disposed, considering his desire for popularity and the opposition he was meeting, to refuse so strong a claim upon popular favour. Were it true, he would have no wish either to fix publicly upon distinguished nobles a practical interest in theatrical composition which they clearly desired to conceal, or to deprive himself of that considerable credit which on any showing belonged to him.

We are therefore compelled to judge the second fact—the existence of the charge itself—on its own merits. What is its intrinsic probability? Are we to believe that Scipio and Laelius were indeed the poet's 'continual collaborators,' that he is little more than the mouthpiece of others, that he stood to them in a relation which some allege Shakespeare to have held towards Bacon? Considered in the abstract, such an arrangement was quite possible. But there is no trustworthy external evidence that it existed. Even the contemporary statement does not prove itself[1]; granted that some were jealous of Terence, and that he was an associate of cultivated noblemen, the charge was in any

[1] Nor does it offer any details. The delightful story that Laelius apologized for coming late to dinner because he had been immersed in composition—which proved to be some lines of *Self-Punishment*—is no earlier than Nepos. (Suetonius, *Vita Terenti.*)

case certain to be made. Nor is there any internal evidence. Where in these six comedies can one point out unevenness of style, inequalities of versification, suspicious excrescences in structure,[1] or (above all) arresting allusions to contemporary Roman policy, events, opinions, eminent persons? It is difficult to believe that the sprightly Laelius would never have inserted some racy piece of 'topical' fun, some witty satire, had Terence been nothing but a secretary and not free to leave his characters and events so generalized that some readers[2] have deplored the absence of all local colour and other such specific features of interest. As it is, these comedies show nothing in their subject-matter which would enable us to date them; in this respect Terence's collaborator might as well have been Hadrian as Scipio. If these works come from various hands, they are a curiosity perhaps unique in literature. Such partnership is far from unknown; but the scholar confidently distinguishes the contributions of Fletcher from those of Beaumont, and in a single play, (*Eastward Ho*, for example) finds not infrequently evidence of even three co-operating dramatists. But the six works before us defy the keenest scalpel.[3]

It is nevertheless plain that Terence wrote in the first instance for a coterie, and we may easily suppose that one or another of his patrons from time to time suggested some Greek play as a model or as containing material which he could turn to account; he may even have received advice

[1] Those weaknesses or peculiarities of construction which we have noted, especially in the earlier plays, are due either to the *contaminatio* which even the most spiteful attributed to Terence himself, or to qualities perfectly natural in an independent writer.

[2] Cp. G. Guizot, *Ménandre*, pp. 384 *sq.*: 'Il crée des personnages qui sont moins Romains que ceux de Plaute sans être plus Grecs. Ce qui domine en eux, ce sont les sentiments généraux et les passions communes à tous les temps.' Leo, p. 249: 'Das Momentane und Lokale fehlt, und damit Glanz und Frische und der Genius des Orts.'

[3] It is possible that an exception is to be found in the Thraso-Gnatho scenes of *The Eunuch*. Here indeed may perhaps lie the origin of the whole story.

as to ideas which he should throw into dramatic form. So much we may safely assume, but assuredly, not that the suggestions were always, or ever, adopted[1]; though it naturally cannot be denied that he may have used hints such as that which John Crowne received from Charles the Second and which resulted in *Sir Courtly Nice*, or may have obeyed a friendly wish, as Shakespeare obeyed Elizabeth in composing *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The important facts are that he wrote for a coterie, and that he passed beyond its influence. The first is proved by his own prologues, by his custom of giving Greek titles to his plays—*Hecyra* instead of *Socrus*, for example, is a curious affectation—and by the boldness wherewith he rebukes the low taste of the *populus stupidus*[2]: he feels that supporting him is a solid, if small, party of cultivated friends. That he passed beyond this, that he did not remain merely the poet of a clique, is the most striking feature of his career.

Instead of becoming a poet of esoteric 'cachet' and producing a subtly artificial 'vintage' calculated only for highly-sophisticated palates, Terence steps forth from the Scipionic circle, determined to be a Roman dramatist. He will take a place in the history of Latin art, and announces to the world the reform of Comedy. A well-known critic has written[3]: 'In all of them (the Terentian prologues) there is a certain hard and acrid purism that cloaks in modest phrases an immense contempt for all that lies beyond the writer's own canons of taste. *In hac est pura oratio*, a phrase of the prologue to *The Self-Tormentor*, is the implied burden of them all. He is a sort of literary Robespierre; one seems to catch the premonitory echo of well-

[1] Cp. Dziatzko-Hauler, *Phormio* (Leipzig, 1913), p. 14: 'Zwar mag Terenz bei seiner Arbeit Anregung und Ermunterung sowie unter Umständen besondere Ratschläge von jenen Freunden empfangen haben, aber für die Annahme einer weiter gehenden Abhängigkeit fehlt ein wohlbegründeter Anhalt.'

[2] *Hecyra*, v. 4.

[3] Dr. J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, p 24 *sq.*

known phrases, "degenerate condition of literary spirit, backsliding on this hand and on that, I, Terence, alone left incorruptible." Three times there is a reference to Plautus, and always with a tone of chilly superiority which is too proud to break into an open sneer.' This is all true, but the writer evidently condemns it as discreditable or misguided in Terence. Others will regard our poet as completely justified in his opinions and his tone, the only cause for wonder being that a dramatist possessing both youth and genius (a combination rarely productive of discretion in criticism) should have expressed himself so urbanely. He is defending himself against the tasteless indifference of the multitude and the pedantic censure of rivals; he is also proclaiming a new and fruitful method of writing comedy. The whole situation reminds one strongly of Marlowe and his prologue to *Tamburlaine the Great*:

> From jigging veins of rhyming mother-wits,
> And such conceits as clownage keeps in pay,
> I'll lead you to the stately tent of war,
> Where you shall see the Scythian Tamburlaine . . .

There is the same self-confidence, defiance, artistic theorizing, the same promise and the same splendid fulfilment.

Hence each of these six prologues contains matter[1] invaluable to the literary historian. We have discussed the alleged collaboration of Scipio and his friends. Another theme is the poet's defence of his method and style. Thus

[1] On their manner, see Leo's highly interesting comments (*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, p. 250): 'Die grosse Überlegtheit dieses Stils wird besonders deutlich, wenn man die Prologe mit den Komödien vergleicht, denen sie vorgesetzt sind. Die Prologe, wohlgesetzte Reden ans Publikum, sind durch und durch künstlich stilisiert, aber nicht im plautinischen Stil, sondern es sind versifizierte Proben der Redekunst wie sie damals in Rom gelernt und geübt wurde; für uns die ältesten Proben dieser rhetorischen Technik und darum von besonderer Wichtigkeit, wie sie auch die ersten sicher dem Römer ganz allein gehörenden lateinischen Gedichte sind.'

the prologue to *The Girl of Andros* tells us that some objected to *contaminatio*; do they not realize that they are herein accusing Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius, the authorities whom Terence follows?[1] So in *Self-Punishment* he says his detractors complain that by this practice he has made few Latin out of many Greek plays: 'quite so; I am not ashamed of that and shall do it again, since I am thereby following good examples.'[2] In *The Eunuch* there is an elaborate defence[3] against the charge of plagiarism from Naevius and Plautus. His own method of composition is well described in *Self-Punishment*[4]: *statariam agere ut liceat per silentium*, and *in hac est pura oratio*. At other times he returns the onslaught with damaging criticism of his censor's own work. *The Girl of Andros* merely hints[5] at this; in *Self-Punishment* an example of rowdyism on the stage is pilloried, with the threat that more rebukes are to follow unless the adversary mends his ways.[6] Accordingly in *The Eunuch*[7] he ridicules a blunder in legal procedure, and in *Phormio* a piece of sensational pathos unsuited to comedy.[8] Lastly, there are remarks on the audience. In the prologues to *The Mother-in-Law*[9] he is naturally bitter against the 'stupidity' of

[1] *Andria*, vv. 15-21. [2] *Heaut.*, vv. 16-21.

[3] *Eunuchus*, vv. 19-43. The defence is that he did not know that others had translated these passages into Latin before him. It is hard to believe this; we have seen reason before (pp. 12 *sq.*) to doubt Terence's word. So Cumberland, in the preface to *The Choleric Man*, is scarcely to be trusted when he disclaims any intention of copying the *Adelphoe*, and asserts that he knew nothing about Shadwell's *Squire of Alsatia*. Crowne, on the other hand, probably received a genuine surprise when he found, after writing three acts of *Sir Courtly Nice*, that his imitation of Augustin Moreto's *No Pued Esser* ('It Cannot Be') had been anticipated by another English playwright. Students of Terence's debt to Greek comedy, it may be added, will find much food for reflection in the fact that Crowne added to his 'version' four characters not found in the Spanish original, actually including the title-rôle itself.

[4] *Eunuchus*, vv. 36, 46. [5] *Andria*, v. 23.

[6] *Heaut.*, vv. 31-4. [7] *Eunuchus*, vv. 9-13. *Hecyra*, vv. 4 *sq.*, 33-42.

[8] *Phormio*. vv. 6-8.

the spectators who have twice caused the play to fail; it seems, too, that this result was partly caused by the annoyance or scandalized hostility which the work aroused in women. The poet appeals for a fair hearing. 'Give me,' he exclaims in an early work,[1] 'a chance to grow: I give you a chance to see new and flawless plays.' But although he has assuredly grown by the time he composes *The Mother-in-Law*, we find his actor-manager Ambivius Turpio hinting[2] that detraction has so discouraged Terence that he has been on the point of retiring from the theatre. This same prologue contains the splendid appeal[3]:

> vobis datur
> potestas condecorandi ludos scaenicos.
> nolite sinere per vos artem musicam
> recidere ad paucos.

These words may reveal something of that haughtiness discussed above, but they are nevertheless the unmistakable language of an artist who, refusing to content himself with a clique of intellectuals, would reform popular comedy and give the whole Roman people a taste for sound art. It proved to be *vox clamantis in deserto*. Quintilian[4] centuries later confessed that comedy was the 'lame dog' of Latin literature.

Here, before we quit this theme, his literary career, some general remarks may be added to what we have already written here and there concerning his style.[5] There is comparatively little in Latin which has kinship with it;

[1] *Heaut.*, vv. 28 *sqq.*

[2] *Hecyra*, vv. 21 *sqq.* The passage refers primarily to Caecilius.

[3] *Ibid.*, vv. 44-7. It has been thought that the last three words refer quite definitely to a clique of poets. Cp. Dziatzko-Hauler, *Phormio* (4th ed.,), p. 14.

[4] X. i. 99: *In comoedia maxime claudicamus.*

[5] Pater's remark on Winckelmann applies admirably to our subject: 'Occupied ever with himself, perfecting himself and developing his genius, he was not content, as so often happens with such natures, that the atmosphere between him and other minds should be thick and clouded; he was for ever jealously refining his meaning into a form, express, clear, objective.'

but often in Horace, in the letters of Cicero and Pliny, we have this sense of well-balanced worldly experience uttering itself in diction unforced and limpid. Congreve's style exhibits the same mastery of unexcited brilliance. Thackeray, especially perhaps in *Esmond*, has much of the quiet Terentian vigour in dialogue as in character-drawing. Marivaux, as Pichon[1] has admirably observed, resembles the Roman poet, not only in the conduct of his drama, but also in his dialogue. Balzac, perhaps more than any other, recalls his ingratiating pungency, his skill in slowly cumulative effect, his expression of sheer humanity. Throughout, the diction of Terence makes upon us the impression of patient and tranquil resourcefulness,

> As a cunning workman, in Pekin,
> Pricks with vermilion some clear porcelain vase,
> An emperor's gift—at early morn he paints,
> And all day long, and, when night comes, the lamp
> Lights up his studious forehead and thin hands.

Of some such pale porcelain, or wrought ivory, delicately tinged with subtly-blent colours, this mode of language may remind us, or of that frail spiritual St. Jerome pictured by Cosimo Tura, kneeling in rapture upon the sand as his eyes, frame, and nervous fingers pass into something ethereal that transcends the flesh under the radiance of the indwelling and transmuting soul.

Let us turn now to gather an appreciation of his strictly dramatic talent, and deal first with two great defects which may plausibly be alleged against Terence here. Julius Caesar[2] thought him but a 'half-Menander' because his *purus sermo*, his *lenia scripta*, are not supported by *vis comica*.[3] Also, it was remarked near the beginning of this essay that many readers will find too much sameness in the general effect of the six plays.

[1] *La littérature latine*, p. 81. [2] See pp. 10 *sq.*

[3] In the passage as Caesar wrote it, *vis* no doubt stands alone and *comica* qualifies *virtus*. Still, in this connexion *vis* even by itself surely means what is generally understood by *vis comica*, so that for clearness' sake it is well to quote the two words together.

*Vis comica* means one of two things : power, forcefulness, dramatic pungency as seen in comedy, of whatever type the comedy may be ; or that 'comic' force which illuminates and refreshes by means of racy humour and fun in action, the whole plot being a well-constructed joke. In the first kind a magnificent example is the work of Molière ; in the second, the *Frogs* (let us say) of Aristophanes. That Terence, save in the curious and unsuccessful 'battle-scene' of *The Eunuch*, never attempted the latter type is manifest[1]; but it is clear that in the former he is a master fully equal to Molière. Of what, then, is Caesar complaining ? The obvious answer might seem to be that he prefers comedy, of which the *Frogs* is possibly the best existing specimen, or rather that he confines *vis comica* to this type, and that he blames Terence for lack of excellence therein. But, as a fact, he blames him in comparison with Menander, not with Aristophanes. It seems an inevitable dilemma that we must either suppose Menander to have shown an Aristophanic quality for which there is no other evidence—the other available evidence, of course, is entirely against such a belief—or suppose that Terence, in Caesar's view, had no *vis* even of Menander's kind. Whichever horn of the dilemma we choose, Caesar must be set down as the worst of critics.[2]

[1] See Parry's *Introduction* to his edition, p. xxiii., especially the remark that the 'sentimental comedy' of Terence should be classed, not with the work of Aristophanes, Shakespeare, or Molière (though the last of these should not have been mentioned here), but with Massinger, Racine, and Alfieri.

[2] His celebrated description of Terence, *o dimidiate Menander*, has been variously explained. Sellar (*Roman Poets of the Republic*, p. 212) understands it to imply 'a Roman only in his language.' M. Meyer (*Études sur le théâtre latin*, p. 336) says : 'il n'a été qu'à moitié comique, il est resté un demi-Ménandre.' Guizot, *Ménandre*, p. 385, takes it to mean that 'les hommes de Térence ne sont pas complets ; il leur manque un caractère propre et nettement marqué.' Leo (p. 253) adopts the more general view : '*lenia* ohne *vis*, Menander hat beides ;' So Legrand, p. 515. It is to be noted that according to Aulus Gellius III. xiv. (who does not, however, mention this passage), *dimidiatus Menander* should

The other charge, an excessive sameness in the general effect, must be admitted as fairly true. We have seen, and are about to summarize, marked differences between the plays in psychology and construction; but it cannot be denied that there is small variation from one to another in the ordinary fabric of diction. This evenness of surface seems a mark of the Comedy of Manners—both Molière and Congreve show it too—and in Terence the defect is aggravated by the extremely brief catalogue of proper names which he would appear to have at his disposal. It is probably an inheritance from Menander, and may remind us how Greek literature after the fifth century, despite its elegance and high value, does tend strongly towards monotony of texture. Isocrates, for example, cannot be read for more than half an hour without effort. Menander, if we may judge from his copious though comminuted remains, shared this slipperiness of surface. It is, finally, due (to no small degree in Terence, and no doubt in his Greek predecessors) to an almost total absence of picturesqueness in the details of events or stage management—such things as the caskets in Portia's house, Perdita's distribution of the flowers, and countless other such beauties. *In hac est pura oratio.*

We may next summarize the progress in dramatic power shown by these works when viewed chronologically. The *Andria* is a plain love-story, obtaining the complication necessary for drama from the elementary facts that

mean not 'a half-Menander' (that would be *dimidium Menandri*) but 'a Menander in two sections.' Gellius is very emphatic on the point, and concludes by stating: *neque quisquam omnium, qui probe locuti sunt, his verbis sequius quam dixi usus est.* This may induce us to seek a new explanation of Caesar's phrase; and my friend Mr. R. T. Jenkins suggests to me that its meaning may be paraphrased thus: 'each of your plays consists of two plays by Menander, both of these being abridged and then joined together.' Such a description, even on the theory most hostile to Terence's originality, would be only very roughly true, and, concerning some of the plays, not true at all. But it is a view possible to a casual reader of Terentian criticism, and seems the only way of admitting Gellius' *dictum* in this place.

Glycerium is supposed not of free Attic birth and that Pamphilus therefore does not tell his father the truth when marriage with another woman is suggested. Among these facts we do not include the interests of Charinus because they are not necessary to the complication here spoken of. But they are interesting as proof that Terence's duality-method is in his mind from the outset of his career; so much so that he has given us in Charinus a character not found in Menander's play.[1]

*Self-Punishment* deals with the same love-story, helped out technically by the father's peculiar connexion therewith and by another youth's liaison with a courtesan. In *The Eunuch* we find the same story, but shown in its very inception; it is helped out both technically and morally by a similar liaison, the courtesan being now of first-rate importance. *Phormio* shows the love-match again, but as a legal marriage; the courtesan-element is present, but slight, owing most of its interest to the part played in connexion with it by Phormio, who dominates the whole action, including the factor contributed by the bigamy of the heroine's father. In *The Mother-in-Law* the two familiar elements again appear, but very differently handled. The love-match which has begun, as in *The Eunuch*, and at the end continues in affectionate marriage, as in *Phormio*, is here shown combined with the liaison far more closely than hitherto, the courtesan being the former mistress of the husband himself.[2] Moreover, the *senes*, who are usually somewhat distant from the technical centre of gravity, here not only develop into two elderly married couples, but, since this is a drama of more normal life and more permanent elements, stand at the very heart of the action. *The Brothers* exhibits once again the more

[1] Donatus on v. 997: *Et audacter et artificiose binos amores duorum adulescentium et binas nuptias in una fabula machinatus est: et id extra praescriptum Menandri, cuius comoediam transferebat.*

[2] Donatus, therefore, in reality goes astray when on *Andria* 301 he remarks: *Andria ex duorum adulescentium pavoribus gaudiisque componitur, cum fere solam Heeyram ex unius comoedia adulescentis effecerit.*

reputable and the less reputable love-affair, superficially with the same baldness as in *Self-Punishment*, but employing it to raise the whole problem of the true relation in which fathers should stand to their sons. Throughout, then, is to be observed the same starting-point, two love-affairs. In the *Andria* this *motif* is faint and poor, since the suit of Charinus is so feebly handled; the three succeeding plays give it a strong but obvious interest; in the two final masterpieces it serves as occasion for a noble study of family life; in the *Hecyra* the root-interest being purely domestic and internal, while in the *Adelphoe* the family interest leads us outward to consider its import for society at large.

Terence's splendid principle of accepting the traditional framework and evolving from it a thoroughly serious, permanently interesting, type of drama, becomes instantly evident from this survey. But the double love-entanglement is not the sole, though it is the most striking, example of this. It will have been noticed how steadily the *senex* develops in psychology and structural value, from the *Andria*, where he is mere machinery to further or thwart a marriage, right through to the *Adelphoe*, where he is himself the very heart of the interest.[1] In the earlier period he is seen entirely from the outside—a permanent and dangerous feature of the landscape; in the later we are admitted into his soul and can watch him from every angle. Another instance of this development is the *rôle* assigned to the confidential slave. Davus in the *Andria* presents the traditional type, the playwright's ostensible[2] agent to keep things moving; his part is very long, he exhibits the normal cunning, fears, and resource, meddles with everything and orchestrates everyone's emotion. Syrus in *Self-Punishment* is much the same, but his part is not quite so extensive, and the set-back which he meets in the middle

[1] Here, then, is to be observed an interesting coincidence between the latest phase of Terence and what was (according to Mr. F. M. Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy*, pp. 84-93, 171 *sqq.*) an essential element of Greek Old Comedy. It is clearly an accidental agreement.

[2] See above, pp. 33 *sq.*

of the play (the revelation of Antiphila's parentage) is more serious than that faced by Davus (Simo's determination to turn the pretended marriage-scheme into earnest). *The Eunuch* marks a notable development. Parmeno is fairly important, in particular because he suggests the stratagem to Chaerea. But Terence is careful to rob him of the credit: Chaerea jumps at the plan, while Parmeno seeks nervously to withdraw. Moreover he is deluded by Pythias so utterly that he reverses the customary situation by divulging the whole affair to his old master and embroils himself unnecessarily. In *Phormio*, Geta is technically still lower: though he performs good service, it is merely as an underling to the magnificent Phormio, and long before the end he is forgotten. The Parmeno of *The Mother-in-Law* is merely pitiable: he is constantly ordered off the stage so as not to impede the action, and his being kept in the dark at the end is the exact negation of the *rôle* traditionally given to such characters. In *The Brothers*, however, Syrus is better treated; for example, he succeeds in postponing Demea's discovery of Ctesipho's secret.[1]

In this manner one might pass from his handling of tradition to his advance in characterization as a whole. But this has been already explored. Here it is enough to recall one class of examples, which also reveal once more his power of self-improvement. Terence seems to dwell with especial delight on the idea of a noble and amiable courtesan. In the *Andria* Chrysis does not appear on the stage at all; she is dead before the play opens, but her goodness and gentle wisdom suffuse the scenes with a glow of distant sunshine. *The Eunuch* presents a very similar creation, but there Thais in her own person pervades and directs the action, a figure structurally analogous to Phormio. Bacchis in *The Mother-in-Law* is one of the noblest, most authentic, most loveable characters in Roman literature; and her share in the plot, though less active than that of Thais, is no less momentous.

The last element in his dramatic development is one

[1] Pichon (pp. 75 *sq.*) is excellent on the text 'voyons ce que deviennent chez lui les types consacrés.'

which has been mentioned more than once, but which is so vital[1] that it calls for final summary here. It is the method of employing two problems or complications to solve each other. This conception appears already in the *Andria*, fully understood (perhaps) but badly executed. Charinus and his interests do not genuinely affect the situation of Pamphilus. *Self-Punishment* exhibits the method in full vigour, but the interweaving impresses us less with a sense of subtlety and appropriateness than with a feeling of strain due to over-complication and obtrusive cleverness, since the instrument is employed both by Syrus and by Menedemus. Terence purges this excessive elaboration away in *The Eunuch*, but in doing so gravely weakens the effect of his second problem, the love-affair of Chaerea; striking or curious as are the scenes to which that affair gives rise, the genuine interaction of the two interests is limited to this, that Chaerea's amour is made, during the last few minutes of the play and behind the scenes, to extract from the father his acquiescence in the liaison of Phaedria and Thais. *Phormio* shows the principle at last perfected; it might seem capable of no new development. But the playwright is not content with this triumph of mere elegance in intrigue. His broad vivid interest in life takes up the consummate method and employs it upon new tasks. Thus in *The Mother-in-Law* the two problems hinge upon one man only, their interaction securing, not a joyful marriage and a success of gallantry, but the perma-

[1] It has nevertheless always in modern times been overlooked or misunderstood; cp. for example Guizot, *Ménandre*, p. 384: 'La simplicité de l'intrigue a disparu comme celle du langage: à l'*Andrienne* de Ménandre Térence ajoute un amant de plus; à l'*Eunuque* un fanfaron; aux *Adelphes*, tout un épisode de trois scènes empruntées à un autre poète, et, malgré son addresse, *le défaut d'unité divise et amoindrit l'intérêt*.' Evanthius, *De tragoedia et comoedia*, saw more clearly. *Illud etiam inter cetera eius laude dignum videtur, quod locupletiora argumenta ex duplicibus negotiis delegerit ad scribendum. Nam excepta Heeyra, in qua unius Pamphili amor est, ceterae quinque binos adolescentulos habent.* (The reader will remember that it has been contended above that the *Heeyra* is no genuine exception.)

nent happiness of a young couple already married, the satisfaction of their parents, and the future of their child; in *The Brothers* the same two problems lead us quite beyond themselves to a broad consideration of life itself, based on discussion of the relations between old and young.

If, finally, we ask what idea about human life is impressed upon his work, we may find our way to such a generalization by setting out from one simple fact: if we ignore Gnatho and Thraso, who belong to the feeble pseudo-Plautine scenes of *The Eunuch*, we observe that all Terence's people are good.[1] It is not meant that they are 'moral' or show no grave weaknesses; taking that sense of the word 'good,' we must condemn almost all his people. But there is no Terentian character (with the two exceptions already named) whose heart is not sound, whom the reader feels it would be impossible to respect, from whom he would object to receive an obligation if need arose. We do not forget or except the Bacchis of *Self-Punishment*, who (though the least admirable of all) is heard on her first appearance uttering to Antiphila words of wistful admiration and envy:

> edepol te, mea Antiphila, laudo et fortunatam iudico,
> id quom studuisti, isti formae ut mores consimiles forent,

and the rest.[2] The other *meretrices* need no defence; and a study of the slaves and of Phormio, not to mention the fathers, mothers, and sons, will lead us to the same conclusion. 'Contempt is a sentiment that cannot be entertained by comic intelligence.'[3]

[1] So Pichon, pp. 79 *sqq.*, who even goes so far as to remark that 'on songe parfois à ces romans édifiants où tout le monde est parfait, à ces bergeries sentimentales où l'on voudrait voir un petit loup.' (There is at least one sufficiently large wolf in each Terentian comedy—the terrible lack of will-power shown by his young men.) Sellar (p. 213) takes a more balanced view, though he also (p. 217) offers the stupefying criticism that 'his personages seem to move about in a kind of "Fools' paradise" without the knowledge of good or evil.'

[2] *Heaut.* vv. 381-395. [3] Meredith, *Essay on Comedy* (p. 63).

But the most arresting example is provided by the *lenones*. It is easy to misjudge this class. If we take a modern view, translate *leno* by 'pandar,' and imagine a wretch who makes money by dragging the innocent into shame and keeping them there, we shall go astray. These things, as cold facts, were true of the ancient *leno*; but here, as elsewhere, we must cultivate the historical imagination. His conduct may have been as bad then as now, absolutely considered; relatively, it was far less heinous. The recognition of slavery makes an immense difference.[1] The women under his control were allowed on all hands to be his property; if he purchased them legally, he could employ them as he did with precisely as much right as others employed male slaves to toil in mines or cultivate a farm. It is not to be denied that his trade was despised, but a regular trade it was. He was regarded in the same light, not as a modern *leno*, but as a modern money-lender. It was conceivable that he should be a tolerably acceptable fellow-citizen, though he is of course often represented as falling ignominiously short of this, the chief reason perhaps being that the plays in which he appears demand objectionable features in him so as to create or increase the difficulties of the 'hero.' But it is notable that, vigorous as is the abuse cast upon him, none of the modern accusations is to be found. His great crimes are rapacity and fraud, as numberless passages in Plautus testify; all the sneers—*si leno est homo*[2] and the rest—amount to that when the speaker comes to details. Terence has made of him a tradesman. Read the scenes in *Phormio* and *The Brothers* where Dorio and Sannio appear, and imagine for an instant that the former is a horse-dealer, the latter a dog-fancier; what objection can be offered to anything they do or say? Only this, that Dorio in the *Phormio*, after agreeing to a date by which Phaedria is to pay, proposes to sell the girl before the fixed day to a person who has made a more attractive offer. (This is undoubtedly

[1] Cp. Prof. R. G. Moulton, *The Ancient Classical Drama*, p. 421 *n.*
[2] *Poenulus*, v. 89.

sharp practice, and brings Dorio nearer to the Plautine *lenones*. Sannio is quite free from such offence: here again we observe development.)

That these two men deal in other merchandise than dogs or horses is terrible and vile, but that fact is plainly the shame of the whole civilization which recognizes them. Sudden incursions of irrelevant, though superior, morality are unfair. Dorio is a man of business. Before the question of date is mentioned, we read[1]:

*Antipho*: heia, ne parum leno sies.
numquid hic confecit?
*Phaedria*: hicine? quod homo inhumanissumus:
Pamphilam meam vendidit.
*Antipho*: quid? vendidit?
*Geta*: ain vendidit?
*Phaedria*: vendidit.
*Dorio*: quam indignum facinus, ancillam aere emptam meo!

All the logic, all the business attitude which Phaedria himself is perfectly ready to accept when it suits his own purpose, are on Dorio's side. As for his colleague in *The Brothers*, his case is even stronger. Aeschinus coolly robs him of his property, and Demea, when the news comes to his ear, rightly considers Sannio as the victim of an outrage.[2] It is, then, the plain truth that in Terence everyone (save always Thraso and Gnatho) is, despite lapses, on the whole and in his situation, sound, worthy of respect, what our colloquial language calls 'decent.' If we contrast his method with that of Dickens, to whom it is fashionable to attribute an almost morbid charity, and contemplate his Pecksniffs, Quilps, Chadbands, Carkers, we shall appraise duly the breadth and insight of the heathen dramatist.

But what of the sexual morality expressed by these plays, and the tinge even of lubricity in *Self-Punishment*

[1] *Phormio*, vv. 508-511.

[2] *Adelphoe* vv. 88-97. Donatus remarks on v. 89: *Bene dicit 'alienas,' qui si 'lenonis' diceret, parva res videretur;* and on v. 90: *contentus facti atrocitate personarumque vilitatem reticens.*

and *The Eunuch*? Most readers are unlikely to go wrong with regard to the general tone. Terence adopts a standard less strict than ours, but not in itself surprising or unworkable. Intimacy with a courtesan on casual terms is in his works a serious fault which is, however, by no means damning; it corresponds to reckless gambling or occasional drunkenness in our own day. Cohabitation based on mutual affection is considered by him, naturally, as far less censurable. The great objection to it is its unwisdom—so many unhappy or awkward results may arise. But such unions are 'morally' equivalent to marriage; *pro uxore habere* is a phrase more than once employed by Terence.[1] Such women were really in the situation of those in our own country a few years ago who 'married' their deceased sisters' husbands; the union was simply ignored by the courts. With the best will in the world, a foreign woman could not in Athens marry a citizen: such 'marriages' were illegal.[2] As for the lubricity shown by two passages, it is a passing feature. In *Self-Punishment* it is very slight; in *The Eunuch* it is a blot, but may be partly condoned as marking the character of Chaerea and so giving peculiar value to the change of heart which Thais works in him. A significant comment on the whole subject is, as we saw, the sound-hearted attitude which prevails regarding the possibility of children.

This impression, that all his persons are good, rests on the central fact about Terence. He is interested most of all, not in virtue or vice, or 'problems' or 'movements,' but in people. His subject is mere humanity; hence the notable frequency in his pages of *homo*, *humanus*, and other such words. He knows that the key to life is not the application of standards, but clear-sighted sympathy. From this knowledge flows that 'sweet reasonable-

[1] *E.g. Andria*, v. 273.

[2] In the *Phormio* we find Chremes' daughter, though her mother was a Lemnian, described (v. 114) as *civis Attica*. But Lemnos at the time supposed was an Athenian possession. See Dziatzko-Hauler, p. 78.

ness'[1] which moulds his dramatic structure, his characterization, and his diction alike. Hence flows also his fondness for moralizing. He is one of the few writers whose sententiousness we can not merely tolerate but enjoy; many will even find that the passages which cling most firmly to their memory are Micio's words concerning the game of life—*quasi quom ludis tesseris*[2]—or the slave's homily,[3] at the opening of *The Eunuch*, on the unreason of lovers. Terence is, in fact, the Horace of the theatre. Their affinity lies not only in this apt and pleasant moralizing: it is seen too in their diction—elastic, dignified, elegant; in their exquisitely clear understanding of their own purpose; in their perception of precisely how much they can, and how much they cannot, perform; in their unaffected relish for human nature. Something of all this Horace may actually have imbibed from Terence: the Terentian echoes in his work, though not numerous, are remarkable.[4]

Terence is the most Christian writer of pagan antiquity. It is not difficult to find in Greek, even in Latin, literature authors who surpass him in profundity of thought and feeling, in beauty of language, in wideness of appeal. But in this noble realization that 'We are members one of another'[5] he comes nearest to St. Paul, nearer even than those memorable passages of the *Republic* where Plato bases the efficiency, the happiness, the very life of society upon the doctrine of human fellowship. In Plato this is an intellectual conviction with a political outcome; in Terence it is an instinctive conviction with a moral outcome. For Plato it is an engine of statesmanship; for Terence it is a way of life. So does it come about that our poet, though practising a form of his art where characters especially tend to stereotype themselves, yet takes each person on his own merits, presenting us with sympathetic

[1] Cp. Mr. C. E. Montague's phrase, used in discussing *Le Misanthrope* (*Dramatic Values*, p. 116): 'Comedy, quintessential comedy, with its ungushing humaneness and radiant sanity.'

[2] *Adelphoe*, vv. 737-741.

[3] *Eunuchus*, vv. 56-70.

[4] Cp. Sellar, p. 218.

[5] *Ephesians*, iv. 25.

fathers, noble courtesans, honest slave-dealers. The trade-catalogue of theatrical humanity is to him of no value save as a starting-point. But this voyage of discovery in quest of unexpected virtues must bring to light many weaknesses. Terence depicts these without lessening our faith in the essential goodness of human beings, but they strengthen his passion for human fellowship. It is precisely because we are weak that we need others; and, still more germane to his business, since we observe others' faults so much more keenly than our own (a fact often noted in Terentian comedy) the prime necessity for us is that we should stand together; we dare not suppose that we know ourselves well enough for safety. Hence comes his famous maxim, *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto:* hence, too, the fact that his plots not only contain two interests, but as a rule actually consist of the duality. Hence, in truth, comes also the characteristic that his plays on the surface read so much alike, that his persons have a sometimes confusing family-resemblance. For, in the last analysis, Terence has only one stage-character, and his name is *Homo*.

# INDEX

C.A. Press, Cowley, Oxford.

Norwood, Gilbert
The art of Terence