

Terence and Interpretation

Pierides
Studies in Greek and Latin Literature

Series Editors:
Philip Hardie and Stratis Kyriakidis

Volume I
Stratis Kyriakidis,
Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry:
Lucretius – Virgil – Ovid

Volume II
Antonis Petrides and Sophia Papaioannou (eds),
New Perspectives on Postclassical Comedy

Volume III
Myrto Garani and David Konstan (eds),
The Philosophizing Muse:
The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry

Pierides
Studies in Greek and Latin Literature

Volume IV

Terence and Interpretation

Edited by

Sophia Papaioannou

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Terence and Interpretation,
Edited by Sophia Papaioannou

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Sophia Papaioannou and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6385-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6385-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
CONTRIBUTORS	ix
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Terence and Interpretation	
Sophia Papaioannou	
PART I: TERENCE AS INTERPRETER	
CHAPTER ONE	25
The Innovator's Poetic Self-Presentation: Terence's Prologues as Interpretative Texts of Programmatic Poetics	
Sophia Papaioannou	
CHAPTER TWO	59
Singing the <i>Sermo Comicus</i> with Terence	
Jarrett Welsh	
CHAPTER THREE	75
Tragic and Epic Interactions in Terentian Comedy	
Evangelos Karakasis	
CHAPTER FOUR	95
Terence's Literary Self-Consciousness and the Anxiety of Menander's Influence	
Sophia Papaioannou	
CHAPTER FIVE.....	119
Terence, the Corrective Reader and Innovator	
Alison Sharrock	
CHAPTER SIX.....	143
Terence's Stock Characters and Plots: Stereotypes 'Interpreted'	
Sophia Papaioannou	

PART II: INTERPRETATIONS OF TERENCE

CHAPTER SEVEN	179
Cicero, an Interpreter of Terence	
Gesine Manuwald	
CHAPTER EIGHT	201
Donatus on ‘Appropriate Style’ in the Plays of Terence	
Robert Maltby	
CHAPTER NINE	223
Performing Terence’s Characters: a Study of Donatus’ Interpretation	
Chrysanthi Demetriou	
CHAPTER TEN	241
Interpretations and Adaptations of Terence’s <i>Andria</i> , from the Tenth	
to the Twentieth Century	
Peter Brown	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	267
GENERAL INDEX.....	293
INDEX LOCORUM.....	297

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As editor of this volume I would like, first and foremost, to express my gratitude to the seven distinguished specialists of Terence and Roman Comedy I have been fortunate to collaborate with; all seven accepted with enthusiasm to contribute their own expert interpretation of Terence or his interpreters. My communication with them in the course of the past three years, from initial discussions on argument formation all the way through the composition of the final versions of the individual chapters, has been a source of knowledge, and taught me to become a more careful and sensitive reader of Terence.

Professors Philip Hardie and Stratis Kyriakidis, the editors of CSP's Pierides Series, endorsed this project from the beginning and facilitated its publication process with exemplary promptness. Warm thanks are due to the anonymous reader of CSP and the Pierides Series for important suggestions that encouraged constructive re-thinking. Several of the arguments advanced in this volume have been developed and improved as a result of discussions with colleagues and friends. I would like to extend special thanks to my colleague Ioannis Konstantakos for his acute comments and bibliographical suggestions. No less profitable has been the discussions with my students at the University of Athens, who attended my lectures and seminars on Terence and Plautus in the past three years. Most of them had never read or attended a performance of a Roman comic play prior to reading Roman Comedy under my direction. Their 'first-time audience' perspective has been invaluablely instructive.

The fiscal crisis that hit Greece harshly in the past four years affected deeply university budgets, and library resources were drastically reduced. Thankfully, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens has held its doors wide-open to the Hellenic academic community, and has provided unfailing support, congenial environment and the resources necessary for uninterrupted academic research.

This book is intended for the specialist scholars of Roman Comedy but also for the graduate students working in the fields of Classics and Literary History. All long quotations of Greek and Latin are translated.

Athens, September 2014
SP

Note on the Critical Editions of the Texts Cited

Unless otherwise noted, Terence's plays are quoted from the OCT edition of Kauer/Lindsay/Skutsch (1958) or from Barsby (2001), the more recent Loeb edition, while the translations follow Barsby (2001). Plautus' text follows Lindsay (1904-5) or De Melo's (2011-13) Loeb; unless noted, the translations are those of De Melo (2011-13). Menander's texts follow the following editions: *Dyskolos*: Arnott (1979); *Epitrepontes*: Furley (2009); *Samia*: Arnott (2000). Translations of other sources either are the authors' own or follow the authors' individual choices and when so, clearly noted.

Abbreviations

*FPL*⁴: Blänsdorf, J. (ed.) (2011) *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum Praeter Enni Annales et Ciceronis Germanicique Aratea post W. Morel et K. Büchner editionem quartam auctam curavit J. B.* Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

LHS: Leumann, M, Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr, A. (1965-67) *Lateinische Grammatik*. 2 vols. Munich: Saur.

PCG: Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds) (1983-2001) *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Vols. I-VIII. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

SH: Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P.J. (eds) (2011) *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Revised edition by H.-G. Nesselrath. Berlin: De Gruyter.

TrGF: Kannicht, R., Snell, B., and Radt, S. (eds) (1971-2004) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 5 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Barwick: Barwick, K. (ed.) (1925) *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri V*. Leipzig: Teubner.

D'Anna: D'Anna, J. (ed.) (1967) *M. Pacuvii fragmenta*. Rome: Athenaeum.

Jocelyn: Jocelyn, H.D. (ed.) (1969) *The Tragedies of Ennius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx: Marx, F. (ed.) (1904) *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Pfeiffer: Pfeiffer, R. (1949-1953) *Callimachus*. 2 volumes (Volume I: Fragments; Volume II: Hymns and Epigrams). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ribbeck: Ribbeck, O. (ed.) (1898) *Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Third Edition. Leipzig: Teubner, 157-187.

Skutsch: Skutsch, O. (ed.) (1985) *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Other abbreviations of authors or works follow the *Année Philologique*.

CONTRIBUTORS

Peter Brown is an Emeritus Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford University (United Kingdom) and a member of the Advisory Board of the Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama. He has published extensively on Greek and Roman drama, and his translation of Terence's Comedies appeared in the Oxford World's Classics series in 2008. He is co-editor with Suzana Ograjensek of *Ancient Drama in Music for the Modern Stage* [Oxford: Oxford University Press (2010), paperback ed. (2013)].

Chrysanthi Demetriou studied Classics at the University of Cyprus (BA), the University of Cambridge (MPhil) and the University of Leeds (PhD). She has written on Roman comic dramaturgy and Donatus. She is an Adjunct Tutor of Studies in Hellenic Culture at the Open University of Cyprus.

Evangelos Karakasis is Assistant Professor of Latin literature at the University of Ioannina. He studied Classics at the University of Ioannina, Greece (BA, 1995) and Pembroke College, University of Cambridge (MPhil, 1997; PhD, 2001) and taught Latin Language and Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Lecturer in Latin 2004-11). He is the author of *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*, Cambridge (2005; 2008, paperback); *Song-Exchange in Roman Pastoral*, Berlin (2011); and of various papers on Roman comedy, elegy, pastoral, epic and novel. He is also the editor of the *Trends in Classics* Special Issue (4.1) with the title: *Singing in the Shadow... Pastoral Encounters in Post-Vergilian Poetry*. He is currently completing a monograph on Neronian Pastoral and a collective volume on Plautus.

Robert Maltby studied as an undergraduate and postgraduate at Cambridge. He worked for a spell on the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in Munich before becoming a lecturer in Latin at Sheffield and later at Leeds, where he became Professor of Latin Philology in 2000 and has been Emeritus since 2010. His main publications include *A Selection of Latin Love Elegy* (1980), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (1991), *Tibullus Elegies: Text, Introduction and Commentary* (2002), *Terence: Phormio* (2012) and most recently, in collaboration with Kenneth Belcher,

a course-book entitled *Wiley's Real Latin: Learning Latin from the Source* (2013).

Gesine Manuwald is Professor of Latin in the Department of Greek and Latin at University College London (UCL). Her research interests cover Roman drama, Roman oratory and especially Cicero's speeches, Roman epic and the reception of the classical world, particularly in Neo-Latin literature. Her publications on Cicero and Roman drama include a commentary on Cicero's *Philippics* (2007), a co-authored Loeb edition of these speeches (2009), a Roman drama reader (2010), an overview of Roman Republican theatre (2011) and an edition of the fragments of Ennius' tragedies (2012) as well as bibliographical surveys and numerous articles for handbooks and scholarly journals.

Sophia Papaioannou is Associate Professor of Latin literature in the Department of Classics, Faculty of Philology at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. Her research focuses on Roman epic, Augustan literature and culture, and Roman comedy. Her publications include two books on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the inventive reception of earlier epic of Homer and Vergil (2005 and 2007), and the first translation and commentary on Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* in Modern Greek (2009) as well as several journal articles and chapters in collective volumes on the above areas of research and beyond. She is currently working on a commentary of Plautus' *Curculio*.

Alison Sharrock is Professor of Classics at the University of Manchester. After starting out with Ovid, elegy, and literary theory, she turned to Roman comedy, and in 2009 published *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence* (Cambridge). She is now returning to Ovid, working on a book on *Ovid and Epic*.

Jarrett Welsh is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Toronto (Canada). He holds an AB from Davidson College and the AM and PhD from Harvard University. His research focuses on early Latin literature and drama, particularly fragmentary texts, and later grammarians and lexicographers. He has written on ancient methods of citing and quoting Latin dramatic verse, and is currently preparing an edition, with translation and commentary, of the fragments of the *fabulae togatae*

INTRODUCTION

TERENCE AND INTERPRETATION

SOPHIA PAPAIOANNOU

Interpretation

Terence's comedy is the product of a long literary tradition that begins in Classical Greece with Old Comedy, undergoes gradual transformation in the next century, and through diffusion and dissemination across the Hellenistic world reaches Rome and initiates a thorough revision of native dramaturgy. The six plays that survive under Terence's name draw on this rich tradition, inasmuch as they comprise products of a literary genius that aspires to add a dimension of freshness and authenticity to the history of appreciation of the comic genre.¹ As with any literary collection that belongs to a specific genre, Terence's plays are both inspired and challenged by the earlier representatives of the genre. Primarily antagonistic by definition, drama, especially comedy, measures success on the basis of criticism often expressed indirectly, through reception and revision. The process of agonistic reception of an earlier tradition, aiming primarily at the production of original material and defining one's own position in the evolutionary course of the genre as a result, is essentially a process of interpretation.

Interpretation, defined in this study as original critical reception of earlier material, is inextricably linked to creativity. According to Heidegger,² interpretation is a process that traces the course from matter-of-fact, tacit

¹ The critical reception of Terence's interaction with tradition and the question of originality in Terence's plays, has always been remarkably polyphonic; cf., for example, the diversity in the assessment of Terence's originality by early scholars as summarised in Duckworth (1952) 385-6. More recent criticism has been no less diverse, though critics nowadays tend to acknowledge the subtlety and sophistication of Terence's artistry; cf. recently Sharrock (2009) 201; and earlier, J. Wright (1974) 127; Goldberg (1986) chapter 6.

² Heidegger (1927).

pre-understandings to reflection, improving modification (refinement) and originality. The completion of an interpretation process, the production of creativity, preconditions contextualisation, an earlier situation of significance that is taken for granted. The originality in Terence's dramaturgy, accordingly, may be illustrated once the plays are contextualised. Hence, the definition of this context, inside and against which Terence interacts and creates, indeed interprets, should be determined. The context comprises the literary tradition of the genre, that is, the plays of the earlier dramatists, Greek and Latin, and the ideology or politics of antagonism, elemental in the production of a drama, that is embraced by a given dramatist—Terence—to serve as the methodological platform upon which the interpretation will be built.

In the interpretation of an author who composes inside an antagonistic environment, there are three types of elements involved: the conceptual structures that constitute the 'literary' understanding of the text (language, generic rules and conventions, etc.); the over-all conceptual fabric that constitutes what we call the experiential world (in Terence's case, performance circumstances, audience and its needs and expectations, momentum, etc.); and the conceptual links used to connect the two. In the case of antagonism between literary texts, interpretation is defined on the basis of intertextuality. Intertextuality is a literary phenomenon of broad application. It often points to a role consciously played by a character in the text, but its interpretative force is of greater impact when it underlines differences as much as similarities, or differences within similarities; it can be a tool for bringing out how, and how far, a world has changed. A new comedy is simply *more acceptable* if it engages in dialogue with a set of forces (the 'context') that the audience finds familiar. Stories are built on other stories, characters on other characters, and plots on other plots, consciously (when a playwright develops a pre-existent script) and without apparent intention (when a new play seems to the audience to resemble in structure and themes an earlier one, without this necessarily or actually being the case); writers and readers apply familiar codes in order to make sense of what they say and what they read. *Interpretative inferences*, that is, evocations of earlier, similar events/jokes/data in general, a) aid the plausibility of the more recent event, meaning, they help us understand the present event better in light of the past one; and b) exploit the knowingness of the reader to produce artistic *aemulatio*, to compete against an earlier great text, all the while cultivating a special, exclusive bond with the particular reader, who is encouraged to believe that she belongs to a special small category of select 'interpreters'—those qualified to appreciate the specialness of the new opus to be produced.

Interpretation, in short, is a matter that involves ‘interpreters’ and interpreters, with the former ‘interpreting’ (creatively re-contextualising pre-existing data) and the latter interpreting the ‘interpretation’ (applying hermeneutics, that is, a particular master code, to make the ‘interpretation’ familiar to their individual experiences and part of the cultural context that determines their interpretative strategies).³

Before proceeding with adjusting the focus on the various aspects of the interpretative methodology that initially produced and subsequently re-informed Terence’s text, it is necessary to distinguish interpretation as a critical activity at work in the process of original literary creation, from appropriation, another important form of dynamic critical interaction with a model text, and which results in the production of new literature. In the analysis of Terence advanced in this book, interpretation is defined according to the identity of the interpreting agent. These agents belong to two separate groups and this categorisation determines the structure of the present volume which is thus comprised of two parts. The First Part (‘Terence as Interpreter’) examines Terence as an interpreter of earlier literary traditions. The Second Part (‘Interpretations of Terence’) identifies and explores different expressions of critical reception of Terence’s output. The leading common objective of the papers in both sections is to illustrate the various expressions of originality and individual creative genius that the process of interpretation entails. What is more, this volume is the first study to focus not only on the interpreter but also on the continuity and evolution of *the principles* of interpretation. In this way, it directs the focus from Terence’s work to the meaning of Terence’s work in relation to Terence’s predecessors (the past literary tradition), Terence’s contemporaries (his literary antagonists, but also his audience) and posterity (his critical readers across the centuries).

In light of this emphasis on chronology, a second objective, underlining the interpretative perspective of the papers in the Second Part, is to assess the ways in which temporal distance and alienation due to the change of viewpoint condition the definition of interpretation: the so-defined interpreters of Terence examined in the volume lived in different eras and were not professional dramatists, even though some experimented with dramatic compositions. Cicero, Donatus and Terence’s Renaissance translators were not interested in using Terence as a source for literary inspiration, but approached Terence from the perspective of an exegete, either systematically and self-consciously critical (as Donatus did), or in

³ Jameson (1981) 10: “Interpretation is here construed as an essentially allegorical act which consists in rewriting a given text in terms of a particular interpretative master code”.

the context of performance-response, a reader who uses selectively parts from Terence for a variety of reasons (Cicero's various quotations of Terence are interpreted in this context). A third category of critical readers, the most common one, comprises the numerous translators across several centuries who strove to transfer Terence's comic speech into their own respective languages and cultural mindsets. This very diverse community of interpretative readers is drawn together by the fact that they are not literary antagonists of the dramatist, a realisation that has drawn anew the parameters of interpretative reception of Terentian drama in its afterlife.

The four chapters in the Second Part of the volume discuss various critical attitudes towards Terence until the end of the twelfth century—shortly before the rediscovery of Terence as leading force of inspiration behind the Humanist comedies—and demonstrate that from the first century BCE onwards Terence's poetry has been received philologically or assessed from an exegetical perspective. Admittedly, as a result of the decline of the *palliata* soon after Terence's death no literary text inspired by Terence's plays has been composed prior to Pierpaolo Vergerio's *Paulus*.⁴ In light of this, the infusion of interpretation with theory is applicable only to the extent this concerns Terence's interaction with the earlier tradition and the forging of his own unique dramatic identity—as such, it is limited to the papers of the First Part in this volume.

By interpreting earlier literature while in the process of composing his own plays, Terence was involved in what might be characterised as acts of appropriation. This is to say that he both produced a new text, which had been modelled on some earlier text, and in the process transported structural and thematic elements of the model text into a new context. The transportation is accompanied by transformation in order that the received elements might acquire a new significance and define themselves inside a new narrative. This process of appropriation is described in a lucid and graphic way by Vergil, in *Georgics* 2.22-34. In this passage Vergil explains

⁴ I do not include in the category of Terentian-type dramas the christianised imitations of Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim, on which see most recently Augoustakis (2013). The only other Latin comedy that survives from the later antiquity and is clearly indebted to the *palliata*, is the anonymous *Querolus sive Aulularia*, of uncertain date (most likely the early fifth century CE); as the title denotes, the principal model is Plautus' *Aulularia*; this is shown by the language which preserves many reminiscences of Plautus' comedy, both archaisms and borrowings of whole phrases; on *Querolus* see primarily Jacquemard-Le Saos (1994); also Küppers (1989).

how it is possible by ‘cultivation’, that is, the employment of artificial techniques, not only to imitate but even perhaps to surpass nature and thus plant trees that would have been impossible to see growing spontaneously.⁵ It is not the artificial techniques, specifically the grafting, however, that attracted attention to this passage but rather the types of trees allegedly subjected to combination—trees that are not genetically compatible, meaning that an amalgamation of them would be impossible regardless of the technology available. The accomplishment of such a natural impossibility, this invention and growing of new kinds of trees, is read nowadays as an allegory for the composition of original literature, gleaned from combinations of genres or models, by creative imitation and in such a manner that had never before been attempted. In fact, this may be clearly observed in the presentation of Vergil’s own creative poetic technique as described in *Georgics* 3.1–48. In the opening section to *Georgics* 3, Vergil defines the originality of his poetry in terms of advancing, by reframing or recoding, ideas already introduced in earlier tradition. Further, the acknowledgement and appropriation of the earlier models is noted by a *recusatio*, a refusal to follow archetypal literary declarations of originality, and more specifically Callimachus’ *Victoria Berenices* (*SH* 254–268C)—an intertext whose identity is extracted from the phrase *lucos Molorchos* of l. 19. At the same time, this *recusatio* entails also an admission that the originality of the *Georgics* may be defined through comparison to Callimachus, and by audiences familiar with Callimachus’ theory of literary originality.

Terence, and presumably the other literary-minded interpreters of his generation, used the term *vortere/vertere* (lit. ‘to turn around’), “a creative and contents-based poetic reformulation of ideas and the adaptation of literary strategies in a different language for different purposes and audiences”, to describe the production of original Latin plays on the inspiration of Greek models.⁶ The original and artistic, interpretative, character of Terence’s appropriation of the literary model by means of this *vortere/vertere* process is underscored by the fact that he refers to himself with the distinct literary Greek term *poeta*. In Greek, a *poiētēs*, in the literary sense the ‘creator of artistic verse compositions’, is a catachresis of the term that describes the creator more generally and presumes the component of labour. The latter meaning is ever implicit in the essence of the poet, the demiurge of poetry. In Latin, on the other hand, a *poeta* is exclusively the creator of verse literature, and the term is strictly defined

⁵ On this passage see, e.g., Leach (1981); Thomas (1988) 157ff.; Mynors (1990) 101ff.; Erren (2003) 310ff.

⁶ Walde (2009) 18.

in the context of poetics. In Plautus the term *poeta* is a *terminus technicus* for the composer of a dramatic performance, but on three occasions (*As.* 746-8; *Cas.* 860-1; *Ps.* 401-5) the same term clearly presupposes familiarity with the more general, Greek meaning of the word, ‘maker, producer’; furthermore, in all three passages the term is employed with the distinct metaphorical, indeed metapoetical, meaning of ‘deviser’ or, implicitly, ‘trickster’, ‘contriver’, for it is set in the context of plot-making and characterises the agent who devises some form of counter-plot.⁷ Terence’s *poeta* as self-introduced in the prologues is much closer to the Greek *poiētēs* in breadth of meaning: the emphasis is on the inventiveness and artistry or talent that are required in order to execute successfully the *vortere/vertere* process of the Greek model, but also on the considerable

⁷ A Plautine *poeta* is the tragedian (cf. *Curc.* 591: *antiquom poetam audivi scripsisse in tragoedia*, I have heard that an old poet had written in a tragedy...), the comic dramatist (cf. *Men.* 7: *hoc poetae faciunt in comoediis*, this the poets do in the comedies; also, *Capt.* 1033: *huius modi paucas poetae reperiunt comoedias*, the poets will come up with few comedies of this type), the dramatist in general (cf. *Mil.* 211: *poetae... barbaro*, a barbarian poet, for Naevius; *Vid.* 7: *poeta hanc noster fecit Vidulariam*, our poet made this *Vidularia* play; *Cas.* 18: *ea tempestate flos poetarum fuit*, at this time there existed a boom of poets), but also the improviser (cf. *Ps.* 404: *nunc ego poeta fiam: viginti minas... inveniam*, now I shall become a poet: I shall find... the twenty minas), including the conceiver of fictitious, false tales (*Ps.* 401: *quasi poeta, tabulas quom cepit sibi / quaerit quod nusquam gentiumst, reperit tamen*, just like a poet when he has taken up his tablets, seeks what exists nowhere on earth, yet he invents it), as well as the schemer and the trickster (cf. *As.* 748: *tu poeta’s prosus ad eam rem unicus*, you are the singular deviser for the business; *Cas.* 841: *nec fallaciam astutiorem ullus fecit poeta*, no crafty mind ever made a more clever deception). Specifically on the programmatic use of the *poeta* in the *Pseudolus* passage, and in terms of literary composition more generally, see Hunter (2006) 82; and Sharrock (2009) 116-7; Slater [(2000) 9] detects a similar meaning of the term *poeta* in the *Asinaria* passage; the similar use of the term *poeta* in all three passages is noted in Bertini (1968) 294 ad *As.* 746-8nn. The toying of the poet with the schemer and the trickster, the teller of tall tales, has a long and famous tradition that reaches back to Plato and his well-known objection to all poets who fabricate stories and do more harm than good to their audiences (cf. *Plat. Rep.* 363a-367a); and even earlier, to the epic *aidos* of Homer and Hesiod, who is a *poeta creator*, a craftsman who toils over a task, but also an agent of crafty deception since his creations are of compromised veracity as products of inspiration by the Muses who are famously known to speak both truth and falsehood (*Theog.* 24-8; see also *Od.* 19.203). Despite the prerequisite that they must be divinely inspired, in Homer and Hesiod the bards or singers (*aidoi*) are classified as *demiourgoi*, that is, as ‘public’ or ‘professional’ craftsmen (*Od.* 17.383-5; *Op.* 26).

labour this artistic initiative needs to materialise both literally, in light of the substantial difficulties tied to the production and staging of Terence's innovative—as it will be presently argued—script, and metaphorically, given the lack of a precedent. It may be said that the very Greek term *poiētēs* is subjected to the *vortere/vertere* process as Terence expands its meaning to include in the semantic context of his *poeta* the Greek 'maker' who specialises in verse compositions, the Latin composer of drama, and the Plautine 'contriver'.

Interpretation and Terence

In the various cases in which Terence is in critical interaction with earlier tradition, we may see two different types of dialogue: a dialogue of the poet with a predecessor (Greek and/or Roman), summoning up a past plot to illuminate a present one; and a dialogue of two voices within the Terentian play at hand, one of continuity and one of change. Close allegiance to earlier, highly regarded tradition carries such authority that one can certainly be more persuaded about the accuracy and the credibility of a plotline if it fits into a familiar pattern. But the changes matter too. If the story treated in Terence has already an earlier, markedly different precedent, or is recast centuries later in a different world and with different motives in the work of another comic dramatist, why should that be? Those are fundamentally interpretative questions, and the de-familiarisation of the intertextual templates plays just as important a role in prompting them as the familiarity of the patterns we see.

We already noted that a successful interpretative appropriation is effected when marked by creativity: 'someone' must explicitly interpret an object as 'something', as having a certain new significance that nonetheless fits into a familiar and comprehensible background. In the case at hand, this 'someone' is, for the first section of this book, Terence; and, for the second half of the book, those who interacted with Terence's work, either in order to show that they 'comprehended' it and share this comprehension, or in order to 'reproduce' it in their own language. We also have noted that the two acts of interpretation are not identical in character, methodology or motivation. Further, Terence's interpretation of a given context and the interpretation applied to the same context by his contemporary Roman audience, the primary addressees of Terence's plays, are distinct as well. Terence re-contextualises the tacit pre-understandings (the conventions of the *palliata*) and *interprets* them (subjects them to reflection and refinement), while the audience assesses—more or less critically—the process of re-contextualisation and the outcome, and either

interprets them too, by producing new original literature that follows a new interpretation pattern inspired by Terence's own, or 'interprets' them, that is, subjects them to an exegesis. On both occasions interpretation of something *as* something is always a re-interpretation of the situated context, and this is what brings both acts together under the label *interpretation*.

Interpretation is an evolving process of 'tacit pre-suppositions', in Heidegger's philosophical language: tentative (that is, subjectively determined) pre-understandings and anticipations. The interpretative process allows one to reflect upon these pre-understandings methodically and to refine new meanings, perspectives and terminologies in order to understand how re-contextualisation works, and so, to produce originality. To bring this refinement of meaning successfully into being, an interpretation must have a perspective, which means that the aspiring interpreter should take a specific approach in interpreting something, and must use a special language, which in turn suggests that some system of expression is available in order to provide a conceptual framework for the interpretation to materialise.

In the case of Terence's interpretation the pre-understandings include: first, the theatrical tradition. This tradition includes all forms of Greek and Roman dramatic expression contributing to the evolution of the *palliata*; the present study, however, sets a limit and considers the plays which Terence's audiences have attended or read (in case of the literate, upper classes) prior to their first Terentian experience. These plays include the plays of Plautus and the other Roman playwrights, contemporary and earlier; and the plays of Greek New Comedy, specifically Menander and Apollodorus, which may have been attended by the Roman audience, since Menander's plays, the most popular works of New Comedy by the end of the third century BCE, were being staged all over the Hellenophone world (including Southern Italy) by travelling theatrical companies. An experienced theatrical audience in Terence's day would have attended dozens of plays, several of them repeatedly over the years (the most successful plays routinely were brought to the stage more than once, and this repetition was often remarked upon by the reproducing authors themselves, to advertise the commercial value of the play⁸), and the more

⁸ Such later additions to earlier scripts are identified in the prologues of several of Plautus' plays, including *Casina* and *Menaechmi* (*Cas.* 12, *Men.* 3; *Cas.* 5-20 is commonly acknowledged as an addition written within a generation of Plautus' death); both texts include passages that were written for revivals later in the second century, indicating a continuing popularity of Plautus' plays as well as a guaranteed reputation and profit associated with a successful reproduction of a

experienced spectators among them would have been able to identify Terence's conscious interaction with his sources.

The second major pre-understanding in the proper study of Terence's interpreting perspective is the assessment of the ways in which the playwright perceives himself as a literary representative of a specific genre, that of the *fabula palliata*, and also as a contributor to the production and definition of literature of distinct Latin identity. This entails that we ascertain a) Terence's knowledge of earlier tradition; b) Terence's acceptance of basic principles of this tradition; c) Terence's tendency to differentiate himself from popular manifestations of this tradition, or from what is considered 'canonical' or 'anticipated' on the basis of these popular manifestations of this tradition; and d) Terence's criticism of this tradition and desire to move beyond it, to contribute towards its evolution (self-referentiality). To ascertain these is sometimes easy, sometimes challenging. Easy, because for literary professionals of the second century belonging to a tradition meant acknowledging that they draw inspiration from the work of a distinguished representative of this tradition; difficult, because the ongoing reproduction of popular plays through the years altered them as conditions required, without consulting their nominal authors.⁹ This explains, as will be discussed later in this volume (Papaioannou, chapter 4; Sharrock, chapter 5), why, for example, Terence eagerly claimed Plautus as one of the *auctores* that directly influenced his work, yet denied he knew of a play *Colax* by Plautus (*An.* 15-21, *Eun.* 30-4).

The involvement of the audience in the successful production of a theatrical performance is the third pre-supposition in the proper assessment of Terence's interpretative revision of earlier tradition. An audience attests that a literary interpretation is successful, that the new literary product is original and has been properly re-contextualised. Identifying the details of the re-contextualisation is the audience's interpretation of the author's interpretation. In order to lead, even manipulate his audience to accept his interpretation as their own, the author/interpreter needs to employ three additional pre-understandings: the representation of the situation, the recasting of the situation from new perspectives, and the employment of a special language. A playwright must be able to represent the situation to be interpreted, which means to produce what the audience anticipates from experience, 'a play along

Plautine play after Plautus' death; on the revision and alteration of Plautus' plays on stage in Terence's time (a process known with the scholarly term *retractatio*) see Coulter (1911) 8-15; Duckworth (1952) 65-8; and Parker (1996) 587-90.

⁹ Goldberg (2005) 52-86, esp. 66-7.

traditional lines', in Terence's case, a Plautine-type *palliata*. Then, in the context of this representation, our playwright will introduce certain innovations, by violating traditional motifs, changing structures, altering typical characterisation, etc.—parameters which will enable the most experienced and better educated among his audience to change their own interpretative perspective accordingly. The third pre-understanding is the employment of a special language, Terence's *purus sermo*. This comic language that has been admired by Cicero and Caesar in the first century BCE, and has been held by Quintilian to exemplify proper Latin speech alongside the languages of Cicero, Sallust and Vergil, has been the reason for the survival and continuous transmission of Terence's complete corpus throughout the Middle Ages, since it has been endowed with a "simplicity and an elegance that make [Terence] proper to be accurately studied as a model" as late as the early 19th century, according to the second US president John Adams.¹⁰

Terence's language constitutes an exemplary and ingenious way of model interpretation in more than one respect: inspired by the popularity of Menander *post mortem* thanks to his language, the common Attic speech which avoids dialectic infusions and extreme colloquialism, Terence similarly "chose consciously to distance himself from the linguistic/stylistic tradition of Plautus".¹¹ To be clear, Terence did not imitate Menander's language and style but rather Menander's inventive forging of a sophisticated yet ostensibly simple language. Menander's language was at once widely understood and distinctly personal, and yet meant to be embraced for its clarity of meaning, but also appreciated for its ability to produce a sexual joke through suggestive verbal humour and a clever turn of phrase, not vulgarity and explicitness, graphic language, or obscene gestures.¹² The authenticity in Terence's reproduction of Menander's plain speech is to be found in the production of plays from a complete scripted text that the actors were not allowed to alter during the performance (cf. full discussion in chapter 1). The 'fixidity' of Terence's texts pointedly contrasted the fluidity of Plautus' plot-making that was marked by the actors' improvisation while on stage, and this conscious break-away from the Plautine tradition is repeatedly commented upon in Terence's extradiegetic prologues, where references to the act of writing

¹⁰ McCullough (2001) 259; the phrase is recorded in one of the letters Adams wrote to his son advising the latter on his readings.

¹¹ The phrase is quoted from the back cover of Karakasis (2005) referring to the language of *Eunuch*.

¹² On the sophisticated 'simplicity' of Menander's language see recently Krauss and Miner (2009).

feature prominently with formulaic frequency. This new technique may or may not have won over the audience who attended these plays during the dramatist's lifetime,¹³ but it certainly proved catalytic in making Terence a timeless classic across the centuries. In this respect, Terence succeeded in surpassing Menander's popularity, after all.

The interpretative aspect of Terence's creative reaction to earlier tradition strings together the six papers in the First Part ('Terence as Interpreter'). Sophia Papaioannou's study of the prologues in the opening chapter ('The Innovator's Poetic Self-Presentation: Terence's Prologues as Interpretative Texts of Programmatic Poetics') follows the way Terence's interpretative interaction with the tradition of literary antagonism, and his capitalising on self-consciousness as a distinct style of personal expression, are articulated. The *fabula palliata* as a genre born and developed within a culture of antagonism logically may reflect upon its own poetics. Several important recent studies principally on Plautus have shown that there are numerous passages in which a play comments on its own merits or on the merits of another play by the same playwright.¹⁴ Papaioannou studies how poetic self-consciousness becomes a thematic motif in Terence's *palliata* poetics and she follows how the mission of comic craftsmanship is articulated in the diction of the Terentian prologue along these lines. The Terentian prologue is engineered to be a political text that declares innovative poetics and, following after the example of the Callimachean *Aetia* prologue, transforms itself into a text with programmatic function.

The principal elements of the meta-language of the prologues will be identified and analysed in this chapter to the extent that they re-contextualise traditional *palliata* poetics. In the opening section Papaioannou focuses on the metaliterary and meta-linguistic significance of *contaminatio*, the principal accusation cast against Terence's works, and the variant accusation of *furtum* (section I). Subsequently, she examines the *vetus* vs. *novus poeta* dichotomy in the context of poetic succession, and the literary politics tied to it (section II). The remainder of the chapter (section III) is concerned with the employment of the technology of oral poetic composition in the prologues in conjunction with the declaration that these texts (and the plays following them) are pieces of laborious writing. The emphasis on the scripted character of the plays to

¹³ For the critical majority Terence's plays were less popular than Plautus' own; *contra* Parker (1996).

¹⁴ E.g. Blänsdorf (1982); Riemer (1996); Frangoulidis (1997); Moore (1998); Slater (2000); Batstone (2005); Marshall (2006).

be produced directs the peculiar style of model-manipulation exercised by Terence. The interplay between orality and literacy in the prologues encapsulates Terence's new language of comic expression, which transfers Menander's comic style into Latin and also tries to incorporate parts of spontaneous dramaturgy as to maintain a distinctly Roman authorial identity.

By virtue of his stylised language, Terence stood outside, even rejected the consistent traditional style of Roman light drama, which is evident in the scripts of Plautus and the comic fragments alike.¹⁵ By building on research on Terence's own style, Jarrett Welsh in the second chapter ("Singing the *Sermo Comicus* with Terence") sets out to consider how Terence interpreted and exploited stylistic tics of the traditional *sermo comicus*. Welsh points out that Terence's language is not monolithic: the dramatist was a skilful manipulator of speech, striving for diverse effects by modulating the utterances of character-types and of individual personages alike.¹⁶ One of those desired effects was, broadly, the abandonment of the traditional style, but it is also clear that Terence had a finely honed sense of that style and could imitate it when it suited him, as *Eunuch* amply and eloquently demonstrates.¹⁷ Just as J. Wright [(1974) 195] has argued that we must judge Plautus not by his failure to escape tradition, but by his success within that tradition, so too, it would seem, we must judge Terence not just as a dramatist who abandoned the language of his comic predecessors with little impact, linguistically, upon his successors, but also as a comedian who could work within tradition, exploiting its recognisable linguistic qualities to achieve his dramatic ends.

Focusing especially on language but with a secondary concern for dramatic function, Welsh examines the effects of traditional comic language in Terence's 'songs' (both *mutatis modis cantica* and the isolated lyric *cantica* of *Andria* and *Adelphoe*), aiming at a two-fold goal. First, he argues that Terence, like his predecessors but also his successors, exploited songs at moments of high emotion and high dramatic tension. This observation is not surprising, but is significant as an indicator of how attuned Terence was to the emotional fluctuations that we can now trace in the scripts of Plautus; for all that Terence abandoned Plautine polymetry and style, we can also see him fashioning his own interpretation of comic song and its functions. Secondly, he points out that, in the irruption of

¹⁵ J. Wright (1974); Karakasis (2005).

¹⁶ For instance, Maltby (1979), (1985); Martin (1995); Karakasis (2005), (2003), on meter.

¹⁷ With Karakasis (2005) 121-43.

elements of the traditional *sermo comicus* into the songs, we can see Terence's interpretation of that style. These arguments are necessarily somewhat more subjective than traditional arguments about the distribution of linguistic items, but they open up an important aspect of the function of linguistic colouring in Terence. While Terence sought certain verisimilistic effects in the modulations of language he gave his characters, he could also make those characters speak like their Roman comic ancestors; in those momentary irruptions of 'Plautinity', we get a glimpse of Terence interpreting and reworking the style of his predecessors.

The focus stays on Terence's language also in the third chapter, but the interpretative perspective now is dictated by genre. Evangelos Karakasis ("Tragic and Epic Interactions in Terentian Comedy") takes off from the premise that the language of Terence is a literary construction, a *Kunstsprache*, a rhetorically embellished *sermo*, often stylised and made up (fraught with inflated/padded style, a range of figures of speech, etc.), which occasionally makes use of several means to further distance itself from common linguistic habits. In this endeavour the comic dramatist draws not only on his archaising register but also on the diction of higher poetic registers (epic, tragedy), and specialised registers such as the sacral language, the legal and the formal-official *sermo* in general. The study of the influx of linguistic elements from other literary genres, specifically tragedy and epic, in Terence, is Karakasis' primary concern. Karakasis notes that tragedy, epic and comedy are the three genres mainly favoured by the Early Latin poets, with some of them (Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Naevius) composing in all three. By the time of Plautus and Terence, each of these three genres had developed their own tradition and distinctive generic markers in terms of themes and language/style, but 'generic interaction' operated without interruption, becoming with the passing of time subtler and more complex. This was especially the case with comedy, which traditionally invested in the transformation of the lofty genres of epic and tragedy, either by assimilation or by stark differentiation, in order to produce laughter.

Within this broad interpretative perspective, Karakasis looks into the way Terentian comedy interacts with the tragic and the epic, and advances a threefold approach: first, to survey the way in which this practice adds to the unfolding of the comic plot and the production of (generic) meaning, both in terms of a specific scene or dramatic act, and also within the whole of a comic drama; second, to examine this Terentian practice against the backdrop of the *palliata* tradition, especially Plautus; and third, to explore the means by which such a technique may be used for character

delineation and individualisation. Instances of such ‘generic interaction’ between tragedy or epic and comedy contribute to our understanding of the ways in which Terence read and, as such, interpreted earlier literature that often functions as a Terentian intertext.

Terence’s decision to follow Menander rather than other equally popular Greek dramatists of New Comedy, such as Diphilos or Philemon, was directed both by the original style of Menander’s comic speech (which was the exception rather than the rule during Menander’s lifetime, and yet was the reason he skyrocketed in popularity after his death) and by the knowledge that Menander was not Plautus’ primary model. The fourth chapter, by Sophia Papaioannou, titled “Terence’s Literary Self-Consciousness and the Anxiety of Menander’s Influence”, focuses on various registers of the special relationship between Terence and Menander, specifically as this applies to the phenomenon of literary metatheatricity. The chapter identifies and explores examples of model referentiality in Terence, wherein it is possible to identify interaction with the Menandrian text (though not necessarily a specific Menandrian text). The anatomy of this intertextual engagement showcases Terence’s approach towards ‘interpreting’ the model, meaning his effort to identify issues that exhibit the originality of Menander in the context of the Comedy genre of his day, and underscore their importance by treating them anew in conjunction with his own understanding of the reformed *palliata*.

Two representative case studies illustrate the thoughtful character of Terence’s agonistic interaction with Menander. In the first, Papaioannou zooms in on the question of the potential textual relationship between Terence’s *Eunuchus* and Menander’s *Kolax*, acknowledged in the prologue to *Eunuchus* (whose primary model is Menander’s *Eunouchos*); there, Terence states that he took the characters of the parasite and the soldier in his *Eunuchus* from *Kolax*—and only from that play. With this statement, Terence underscores his independence from other famous Roman dramatic ‘readings’ of *Kolax* (and possibly alerts his audience to those other plays), and encourages an appreciation of his innovative reinterpretation of the stock comic character of the parasite that plays a dominant role in all these plays. Papaioannou’s second example of intertextual interpretation discusses the creative reception of the political character of New Comedy in Terence, as depicted in *Phormio* and the dramatisation therein of situations informed by Athenian family legislation. The play develops around the Athenian law of the *epiklēros* and comments upon a series of important issues on citizenship identity.

Terence chose to ‘Romanise’ this distinctly Athenian dramatic cultural environment by urging his audience to discern the meta-dramatic commentary behind a political façade.

In the next chapter (“Terence, the Corrective Reader and Innovator”) Alison Sharrock argues along similar but much broader lines. She explores Terence’s interpretative readings not only of Menander but of the entire comic tradition that preceded (and, perhaps, even haunted) him. This tradition includes Plautus, Aristophanes but also Euripides, whose later plays are generally considered to have inspired important changes in the evolution of the comic drama during the fourth century. Coming at the end of the first great flowering of Roman literature, Terence was acutely conscious of his place within a dramatic and literary tradition. Although parody of other literature, particularly comic parody of tragedy, had played a role in Greek and Roman drama for centuries, Terence was remarkable in the extent to which he applied careful and critical reading of earlier texts in the composition of his own, thus producing pointed re-readings which we may see as early precursors of the Augustan method of intertextuality and poetic correction. Sharrock draws on a number of case studies to explore Terence’s knowing corrections of past dramatic texts and his innovations in narrative technique.

An example of such ‘correction’ of specific earlier texts is the overheard scene which causes a change of heart in *Hecyra* and *Epitrepontes*. This scene is transferred from the young couple to one of the older couples, thus greatly developing the strands of human interaction involved in the play. This chapter will also offer a close reading of *Phormio*, as a case study in Terentian techniques of narrative exposition and direction of the audience as reader, both of the play itself and of the tradition. Sharrock’s analysis comprises the parasite-type embodied in Phormio and the particularly complicated portrait of the *senex amator* Chremes, whose conduct in this play “appears to take erotic complication among the older generation to a level of excess almost unparalleled in Greek and Roman Comedy” (Sharrock, this volume, p. 138). The portrait of the extraordinary *senex amator* and the plot developing around an adulterous-bigamous situation as a result, evoke similar circumstances in Plautus, most clearly the plots of *Epidicus* and *Cistellaria*, which Sharrock then proceeds to illustrate, and thus prove the corrective, innovative revision that the Plautine plotting has undergone in *Phormio*.

In the sixth and last chapter of Part One, Papaioannou looks at Terentian characterisation as another way of interpretation (“Terence’s

Stock Characters and Plots: Stereotypes ‘Interpreted’”). Terence evokes the typical behaviour of stock characters only to prove that prejudices are wrong. Thus, in *Andria* the old man both enters the play with a plan of his own and implements it by tricking his son into marrying a bride he, the father, has chosen. Furthermore, nearly all courtesans in Terence are agreeable and kind; Sostrata, the *matrona* of *Hecyra*, is the most sympathetic female of her dramatic kind; while her son, the *adulescens* in the same play, takes over the *callidus* part and along with it the control of the plot. Even more impressive than the magnanimous courtesans and the amicable wives, is Terence’s marginalisation of the ‘cunning slave’, a process that evolves gradually in the six-play corpus. Such a dynamic revision of comic stereotypes is vital in bringing forth the liveliness of Terence’s dramatic art. Audience and characters alike are deceived because they rely on social and comic expectations. From this perspective, Terence interprets ‘deception’ (a crucial concept in New Comedy) anew, giving it a new dimension.

The first half of the chapter follows the gradual deposition of the cunning slave from the control of the plot in all six plays, and assesses the alternative mechanisms developed in replacement, from the standpoint of dramaturgical artistry and appeal to an audience trained to determine the success of a *palliata* on the basis of set criteria dictated by genre. The remaining part discusses mostly *Hecyra* and argues that the plot of deception is played out against the background of social and comic stereotypes. Such an approach is crucially informed by the reading of *Hecyra* in Sharrock (2009) and focuses on the subversion of stock characters as being the driving force of Terence’s comic plot. To that end, Papaioannou examines the overall behaviour of Terence’s characters, but also analyses conventional comic diction in detail, in order to show that Terence raises his audience’s expectations only to flout them.

The Second Part (‘Interpretations of Terence’), comprised of four chapters in total, examines Terence’s artistry from the perspective of his readers. These readers, unlike the dramatist’s contemporary audience, are experienced literary critics—professional appraisers of literature or literary figures themselves. In their own peculiar ways, they read Terence’s plays from a philological standpoint which is directed by individual objectives. Their approach is markedly different from the reaction of literary critics when confronted with dynamic and complex intertextual compositions forged in agonistic context and at the eve of a great cultural revolution. This, however, does not mean that these ancient readers were not alive to literary criticism. At least Donatus was very much interested in Terence’s

characterisation and the way Terence experiments with the conventions of New Comedy as far as character portrayal is concerned (see Demetriou's discussion in chapter 9). The philological interpretations of Terence explored here include those of Cicero, Donatus and the long tradition of the medieval translators of *Andria* from the tenth century CE onwards.

Chapter 7, by Gesine Manuwald, defines, as the title denotes, "Cicero, an Interpreter of Terence". Cicero is well known to quote extensively from early Roman drama in almost all of his writings. As he is still linked to the creative period of early Roman drama, since he knew Accius and saw performances in the theatre, in addition to reading dramatic scripts, he is generally regarded as one of the main sources on early Roman drama and its reception in the first century BCE. In the case of Roman Republican tragedy and other dramatic genres that only survive in fragments, Cicero's references have contributed to preserving pieces and can provide clues as to how these isolated lines may be interpreted. It is, however, obvious that it was not Cicero's aim to record information on early Roman drama (he did not write dramatic treatises like his contemporary Varro); instead, he refers to verses and scenes as an element within the general knowledge of an educated Roman of his day and exploits the material in his argument.

Manuwald notes that whenever Cicero quotes from fragmentary plays, there are often hints in his text suggesting that he interprets the excerpts in a particular way as it suits him, but it is impossible to establish the relationship between the original meaning in the dramatic context and Cicero's interpretation. Within the area of Roman drama Terence (whom Cicero quotes more frequently than Plautus) provides a unique example since in this case Cicero's references and interpretations can be checked against a complete text. Manuwald's contribution, by means of a paradigmatic overview of some of Cicero's most telling quotations of Terence, investigates how Cicero uses Terence and what this reveals about his reading of Terence. She explores whether there is any pattern or how far the views expressed and the details given in these quotations depend on the respective contexts, and subsequently considers how Cicero's assessment of Terence's works had an impact on designating these plays (as well as the plays of other early Roman dramatists) as pieces of literature. She also studies Cicero's engagement with the plays, his tendency to excerpt quotations, and she underscores Cicero's influence on the formation of the rules determining the reception of dramatic literature in the first century BCE. While some work on Cicero's quotations of early Roman drama has already been done, Manuwald's discussion is the first

systematic attempt to explore fully the specific character and function of Cicero's references to Terence.

Five centuries later, the Roman grammarian and rhetorician Aelius Donatus will produce a commentary on Terence's plays. His comments constitute the earliest systematic interpretation of Terence and the source of necessary reference for all critical readers of Terence since. In this volume, the interpretative character of Donatus' commentary is approached from two different but complementary angles. First, in chapter 8 ("Donatus on Style and Language in the Plays of Terence"), Robert Maltby investigates remarks in the commentary of Aelius Donatus, on the rhetorical theory of the *proprium*, or 'appropriate style' as it applies to the language of Terence's plays. The comments contain discussions of the stylistic level appropriate to comedy as opposed to tragedy, and the circumstances in which tragic diction could be employed in comedy. They also discuss the levels of language appropriate to the different character-types and dramatic situations in the plays. In this respect, Maltby's study is linked to Karakasis' interpretative perspective of Terence's style and the language of Terence's characters. Karakasis is investigating Terence's experimentation with language in the *palliata* setting, and Maltby is looking at how Donatus interprets Terence's language.

The chapter investigates Donatus' views on the role in Terentian comedy of what he identifies as archaic and colloquial language, including dramatic interjections, and of etymological and other types of word play. The emphasis falls mainly on what Donatus sees as the literary function of these stylistic features in Terence. Maltby shows, however, that Donatus' comments on style have a double educational role. While at a primary level they are concerned with making literary judgments on the plays under discussion, they are also aimed at providing his students with the knowledge of correct Latin usage as it applies to their own time and how this may on occasion differ from what was acceptable in the period in which Terence was writing. From this point of view the commentary can be taken as a valuable document for the state of the Latin language in the fourth century CE. In a final section of his chapter Maltby draws some general conclusions on the purpose of the stylistic comments analysed, on their relation to the ancient tradition of dramatic commentary, and on their role within the broader field of fourth-century rhetorical and linguistic education.

The second paper on Donatus, by Chrysanthi Demetriou, looks at Donatus' sensitive reading of characterisation in Terence ("Performing

Terence's Characters: a Study of Donatus' Interpretation"). The commentator, Demetriou indicates, elaborates—among other things—on the way Terence makes use of comic traditions and conventions. In such instances, Donatus finds the opportunity to explain aspects of the genre and proceeds further to praise Terence and analyse the way the playwright follows or even alters comic stereotypes and conventions. Perhaps the most well-known (and most discussed) instance of 'surpassing' the comic tradition is Donatus' discussion about the comic courtesan.¹⁸ Nevertheless, as Demetriou illustrates in her contribution, Donatus is interested in other Terentian characters as well. After pointing out that Donatus' references to Terence's comic characters have been mainly treated in regard to the commentator's interest in linguistic characterisation, Demetriou examines the systematic representation of comic characters by Terence. In this context, she argues that the commentator, following the principle that comic character-types are defined by certain characteristics, proceeds to a systematisation of these characters' performance. Donatus' scholia on the way Terence's comedy is performed (in terms of voice, face and, mainly, gesture) often show a detailed interpretation of Terence's characterisation; hence, according to the commentator, some well-known comic characters seem to present a uniform nonverbal behaviour which is consistent with their traditional (or even Terentian) characteristics.

As Demetriou makes clear, the study of such scholia revolves around two axes: first, we have Donatus' interpretation of Terence's use of comic conventions and, second, we are consequently urged to think of Terence's actual interpretation and use of such conventions, mostly in regard to the (visual) representation of well-known characters. Although considerations on Donatus' sources and the context of his work lie in the background, the discussion focuses on the commentator's principles of interpretation. The critical issue a modern reader faces, therefore, is to consider whether Donatus' interpretation is always right. Directed by these questions Demetriou looks at Donatus' scholia on performance with emphasis on Donatus' discussion of comic character-types, in close connection with his understanding of central aspects in Terence's comic composition.

The final chapter, by Peter Brown, accomplishes the ambitious task of reviewing the long tradition of the translations of *Andria*, Terence's first play, from the tenth century onwards ("Interpretations and Adaptations of Terence's *Andria*, from the Tenth to the Twentieth Century"). In defining the scope of his study Brown begins with the acknowledgement of a

¹⁸ Detailed discussion in Demetriou (2010).

general approval for Terence's works across the literary traditions in the centuries following the Late Antiquity, specifically from the tenth century onwards, and he proposes to systematise and present as 'interpretations' the different uses made of *Andria* across these centuries. In his own words, "the fortunes of [*Andria*] have been typical of the fortunes of all of Terence's plays: they were admired, imitated, translated, performed and quoted, a reference point for anyone with any pretensions to learning or culture, for a great many centuries, and it was only in the twentieth century that they ceased to 'maintain an universal, undisputed empire over the minds of men' and became a rather specialised taste even within the world of Classical scholarship" (Brown, this volume, pp. 242-3). The exclusive focus on *Andria* is dictated first and foremost by the limitations of space (the reception of Terence's work in the post-Latin European world, Brown admits, is a vast topic that has never yet been fully documented, and the variety of literary reactions recorded in the various national traditions requires a study much longer than a chapter), and secondly by the fact that *Andria* was the first Latin comedy ever to have been performed in the Renaissance (at Florence in 1476), the first Latin comedy to be translated into English (in the 1520s), and an overall Terentian favourite.

Brown's point of departure is not a translation but an adaptation of Terence's *Andria*, by Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim, who created original literature by drawing directly and deliberately on Terence, and he discusses the extent to which one might discover critical intention behind Hrotsvitha's reproduction of the Terentian *Andria* phraseology and also how Hrotsvitha's prologues try to rephrase into her own dramatic context, so unlike that of Terence's own (Hrotsvitha's comedies are about Christian saints), the polemic of Terence's prologues. Then, Brown moves on to the 16th-century translations of *Andria*. First he discusses Machiavelli, where among other things he points out the influence of the commentators Guido Juvenalis and Donatus, whose interpretative comments influenced Machiavelli's choice of expression at several points. Next, under Brown's focus comes the first English translation of *Andria*, a team project, composed in 1520, for a production of the play at Cambridge University (a fairly accurate translation, in verse and in rhyme, and quite lively even though a bit more restrained than Machiavelli's). The third and final 16th-century translation Brown examines—in his view, the best of all—is the German translation by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, which was the first that translated Terence's critical prologue, while also observed the meters of the original Latin and included stage directions. The next two sections in Brown's chapter assess 'interpretations' of *Andria*, first in a series of staged performances, and then in various dramatic adaptations, all the way